Abstract—Seismic data fault detection has recently been regarded as a 3D image segmentation task. The nature of fault structures in seismic image makes it difficult to manually label faults. Manual labeling often has many false negative labels (abnormal annotations), which will seriously jeopardize the training process. In this work, we find that region-based loss significantly outperforms distribution-based loss when dealing with false negative labels, therefore we proposed Mask Dice loss (MD loss), which is the first reported region-based loss function for training 3D image segmentation networks using sparse 2D slice labels. In addition, fault is an edge feature, and the current network widely used for fault segmentation downsamples the features multiple times, which is not conducive to edge representation and thus requires many parameters and computational effort to preserve the features. We proposed Fault-Net, which uses a high-resolution and shallow structure to propagate multi-scale features in parallel, fully preserving edge features. Meanwhile, in order to efficiently fuse multi-scale features, we decouple the convolution process into feature selection and channel fusion, and proposed a lightweight feature fusion block, Multi-Scale Compression Fusion (MCF). Because the Fault-Net always keeps the edge features during propagation, only few parameters and computation are required. Experimental results show that MD loss can clearly weaken the effect of false negative labels. The Fault-Net parameter is only 0.42MB, support up to 528×1024×1024 video ram, its inference speed on CPU and GPU is significantly faster than other networks. It works well on most of the open data seismic images, and the result of our approach is state-of-the-art in FORCSE fault identification competition.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Fault detection is a crucial step for seismic structural interpretation, reservoir characterization and well placement, which determines that fault detection is an important topic in the field of oil-gas exploration. Traditional methods use theory of fault anisotropy [1]–[3], coherence [4]–[6] and ant colony algorithms [7]–[9] etc. to interpret faults, but these become problematic when undesired noises have a wavenumber spectrum similar to that of the image itself, and can be computationally intensive.

Some recent work has treated fault detection as an image segmentation task [10]–[17], image segmentation using deep learning requires a large number of accurate labels, but faults in seismic images are very difficult to label. The first applications to seismic fault detection were 2D semantic segmentation algorithms [10]–[13], but seismic data is the 3D image and segmentation results on inline slices concatenated into 3D can lead to discontinuous results on crossline [17]. Guittion uses 3D CNN for fault segmentation [13]. Instead of choosing the currently widely used pixel level segmentation structure [18], [19], his method is to divide the seismic image into cuboids and classifies each one, which cannot learn the spatial structure of seismic image. The inability to obtain accurate labels has been a thorny problem afflicting the field of seismic image. Because of the difficulty in obtaining accurate labels, Wu et al. use synthetic seismic image is used to train the 3D U-Net [16], [20]. Synthetic data avoids problems caused by manual labeling. However, in many cases, synthetic data cannot be generalized to real seismic image [17].

Seismic image is difficult to label. In our previous work, we proposed the λ-BCE to train 3D fault segmentation models using a few slices labels [17]. When slicing and labeling 3D seismic images, the slices are usually along the inline direction because the faults are mostly perpendicular to inline, making the faults on the slice easy for humans to observe and label. However, there are still many seismic images with many crisscross faults, and faults parallel to the slices are very difficult to find (Figure 1) and certain faults that are very difficult to annotation manually even if they are not parallel to the slice. This leads to the possibility of many False Negative Labels (FNL) during the labeling process, which will seriously jeopardize the training process.

Segmentation loss functions are divided into two main categories, distribution-based and region-based [21]. Distribution-based loss aims to minimize the difference between two distributions, and the common practice is to treat each pixel as a sample [16], [17], i.e., calculate the cross-entropy loss for each pixel and then average it. When using distribution-based loss for training under sparse labels, the general practice is to ignore the gradient of unlabeled pixels [17], [20]. Region-based loss aims to minimize the mismatch or maximize the overlap region between ground truth and predicted segmentation results [22], [23], which limits the application of it to training on sparsely labeled data, thus all the current training...
under 3D sparse labels are distribution-based methods.

In this work we find that the distribution-based is more sensitive to FNL than the region-based loss, and therefore it is more appropriate to use the region-based loss function in seismic image with more FNL. Therefore we propose Mask Dice loss (MD loss), which extends region-based loss to 3D segmentation tasks under sparse labels, and then to further weaken the effect of FNL, we introduce the weight γ for MD loss. This is the first reported region-based segmentation loss that can be trained with sparse labels.

The general CNN models such as U-Net-based [18] (for medical images) and FCN-based [19] (for natural images) series high resolution features with low resolution features, which lose more edge-related high frequency information after multiple downsamplings, so using a series of neural networks for seismic fault segmentation may not be the best choice. There has been some work on paralleling high-resolution features of models with low-resolution features so that they maintain high-resolution features throughout [24], [25]. Wang et al. proposed HRNet for pose estimation and semantic segmentation of 2D images and achieved state of the art [24], demonstrating the significant advantages of high-resolution feature representation for pixel-level tasks. However, the network requires high computational cost and hardware requirements. To solve this problem, Yu et al. proposed Lite-HRNet [25], using shuffle block instead of resblock in HRNet, and proposed channel fusion instead of 1×1 convolution. Its channel fusion is similar to the method of Pereira et al. [26], although it can improve the performance, it requires a greater computational effort. However in practice, this network’s FLOPs and parameters were reduced, the inference time on CPU and GPU is slower compared to HRNet at the same depth.

