

EVALUATION OF MODEL SELECTION FOR KERNEL FRAGMENT RECOGNITION IN CORN SILAGE

Christoffer Bøgelund Rasmussen & Thomas B. Moeslund

Department of Architecture, Design & Media Technology

Aalborg University

Rendsburggade 14, 9000 Aalborg, Denmark

{cbra,tbm}@create.aau.dk

ABSTRACT

Model selection when designing deep learning systems for specific use-cases can be a challenging task as many options exist and it can be difficult to know the trade-off between them. Therefore, we investigate a number of state of the art CNN models for the task of measuring kernel fragmentation in harvested corn silage. The models are evaluated across a number of feature extractors and image sizes in order to determine optimal model design choices based upon the trade-off between model complexity, accuracy and speed. We show that accuracy improvements can be made with more complex meta-architectures and speed can be optimised by decreasing the image size with only slight losses in accuracy. Additionally, we show improvements in Average Precision at an Intersection over Union of 0.5 of up to 20 percentage points while also decreasing inference time in comparison to previously published work. This result for better model selection enables opportunities for creating systems that can aid farmers in improving their silage quality while harvesting.

1 INTRODUCTION

Computer vision systems for quality inspection are widespread throughout agriculture and many other industries. Deep learning has become the driving force in many applications largely due to advantages such as potentially high accuracy and ease of use due to the large number of open source libraries. The common methodology for training the networks is either to adapt an open-source network or for an author to design their own network. However, it can be difficult to choose which network is best for a specific task as it often comes with a trade-off between complexity, accuracy and speed. Therefore, in this work our contribution is showing a systematic approach to create an overview over the trade-off for a specific agricultural task of corn kernel fragment recognition from corn silage harvested from a forage harvester. In corn silage kernels must be cracked sufficiently such that when used as fodder for dairy cows the starch content is easily ingested and milk yield can be optimised (Johnson et al., 2003). A recognition system for high quality can help farmers use their machine optimally, avoiding both quality decreasing by up to 25% and inefficient usage of diesel fuel (Marsh, 2013). Furthermore, such systems can help solve the potential food crisis as the population is expected to reach 9.1 billion in 2050 (FAO, 2009).

This work extends upon that done in Rasmussen & Moeslund (2019) where it was shown that kernel fragment shape and size characteristics could be measured with Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) for bounding-box detection and instance segmentation, however, only a single form of each was trained and it is unknown if these architectures are optimal. In Huang et al. (2017) the trade-off between speed and accuracy was explored for CNN-based object detectors. Whilst comprehensive and useful as the open-source implementations are available through TensorFlow object detection API, networks are trained and evaluated on the large COCO benchmark dataset (Lin et al., 2014) and it is not as clear what the trade-off is for a specific use-case on a smaller scale like kernel fragmentation. We provide an overview of the trade-off for the kernel recognition by training variants of three meta-architectures of increasing complexity with the API from Huang et al. (2017) and explore different feature extractors and input image resolutions. This allows us to show an approach to determine optimal model design choices for CNN-based kernel fragment recognition.

2 DATA

The data used to train and test the networks are the same as that used in Rasmussen & Moeslund (2019) and consist of RGB images of silage taken post-harvest. Typically, kernel processing evaluation requires the separation of kernels and stover (leaves and stalks) either through manual means as in (Mertens, 2005; Penn State Extension, 2016) followed by sieving measurements or sieving estimation with image processing (Drewry et al., 2019). However, the manual separation step can be cumbersome making it problematic for a farmer whilst harvesting. Therefore, in Rasmussen & Moeslund (2019) images and annotations were collected of non-separated corn silage for a direct measurement.

The dataset consists of a total of 2043 images with 11601 kernel fragment annotations. A notable difference in this work compared to Rasmussen & Moeslund (2019) is a validation set is added to combat overfitting whilst training by evaluating a model variant with the lowest validation loss. In Rasmussen & Moeslund (2019) the data was split 60% for training and 40% for testing, here we keep the same training set but evenly split the original test set such that validation and test cover 20% each. For the variation of image sizes when training and testing models images are resized from the original images dimensions of 640×1280 to either 600×1200 , 400×730 or 200×365 using bilinear interpolation.

