

Fine-grained Metrics for Point Cloud Semantic Segmentation

Zhuheng Lu¹, Ting Wu¹, Yuewei Dai¹, Weiqing Li², and Zhiyong Su¹(✉)

¹ School of Automation, Nanjing University of Science and Technology, Nanjing 210094, China

su@njjust.edu.cn

² School of Computer Science and Engineering, Nanjing University of Science and Technology, Nanjing 210094, China

Abstract. Two forms of imbalances are commonly observed in point cloud semantic segmentation datasets: (1) category imbalances, where certain objects are more prevalent than others; and (2) size imbalances, where certain objects occupy more points than others. Because of this, the majority of categories and large objects are favored in the existing evaluation metrics. This paper suggests fine-grained mIoU and mAcc for a more thorough assessment of point cloud segmentation algorithms in order to address these issues. Richer statistical information is provided for models and datasets by these fine-grained metrics, which also lessen the bias of current semantic segmentation metrics towards large objects. The proposed metrics are used to train and assess various semantic segmentation algorithms on three distinct indoor and outdoor semantic segmentation datasets.

Keywords: Point cloud · Semantic segmentation · Evaluation metrics.

1 Introduction

Point cloud semantic segmentation algorithms aim to classify the point clouds at the point level. Algorithm optimization and improvement heavily depend on the choice of suitable and thorough evaluation metrics for various algorithms and application circumstances. In the past few years, the overall accuracy (OA) is provided to evaluate the segmentation results. However, it is inappropriate to use only OA when the semantic segmentation datasets have long-tailed distributions, since it is biased to categories with larger number of points. As a result, mean class accuracy (mAcc) is then used in the semantic segmentation experiment, which computes and averages the point accuracy of each category based on the datasets. Besides, mean intersection over union (mIoU) is suggested as an evaluation metric of segmentation results, nevertheless, as the mAcc does not take false positives into account. Since then, dataset-level mAcc and mIoU is widely used for semantic segmentation tasks on different datasets, such as indoor scene dataset ScanNet [5], S3DIS [1] and outdoor scene dataset Semantic3D [7].

Among the existing dataset-level evaluation metrics, the prediction results of true positive, false positive, true negative and false negative are counted across

all points over the whole dataset. These evaluation metrics still face several problems:

- Existing evaluation metrics exhibit a bias in favor of larger objects due to the imbalances. Nonetheless, a significant proportion of points are unequally distributed among categories in the majority of point cloud semantic segmentation datasets.
- Existing dataset-level evaluation metrics fail to capture valuable statistics about segmentation algorithms on a single point cloud or object instance, preventing comprehensive comparisons.

In this paper, fine-grained mIoU and mAcc are proposed for the evaluation of semantic segmentation algorithms. Specifically, the point cloud-level metrics are first calculated to deal with the category imbalances. Then, the approximate instance-level metrics are further calculated to cope with the size imbalances. These fine-grained metrics reduce bias toward large objects. Furthermore, they supply a wealth of statistical information, allowing for more robust and comprehensive comparisons.

2 Related Work

In the semantic segmentation task, each point in the point cloud is assigned a predictive semantic label by the algorithm. The predicted labels are compared with the manually labeled labels, and four indicators are counted for each category: true positive, false positive, false negative, and true negative. The most common evaluation metrics include: OA, mAcc, and mIoU.

OA represents the proportion of correctly segmented points to the total number of points [14,20]. However, overall accuracy is biased to categories with large number of points. Moreover, the overall accuracy contains limited information, making it easy to overlook the phenomenon of poor segmentation performance of a certain category. It cannot accurately report the segmentation results of particular categories.

mAcc is introduced to average point-wise accuracy across all categories [14,20]. It is applicable to datasets with a large and imbalanced number of categories, and can represent the semantic segmentation accuracy of each category. However, mAcc does not take false positives in account, which leads to over-segmentation of the results.

IoU, also known as the Jaccard Similarity Coefficient (JSC), is now the most commonly employed in semantic segmentation [14,15]. In point cloud semantic segmentation, IoU represents the overlap rate between the predicted mask and the labeled point cloud, which is used to evaluate the accuracy of the predicted segmentation area. It is also used in object detection and instance segmentation. Mean intersection over union (mIoU) is the arithmetic mean of the IoU values of all categories, used to evaluate point overlap in the overall dataset. As the most widely used metric in point cloud semantic segmentation, the mIoU indicates

the prediction ability of the segmentation methods to the correct point in the datasets.

Therefore, selecting appropriate and comprehensive evaluation metrics for different algorithms plays an important role in algorithm optimization and improvement. Traditional dataset-level evaluation metrics cannot capture valuable statistical information regarding the performance of segmentation methods on a single point cloud or instance, preventing comprehensive comparisons.

3 Fine-grained mIoU

This section first reviews the dataset-level mIoU^{D} , and then proposes point cloud-level mIoU^{P} , mIoU^{C} and instance-level mIoU^{I} .