We propose Fault-Net, which uses 3D high-resolution representation features, allows it to learn more reliable edge information. In addition, in order to efficiently fuse features from multi-scales, we propose a lightweight feature fusion module: Multi-Scale Compression Fusion Block (MCF), which decouples the convolution process into feature selection and channel fusion. Since our model is downsampled only twice, which fully preserves the edge information of the faults, it does not need redundant parameters to retain features. The number of parameters of Fault-Net is only 0.42MB, FLOPs are only not need redundant parameters to retain features. the number which fully preserves the edge information of the faults, it does channel fusion. Since our model is downsampled only twice, decouples the convolution process into feature selection and rule: Multi-Scale Compression Fusion Block (MCF), which multi-scales, we propose a lightweight feature fusion mod-

A. Mask Dice Loss

The peculiarities of the fault structure in seismic image make it almost impossible to label them completely in 3D, so in our previous work we proposed to use a combination of sigmoid and binary cross-entropy (BCE loss) for training seismic image under sparse labels [17]. The method significantly reduces the annotation effort, but the slices of seismic image have many faults that are not observable to the human eye, as shown in Figure 1 which leads to a large number of FNLs and thus adversely affects the training process.

However, the distribution-based loss is very sensitive to the FNL. BCE loss is represented by equation (1).

\[ \mathcal{L}_{bce}(\hat{y}, y) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i \log \hat{y}_i + (1 - y_i) \log (1 - \hat{y}_i)) \]  

where \( \hat{y}_i = \text{sigmoid}(\hat{x}_i) \), \( \hat{x}_i \) is the output of the neural network. Its expression and gradient form are defined as equation (2).

\[ \hat{y}_i = \frac{1}{e^{\hat{x}_i} + 1} \quad \frac{\partial \hat{y}_i}{\partial \hat{x}_i} = \hat{y}_i (1 - \hat{y}_i) \]

The partial derivative of the loss function to the output of the neural network is expressed as,

\[ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{bce}(\hat{y}, y)}{\partial \hat{x}_k} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{bce}(\hat{y}, y)}{\partial \hat{y}_k} \cdot \frac{\partial \hat{y}_k}{\partial \hat{x}_k} = -\left( \frac{y_k}{\hat{y}_k} + \frac{1 - y_k}{\hat{y}_k - 1} \right) \cdot (\hat{y}_k (1 - \hat{y}_k)) \]

= \hat{y}_k - y_k

in the case of FNL, that is, \( y_k = 0 \), in the later stages of training, \( \hat{y}_k \) trend to 1. The gradients caused by FNL at this

II. APPROACH

The current training of seismic fault segmentation models using real data suffers from two problems. Firstly, seismic image is very difficult to label and there are many FNLs for manual labeling, which can adversely affect the training. The second is that seismic faults are an edge feature and traditional CNN models are detrimental to the characterisation of edges after multiple downsamplings, and there is significant parameter redundancy. This section addresses these two separately and proposes MD Loss and Fault-Net.

A. Mask Dice Loss

The peculiarities of the fault structure in seismic image make it almost impossible to label them completely in 3D, so in our previous work we proposed to use a combination of sigmoid and binary cross-entropy (BCE loss) for training seismic image under sparse labels [17]. The method significantly reduces the annotation effort, but the slices of seismic image have many faults that are not observable to the human eye, as shown in Figure 1 which leads to a large number of FNLs and thus adversely affects the training process.

However, the distribution-based loss is very sensitive to the FNL. BCE loss is represented by equation (1).

\[ \mathcal{L}_{bce}(\hat{y}, y) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i \log \hat{y}_i + (1 - y_i) \log (1 - \hat{y}_i)) \]  

where \( \hat{y}_i = \text{sigmoid}(\hat{x}_i) \), \( \hat{x}_i \) is the output of the neural network. Its expression and gradient form are defined as equation (2).

\[ \hat{y}_i = \frac{1}{e^{\hat{x}_i} + 1} \quad \frac{\partial \hat{y}_i}{\partial \hat{x}_i} = \hat{y}_i (1 - \hat{y}_i) \]

The partial derivative of the loss function to the output of the neural network is expressed as,

\[ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{bce}(\hat{y}, y)}{\partial \hat{x}_k} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{bce}(\hat{y}, y)}{\partial \hat{y}_k} \cdot \frac{\partial \hat{y}_k}{\partial \hat{x}_k} = -\left( \frac{y_k}{\hat{y}_k} + \frac{1 - y_k}{\hat{y}_k - 1} \right) \cdot (\hat{y}_k (1 - \hat{y}_k)) \]

= \hat{y}_k - y_k

in the case of FNL, that is, \( y_k = 0 \), in the later stages of training, \( \hat{y}_k \) trend to 1. The gradients caused by FNL at this
point are very large and have a negative impact on training. It also causes the gradient of the model to drop in the opposite direction in the early stages of training.

Distribution-based losses does not distinguish between foreground and background in the segmentation task. When the current voxel label is for the background, the resulting gradient is the Euclidean distance between the predicted and labeled values, i.e. the gradient is proportional to the distance between the two, and thus FNL causes a significant adverse effect on training.

