Abstract—Segmentation of partially overlapping objects with a known shape is needed in an increasing amount of various machine vision applications. This paper presents a method for segmentation of clustered partially overlapping objects with a shape that can be approximated using an ellipse. The method utilizes silhouette images, which means that it requires only that the foreground (objects) and background can be distinguished from each other. The method starts with seedpoint extraction using bounded erosion and fast radial symmetry transform. Extracted seedpoints are then utilized to associate edge points to objects in order to create contour evidence. Finally, contours of the objects are estimated by fitting ellipses to the contour evidence. The experiments on one synthetic and two different real data sets showed that the proposed method outperforms two current state-of-art approaches in overlapping objects segmentation.

Index Terms—Segmentation, overlapping objects, convex objects, image processing, machine vision.

I. INTRODUCTION

SEGMENTATION of overlapping objects aims to address the issue of representation of multiple objects with partial views. Overlapping or occluded objects occur in various applications, such as morphology analysis of molecular or cellular objects in biomedical and industrial imagery where quantitative analysis of individual objects by their size and shape is desired [1]–[3]. In many such applications, the objects can often be assumed to contain approximately elliptical shape. For example, the most commonly measured properties of nanoparticles are their length and width, which can correspond to the major and minor axis of an ellipse fitted over the particle contour [4].

Even with rather strong shape priors, segmentation of overlapping objects remains a challenging task.
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Fig. 1. Overlapping crystal particles.

Deficient information from the objects with occluded or overlapping parts introduces considerable complexity into the segmentation process. For example, in the context of contour estimation, the contours of objects intersecting with each other do not usually contain enough visible geometrical evidence, which can make contour estimation problematic and challenging. Frequently, the segmentation method has to rely purely on edges between the background and foreground, which makes the processed image essentially a silhouette image (see Fig. 1). Furthermore, the task involves simultaneous segmentation of multiple objects. A large number of objects in the image causes a large number of variations in pose, size and shape of the objects, and leads to a more complex segmentation problem.

In this paper, a method is proposed for the segmentation of partially overlapping objects whose approximate shape are known. The objects to be segmented are assumed to be clearly distinguishable from the background of the image and their contours form approximately elliptical shapes. The proposed method is an edge based segmentation approach that follows three sequential steps: namely, seedpoint extraction, contour evidence extraction, and contour estimation. Seedpoint extraction is performed by a compound model consisting of morphological erosion [5] and the Fast Radial Symmetry (FRS) transform [6]. The contour evidence extraction links the object seedpoints and the edge map obtained from the image. To perform this connection, a metric similar to [1] using the distance between seed and edge points combined with the cosine distance between the gradient and seed-to-edge vectors is sought. Once the contour evidence for each detected seedpoint is obtained, contour estimation is performed using numerically stable direct ellipse fitting.

The work makes two contributions to study of machine vision and object segmentation. The first contribution of this work is the combined method of Bounded Erosion-Fast Radial Symmetry (BE-FRS) for seedpoint extraction from a group of highly overlapping objects in silhouette images. Based on observed general convexity and radial symmetry of the
overlapping objects, the proposed BE-FRS method incorporates a predefined number of morphological erosion operations to eliminate the touching points and increase the convexity of objects and Fast Radial Transform [6] to extract the intersection of the lines of symmetry as individual centroids. The second contribution is integration of the proposed BE-FRS method into the segmentation of overlapping convex objects, enabling improvements compared to existing methods with higher detection rate and segmentation accuracy.

The paper is organized as follows: Related work is reviewed in Sec. II. Sec. III introduces our framework for segmentation of overlapping convex objects utilizing the BE-FRS method for seedpoint extraction. The proposed method is applied to synthetic and real datasets and compared with two state-of-the-art methods in Sec. IV. Conclusions are drawn in Sec. V.

II. RELATED WORK

Several approaches have been attempted to address the segmentation of overlapping objects in different kinds of images [1]–[3], [7]–[9]. The watershed transform is one of the commonly used approaches in overlapping cell segmentation [7], [10], [11]. Exploiting a certain strategies for the initialization, such as morphological filtering [7] or the adaptive H-minima transform [10], the watershed transform may overcome the over-segmentation problem and could be used for segmentation of overlapping objects. Methods based on the watershed transform may experience difficulties with segmentation of highly overlapped objects in which a strong gradient is not present.