3 CNN META-ARCHITECTURES

The TensorFlow object detection API provides a number of options for meta-architectures and includes pre-trained models with different backbone feature extractors and hyperparameters. Hyperparameters for the training of our models remained unchanged to the configurations files provided in the API, apart from the learning rate being decreased by a factor of 10 as only fine-tuning is performed. Networks are trained using TensorFlow 1.13.1 on a machine containing an NVIDIA Titan XP and GTX 1080Ti.

The first meta-architecture adopted is the Single Shot Multibox Detector (SSD) and is an efficient single-stage bounding-box detector. SSD has a competitive accuracy whilst running much faster than other more complex networks. For the varying complexity of feature extraction within SSD we adopt MobileNetv1 (Howard et al., 2017), MobileNetv2 (Sandler et al., 2018) and InceptionV2 (Szegedy et al., 2016). Next, we train Faster R-CNN, a two-stage bounding-box detector that utilises the Region Proposal Network (RPN) to produce candidate proposals whose boxes are regressed and classified. For Faster R-CNN we train variants with Inceptionv2, ResNet50 and ResNet101 from He et al. (2015). Lastly and most complex is the instance segmentation network Mask R-CNN (He et al., 2017). The network is an extension of Faster R-CNN but with the added ability of producing masks for prediction. As the RPN is also part of Mask R-CNN the network is also able to output bounding-boxes, thus both forms will be evaluated. The feature extractors trained for Mask R-CNN are also Inceptionv2, ResNet50 and ResNet101.

4 RESULTS

The results in Table 1 are based upon a subset of the COCO metrics where the models with bounding-box predictions can be seen in first section and segmentation models in the second section. Additionally, we show the AP@0.5 results from Rasmussen & Moeslund (2019) for R-FCN Dai et al. (2016b) with ResNet101 and the MNC (Dai et al., 2016a) with AlexNet (Krizhevsky et al., 2012). As mentioned in Section 2, we altered the test set such that a validation set is also available. Therefore, the results are not calculated on the exact same images as in Rasmussen & Moeslund (2019) but we argue that the new test set is large enough such that the results are comparable.

The results in Table 1 are visualised in Figure 1 where we show the AP@0.5 in (a), AP in (b) and AR@100 in (c) all against the inference time of the models. Firstly, we see a significant improvement in the AP@0.5 in comparison to the R-FCN model from Rasmussen & Moeslund (2019) in addition to a decrease in inference time for all SSD variants and some of the Faster R-CNNs and Mask R-CNNs. The models trained in this work have an AP@0.5 of around 20 percentage points higher, while running at up to $5-8 \times$ faster for bounding-boxes. However, the segmentation variants proved to be slower than previous with only the Mask R-CNN Inceptionv2 at image size 200×365 running

Table 1: Results of the models on the test set. The bounding-box outputs are evaluated are shown in the first section followed by the segmentation outputs.

MODEL	IMAGE SIZE	AP	AP@0.5	AR@100	INFERENCE TIME (ms)
R-FCN ResNet101 (Rasmussen & Moeslund, 2019)	600×1200	NA	34.0	NA	101.0
	600×1200	20.3	43.5	41.8	18.8
	400×730	16.0	34.9	38.9	13.8
	200×365	9.7	27.9	30.8	13.2
SSD MobileNetV1	600×1200	22.2	47.0	44.5	21.1
	400×730	22.1	48.7	43.7	15.6
	200×365	13.5	35.9	33.9	15.4
	600×1200	19.3	41.3	39.1	24.8
SSD MobileNetV2	400×730	19.6	46.3	37.9	19.6
	200×365	14.6	36.9	32.4	18.3
	600×1200	25.6	51.9	45.1	51.1
	400×730	24.5	52.5	41.5	44.1
SSD InceptionV2	200×365	15.7	39.4	27.5	41.6
	600×1200	24.5	51.1	45.8	96.8
	400×730	20.5	44.5	38.0	84.8
	200×365	10.7	29.2	23.3	76.2
Faster R-CNN InceptionV2	600×1200	25.5	52.1	45.3	112.4
	400×730	22.0	47.1	40.6	92.4
	200×365	11.1	28.5	22.9	81.9
	600×1200	26.0	52.7	46.5	129.8
Faster R-CNN ResNet50	400×730	24.6	50.7	43.5	94.5
	200×365	16.4	39.0	29.4	68.5
	600×1200	26.4	50.7	49.2	316.6
	400×730	26.4	51.2	46.5	256.8
Faster R-CNN ResNet101	200×365	13.4	30.0	27.0	214.7
	600×1200	26.9	52.4	50.1	381.5
	400×730	27.5	54.0	47.8	281.1
	200×365	16.0	35.6	34.5	222.0
<hr/>					
MNC AlexNet (Rasmussen & Moeslund, 2019)	600×1200	NA	36.1	NA	87.0
	600×1200	23.3	51.5	41.2	129.8
	400×730	21.7	49.6	38.2	94.5
	200×365	14.1	36.7	24.8	68.5
Mask R-CNN InceptionV2	600×1200	23.7	49.8	43.6	316.6
	400×730	24.2	50.7	42.0	256.8
	200×365	12.2	30.1	24.8	214.7
	600×1200	25.3	52.0	46.4	381.5
Mask R-CNN ResNet50	400×730	26.1	53.8	44.4	281.1
	200×365	14.8	35.6	28.7	222.0