The representative region-based segmentation loss is dice loss, that is insensitive to background voxels and is represented by equation (4).

\[ \mathcal{L}_{\text{dice}} = 1 - \frac{2|\hat{Y} \cap Y|}{|\hat{Y}| + |Y|} \]  
(4)

Its derivable form is equation (5).

\[ \mathcal{L}_{\text{dice}}(\hat{y}, y) = 1 - \frac{\sum_\mathcal{N} y_i \hat{y}_i}{\sum_\mathcal{N} (\frac{1}{2} \hat{y}_i + \frac{1}{2} y_i)} \]  
(5)

Where \( \hat{y}_i = \text{sigmoid}(\hat{x}_i) \), the partial derivative of the loss function to the output of the neural network is expressed as,

\[ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\text{dice}}(\hat{y}, y)}{\partial \hat{x}_k} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\text{dice}}(\hat{y}_k, y_k)}{\partial \hat{y}_k} \cdot \frac{\partial \hat{y}_k}{\partial \hat{x}_k} \]

\[ = \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{\text{dice}} - y_k \beta_{\text{dice}} - \frac{1}{2} y_k^2 \cdot \frac{\partial \hat{y}_k}{\partial \hat{x}_k} \]  
(6)

where, \( \alpha_{\text{dice}} = \sum_{i,i \neq k} \hat{y}_i y_i, \beta_{\text{dice}} = \sum_{i,i \neq k} (\frac{1}{2} \hat{y}_i + \frac{1}{2} y_i). \) If the current voxel label is background, let \( y_k = 0. \)

\[ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\text{dice}}(\hat{y}, y)}{\partial \hat{x}_k} = \frac{\alpha_{\text{dice}}}{2(\frac{1}{2} \hat{y}_k + \beta_{\text{dice}})^2} \cdot \frac{\partial \hat{y}_k}{\partial \hat{x}_k} \]  
(7)

Approximate \( \frac{\alpha_{\text{dice}}}{2(\frac{1}{2} \hat{y}_k + \beta_{\text{dice}})^2} \) as a constant, so when the current label is background, its gradient is related to \( \frac{\partial \hat{y}_k}{\partial \hat{x}_k} \). We refer to this as the dice gradient coefficient. Find its derivative as.

\[ \frac{\partial \hat{y}_k}{\partial \hat{x}_k, \hat{y}_k} = 1 - 2\hat{y}_k \]  
(8)

From equation (8) when \( \hat{y}_k = 0.5 \), the dice gradient coefficient achieves the maximum value (at the initial training), i.e. the dice gradient coefficient due to background is the largest, and as training progresses, the gradient coefficient due to background decreases in square steps when the predicted values tend to be in a certain category. Therefore if the labels are background, a larger gradient will not be triggered even if the predicted values are too different from the actual labels. Assuming that the voxel is FNL, in the later stages of training, \( \hat{y}_k \) should tend to 1, then,

\[ \lim_{\hat{y}_k \to 1} \frac{\alpha_{\text{dice}}}{2(\frac{1}{2} \hat{y}_k + \beta_{\text{dice}})^2} \cdot \hat{y}_k (1 - \hat{y}_k) = 0 \]  
(9)

from equation (7), dice loss causes little effect from FNL in the late training period. However, at the initial of the training period, \( \hat{y}_k \) tends to 0.5 when the effect of FNL on dice loss is also greater.

At present, all loss functions used for training under sparse labels are distribution-based, but the distribution-based loss is sensitive to FNL. We hope to introduce the good properties of dice loss into the training of sparse labels and to minimize the adverse effects of FNL in the early stage of model training.

Firstly, in order to migrate the dice loss to train the 3D segmentation network under sparse labels, we proposed Mask Dice loss (MD loss) by introducing the mask mechanism in dice loss [10] [11].

\[ \mathcal{L}_{\text{md}}(\hat{y}, y) = 1 - \frac{\sum_\mathcal{M} \hat{y}_i y_i}{\sum_\mathcal{M} (\frac{1}{2} \hat{y}_i + \frac{1}{2} y_i)} \]  
(10)

MD loss can train 3D segmentation model under sparse labels. Figure 2 shows the gradient responses of \( \lambda \)-BCE [17] and Mask Dice in the later stages of training, when the labels are false negatives.
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**Fig. 2.** The model has the ability to segment faults, which can be regarded as the late stage of model training. (c) shows that the dice loss is very sensitive to FNL labels and (d) shows that the response of MD loss to FNL is very low in the late training period.

Then, to further attenuate the detrimental effect of FNL on training (mainly the initial stage of training), we introduce the the coefficient \( \gamma \), equation (12).

\[ \mathcal{L}_{\text{md}}(\hat{y}, y) = 1 - \frac{\sum_\mathcal{M} \hat{y}_i y_i}{\sum_\mathcal{M} (1 - \gamma) \hat{y}_i + \gamma y_i} \]  
(12)

where \( \gamma \in [0.5, 1] \), it is the weight coefficient of the fault and background, record it as MD\( \gamma \) loss, when \( \gamma = 0.5 \), it is the original MD loss. We analyses the role it plays in the training by deriving this loss function.