Graph-cut is an alternative approach for segmentation of overlapping objects [12], [13]. Al-Kofahi et al. [12] introduced a semi-automatic approach for detection and segmentation of cell nuclei where the detection process is performed by graph-cuts-based binarization and Laplacian-of-Gaussian filtering. The method is computational expensive and may fail to keep the global optimality of graph cut [14]. Daněk et al. [13] overcomed the problem of overlapping cell separation by introducing shape priors to graph-cut framework.

Another group of approaches is based on concave point extraction. Zhang et al. [2] and Bai et al. [15] addressed the problem of overlapping objects segmentation using concave points extraction through the polygonal approximation. The concave points in the objects contour divide the contour of overlapping objects into different segments based on the location of concavities and ellipse fitting is then applied to separate the overlapping objects. As these approaches strongly rely on ellipse fitting to segment object contours, they may have problems with either objects boundaries containing large scale fluctuations or objects whose shape deviate from ellipse.

Several approaches have resolved the segmentation of overlapping objects within the variational framework through the use of active contours. The method in [16] incorporates a physical shape model in terms of modal analysis that combines object contours and a prior knowledge about the expected shape into an Active Shape Model (ASM) to detect the invisible boundaries of a single nucleus. The original form of ASM is restricted to single object segmentation and cannot deal with more complex scenarios of multiple occluded objects. ASM was extended in [17] and [18] to address the segmentation of multiple overlapping objects simultaneously. The efficiency of the active contour based methods for segmentation of overlapping objects depends closely on the accurate initialization of the active active contour model.

Morphological operations have also been applied to overlapping object segmentation. Park et al. [1] proposed an automated morphology analysis coupled with a statistical model for contour inference to segment partially overlapping nanoparticles. Ultimate erosion modified for convex shape objects is used for particles separation, and the problem of object inference and shape classification are solved simultaneously using a Gaussian mixture model on B-splines. The method may be prone to under-segmentation with highly overlapped objects.

III. OVERLAPPING OBJECT SEGMENTATION

The proposed method consists of three consecutive main steps: seedpoint extraction, contour evidence extraction, and contour estimation. Fig. 2 summarizes the method.
Given a grayscale image as input, the segmentation process starts with pre-processing to build the image silhouette and the corresponding edge map. The binarization of the image is obtained by background suppression based on the Otsu’s method [19]. The edge map is constructed using the Canny edge detector [20]. The purpose of BE before FRS is only to improve the quality of seedpoint extraction and the rest of the process is applied to original objects. Contour evidence is extracted by edge-to-seedpoint association using the obtained seedpoints and their relation to the image edges. The contour estimation is implemented through a non-linear ellipse fitting problem in which partially observed objects are modeled in the form of ellipse-shape objects.

A. Seedpoint Extraction

The seedpoint extraction plays a key role in overlapping object segmentation and influences significantly the accuracy of the final segmentation result. Seedpoints are considered as a certain priori information, which affects the performance of the subsequent contour evidence extraction and contour estimation. The primary goal in seedpoint extraction is to recognize the presence and number of the individual objects in the image as identified by the seedpoints.

Several approaches may be employed for seedpoint extraction. Distance Transform (DT) [21] is an operator commonly applied to image segmentation. Provided that the cores of the objects are separable, i.e. there is only a single local maximum in each object region, DT combined with a global thresholding scheme can be used to separate and to count the overlapping objects. In watershed transformation, the local maxima regions of DT are watershed markers which eventually result in the segmentation of the objects. DT assumes separability of object cores and fails when the cluster of objects is highly overlapped.

Ultimate Erosion for Convex Sets (UECS) [1] is an iterative morphological algorithm that extracts the seed regions from overlapping objects. UECS is an extension of the Ultimate Erosion (UE) method with a modified stopping criteria. The early stopping of the erosion process in UECS is the key feature to overcome the problem of over-segmentation. UECS makes strict assumptions regarding the separability of objects, that cannot separate three overlapping objects with more than one intersecting point and a pair of objects whose subtraction is disconnected. Either a triple highly overlapping objects or a pair of crossing objects are not separable by UECS.

The Slide Band Filter (SBF), which belongs to the family of local convergence filters has previously been applied to detect cell nuclei and to estimate shape [22]. SBF integrates the ideas of the IRIS Filter (IF) [23] and Adaptive Ring Filter (ARF) [24] by defining a support region that has a fixed width convergence band and varying radius in each direction. SBF estimates the overall convergence by combining all the individual convergence degrees of sample points in such way that the convergence of the pixel interest point is maximized along each radial direction.