1.27× faster and improving AP@0.5 by 0.6 percentage points in comparison to the MNC model from Rasmussen & Moeslund (2019). However, improvements of up to 17.7 percentage points are seen for more complex models but at a cost of increased inference time.

Comparing the varying meta-architecture complexity we see that there is a slight gain in the metrics when evaluating bounding-box outputs. However, this comes at a cost of inference time, especially between Faster R-CNN and Mask R-CNN. Within each meta-architecture we see slight differences between feature extractors. At 600×1200 AP for SSD improves by 9.4% from MobileNetv1 to MobileNetv2 but falls for Inceptionv2, Faster R-CNN increases by 4.5% from Inceptionv2 to ResNet101 and Mask R-CNN by 3.5% from Inceptionv2 to ResNet101. This shows that less is gained spending time on determining the optimal architecture for feature extraction in comparison to choosing the meta-architecture. This is in contrast to the findings in Huang et al. (2017) where large improvements could be made, for example, Faster R-CNN had a 70% increase in AP on the MS COCO test set over the evaluated feature extractors. Finally, we do see improvements in the metrics when increasing the image size from 200×365 to 400×730, but not as much when between 400×730 and 600×1200. Additionally, a significant increase in inference time is seen for most meta-architectures when the image size is at the largest.

Lastly, an example image with predictions from the best performing model with respect to AP and AP@0.5 can be seen in Figure 2.




Figure 1: Results from the model variants for AP@0.5 (a), AP (b) and AR@100 (c) against inference time on an NVIDIA Titan XP. Models producing bounding-box outputs are shown with a solid line and square points and segmentation outputs are shown with a dashed line and diamond points. The increase in image size is shown by an increase in the size of the respective points.




Figure 2: Left: Mask R-CNN ResNet101 (400x730) predictions. Right: Ground truth annotations.

5 CONCLUSIONS

In this work we have shown a systematic approach to train object recognition networks towards the task of kernel fragment recognition in corn silage whilst providing an overview of the trade-off in complexity, accuracy and speed. We show that slight improvements in AP and AR can be made by adopting more complex meta-architectures but at a larger cost of inference time. For all models the gain in AP and AR from a small to a medium image size was considerable, however, was minimal or worse when increasing onwards to a larger size. Minimal improvements could be made when altering the feature extractor for each meta-architecture, a contrast to findings on COCO in (Huang et al., 2017). We propose that this approach can be transferred to other similar domains where training data can be sparse in order to select an appropriate model and speculate that these design choices for our models could be directly transferred to tasks with similarities in images, such as high amounts of clutter and occlusion. The improvements in kernel fragment recognition through better model selection open possibilities for a more efficient and robust system for farmers to obtain improved yields.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was funded by Innovation Fund Denmark under Grant 7038-00170B.

