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Abstract—Instance segmentation is an important pre-processing task in numerous real-world applications, such as robotics, autonomous vehicles, and human-computer interaction. Compared with the rapid development of deep learning for two-dimensional (2D) image tasks, deep learning-based instance segmentation of 3D point cloud still has a lot of room for development. In particular, distinguishing a large number of occluded objects of the same class is a highly challenging problem, which is seen in a robotic bin-picking. In a usual bin-picking scene, a lot of objects with one class are stacked together and an object model is known. Thus, the semantic information can be ignored; instead, the focus in the bin-picking is put on the segmentation of instances. Based on this task requirement, we propose a Fast Point Cloud Clustering for Instance Segmentation (FPCC) that includes a network named FPCC-Net and a fast clustering algorithm. FPCC-net has two subnets, one for inferring the geometric centers for clustering and the other for describing features of each point. FPCC-Net extracts features of each point and infers geometric center points of each instance simultaneously. After that, the proposed clustering algorithm clusters the remaining points to the closest geometric center in feature embedding space. The proposed method is compared with existing 3D point cloud and 2D segmentation methods in some bin-picking scenes. It is shown that FPCC-Net improves average precision (AP) by about 40% than SGPN and can process about 60,000 points in about 0.8 [s].
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1 INTRODUCTION

Aquisition of three-dimensional (3D) point cloud is no longer difficult due to advances in 3D measurement technology, such as passive stereo vision [1], [2], [3], phase shifting method [4], gray code [5], and other methods [6], [7], [8], [9], [10]. As a consequence, efficient and effective processing of 3D point cloud has become a new challenging problem. Segmentation of 3D point cloud is usually required as a pre-processing step in real-world applications. The 3D point cloud segmentation is helpful in robotic bin-picking [9], [11], autonomous vehicles [12], human-robot interaction [13], [14], visual servoing [8], and various types of 3D point cloud processing [15], [16]. In the field of robotics, bin-picking scenes have received much attention in the past decade. In this scene, a large number of objects of the same class are stacked together. Thus fast and practical 3D point cloud instance segmentation places significant demands on this type of scene. At present, an application of convolutional neural networks (CNNs) to instance segmentation of 3D point cloud is still far behind its practical use. The technical key points can be summarized as follows: 1) convolution kernels are more suitable for handling structured information, while raw 3D point cloud is unstructured and unordered; 2) the availability of high-quality, large-scale image datasets [17], [18], [19] has driven the application of deep learning to 2D images, but there are fewer 3D point cloud datasets; and 3) instance segmentation on 3D point cloud based on CNNs is time-consuming.

For key point 1), PointNet [20] has been proposed as the first framework which is suitable for processing unstructured and unordered 3D point clouds. PointNet does not transform 3D point cloud data to 3D voxel grids such as [21], [22], but uses multi-layer perceptions (MLPs) to learn the features of each point and has adopted max-pooling to obtain global information. The pioneering work of PointNet has prompted further research, and several researchers have introduced the structure of PointNet as the backbone of their network [23], [24], [25]. It is known that PointNet processes each point independently and it results in learning less local information [23], [26]. To enable learning of the 3D point cloud’s local information, the methods proposed in [26], [27], [28], [29], [30] have increased the network’s ability to perceive local information by exploring adjacent points.

For key point 2), some well-known 3D point cloud datasets include indoor scene datasets such as S3DIS [31] and SceneNN [32], driving scenario datasets such as KITTI dataset [33] and Apollo-SouthBay dataset [34], and single object recognition dataset likes ShapeNet dataset [22]. For robotic bin-picking, it is a huge and hard work to provide a general training dataset of various industrial objects and there is no such dataset currently. Synthesizing training data through simulation provides a feasible way to alleviate the lack of training dataset [35], [36], [37], [38], [39], [40].

For key point 3), the reasons why instance segmentation on 3D point cloud by CNNs is time-consuming are described as follows. Instance segmentation locates different instances, even if they are of the same class. As instances in the scene are disordered and their number is unpredictable,
it is impossible to represent instance labels with a fixed tensor. Therefore, the study of instance segmentation includes two methods: the proposal-based method requiring an object detection module and the proposal-free method without an object detection module. Mask R-CNN [41] belongs to the first method. Mask R-CNN decomposes the problem of instance segmentation into object detection and pixel-level segmentation of a single object. Proposal-based methods require complex post-processing steps to deal with many proposal regions and have poor performance in the presence of strong occlusion. For the instance segmentation of 3D point cloud, most researchers adopt the proposal-free method. The proposal-free method usually performs semantic segmentation at first and then distinguishing different instances via clustering or metric learning, which are time-consuming processes [24], [25], [37], [42].