The proposed BE-FRS method for seedpoint extraction considers two generic properties of the objects under segmentation: convexity and symmetry. Inspired by the idea of morphological erosion for separating of convex-shape objects [1], BE consisting of a predefined number of erosions is first applied to extract the separable seed regions, and then FRS with duplicate seed point removal evaluates the extracted seed regions for rotational symmetry to produce the final seedpoints.

In mathematical morphology, given a binary silhouette \( I \) as a union of overlapping convex objects \( C_i \), \( I = \cup_{i=1}^{n} C_i \), BE is performed by applying a recursive number of erosion operations to increase the separability of every subset \( C_i \). That is, at the \( t \)th iteration of the erosion process, each connected component \( A_t \) of the image silhouette \( I^{(t-1)} \) is subject to Minkowski subtraction [5] with respect to a closed disc structuring element \( B(0,1) \) of the radius 1 defined as

\[
R_i = A_t^{(i)} \ominus B(0,1),
\]

where \( \ominus \) stands for Minkowski subtraction defined by

\[
A_t^{(i)} \ominus B(0,1) = \cap_{\beta \in B} (A_t^{(i)} + \beta)
\]

and \( R_i \) is the result of the erosion process of each connected component by which the image silhouette \( I^{(t)} \) is evolved

\[
I^{(t+1)} = \cup R_i.
\]

Fast radial symmetry (FRS) transform [6] is a feature extraction technique that transforms the original image to a new representation that highlights the local radial symmetry of the image gradient. In [25] FRS is applied for yeast colonies counting.

The main idea behind FRS transform is that every edge pixel point of the image space gives a vote for the plausible radial symmetry at some specific distance from that point. Technically, given the distance value \( m \) of the range \([R_{min}, R_{max}]\), for every pixel \((x,y)\) of the gradient image \( g \), FRS determines the positively-affected \( p_{+ve} \) and negatively-affected \( p_{-ve} \) pixels, and sequentially constructs the orientation projection image \( O_m \) and the magnitude projection image \( M_m \) as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
p_{+ve}(x,y) &= (x,y) + \text{round}\left( g(x,y) \| g(x,y) \| \times m \right), \\
p_{-ve}(x,y) &= (x,y) - \text{round}\left( g(x,y) \| g(x,y) \| \times m \right) \\
O_m(p_{+ve}(x,y)) &= O_m(p_{+ve}(x,y)) + 1, \\
O_m(p_{-ve}(x,y)) &= O_m(p_{-ve}(x,y)) - 1 \\
M_m(p_{+ve}(x,y)) &= M_m(p_{+ve}(x,y)) + \| g(x,y) \|, \\
M_m(p_{-ve}(x,y)) &= M_m(p_{-ve}(x,y)) - \| g(x,y) \|
\end{align*}
\]

Upon constructing the orientation and magnitude images, the radial symmetry contribution \( S_m \) for the radius \( m \in [R_{min}, R_{max}] \) is calculated by the convolution of \( F_m \) with a 2D Gaussian \( A_m \):

\[
S_m = F_m \ast A_m,
\]
where \( F_m \) is formulated as
\[
F_m(x, y) = \frac{M_m(x, y)}{k_m} \left( \frac{O_m(x, y)}{k_m} \right)^\alpha,
\]
\( \alpha \) and \( k_m \) are respectively the radial strictness and the scaling factor that normalizes \( M_m \) and \( O_m \) across different radii. \( O_m \) is defined as
\[
\tilde{O}_m(x, y) = \begin{cases} 
O_m(x, y), & \text{if } O_m(x, y) < k_m, \\
k_m, & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}
\]

The full FRS transform \( S \) by which the interest symmetric regions are defined is given by the average of the symmetry contributions over all the radii \( m \in [R_{\text{min}}, R_{\text{max}}] \) considered:
\[
S = \frac{1}{|N|} \sum_{m \in [R_{\text{min}}, R_{\text{max}}]} S_m.
\]

Eventually, the seedpoints are estimated as the average locations, centroids, of the detected symmetric regions, in \( S \). Fig. 3 illustrates BE-FRS applied for seedpoint extraction.

