

How to Collect Segmentations for Biomedical Images?

A Benchmark Evaluating the Performance of Experts, Crowdsourced Non-Experts, and Algorithms

Danna Gurari¹, Diane Theriault¹, Mehrnoosh Sameki¹, Brett Isenberg², Tuan A. Pham², Alberto Purwada², Patricia Solski², Matthew Walker³, Chentian Zhang², Joyce Y. Wong², Margrit Betke¹,¹ *Department of Computer Science*; ² *Department of Biomedical Engineering*; ³ *Department of Biology*

Motivation

Biology: Relationship between *shape* and *function*?

Question: How to extract accurate object boundaries from images?

Key Challenges:

- * Which annotation method?
- * How to evaluate an annotation method? (no references for “images in the wild”)

Image Library

ID	Modality	Object Type	Mag.	Avg. Pixel Count	Avg. Circularity	Avg. Object Intensity	Avg. Bkgnd Intensity	# Objs
1	Phase Contrast	Rat smooth muscle cells	40x	35,613	0.15	64	61	35
2	Phase Contrast	Rabbit smooth muscle cells	10x	10,963	0.29	52	50	69
3	Phase Contrast	Fibroblasts	10x	3,937	0.53	58	50	47
4	Fluorescence	Lu melanoma cells	10x	836	0.53	48	17	61
5	Fluorescence	WM993 melanoma cells	10x	1,119	0.71	54	19	58
6	MRI	Rabbit aorta	10x	216	0.94	25	42	35

3 image acquisition modalities 6 biological entities 305 Objects

Annotation Methods

Algorithms: Lankton level set, Shi level set, Chan Vese level set, seeded watershed, Hough Transform, Otsu thresholding

Crowdsourcing: LabelMe & Mechanical Turk

Consensus: Pixel Majority Vote

Acknowledgments

NSF Grants: IIS-1421943, IIS-0910908

Method Evaluation

Gold Standard (A) Annotation (B)

$J(A, B) = \frac{|A \cap B|}{|A \cup B|}$

J(A,B) = 0 J(A,B) > 0 J(A,B) -> 1

Expert performance differs, especially for different datasets

Crowd consensus exceeds performance of individual crowd workers

Algorithm performance varies widely, especially for different datasets

Method Comparison

Crowdsourcing consensus statistically similar to experts!

Experts perform best Crowdsourcing similar to experts! Algorithms perform worst

1 2 3 4 5 6