3.1 Dataset-level mIoU^{D}

The dataset-level mIoU^{D} is calculated by accumulating the segmentation results of all points in the entire dataset. For each category, the IoU_c^{D} is defined as:

$$\text{IoU}_c^{\text{D}} = \frac{\sum_{p=1}^P \text{TP}_{p,c}}{\sum_{p=1}^P (\text{TP}_{p,c} + \text{FP}_{p,c} + \text{FN}_{p,c})}, \quad (1)$$

where P is the number of point clouds, $\text{TP}_{p,c}$, $\text{FP}_{p,c}$ and $\text{FN}_{p,c}$ respectively represent the number of TP, FP, and FN points in the c -th category of p -th point cloud. Then, dataset-level mIoU^{D} is defined as:

$$\text{mIoU}^{\text{D}} = \frac{1}{C} \sum_{c=1}^C \text{IoU}_c^{\text{D}}, \quad (2)$$

where C is the number of categories in the dataset.

3.2 Point Cloud-level mIoU^{P} and mIoU^{C}

The point cloud-level metrics aim to give more detailed assessment for semantic segmentation methods to cope with the category imbalances. Since not all categories appear in different point cloud models, there will be statistical bias in the statistical results of the dataset-level evaluation metrics. Therefore, the NULL representation is introduced into the point cloud-level mIoU^{P} and mIoU^{C} . For the p -th point cloud in the c -th category, the $\text{IoU}_{p,c}$ is defined as:

$$\text{IoU}_{p,c} = \frac{\text{TP}_{p,c}}{\text{TP}_{p,c} + \text{FP}_{p,c} + \text{FN}_{p,c}}. \quad (3)$$

Then, based on the $\text{IoU}_{p,c}$ of all categories, the IoU_p^{P} of p -th point cloud is defined as follows:

$$\text{IoU}_p^{\text{P}} = \frac{\sum_{c=1}^C \mathbb{1}\{\text{IoU}_{p,c} \neq \text{NULL}\} \text{IoU}_{p,c}}{\sum_{c=1}^C \mathbb{1}\{\text{IoU}_{p,c} \neq \text{NULL}\}}, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbb{1}$ is the indicator function, and only non-empty categories are counted. If a category does not appear in the point cloud, it is marked as NULL.

Finally, IoU_p^{P} is obtained by calculating the average value of each point cloud-level IoU_p^{P} :

$$\text{mIoU}^{\text{P}} = \frac{1}{P} \sum_{p=1}^P \text{IoU}_p^{\text{P}}. \quad (5)$$

	P_1	P_2	P_3	P_4	P_5
C_1	0.72	0.95	0.88	0.75	0.86
C_2	NULL	0.56	NULL	0.44	NULL
C_3	NULL	NULL	0.77	0.68	NULL

Fig. 1: Statistical chart of mIoU values.

The results of calculating the average by category and then by point cloud are different from those of calculating the average by point cloud and then by category due to the NULL values, as shown in Figure 1. One drawback of the mIoU^{P} metric is that it tends to favor category C_1 , which appears more frequently in point clouds. To address this bias, the mIoU^{C} metric is first counted by point cloud and then by category. The point cloud-level IoU_c^{C} of a certain

category is defined as:

$$\text{IoU}_c^C = \frac{\sum_{p=1}^P \mathbb{1}\{\text{IoU}_{p,c} \neq \mathbf{NULL}\} \text{IoU}_{p,c}}{\sum_{p=1}^P \mathbb{1}\{\text{IoU}_{p,c} \neq \mathbf{NULL}\}}. \quad (6)$$

Similar to mIoU^P , averaging these point cloud-level metrics can yield mIoU^C :

$$\text{mIoU}^C = \frac{1}{C} \sum_{c=1}^C \text{IoU}_c^C. \quad (7)$$

3.3 Instance-level mIoU^I

The instance-level mIoU^I provides a more precise evaluation of segmentation algorithms to deal with size-variance. Specifically, for the i -th instances of c -th category in p -th point cloud, both TP and FN can be accurately calculated. The instance-level FP is approximated by allocating point cloud-level FP proportionally to the size of each instance [21]. Then, the $\text{IoU}_{p,c,i}$ of a certain instance is defined as:

$$\text{IoU}_{p,c,i} = \frac{\text{TP}_{p,c,i}}{(\text{TP}_{p,c,i} + \text{FN}_{p,c,i} + \frac{S_{p,c,i}}{I_{p,c}} \text{FP}_{p,c})}, \quad (8)$$

$$\sum_{i=1} S_{p,c,i}$$

where $\text{FP}_{p,c}$ is the number of points of the c -th category in the p -th point cloud where the segmentation result is FP, and $I_{p,c}$ represents the total number of instances belonging to the c -th category in the p -th point cloud. $S_{p,c,i}$ is the total number of points of the i -th instance, which can be defined as:

$$S_{p,c,i} = \text{TP}_{p,c,i} + \text{FN}_{p,c,i}. \quad (9)$$

Based on the $\text{IoU}_{p,c,i}$ of each instance, the IoU_c^I of a certain category can be defined as follows:

$$\text{IoU}_c^I = \frac{\sum_{p=1}^P \sum_{i=1}^{I_{p,c}} \text{IoU}_{p,c,i}}{\sum_{p=1}^P I_{p,c}}. \quad (10)$$