### B. Contour Evidence Extraction

The contour evidence extraction is carried out by an edge-to-seedpoint association method [1] incorporating the visual parts of the overlapping objects and the detected seedpoints. Specifically, the edge-to-seedpoint association method combines the distance and the divergence index (cosine distance) to assign edge pixel points to the seedpoints. Given the set of object seedpoints \( S = \{s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n\} \), every edge pixel point \( e_k \) in \( E = \{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_m\} \) is linked to the detected object seedpoints based on the relevance metric \( \text{rel}(e_k, s_j) \) defined as
\[
\text{rel}(e_k, s_j) = \frac{1 - \lambda}{1 + \text{dist}(e_k, s_j)} + \lambda \frac{\text{div}(e_k, s_j) + 1}{2},
\]
where \( \text{dist}(., .) \) and \( \text{div}(., .) \) are respectively Euclidean distance and divergence functions, each normalized to \((0, 1]\) and then summed up by the weight \( \lambda \). By this means, the edge point \( e_k \) is assigned to seedpoint \( s_j \) with the highest relevance value.

The distance function \( \text{dist}(., .) \) is defined as the distance from the edge point \( e_k \) to the nearest seedpoint \( s_j \). It is assumed that all the pixel points on the line connecting the edge point to the seedpoint \( l(e_k, s_j) \) reside in the image foreground \( M \):
\[
g(x) = \begin{cases} 
|e_k - s_j|, & \text{if } l(e_k, s_j) \subset M, \\
\infty, & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}
\]

The divergence function \( \text{div}(e_k, s_j) \) measures the difference between the direction of the line connecting the edge point \( e_k \) to seedpoint \( s_j \) and the gradient direction at point \( e_k \), estimated by the cosine of the angle between them:
\[
\text{div}(e_k, s_j) = \frac{\text{g}(e_k) \cdot l(e_k, s_j)}{\|\text{g}(e_k)\| \|l(e_k, s_j)\|}.
\]

In this work, to reduce the number of potential false classified edge points and the amount of computation, the search space is dynamically defined by a circular zone around each individual edge point such that fewer seedpoints are processed.

Fig. 4 demonstrates the edge-to-seedpoint association. While the green solid arrow represents the gradient direction at edge point \( e_1 \), the red and blue dashed arrows represent the direction of the lines connecting \( e_1 \) to \( s_1 \) and \( s_2 \) respectively. Fig. 5 shows the edge-to-seedpoint association applied to extract contour evidences.

### C. Contour Estimation

Once the contour evidence has been obtained, contour estimation is carried out to infer the missing parts of the overlapping objects. In this work, the contour estimation is addressed through a classical ellipse fitting problem in which
the partially observed objects are modeled in the form of ellipse-shape objects.

Given set of data points \((x, y)\), an objective cost function characterizing the goodness of the ellipse is optimized based on algebraic deviation. In algebraic ellipse fitting [26], an ellipse as a special case of a generic conic is formulated by the zero set of the second order polynomial equation. For a given point \((x, y)\) an ellipse with a parameter vector \(a\) is defined as the equation
\[
a_0x^2 + a_1xy + a_2y^2 + a_3x + a_4y + a_5 = 0, \tag{14}
\]
where
\[
a = [a_0 \ a_1 \ a_2 \ a_3 \ a_4 \ a_5]
\]
Eq. 14 defines an ellipse, provided that the quadratic condition
\[
\Delta = a_1^2 - 4a_0a_2 < 0 \tag{15}
\]
is satisfied. The goodness of the ellipse fitting is modeled as the sum of squared algebraic distances of every point involved. Given the ellipse parameter vector model \(a\), the algebraic distance \(d(a, (x, y))\) is the deviation of point \((x, y)\) when applied to the implicit polynomial conic equation as
\[
d(a, (x, y)) = a_0x^2 + a_1xy + a_2y^2 + a_3x + a_4y + a_5 \tag{16}
\]
For the given set of points \(\{(x_i, y_i) \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\}\) the objective cost function is
\[
\hat{a} = \arg\min_a \sum_{i=1}^n d_i(a, (x_i, y_i))^2. \tag{17}
\]

Equivalently, collecting the data points into a design matrix \(D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 6}\) as
\[
D = \begin{bmatrix}
x_1^2 & x_1y_1 & y_1^2 & x_1 & y_1 & 1 \\
x_2^2 & x_2y_2 & y_2^2 & x_2 & y_2 & 1 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
x_n^2 & x_ny_n & y_n^2 & x_n & y_n & 1
\end{bmatrix}, \tag{18}
\]
the objective function can be re-formulated through the matrix representation
\[
d(a) = \|Da\| = a^T D^T Da = a^T Ca,
\]
where \(S = D^T D\) is a scatter matrix.