\[ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\text{md}}(\hat{y}, y)}{\partial \hat{x}_k} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\text{md}}(\hat{y}_k, y_k)}{\partial \hat{y}_k} \cdot \frac{\partial \hat{y}_k}{\partial \hat{x}_k} \]

\[ = \frac{(1 - \gamma) \alpha_{\text{md}} - y_k \beta_{\text{md}} - y_k \beta_{\text{md}}}{(1 - \gamma) \hat{y}_k + \gamma y_k + \beta_{\text{md}}} \cdot \frac{\partial \hat{y}_k}{\partial \hat{x}_k} \]  
(13)

where, \( \alpha_{\text{md}} = \sum_{i,i \neq k} \hat{y}_i y_i, \beta_{\text{md}} = \sum_{i,i \neq k} M_k \hat{y}_i + \gamma y_k + \beta_{\text{md}} \). If the current voxel is background, i.e. \( y_k = 0. \)

\[ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\text{md}}(\hat{y}, y)}{\partial \hat{x}_k} = \frac{\hat{y}_k (1 - \hat{y}_k) \alpha_{\text{md}}}{(1 - \gamma) \hat{y}_k + \beta_{\text{md}}} \]  
(14)

Equation (14) shows that the gradient due to MD loss in the case of the current being a background voxel can be controlled by \( \gamma \). Increasing \( \gamma \) weakens the sensitivity of the model to the background in the early stages of training, making it more inclined to predict the foreground and further weakening the effect of FNL in the later stages of training.

In this section, we discuss the drawbacks of distribution-based losses for seismic fault segmentation tasks and the
advantages of region-based losses. In order to migrate the dice loss to 3D segmentation tasks under sparse labels, we introduce the maks mechanism into the dice loss thus proposing MD loss, and then introduce the weight coefficient $\gamma$ to further weaken the adverse effects of FNL on training in seismic fault segmentation.

B. Fault-Net

Traditional CNN segmentation models perform multiple downsampling and then recover the initial resolution by upsampling or deconvolution, an encoding-decoding structure that loses some edge information and position information, which is detrimental to fault segmentation.

In this section, we propose Fault-Net, which propagates features at different scales forward in parallel, maintaining high resolution throughout, giving more reliable location and edge information. Thus we can obtain better fault segmentation results than general segmentation models with very few trainable parameters. In addition, we propose a multi-scale compression fusion block (MCF) that expresses the feature selection process explicitly by decoupling feature selection and channel fusion to efficiently fuse features at different scales in high-resolution networks.

1) Fault-Net Structure: We use resblock as the base unit of the model and the model has four stages. First, the model is first downsampled twice using two convolutions with a stride of 2. Downsampling using the convolution operation maximises the retention of the original features of the data. Secondly, downsampling is again performed by convolution, but while retaining the high resolution features, i.e. adding a branch of low resolution features that propagate the two resolutions forward in parallel. Third, a low-resolution branch is added, which is obtained by fusing the downsampled features of the other two branches, while the other two branches also perform feature fusion, and at the end of this stage, the features of the three branches are fused with each other. Feature fusion allows the three resolution features of the model to interact with each other, so that the high resolution features can obtain the semantic information of the low resolution features, and the low resolution features can obtain the image detail information of the high resolution features. Finally, the features of the two low-resolution branches are upsampled and fused with the high-resolution features, and the final segmentation result is obtained after two upsampling and residual.

In general, traditional CNN models double the width of the features for each down-sampling to attenuate the information loss due to sampling, whereas Fault-Net does not require an excessive width because it maintains edge feature when propagating forward, with three branches of 8, 16 and 32 widths respectively. Faults in seismic image exist in the form of edge features, which are a low-level feature for images and which are easily characterised, so the general CNN model overlaying too many layers is redundant for the task of fault segmentation of seismic image. Therefore Fault-Net uses a shallow layer structure, as shown in Figure 3.

2) Multi-Scale Compression Fusion Block: In stage 4 of Figure 3, so as to obtain high quality segmentation results, the three scales of features need to be fused, and in order to ensure the effectiveness of the fusion and reduce parameter redundancy, the width of the fused features should be the same as the width of the individual features before fusion, and there are two general ways of fusing features. One is to upsample the low-resolution features and add them to the high-resolution features; the other is to upsample the low-resolution features and concatenate them with the high-resolution features and fuse them by $1 \times 1$ convolution. The first approach does not require too much computation, but feature addition results in a significant loss of information. The second approach uses convolution for feature fusion, which performs feature selection and channel fusion simultaneously, and its default training process causes the model to adaptively select the best combination of features for fusion. However, in practice the task performed by the $1 \times 1$ convolution during the training of the model is the weighting of features rather than feature selection and channel fusion, which makes the channels at each scale equivalent when fused. We therefore propose a multi-scale compression fusion block, which decouples the two tasks of feature selection and channel fusion by explicitly performing feature selection and using the results of feature selection for channel compression fusion, significantly increasing the performance of the model with only a small increase in computational cost.

We consider that efficient multi-scale feature fusion in networks requires three conditions to be met: firstly, to retain features that are beneficial to the model task, secondly, to strip away redundant or ineffective features, and thirdly, not to consume excessive computational resources.