This paper aims to design and proposes a fast point cloud clustering for instance segmentation method named FPCC consisting of FPCC-Net and a fast clustering algorithm based on the output of FPCC-Net. FPCC-Net is a graph convolutional neural network that can effectively segment the 3D point cloud at instance-level without training by any manually annotated data. FPCC-Net involves mapping all points to a discriminative feature embedding space, which satisfies the following two conditions: 1) points of the same instance have similar features, 2) points of different instances are widely separated in the feature embedding space. Simultaneously, FPCC-Net finds center points for each instance, and the center points are used as the reference point of the clustering process. After that, the fast clustering is performed based on the center points as shown in Fig. 1.

The main contributions of this work are as follows:

- A high-speed instance segmentation scheme for 3D point cloud is proposed.
- The proposed scheme is consisting of a novel network of 3D point cloud for instance segmentation named FPCC-Net and a novel clustering algorithm using the found center points.
- A hand-crafted attention mechanism is introduced into the loss function to improve the performance of FPCC-Net, and its effectiveness is verified in an ablative study.
- FPCC-Net trained by synthetic data demonstrates excellent performance on real data than SGPN and SD Mask R-CNN.
- Validation results show that the average precision (AP) of FPCC is about 40 points higher than that of SGPN on two datasets and the processing speed is very fast: about 60,000 points can be processed in 0.8 s.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses the progress of instance segmentation on images and 3D point cloud. Section 3 shows the structure and principle of FPCC-Net. Experimental analyses are provided in Section 4. Finally, section 5 concludes the paper.

We use the following notations in this paper. A real number set is represented by $\mathbb{R}$. A coordinate of point $i$ is denoted by $p_i = (x_i, y_i, z_i) \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Point cloud containing $N$ points is denoted by $P = \{p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_N\}$. Distance function is denoted by

$$d(a, b) = \|a - b\|_2, \quad (1)$$

where $d(a, b)$ denotes Euclidean distance between $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$. For a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $(i, j)$-th element of $A$ is denoted by $a_{i,j}$.

2 RELATED WORKS

With the emergence of CNNs, the methods of feature extraction from images and 3D point cloud have been changing from manual design to automatic learning [43], [44], [45]. Instance segmentation is one of the most basic tasks in the field of computer vision and receives much attention. Segmentation on two-dimensional (2D) images has been almost fully developed [46], [47], but 3D point cloud segmentation has remained underdeveloped.

2.1 Instance segmentation on 2D

K. He et al. [41] have proposed Mask R-CNN for object instance segmentation, which has shown good performance in almost all previous benchmarks for many instance segmentation tasks. Mask R-CNN has added a branch for the prediction of object mask to Faster R-CNN [48], which is a flexible and robust detection framework on a 2D image. Mask R-CNN effectively detects objects in the image and generates high-quality segmentation masks for each instance with a low computational cost. However, Mask R-CNN requires a lot of high-quality and manually labeled datasets [17], [49], while it is often difficult to obtain labeled datasets in industrial bin-picking scenes.

To overcome the difficulties of making datasets, SD Mask R-CNN [40] has been proposed as an extension of Mask R-CNN. The paper [40] also has presented a method to generate synthetic datasets rapidly, and the network is trained only with the generated synthetic depth images instead of RGB images. However, SD Mask R-CNN does not show enough performance, especially for multiple object instances with occlusion in the scene.