REFERENCES

- Jifeng Dai, Kaiming He, and Jian Sun. Instance-aware semantic segmentation via multi-task network cascades. In *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2016, Las Vegas, NV, USA, June 27-30, 2016*, pp. 3150–3158. IEEE Computer Society, 2016a. doi: 10.1109/CVPR.2016.343. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2016.343>.
- Jifeng Dai, Yi Li, Kaiming He, and Jian Sun. R-fcn: Object detection via region-based fully convolutional networks. In D. D. Lee, M. Sugiyama, U. V. Luxburg, I. Guyon, and R. Garnett (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29*, pp. 379–387. Curran Associates, Inc., 2016b. URL <http://papers.nips.cc/paper/6465-r-fcn-object-detection-via-region-based-fully-convolutional-networks.pdf>.
- Jessica L. Drewry, Brian D. Luck, Rebecca M. Willett, Eduardo M.C. Rocha, and Joshua D. Harmon. Predicting kernel processing score of harvested and processed corn silage via image processing techniques. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture*, 160:144 – 152, 2019. ISSN 0168-1699. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2019.03.020>. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0168169918311955>.
- FAO. How to Feed the World 2050. http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/wsfs/docs/expert_paper/How_to_Feed_the_World_in_2050.pdf (accessed February 10, 2020), 2009.
- K. He, G. Gkioxari, P. Dollr, and R. Girshick. Mask r-cnn. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pp. 2980–2988, Oct 2017. doi: 10.1109/ICCV.2017.322.
- Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pp. 770–778, 2015.
- Andrew G. Howard, Menglong Zhu, Bo Chen, Dmitry Kalenichenko, Weijun Wang, Tobias Weyand, Marco Andreetto, and Hartwig Adam. Mobilenets: Efficient convolutional neural networks for mobile vision applications. *CoRR*, abs/1704.04861, 2017. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1704.04861>.
- J. Huang, V. Rathod, C. Sun, M. Zhu, A. Korattikara, A. Fathi, I. Fischer, Z. Wojna, Y. Song, S. Guadarrama, and K. Murphy. Speed/accuracy trade-offs for modern convolutional object detectors. In *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pp. 3296–3297, July 2017. doi: 10.1109/CVPR.2017.351.
- L.M. Johnson, J.H. Harrison, D. Davidson, W.C. Mahanna, and K. Shinnors. Corn silage management: Effects of hybrid, chop length, and mechanical processing on digestion and energy content. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 86(1):208 – 231, 2003. ISSN 0022-0302. doi: [https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302\(03\)73601-7](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(03)73601-7). URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022030203736017>.
- Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E Hinton. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. In F. Pereira, C. J. C. Burges, L. Bottou, and K. Q. Weinberger (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 25*, pp. 1097–1105. Curran Associates, Inc., 2012. URL <http://papers.nips.cc/paper/4824-imagenet-classification-with-deep-convolutional-neural-networks.pdf>.
- Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge J. Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C. Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *ECCV*, pp. 740–755, 2014.
- Brian H. Marsh. A comparison of fuel usage and harvest capacity in self-propelled forage harvesters. *International Journal of Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering*, 7(7):649 – 654, 2013. ISSN eISSN: 1307-6892. URL <https://publications.waset.org/vol/79>.
- David Mertens. Particle size, fragmentation index, and effective fiber: Tools for evaluating the physical attributes of corn silages. In: *Proceedings of the Four-State Dairy Nutrition and Management Conference*, 01 2005.

Penn State Extension. Penn State Particle Separator. <https://extension.psu.edu/penn-state-particle-separator> (accessed February 10, 2020), 2016.

Christoffer B. Rasmussen and Thomas B. Moeslund. Maize silage kernel fragment estimation using deep learning-based object recognition in non-separated kernel/stover rgb images. *Sensors*, 19 (19), 2019. ISSN 1424-8220. doi: 10.3390/s19163506. URL <https://www.mdpi.com/1424-8220/19/16/3506>.

Mark Sandler, Andrew G. Howard, Menglong Zhu, Andrey Zhmoginov, and Liang-Chieh Chen. Mobilenetv2: Inverted residuals and linear bottlenecks. In *2018 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2018, Salt Lake City, UT, USA, June 18-22, 2018*, pp. 4510–4520. IEEE Computer Society, 2018. doi: 10.1109/CVPR.2018.00474. URL http://openaccess.thecvf.com/content_cvpr_2018/html/Sandler_MobileNetV2_Inverted_Residuals_CVPR_2018_paper.html.

C. Szegedy, V. Vanhoucke, S. Ioffe, J. Shlens, and Z. Wojna. Rethinking the inception architecture for computer vision. In *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pp. 2818–2826, June 2016. doi: 10.1109/CVPR.2016.308.