The three scale features are first compressed to the same width by $1 \times 1$ convolution, and then the two low resolution features are scaled up to the same size as the high resolution features by trilinear interpolation. We express the features before fusion as,

$$F_1 = F_{1\text{conv}}(F_{1}'; 1, 1, C_2, C_2)$$
$$F_2 = F_{2\text{conv}}(F_{2}'; 1, 1, C_3, C_2)$$
$$F_3 = F_{3\text{conv}}(F_{3}'; 1, 1, C_4, C_2)$$

the three scales of features are concatenated and denoted as.

$$F_{\text{cat}} = F_{\text{cat}}(F_1, F_2, F_3)$$

$F_{\text{cat}}$ contains all the information for the three scales of features, but it is also redundant, containing many features that are duplicated or not useful for the segmentation task. We want to explicitly express the responses of the features in $F_{\text{cat}}$ to the task, and thus use these responses as weights to compress the features in $F_{\text{cat}}$. We first compute the linear projection $F_{\text{cat}}^1$ of $F_{\text{cat}}$ using a $1 \times 1$ convolution. By compressing the width and then restoring, the model can learn sparse features, which are normalized by sigmoid as the compression weight, denote $W$. This completes the explicit representation of feature selection, i.e. through the compression and restoration of the feature map, the sparse feature map is obtained and used as
The MCF block is equivalent to selecting the features to be compressed in advance, i.e., obtaining the compression weights $W$. The Hadamard product is performed using $W$ with the high-dimensional projection $F_{cat}^2$ of $F_{cat}$ before compressing and fusing the features, with the positions of important features in $W$ retaining weights close to 1 and the weights of minor or redundant ones close to 0. This explicitly characterises the selection of features, decoupling the convolutional feature selection and channel fusion.

In this section, we describe Fault-Net and its design in detail. We integrate high-resolution representations into the network design based on the edge characteristics of seismic faults, i.e., three scales of features are propagated forward in parallel. In order to fully fuse the three scales of features for better decision making on the category of each voxel, we design and propose the MCF block, which decouples the convolution through an explicit representation feature selection process, stripping out redundant features while retaining valid features. Fault-Net has only 0.42MB of parameters and 16G of FLOPs. Its inference speed on both CPU (Intel Xeon E5-2640 v4) and GPU (NVIDIA Tesla P100) is much lower than that of U-Net (Table I), but we experimentally demonstrate that the network performs better than U-Net for segmentation of faults. In addition, Our network can support inference up to a cuboid of size $528^3$, which can greatly reduce the discontinuity caused by the splicing surface. We also compare the number of parameters of the three most lightweight backbone networks available, Lite-HRNet [25], ShuffleNetV2 [28], SqueezeNet [29] and MobilenetV3 [30].

III. EXPERIMENT

We conduct experiments on real data and synthetic data to verify our method. Our real data comes from the Shengli Oilfield Branch of Sinopec, and thanks to Wu et al for published the synthetic seismic fault dataset [16]. There are significant differences in the numerical distribution of different seismic image, so in the experiment we have standardized and normalized all the data. In addition the experiments show the segmentation results of many publicly available real seismic images.

A. Data illustration

The experiments were carried out on seismic image from three work areas, $A$, $B$ and $C$, you can see the spatial
TABLE I
COMPARISON OF EXECUTION EFFICIENCY OF DIFFERENT NETWORKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>FLOPs (128³)</th>
<th>Maximum Cuboid Size (16G Video Ram)</th>
<th>Infer Time (128³/GPU)</th>
<th>Infer Time (128³/CPU)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lite-HRNet-18 (2D backbone)</td>
<td>1.10M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ShuffleNetV2×0.5 (2D backbone)</td>
<td>1.37M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SqueezeNet (2D backbone)</td>
<td>1.25M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MobileNetV3 small (2D backbone)</td>
<td>2.54M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-Net (base width is 16, 3D)</td>
<td>1.46M</td>
<td>136.46G</td>
<td>240³</td>
<td>0.21s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fault-Net (3D)</td>
<td>0.42M</td>
<td>16.12G</td>
<td>528³</td>
<td>0.13s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fault-Net (Without MCF, 3D)</td>
<td>0.39M</td>
<td>13.49G</td>
<td>528³</td>
<td>0.12s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II
TRAIN SET AND VALIDATION SET PARTITIONING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Train set</td>
<td>A, B, Synthetic train data</td>
<td>A, C, Synthetic train data</td>
<td>B, C, Synthetic train data</td>
<td>Synthetic train data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation set</td>
<td>Synthetic validation data</td>
<td>Synthetic validation data</td>
<td>Synthetic validation data</td>
<td>Synthetic validation data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test set</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE III
QUANTITATIVE EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MD⁰.⁵ loss</td>
<td>MD⁰.⁶ loss</td>
<td>MD⁰.⁷ loss</td>
<td>MD⁰.⁸ loss</td>
<td>MD⁰.⁹ loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-Net</td>
<td>64.66</td>
<td>64.21</td>
<td>63.97</td>
<td>62.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fault-Net</td>
<td>65.78</td>
<td>65.90</td>
<td>64.89</td>
<td>62.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD⁰.⁵ loss</td>
<td>MD⁰.⁶ loss</td>
<td>MD⁰.⁷ loss</td>
<td>MD⁰.⁸ loss</td>
<td>MD⁰.⁹ loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-Net</td>
<td>63.37</td>
<td>64.11</td>
<td>63.13</td>
<td>61.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fault-Net</td>
<td>63.76</td>
<td>63.94</td>
<td>64.02</td>
<td>62.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD⁰.⁵ loss</td>
<td>MD⁰.⁶ loss</td>
<td>MD⁰.⁷ loss</td>
<td>MD⁰.⁸ loss</td>
<td>MD⁰.⁹ loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-Net</td>
<td>63.89</td>
<td>63.78</td>
<td>63.88</td>
<td>62.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fault-Net</td>
<td>64.50</td>
<td>63.69</td>
<td>64.58</td>
<td>62.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD⁰.⁵ loss</td>
<td>MD⁰.⁶ loss</td>
<td>MD⁰.⁷ loss</td>
<td>MD⁰.⁸ loss</td>
<td>MD⁰.⁹ loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-Net</td>
<td>65.90</td>
<td>65.68</td>
<td>65.01</td>
<td>64.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fault-Net</td>
<td>66.23</td>
<td>65.39</td>
<td>65.32</td>
<td>64.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fault-Net (Without MCF)</td>
<td>64.52</td>
<td>63.45</td>
<td>63.29</td>
<td>62.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD⁰.⁵ loss</td>
<td>MD⁰.⁶ loss</td>
<td>MD⁰.⁷ loss</td>
<td>MD⁰.⁸ loss</td>
<td>MD⁰.⁹ loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-Net</td>
<td>63.33</td>
<td>63.74</td>
<td>62.39</td>
<td>62.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fault-Net</td>
<td>63.52</td>
<td>63.71</td>
<td>62.55</td>
<td>62.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fault-Net (Without MCF)</td>
<td>62.12</td>
<td>61.51</td>
<td>60.89</td>
<td>61.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The faults in A and B are mostly perpendicular to inline, and labeling is easy, so it can guarantee that most of the labels are accurate. Work area C has more crisscross faults, and there will be more FNL in labeling. The pioneering work of Wu et al. to train CNN using synthetic data has achieved good results on many seismic images [16], but this still does not guarantee that the model obtained by this method can be generalized to more seismic images [17], especially the seismic images come from different instruments and regions. As mentioned above, it is very difficult to obtain fault labels for real seismic data, and there are many FNLs in manual labels, so the metrics quantified using manual labels will have large errors. The labels of the synthetic data are perfect, so we mix the real data with the synthetic data to construct the dataset together and use the synthetic data for validation. The mixed dataset ensures that most of the labels are accurate and the obtained quantitative metrics are precise, while enabling the model to generalize to real data. More importantly, we can thus obtain the effect of FNL on different loss functions. Also, our proposed MD loss allows for the presence of both real data (sparse labels) and synthetic data (3D labels) in the train set.