2.2 Instance segmentation on 3D point cloud

Some researchers have adopted the proposal-based method that detects objects and predicts the instance mask. J. Hou et al. [50] have combined images and 3D geometric information to infer the bounding boxes of objects in 3D space and the corresponding instance mask. B. Yang et al. [51] have directly regressed the bounding box of each instance in the 3D point cloud and simultaneously predicts point-level
Fig. 2: Network architecture of FPCC-Net. The represented 3D point cloud \([\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{z}_i, n_{i,x}, n_{i,y}, n_{i,z}]^T (i = 1, 2, \cdots, N)\) is fed into the network and the instance label is outputted for each point. The features of each point are extracted using a feature extractor and then sent to two respective branches. The embedded feature branch extracts 128-dimensional features of each point and the center score branch predicts the center score of each point. For supervising FPCC-Net, the following matrices are introduced. Valid distances matrix defined by (2?) is a binary matrix used to ignore some point pairs whose distance is greater than a certain threshold. Attention score matrix defined by (7) is used to increase the weight of point pairs closer to the center position.

masks for each instance. The proposal of 3D bounding box is time-consuming. Besides, the overlap of many objects in the bin-picking scenes makes it difficult to regress reasonable bounding boxes.

SGPN [24] is proposal-free and the first instance segmentation method to be directly performed on a 3D point cloud. SGPN performs the point cloud instance segmentation based on the hypothesis that the points of the same instance should have similar features. A subnetwork of SGPN predicts the confidence score of each point. The confidence score of each point indicates the confidence of the reference point of clustering. The authors [24] have highlighted an interesting phenomenon that the clustering confidence scores of the points located in the boundary area are lower than others. Inspired by this, FPCC takes only one point that is most likely to be the geometric center of the target object. The authors [24] have performed instance segmentation by clustering 3D points and mapping the features of points to the feature embedding space according to relationships of point pairs.

Although these proposal-free methods without the proposal regions have used different ways to extract features of points, they all need clustering methods to obtain the final instance label, which are time-consuming. The reason for time-consuming is described in more detail in Section 4.3.2. In addition, all these methods are based on public datasets such as S3DIS [31] and SceneNN [32] with real scenes. Making such a dataset for bin-picking scenes is a time-consuming and laborious task [37].

3 Method

This paper proposes a novel clustering method for instance segmentation on the 3D point cloud. The training data are 3D point cloud without color and can be automatically generated in simulation by using a 3D shape model of the target object. The main idea of fast clustering is to find geometric centers of each object, and then use these points as reference points for clustering. The training data are 3D point cloud without color and can be automatically generated in simulation by using a 3D shape model of the target object.

3.1 Backbone of FPCC-Net

In the first step, coordinates of original 3D point cloud \(p_i = (x_i, y_i, z_i), i = 1, 2, \ldots, N\) is converted to new coordinate system by

\[
\mathbf{x}_i = x_i - \min\{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_N\}, \\
\mathbf{y}_i = y_i - \min\{y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_N\}, \\
\mathbf{z}_i = z_i - \min\{z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_N\},
\]

Then converted each point is represented by a six-dimensional (6D) vector of \(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}\) and \(\pi\) and a normalized location \((n_x, n_y, n_z)\) as to the whole scene (from 0 to 1). The represented 3D point cloud is fed into the network and outputs are 128-dimensional features and the center score of each point.

As shown in Fig. 2, FPCC-Net has two branches that encode the feature of each point in the feature embedding
space and infer each point’s center score. First, the point-wise features of \( N \) points are extracted through a feature extractor. In FPCC-Net, DGCNN [26] without the last two layers is adopted as the feature extractor. DGCNN has better performance than PointNet in extracting the features of point cloud without color [37]. The extracted point-wise features with size \( N \times 256 \) are fed into two branches, embedded feature branch and center score branch.

In the embedded features branch, the extracted features pass through an MLP to generate an embedded feature with size \( N \times 128 \). The center score branch is parallel to the embedded feature branch and used to infer the center score of each point. In the center score branch, the point-wise features generated by the feature extractor are activated by a sigmoid function after passing through two MLP. Then, predicted center score \( \hat{s}_{\text{center}} \) with size \( N \times 1 \) is obtained. After the prediction of the center scores, We use algorithm 1 to find the points most likely to be the geometric centers of each object, and the found points are taken as reference points in the clustering process.

3.2 Inference phase

As described in the previous section, two branches of FPCC-Net output the embedded features and the center scores of each point. Non-maximum suppression is performed on all points with center scores to find the centers of each instance. The points with a center score higher than 0.6 are considered as candidates of the center points. The point with the highest center score is selected as a first candidate of the center point, and all the other points located in the sphere with the center being the candidate point and radius \( d_{\text{max}} \) are removed, where \( d_{\text{max}} \) means the maximum distance from the geometric center to the farthest point of the object. This process is repeated until there are no more points left. The detailed processes of selecting the center points are presented in Algorithm 1.