In essence, the matrix form representation of the ellipse fitting problem in Eq. 19 along the quadratic condition in matrix form
\[
a^T Ca < 0 \tag{20}
\]
with the constrain matrix
\[
C = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}. \tag{21}
\]
is the underlining formulation to resolve the minimization problem by adopting generic conics polynomial equations. However, to guarantee that the solution is an ellipse, specific auxiliary conditions need to be considered. Within the family of direct least squares ellipse fitting, the quadratic condition of Eq. 15 is replaced by
\[
\Delta = a_1^2 - 4a_0a_2 = -1, \tag{22}
\]
or equivalently
\[
a^T Ca = -1. \tag{23}
\]
Given the Lagrange multiplier \(\lambda\) and differentiation
\[
D^T Da + 2\lambda Ca = 0, \tag{24}
\]
the minimization problem in its original form [27] is to resolve the following system of equations
\[
Sa = \lambda Ca
\]
\[
a^T Ca = -1 \tag{25}
\]
which can be obtained explicitly through a rank-deficient generalized eigen-system for the parameter vector \(a\).

IV. EXPERIMENTS

This section, presents the data, the performance measures, parameter selection and results for seedpoint extraction and segmentation.

A. Data

The experiments were carried out using one synthetically generated dataset and two datasets from real-world applications.

The synthetic dataset (Fig. 6(a)) consists of images with overlapping ellipse-shape objects that are uniformly randomly scaled, rotated, and translated. Three subsets of images are generated to represent different degrees of overlap between objects. The dataset consists of 150 sample images divided into three classes of overlap degree. The maximum rates of overlapping area allowed between two objects are 40%, 50%, and 60%, respectively, for the first, second, and third subset. Each subset of images in the dataset contains 50 images of 40 objects. The minimum and maximum width and length of the ellipses are 30, and 45 pixels. The image size is 300 \times 400 pixels.

The first real dataset (crystal particles dataset) contains crystal particles images captured by transmission electron
microscopy (Fig. 6(b)). In total, the dataset contains 11 images of 4008 × 2672 pixels. Around 200 particles are marked manually in each image by an expert. The annotations consist of manually drawn contours of the objects. This information is, additionally, used to determine the centroids and annotated edge points. Since not all the objects are marked, a pre-processing step is applied to eliminate the unmarked objects from the images. It should be noted that the images consist of dark objects on a white background and, therefore, pixels outside the marked objects could be colored white without making the images considerably easier to analyze.

The second real dataset (nanoparticles dataset), originally presented in [1], consists of 9 microscopy images of nanoparticles divided into two classes, medium and high degree of overlap (Fig. 6(c)). The dataset is used to replicate the experiments of the original publication with the method presented in this paper included. The ground truth for the object contours is not available and, therefore, the method evaluation is performed based on the manually counted total number of correctly detected particles in each image.

B. Performance Measures

To evaluate the method performance and to compare the methods, two specific performance measures, True Positive Rate (TPR) and Positive Predictive Value (PPV), were used:

\[
TPR = \frac{TP}{TP + FN} \quad (26)
\]

\[
PPV = \frac{TP}{TP + FP} \quad (27)
\]

where True Positive (TP) is the number of correctly detected seedpoints or segmented objects. False Positive (FP) is the number of incorrectly detected seedpoints or segmentation results, and False Negative (FN) is the number of missed seedpoints or objects.

To determine whether a seedpoint was correctly detected (TP), the distance to the ground truth object center was computed and the decision was made using a predefined threshold value (distance threshold, \(\rho_1\)). The threshold value was set to 8 pixels. The average distance (AD) from detected seedpoints to the ground truth object center point was used as the third performance measure for the seedpoint extraction.

To decide whether the segmentation result was correct or incorrect, Jaccard Similarity coefficient (JSC) [28] was used. Given a binary map of the segmented object \(O_s\) and the ground truth particle \(O_g\), JSC is computed as

\[
JSC = \frac{O_s \cap O_g}{O_s \cup O_g} \quad (28)
\]

The threshold values for the ratio of overlap (JSC threshold, \(\rho_2\)) were set to 0.5 and 0.7 in the real and synthetic datasets respectively. Since the synthetic dataset contains perfect ellipses and the contour estimation applied by ellipse fitting the threshold value was set to higher value than in real dataset where the object are not perfect ellipses. The average JSC (AJSC) value was also used as a third measure to evaluate the segmentation performance.