The synthetic data published by Wu are divided into 200 cuboids in train set and 20 in validation set, the size of each cuboid is 128 × 128 × 128. In order to make the model learn the fault features of seismic image at different scales, we
Fig. 5. (a) is the result obtained from the public model of Wu et al. (using synthetic data to train U-Net with BCE loss), (b) is the result for Group-4 (using synthetic data to train Fault-Net with MD$^{0.7}$ loss), and (c) is the result for Group-3 (using mixed data to train Fault-Net with MD$^{0.7}$ loss).

Fig. 6. Performance of different loss functions on timeline slices.

Fig. 7. The performance difference between Group-1 with Group-2 and Group-3, respectively. $\lambda$-BCE has the most significant performance difference.

We only annotate 3.3% of the slices in real data, and the procedure is as follows. First, on the inline, label one slice every 30 slices. Second, slide sampling in three directions, the sliding stride is 35, and the size of each sample is $128 \times 128 \times 128$. When sampling, samples with fault voxels less than 128 are deleted. Finally, the redundant samples are randomly deleted, so that the number of samples to 300. There are more detailed labeling steps in [17].

The proposed MD loss function allows us to mix the real data (3.3% sparse labels) with synthetic data (3D labels) for training. Therefore we mixed real data with synthetic data for the experiment and it has five groups, the train set, validation set and test set are shown in Table II. The experiments use six loss functions, MD$^{0.5}$, MD$^{0.6}$, MD$^{0.7}$, MD$^{0.8}$, MD$^{0.9}$ (represent $\gamma = 0.5, 0.6, 0.7, 0.8, 0.9$ respectively) and $\lambda$-BCE loss. We use random rotation for data augmentation.

B. Experimental results and analysis

We use IOU (Intersection Over Union) as the performance evaluation metric. The IOU is expressed by equation [19]

$$ IOU = \frac{TP}{FP + TP + FN} $$

Among them, TP (True Positive) is classified as a positive sample, in fact it is also a positive sample. FP (False Positive), is classified as a positive sample, but in fact it is a negative sample. FN (False Negative) is classified as a negative sample, but in fact it is a positive sample. The output of the model is normalized to the probability $\hat{y}_i \in [0, 1]$ through the sigmoid activation function, and $\hat{y}_i > 0.5$ is regarded as a positive sample, $\hat{y}_i \leq 0.5$ is regarded as a negative sample, so as to calculate the IOU.

Training was performed using the Adam optimizer with a batch size of 8 and a learning rate of 0.001, and all experimental code was implemented using PyTorch 1.7.0.
Fig. 8. Results of Fault-Net trained with MD$^{0.7}$ in three group test data.

Fig. 9. New Zealand 3D, (a) Kerry-3D, (b) Opunake-3D.

Each model is trained for 200 epochs and run on the validation set for every 100 steps trained, thus recording the metric. Table III shows the best quantified metrics within 200 epoch for each group of experiments. It reflects the metrics of various loss functions and networks when FNL is mixed in the train set.

1) Comparison of training with mixed data versus using synthetic data: We compare the generalization ability on real data of the models obtained by training with mixed real and synthetic data separately versus training entirely with synthetic data. In Table III while the model trained entirely with synthetic data shows greater quantitative metrics on the validation set consisting of synthetic data, the model obtained by adding real data training in Figure 5 achieves better qualitative results.