After the above process, the feature distances between the center points and the other points are computed by

\[
d(\mathbf{c}_F^{(i)}, \mathbf{c}_F^{(k)}) = \|\mathbf{e}_F^{(i)} - \mathbf{e}_F^{(k)}\|_2,
\]

where \( \mathbf{e}_F^{(k)} \) represents the feature of \( k \)-th center point selected by Algorithm 1, and \( \mathbf{e}_F^{(i)} \) represents the feature of \( i \)-th point in the remaining points. All points except the center points are clustered with the nearest center point in terms of the feature distance. Note that, we find the nearest center point \( c_k \) of point \( p_i \) in the feature embedding space, and then calculate Euclidean distance \( d(p_i, c_k) \) between \( p_i \) and \( c_k \) in 3D space. If \( d(p_i, c_k) \) exceeds \( d_{\text{max}} \), \( p_i \) is regarded as noise, and an instance label will not be assigned to \( p_i \).

3.3 Training phase

The loss of the network is a combination of two branches: \( L = L_{EF} + \alpha L_{CS} \), where \( L_{EF} \) and \( L_{CS} \) represent the losses of the embedded feature branch and the center score branch, respectively. The constant \( \alpha \) is a constant that makes \( L_{EF} \) and \( L_{CS} \) terms are roughly equally weighted. We introduce three matrices, feature distance matrix, valid distance matrix (VDM), and attention score matrix (ASM) for the learning of embedded features.

```
Algorithm 1: Non-maximum suppression algorithm on points; \( N \) is the number of points; \( K \) is the number of center points.

Input: Threshold for center score \( \theta_{th} \); Screening radius \( d_{\text{max}} \); Set of points \( P = \{p_1, p_2, ..., p_N\} \); Corresponding predicted center scores of points \( S = \{s_1, s_2, ..., s_N\} \)

Output: Center points \( C = \{c_1, c_2, ..., c_K\} \)

\[
\text{for } i = 1 \text{ to } N \quad \text{do}
\]

\[
\text{if } s_i \leq \theta_{th} \quad \text{then}
\]

\[
\text{P} \leftarrow P \setminus \{p_i\};
\]

\[
S \leftarrow S \setminus \{s_i\};
\]

\[
\text{end}
\]

\[
C \leftarrow \{\};
\]

\[
\text{while } P \neq \emptyset \quad \text{do}
\]

\[
m^* \leftarrow \arg \max_m \{s_m \mid s_m \in S\};
\]

\[
C \leftarrow P_{m^*};
\]

\[
P \leftarrow P \setminus \{p_{m^*}\};
\]

\[
S \leftarrow S \setminus \{s_{m^*}\};
\]

\[
\text{for } p_i \in P \quad \text{do}
\]

\[
\text{if } d(p_{m^*}, p_i) \leq d_{\text{max}} \quad \text{then}
\]

\[
P \leftarrow P \setminus \{p_i\};
\]

\[
S \leftarrow S \setminus \{s_i\};
\]

\[
\text{end}
\]

\[
\text{end}
\]

\[
\text{return } C;
\]
```

We explain our design for the training phase in the following order: feature distance matrix, valid distance matrix, center score, attention score matrix, embedded feature loss, and center score loss. Attention score matrix is obtained from the center score of each point.

3.3.1 Feature distance matrix

In the feature embedding space, the points belonging to the same instance should be close, while the points of different instances should be apart from each other. To make features of the points in the same instance similar, we introduce the following feature distance matrix \( D_F \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N} \). The \((i, j)\)-th element of \( D_F \) is represented by

\[
d_F(i,j) = \|\mathbf{e}_F^{(i)} - \mathbf{e}_F^{(j)}\|_2.
\]