C. Parameter Selection

The proposed method requires the following major parameters:

Type of structuring element determines how the erosion process proceeds and affects the extent of erosions. In this work, the erosion process is performed using the disc-shaped structuring element of size one. The disc-shape structuring element is a convenient choice for smoothing concave boundaries and roundish shape objects.

Number of erosion operations (\(t\)) determines the extent of erosion, applied as a predefined number of iterations, to eliminate the touching points and increase the convexity of objects. Defining the number of erosion iterations is fairly an empirical task and is closely connected to the object size and the degree of overlap. In particular, with a very large number of erosion, it is possible that some objects with a high degree of overlap are totally faded away from the image. In this particular work, due to the large variation in size of objects and the high degree of overlap, the number of erosion operations is set to 2. Fig. 7 shows the performance of seedpoint extraction with various settings of number of erosion operations. It should be noted that since the objects size changes per each erosion operation, the radial range is adjusted.

Radial range \([R_{min}, R_{max}]\) determines the range of radii at which the FRS full transform \(S\) is computed. The radial range should be defined such that it covers the range of all objects sizes available in the image. Considering the smallest and largest object axes, the radial ranges were set to \(R_{min} = 16\) and \(R_{max} = 18\) for the synthetic dataset and \(R_{min} = 10\) and \(R_{max} = 17\) for the crystal particles dataset.

Radial-Strictness (\(\alpha\)) defines to what extent the radial symmetry-ness of features must be weighted in the computation of the FRS full transform \(S\). A lower value of \(\alpha\) emphasizes on non-radially symmetric features where as a higher value of \(\alpha\) ensures that non-radially symmetric features are eliminated. This parameter is useful when the objects are not perfectly radial symmetric.

Fig. 8 presents the effect of different values of \(\alpha\) on the performance of the FRS algorithm applied on the crystal particles dataset. In this work, the radial strictness parameter \(\alpha\) was set to 1 to obtain the highest performance of FRS. With varying values of \(\alpha\), the other parameters are kept fixed as described above.

Divergence weight factor (\(\lambda\)) is a scalar parameter that defines the relative importance of the divergence index with
Fig. 8. Performance of seedpoint extraction with different values of $\alpha$ in the crystal particles dataset.

Fig. 9. Performance of the proposed segmentation method with different values of $\lambda$ in the crystal particles dataset.

respect to the Euclidean distance as formulated in Eq. 11. The parameter $\lambda$ takes a value from the range $[0, 1]$. A high value ($\lambda > 0.5$) results a relevance function that out-weighs divergence index to the Euclidean distance, while a low value ($\lambda < 0.5$) results a relevance function that out-weighs the Euclidean distance. Determining the value of $\lambda$ is closely connected to the quality of the estimated seedpoint. In general, provided accurate estimates of object seedpoints, the performance of the relevance function, assigning edge to seedpoints, is ruled by the Euclidean distance, and the value of parameter $\lambda$ is not critical. However, if the estimated seedpoints do not optimally resemble the object centroids, the Euclidean distance can be ambiguous, and accordingly a large value of $\lambda$ is a preferable choice.

Fig. 9 presents the effect of the various values of $\lambda$ on the performance of the proposed segmentation method for the crystal particles dataset. The performance decreases at the high range $[0.51]$. Since the estimated seedpoints by the BE-FRS method are quite close to the center of the object the value of $\lambda$ was set to 0.2.

D. Results

1) Seedpoint Extraction: The proposed method for seedpoint extraction was applied to detect the location of objects in both the synthetic and real datasets. As previously mentioned, the ground truth was not available for the nanoparticles dataset and it is excluded from seedpoint extraction comparisons.

The results for the seedpoint extraction applied to the synthetic and crystal particles datasets are presented in Tables I and II respectively. The results obtained from the synthetic dataset (see Table I) show that BE-FRS, FRS, and SBF methods are comparable, in terms of PPV, BE-FRS outperforms the other methods. The results in Table II show the advantage of BE-FRS over the other methods when
applied to the crystal particles dataset. While the TPR and PPV values indicate its higher accuracy, the lower AD reveals its performance in terms of seedpoint quality. Note that BE-FRS performs better than SBF in the case of the real dataset since it is more robust when the object shapes are less convex.