In Figure 5 (b) and (c) use the same network and loss function, but (c) qualitative results are clearly better. It differs from (b) in that (c) is trained with a mixture of real data labeled with sparse labels, which allows (c) to generalize better over real data. Although the work of Wu et al. demonstrates that the model trained from synthetic data has excellent performance, it does not guarantee that the model generalizes to all types of seismic image.

In Figure 5 (b) and (c) have higher likelihoods compared to (a) for faults, which is mainly due to the loss function. Region-based loss essentially determines whether a region is
the fault (‘yes’ or ‘no’), while distribution-based loss gives the likelihood that a voxel is a fault voxel, so the likelihoods obtained using the region-based loss function are mostly close to 1, this phenomenon is also reflected in Figure 6. Thus the advantage of region-based loss functions in fault segmentation tasks is not only to weaken the negative effect of FNL, but also to give a more explicit interpretation of the faults.

2) **Comparison of training with MD loss versus using BCE loss:** Second, we compare the ability of the MD loss to weaken the effect of FNL compared to the distribution-based loss. This has been adequately revealed in Table III. By comparing Groups-1, 2 and 3 we can see that when we mix many FNL in the sample (work area C), the network trained with the distribution-based loss (BCE) shows a clear degradation in performance, while the MD-trained network shows significantly less degradation than the BCE loss. We visualize this trend in Figure 7. It shows the variation of the difference in quantitative metrics between Group-1 and Group-2, 3 respectively, where the difference in performance of different experimental groups in $\lambda$-BCE loss is much higher than in other loss functions.

Figure 6 shows the segmentation results of Group-3 individual loss functions for work area A. When $\gamma = 0.7$, it shows the best quantitative and qualitative performance in training with many FNL samples mixed (Figure 6 and Table III). When we label fault slices of seismic image, sometimes we cannot judge the spatial distribution of the faults, which can inadvertently lead to a large number of FNLs and affect the model performance, while MD$^{0.7}$ greatly weakens the effect of FNLs and shows good performance, so we recommend using MD$^{0.7}$ as the loss function. We go on to show the segmentation results of training Fault-Net using MD$^{0.7}$ in Groups-1, 2 and 3 test data (Figure 8).

In Groups-4, 5 trained entirely with synthetic data, the model performance obtained by our model using only 3.3% of the synthetic data slices (2D) is similar to that trained with 3D labels. This demonstrates that MD loss is able to fully extract 3D information from sparse slices.

3) **Performance of Fault-Net:** In Table 3, our method shows a slight advantage over U-Net in terms of quantitative metrics, but the number of parameters, memory usage, and inference speed of Fault-Net is clearly better than that of U-Net, which supports inference on up to $528^3$ cuboid size on 16G video ram, which allows us to greatly reduce the discontinuity caused by slicing the seismic image before inference and then stitching. Moreover, it also demonstrates the significant advantage of high-resolution networks in fault segmentation tasks, which can fully preserve the edge features of the faults, thus allowing us to obtain good segmentation results without the need for a large number of parameters.

In Table III the network without MCF uses 3D convolution instead of the MCF block, which shows a certain degree of degradation in parameters and FLOPs, but no significant change in inference speed. In contrast, in Table III Group-4 and 5, the performance with MCF shows a clear advantage over the one without it, which indicates that the MCF block greatly improves the performance of the model with few impacts on its inference efficiency. This also illustrates the importance of improving the approach of feature fusion at different scales in fault segmentation tasks.

### C. Open data test

To demonstrate the generalization ability and performance stability of our method, we tested it on publicly available data, and the results of this subsection were all obtained using MD$^{0.7}$ training in Group-1. Although we trained using $128^3$ cuboids, the network is valid for any size of cuboid during inference, and all the results in this section are obtained by inference from $528^3$ cuboids, so our results are very smooth, with almost no traces of splicing.

The data we tested include New Zealand-3D, Canning-3D and FORCE competition data. Readers can also test more use cases through https://github.com/douyimin/FaultNet.

1) **New Zealand 3D:** Many thanks to SEG Wiki and New Zealand government for publishing this data, of which we chose Opunake-3D and Kerry-3D as the test data. Among them, the segmentation results of Wu et al. can be seen in URL [31], and the segmentation results of Gao et al. are published in [14].
Fig. 11. Ichthys-3D, FORCE ML Competition 2020. (a) Original pseudo-color view, (b) slice view, (c) 3D point cloud view.

The advanced segmentation results have been obtained by Wu and Gao \cite{31,14}, but our model shows a more continuous and richer interpretation of the faults with less noise. The network is mixed with real data in the training, which allows the model to generalize better in the real data, and thus a clearer and more unambiguous fault segmentation result can be obtained by this network. In addition, our model uses fewer parameters, is more lightweight and uses very few computational resources to obtain high quality segmentation results compared to Wu and Gao’s results, since Fault-Net uses high resolution features and thus achieves a high degree of preservation of the fault features.

2) Canning 3D: Thanks to Geoscience Australia for making this data public \cite{32}. The data are from the Canning Basin, there are a large number of faults that are dense and perpendicular to the inline. We show our results from two views. Figure 10 (a) shows the results of fault segmentation on timeline slices, there is one major fault along the diagonal and other faults are very close to each other and numerous, so it is difficult to segment the faults in this area, but our method still yields a clear and accurate interpretation of the faults. Figure 10 (b) shows some inline slices with some cross faults on the inline, which are accurately located by Fault-Net, and where different faults have different widths, with larger widths indicating a smaller angle between the fault and the slice, and smaller widths being almost perpendicular to the slice.