3.3.2 Valid distance matrix

The valid distance matrix \( D_V \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N} \) is a binary matrix in which each element is 0 or 1. The purpose of introducing \( D_V \) is to make the network focus on distinguishing whether point pairs within a certain Euclidean distance belong to the same instance or not. In the inference phase, points are clustered based on the feature distance and the Euclidean distance of the point pair at the same time. If the Euclidean distance of two points exceeds twice the maximum distance \( d_{\text{max}} \), the two points cannot belong to the same instance. Therefore, we ignore these point pairs with too far distance...
Fig. 3: Distribution of the center score in the same scene. It is apparent that $\beta = 2$ makes the scores more uniform in the 0-1 interval.

so that they do not contribute to the loss. The $(i, j)$-th element of $D_V$ is defined by

$$d_{V(i,j)} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \|p_i - p_j\|_2 < 2d_{\text{max}} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

Equation (5) indicates whether the Euclidean distance between point $p_i$ and $p_j$ is within a reasonable range or not.

3.3.3 Center score

The center score is designed such that it should reflect the distance between a point and its corresponding center. The points near the center of object have higher scores than the points on the boundary. Based on this concept, the center score of $p_i$ is introduced by

$$s_{\text{center}}(i) = 1 - \left( \frac{\|p_i - c_i\|_2}{d_{\text{max}}} \right)^\beta,$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

where $\beta$ is a positive constant and $c_i$ is the coordinate of the geometric center of the instance to which point $p_i$ belongs. The value of $s_{\text{center}}(i)$ is in the range $[0, 1]$. If $\beta = 1$, the distribution of the center score will lead to imbalances, as shown in Fig. 3: only a very small number of points have higher scores, while most points have lower scores. This causes the center score branch to fail to effectively predict the center scores (all scores are biased towards zero). Fig. 3 shows that $\beta = 2$ leads to more uniform balance than $\beta = 1$. Thus, $\beta$ is set to 2 in our implementation. The center scores are visualized in Fig. 4. Fig. 4 shows that the points on the boundary area are mostly scored 0, and those near the center are approximately scored 1.

3.3.4 Attention score matrix

We introduce attention score matrix $S_A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ to increase the weight of important point pairs. The $(i, j)$-th element of $S_A$ represents the weight of a point pair for point $i$ and $j$. Because the center point is used as the reference point for clustering in inference phase, the point pair closer to the center position should have a higher weight. In this paper, $s_{A(i,j)}$ is computed by

$$s_{A(i,j)} = s_{\text{center}}(i) + s_{\text{center}}(j).$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

3.3.5 Embedded feature loss

A point pair $(p_i, p_j)$ has two possible relationships as follows: 1) $p_i$ and $p_j$ belong to the same instance; and 2) $p_i$ and $p_j$ belong to different instances. By considering this, embedded feature loss $L_{EF}$ is defined by

$$L_{EF} = \sum_{i}^{N} \sum_{j}^{N} w_{(i,j)} \kappa_{(i,j)},$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

where $w_{(i,j)}$ is an element of $W \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ which is a weight matrix obtained through element-wise multiplying $D_V$ by $D_A$, that is,

$$w_{(i,j)} = d_{V(i,j)} s_{A(i,j)}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

In Equation (8), $\kappa$ is the loss based on the relationships of point pair and it is defined as:

$$\kappa_{(i,j)} = \begin{cases} \max(0, d_{F(i,j)} - \epsilon_1) & \text{if } p_i \text{ and } p_j \text{ in the same instance} \\ \max(0, \epsilon_2 - d_{F(i,j)}) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

where $\epsilon_1$, $\epsilon_2$ are constants and set to satisfy the condition $0 < \epsilon_1 < \epsilon_2$, because the feature distance of point pairs in different instances should be greater than those belonging to the same instance [24]. We do not need to make the feature distance for point pairs in the same instance close to zero but
4.1 Dataset

We test five types of industrial objects, as shown in Fig. 5. Gear shaft and ring screw are from the Fraunhofer IPA Bin-Picking dataset [35] and object A, B and C are from XA Bin-Picking dataset [37]. The details of datasets are as follows:

- Fraunhofer IPA Bin-Picking dataset (IPA) [35]: This is the first public dataset for 6D object pose estimation and instance segmentation for bin-picking that contains enough annotated data for learning-based methods. The dataset consists of both synthetic and real-world scenes. Depth images, 3D point cloud, 6D pose annotation of each object, visibility score, and a segmentation mask for each object are provided in both synthetic and real-world scenes. The dataset contains ten different objects. The training scenes of all objects are synthetic, and only the test scenes of gear shaft and ring screw are real-world data.
- XA Bin-Picking dataset (XA) [37]: Y. Xu and S. Arai et al. have developed a dataset of boundary 3D point cloud containing three types of industrial objects as shown in Fig. 5 for instance segmentation on bin-picking scene. The training dataset is generated by simulation, while the test dataset is collected from the real-world. There are 1,000 training scenes and 20 test scenes for each object. In the test dataset, only the ground truth of object A is available. Each test scene contains about 60,000 boundary points. The examples of synthetic scenes are presented in Fig. 6, respectively.