Fig. 10 demonstrates the result of seedpoint extraction applied to a slice of crystal particles dataset. Of the methods studied, it can be seen that BE-FRS outperforms the other methods and that while DT and UECS exhibit under-segmentation, SBF and FRS suffers from over-segmentation.

2) Segmentation: The performance of the proposed segmentation method was compared to two existing methods, Nanoparticles Segmentation (NPA) [1] and Concave-point Extraction and Contour Segmentation (CECS) [2]. The NPA and CECS methods are particularly chosen as previously applied for segmentation of overlapping convex and elliptical shape objects, respectively. The implementation made by the corresponding authors was used for NPA [1]. CECS was implemented by ourselves based on [2]. Examples of typical segmentation results are presented in Fig. 11. NPA suffers from undersegmentation while CECS tends to oversegment the objects. The proposed method neither under- nor oversegments the objects.

The corresponding performance statistics of the competing methods applied to the synthetic and the crystal particles datasets are shown in Tables III and IV respectively. In the case of the synthetic dataset, the proposed method is the best one in all terms. This is clearly because of the fitted ellipse
model, which is in line with the elliptical shape of objects. In the case of the crystal particles dataset (Table IV), the proposed method outperforms the other two with respect to the TPR and AJSC, but in terms of PPV, NPA performs slightly better than the proposed method. The high AJSC value of the proposed method indicates its superiority with respect to the resolved overlap ratio.

Table V presents results for the nanoparticles dataset from [1] updated with the proposed method. The other methods are NPA, watershed segmentation with h-dome transform (WHD) [29], marker-controlled watershed with h-maxima transform (WHM) [30], normalized-cut (N-Cut) [31], multiphase active contour (MPAC) [32], sliding band filter (SBF) [22], morphological multi scale method MSD [33], and iterative voting method IVM [9]. Due to the non-availability of ground truth data, the performance of the methods is quantified using the total number of correctly identified objects, similar to original publication. For the images of the medium and high degree of overlap the proposed method achieves the highest segmentation rate in six images and the second-highest rate in the rest. Overall, the proposed method outperforms the competing methods in terms of average percentage of correctly detected objects. An example of segmentation on the nanoparticles dataset is presented in Fig. 12.

E. Analysis of Evaluation Parameters

The results reported above were obtained with a fixed set of evaluation parameters chosen as described in Sec. IV-B. To study the reliability of the results, the effect of the evaluation parameters, the distance threshold ($\rho_1$) and JSC threshold ($\rho_2$), were analyzed using the synthetic and crystal particles dataset.

The effect of $\rho_1$ on the TPR, PPV and AD scores obtained with different seedpoint extraction methods are presented in Figs. 13 and 14. As it can be seen, the value of $\rho_1$ has only minor effect on the ranking order of the methods and the proposed BE-FRS method is one of the best methods regardless of the selected threshold value. In general, at low values of $\rho_1$, in terms of TPR, BE-FRS is the best method, while in terms of PPV and AD, DT is slightly better than BE-FRS. High PPV and AD scores of DT, reflecting the higher precision rate of detected seedpoints, are consistent with the specific formulation in DT that does not make assumption about the shape of objects.

F. Computation Time

The proposed method was implemented in MATLAB, using a PC with a 3.20 GHz CPU and 8 GB of RAM. The processing
time depends on the image resolution. With the selected combination of parameters the computational time was 150 seconds per crystal particle image, while NPA demanded 200 seconds and CECS 77 seconds. The computational time breakdown was as follows: seedpoint extraction 53%, edge-to marker association 45%, and ellipse fitting 2%. However, it should be noted that the method performance was not optimized and the computation time could be significantly improved.

V. CONCLUSIONS

This paper presented a method to segment multiple partially overlapping approximately elliptical shape objects in silhouette images using radial symmetry. The proposed method consists of seedpoint extraction using Bounded Erosion and Fast Radial Symmetry Transform, contour evidence extraction using edge-to-seedpoint association, and contour estimation using ellipse fitting. The experiments were carried out using one synthetically generated dataset and two datasets from real-world applications. The proposed approach for seedpoint extraction and the segmentation method were shown to achieve high
detection and segmentation accuracies and they were found to outperform the competing methods in all datasets. In future work it would be worthwhile to include the generalization of the method with more complex convex objects.
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