3) FORCE ML Competition: Thanks to FORCE, this data was provided by FORCE ML Competition 2020 \cite{33}. This competition wanted to find out if these very efficient modern machine learning based fault detection algorithms perform equally as good on not so perfect data. The competition had 80 teams registered, the final results of this competition are published in this URL \cite{34}, as well as a demonstration of each team’s testing results.

The competition provided a validation seismic image from the Ichthys Field on the NW Shelf of Australia, the blind dataset that organizers provided to the contestants comes from the Adele seismic survey that is located some 15 to 20 km to the NE of the Ichthys seismic survey. We used the trained network from our Group-1 and used both Ichthys-3D and Adele-3D as our test data. As mentioned by the organizers, the faults in these two seismic images are less than perfect and very difficult to interpret even by humans, but our method still gives very satisfactory results.

Figure 11 shows the results of the Fault-Net segmentation of Ichthys-3D. We use pseudo-colors to show the original data slice, from which even experienced experts have difficulty in
interpreting the faults accurately. Our method gives very clear inference of the faults. As we mentioned before, the larger widths or fault plane in the figure indicate that the fault is less angular or parallel to the current slice, while the slender faults are closer to 90° to the slice, and our results show some fault plane in the crossline, which are not false positives. In the point cloud view, our method also shows smooth and continuous faults, and from this view, there are some faults parallel to the crossline.

Figure 12, 13 shows the segmentation results of our network for Adele-3D. The faults in this region are hidden in the broken reflectors at the bottom and are very difficult to find, and it is difficult for humans to find all the faults in these 2D slices. Our method fully extracts edge information from 3D data and finds almost all faults. We download and visualize the results of the winner and runner-up of this competition from this URL [34].

We first compare the results on the timeline slice (Figure 13). Timeline can reflect the spatial distribution of faults, which are mostly perpendicular to inline in this image. Figure 13 (a) shows a pseudo-color slice of timeline (390) from Adele-3D, from which there are three main fault regions (red box), plus some scattered small faults. The winner of this competition only detected some of the fragmented faults, which are very coarse and discontinuous. The performance of this algorithm (the winner) shows that it is very difficult to detect faults in this seismic image. The runner-up detected only one major fault and the results were very fuzzy. Wu’s network detected three major faults but its results had very low signal-to-noise. Our method detects all faults with very smooth and no noise.

Figure 12 shows the results of the inline slices, Figure 12 (c) from the shape of its detected faults, the team used a 2D image segmentation algorithm whose detection results show significant discontinuities on the 3D slices, and the algorithm ignores many obvious faults, Figure 12 (d) only a very small number of faults are detected. Figure 12 (e) shows a large amount of noise and false positives. Compared to other methods, our results show a huge advantage, with Fault-Net accurately segmenting most of the faults from the broken reflectors with almost no noise.

IV. CONCLUSION

Networks trained using synthetic data are difficult to generalize to real seismic images, so we proposed to train 3D segmentation networks using a few 2D slice labels [17], while faults in real seismic images are very difficult to label and the presence of many FNLs in manual labels can mislead the training process. In this work, to address the above problem, we proposed MD loss, which is the first region-based loss function for training 3D image segmentation networks under sparse 2D slice labels. Experimental results show that the performance degrades of the network using this loss function significantly lower than that of the distribution-based loss function in many FNL data, indicating that the loss can weaken the undesirable effects of FNL. We used a mixture of real data (3.3% sparse slice labels) and synthetic as the train set can enable the model to generalize to more real data and obtain better fault segmentation results. We used sliced labels for 3.3% of the total synthetic data and obtained similar performance to training with all labels (3D label). In addition, FNL is also widespread in the field of medical image segmentation, and we believe that one of the reasons for the advanced performance of dice loss on medical images is that it can greatly weaken the effect of anomalous labels, so MD loss may solve the FNL problem in the field of 3D medical image segmentation under sparse labels.

The faults in seismic images can be regarded as edge features, and we proposed Fault-Net based on this character of
faults, and the MCF block is proposed and incorporated, which compresses and fuses multi-scale features efficiently using few parameters. The Fault-Net has only 0.42MB of parameters supports 528\textsuperscript{3} size cuboid inference on 16GB of video ram, which greatly reduces the discontinuity of the stitching surface when cuboid stitching in 3D image segmentation tasks, and its inference speed on GPU and CPU is significantly faster than other networks. Although our network is very lightweight, it obtains very advanced results in publicly available seismic images and gives satisfactory segmentation results in two very difficult seismic images provided by the FORCE ML competition, reaching state-of-the-art.

We propose the first region-based loss function for 3D image segmentation under sparse labeling, and a high-resolution shallow layer-based segmentation network, Fault-Net. Our approach greatly improves the metrics of seismic image fault segmentation task (detection accuracy, speed, lightweight), which is of great importance for seismic structural interpretation, reservoir characterization and well placement. Moreover, our conclusions and findings are also applicable to the study of other image-related tasks, such as medical image segmentation and image edge detection, etc.
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Fig. 13. Adele-3D, FORCE ML Competition 2020.