4.2 Experimental setting

FPCC-Net is implemented in the TensorFlow framework and trained using the Adam [55] optimizer with initial learning rate of 0.0001, batch size 2 and momentum 0.9. All training and validation are conducted on Nvidia GTX1080 GPU and Intel Core i7 8700K CPU with 32 GB RAM. During the training phase, $\epsilon_1 = 5$, $\epsilon_2 = 10$, $\alpha = 30$ and $\beta = 2$ are set. In each batch in the training process, input points ($N = 4,096$) are randomly sampled from each scene and each point can be sampled only once. Each point is converted to a 6D vector $(x, y, z, n_x, n_y, n_z)$ for inputting FPCC-Net. The sampling is repeated until the remained points of the scene is less than $N$. The network is trained for 30 epochs. It takes around ten hours to train FPCC-Net for each object.

4.3 Instance segmentation evaluation

4.3.1 Average precision

Fig. 8 shows results of instances segmentation and center scores predicted by FPCC-Net on the five types of industrial objects. The points near the center have higher score than boundary points. FPCC can distinguish the majority of instances clearly even with heavy occlusion. However, the performance of FPCC drops in long objects such as gear shift.

Fig. 7 shows the comparison results of instances segmentation with SGPN, SD-Mask, and FPCC. Different predicted instances are shown in different colors. SGPN predicts multiple instances as one instance in the heavy occlusion, and SD-Mask also misses many instances. In contrast, FPCC is robust to occlusion.

Table 1 reports the AP with an IoU threshold of 0.5 on gear shaft, ring screw, and object A. Scannet Evaluation [56] is adopted to compute AP. The predicted center score is used as a confidence score for computing AP. AP of object B and C are not reported due to the lack of instance ground truth of object B and C in XA Bin-Picking dataset [37]. Since the depth images of the scene are not provided by XA, SD-Mask cannot be performed on their scenes. In conclusion, FPCC improves AP by about 40 points than SGPN and SD-Mask.

For bin-picking tasks, it is not intuitive to use AP as an evaluation metric, and the bin-picking tasks focus more attention on precision than the recall rate. The precision with changes of the number of predicted instances in each scene is presented in Fig. 9. Each predicted instance in each scene is ranked according to its center scores, and the first to tenth ($m \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 10\}$) instances are used to compute precision. Predicted instances with an IoU of more than 0.5 are regarded as correct. For the gear shaft and ring screw in IPA, scenes with more than ten objects are selected for the evaluation. The results show that FPCC can achieve about 80% precision on the first five predicted instances in each scene. FPCC performs the best precision among the methods.
Fig. 8: Visualization of the results of instance segmentation given by FPCC on IPA [35] (top) and XA [37] (bottom). Many objects of the same class are stacked together in the Real Scene. 3D Point Cloud is represented by $(x_i, y_i, z_i, n_x, n_y, n_z)$ and then input into FPCC-Net. Center Score Prediction is the predicted center score and the color bar is the same as one in Fig 4. The results for instance segmentation is shown in the last column. Different colors represent different instances.
Fig. 9: Precision with an IoU threshold of 0.5 against the number of predicted instances in the scene of (a) ring screw, (b) gear shaft, and (c) object A.

Table 1: Results of instance segmentation on industrial objects. The metric is AP(%) with an IoU threshold of 0.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>IPA</th>
<th>XA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ring Screw</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGPN</td>
<td>Gear Shaft</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD-Mask</td>
<td>Object A</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Computation speed comparisons [ms/scene].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>IPA</th>
<th>XA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ring Screw</td>
<td>25,087</td>
<td>30,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGPN</td>
<td>Gear Shaft</td>
<td>16,521</td>
<td>14,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD-Mask</td>
<td>Object A</td>
<td>12,843</td>
<td>10,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPCC</td>
<td>Object B</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object C</td>
<td>656</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 Computation Time

Table 2 reports the average computation time per scene measured on Intel Core i7 8700K CPU and Nvidia GTX1080 GPU. Due to the lack of depth images, SD-Mask is unfit to process the object A, B, and C. Each bin-picking scene of XA (Object A, B, and C) contains about 60,000 points. It takes around 0.6 ~ 0.8 [s] to process one scene of XA by FPCC. A scene of IPA contains about 15,000 points, which could also be processed in about 1.5 [s] by FPCC. In summary, FPCC is about 20 times faster than SGPN. However, as a representative method of directly processing images, SD-Mask is still about 5 times faster than FPCC because of the shorter computation time of CNNs for 2D image processing. The computation complexities for clustering processes of SGPN and FPCC are analyzed as follows: Firstly, we assume that there are m instances and n points in the scene (m ≪ n), and the outputs of clustering algorithms of SGPN and FPCC are correct. The clustering of SGPN is divided into two steps: potential groups generating and groups merging. Firstly, SGPN takes \( N_{SGPN} \gg m \) points with high confidence as reference points of the clustering. Then \( N_{SGPN} \) groups are generated based on the feature distance between the reference points and the other points. The computational complexity of groups generating, that is, the number of computation of the feature distances tends towards \( O(mN_{SGPN}) \). Next, two groups with an IoU greater than a threshold, such as 0.5, are merged together, as shown in Fig. 10. The computation complexity of groups merging for SGPN, that is, the number of computation of IoUs between two potential groups tends towards \( O(mN_{SGPN}) \).

In contrast, FPCC does not generate any potential group. The reference points of FPCC are found by Algorithm 1. Each point in the scene point cloud is directly clustered with the nearest reference point, that is, the center point based on feature distance. Hence the computational complexity of clustering for FPCC tends towards \( O(nm) \). In summary, the computational complexities of groups generating of FPCC is much lower than SGPN, that is \( O(nm) \gg O(mN_{SGPN}) \), since the number of potential groups \( N_{SGPN} \) is much higher than the number of instances m. In addition, the calculation of IoU between groups which is not required for FPCC needs more computational resources than that of feature distances. Thus we can conclude that the computational cost of FPCC is much smaller than that of SGPN theoretically. An example of the relationship of computation time and the number of instances is shown in Fig. 11.
Table 3: Results of instance segmentation on industrial objects. The metric is AP(%) with an IoU threshold of 0.5 and 0.75.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VDM</th>
<th>ASM</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Ring Screw</th>
<th>Gear</th>
<th>Shaft</th>
<th>Object A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 11: Average computation time for different number of instances. As the number of instances increases, the computation time of SGPN increases significantly.

### 4.4 Ablation studies

Three ablation experiments are conducted on the bin-picking scenes to evaluate the effectiveness of VDM and ASM in FPCC-Net. A new metric, AP with an IoU threshold of 0.75, is added to interpret the results. Three groups for this ablation experiments are explained below:

1. VDM and ASM are removed, that is to say, no weights are added to compute the embedded feature loss $L_{EF}$.
2. Only VDM is used in loss $L_{EF}$.
3. Both VDM and ASM are adopted in loss $L_{EF}$.

Table 3 shows that the performance of the first group is the worst among the three experiments and two weight matrices improve the ability of the network to extract distinctive features of the 3D point cloud.

### 5 CONCLUSIONS

This paper proposes a fast and effective 3D point cloud instance segmentation named FPCC for the bin-picking scene, which has multi instances but a single class. FPCC includes FPCC-Net which predicts embedded features and the geometric center score of each point, and a fast clustering algorithm using the outputs of FPCC-Net. Two hand-designed weight matrices are introduced for improving the performance of FPCC-Net. A novel clustering algorithm is proposed for instance segmentation. For multi instances but single class scenes, FPCC achieves better performance than SGPN even without manually labeled data. Besides, we theoretically prove that the computational complexity of FPCC is much lower than SGPN.

This study also has a certain limitation that must be addressed in future work, as follows: The speed of FPCC is still slower than the image-based method. It is desirable to improve the computational efficiency of FPCC in order to make it suitable for various applications.
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