By averaging IoU_c^I of all categories, the instance-level mIoU^I metric can be obtained as follows:

$$\text{mIoU}^I = \frac{1}{C} \sum_{c=1}^C \text{IoU}_c^I. \quad (11)$$

4 Fine-grained mAcc

This section first reviews the dataset-level mAcc^{D} , and then presents point cloud-level mAcc^{P} , mAcc^{C} and instance-level mAcc^{I} .

4.1 Dataset-level mAcc^{D}

mAcc^{D} reports the average segmentation accuracy of various categories in the dataset. For the c -th category, the Acc_c^{D} is defined as:

$$\text{Acc}_c^{\text{D}} = \frac{\sum_{p=1}^P (\text{TP}_{p,c} + \text{TN}_{p,c})}{\sum_{p=1}^P (\text{TP}_{p,c} + \text{FP}_{p,c} + \text{TN}_{p,c} + \text{FN}_{p,c})}. \quad (12)$$

Then, dataset-level mAcc^{D} is defined as:

$$\text{mAcc}^{\text{D}} = \frac{1}{C} \sum_{c=1}^C \text{Acc}_c^{\text{D}}. \quad (13)$$

4.2 Point Cloud-level mAcc^{P} and mAcc^{C}

The point cloud-level mAcc^{P} and mAcc^{C} are designed to provide a more comprehensive evaluation of segmentation algorithms with a focus on category imbalance. The NULL representation is also introduced into the point cloud-level mAcc^{P} and mAcc^{C} similar to the point cloud-level mIoU^{P} and mIoU^{C} . For the p -th point cloud in the c -th category, the $\text{Acc}_{p,c}$ is defined as:

$$\text{Acc}_{p,c} = \frac{\text{TP}_{p,c} + \text{TN}_{p,c}}{\text{TP}_{p,c} + \text{FP}_{p,c} + \text{FN}_{p,c} + \text{TN}_{p,c}}. \quad (14)$$

The Acc_p^{P} for p -th point cloud can be calculated using the $\text{Acc}_{p,c}$ of all categories, which is specified as:

$$\text{Acc}_p^{\text{P}} = \frac{\sum_{c=1}^C \mathbb{1}\{\text{Acc}_{p,c} \neq \text{NULL}\} \text{Acc}_{p,c}}{\sum_{c=1}^C \mathbb{1}\{\text{Acc}_{p,c} \neq \text{NULL}\}}, \quad (15)$$

where $\mathbb{1}$ is the indicator function. Only non-empty categories are counted in the Acc_p^{P} . Then, the point cloud-level mAcc^{P} is defined as:

$$\text{mAcc}^{\text{P}} = \frac{1}{P} \sum_{p=1}^P \text{Acc}_p^{\text{P}}. \quad (16)$$

Then, segmentation results are counted by point cloud and then by category. Specifically, the point cloud level Acc_c^C of a certain category is defined as:

$$\text{Acc}_c^C = \frac{\sum_{p=1}^P \mathbb{1}\{\text{Acc}_{p,c} \neq \mathbf{NULL}\} \text{Acc}_{p,c}}{\sum_{p=1}^P \mathbb{1}\{\text{Acc}_{p,c} \neq \mathbf{NULL}\}}. \quad (17)$$

The point cloud-level mAcc^C is achieved by averaging all the Acc_c^C :

$$\text{mAcc}^C = \frac{1}{C} \sum_{c=1}^C \text{Acc}_c^C. \quad (18)$$

4.3 Instance-level mAcc^I

The instance-level mAcc^I is designed to provide a more granular evaluation for segmentation algorithms to deal with size differences among objects. For the i -th instances of c -th category in p -th point cloud, the $\text{Acc}_{p,c,i}$ is defined as:

$$\text{Acc}_{p,c,i} = \frac{\text{TP}_{p,c,i} + \text{TN}_{p,c,i}}{(\text{TP}_{p,c,i} + \text{FN}_{p,c,i} + \text{TN}_{p,c,i} + \frac{S_{p,c,i}}{I_{p,c}} \text{FP}_{p,c})}. \quad (19)$$

$$\sum_{i=1} S_{p,c,i}$$

Then, the Acc_c^I of a certain category can be defined as follows:

$$\text{Acc}_c^I = \frac{\sum_{p=1}^P \sum_{i=1}^{I_{p,c}} \text{Acc}_{p,c,i}}{\sum_{p=1}^P I_{p,c}}. \quad (20)$$

Finally, the instance-level mAcc^I is defined as:

$$\text{mAcc}^I = \frac{1}{C} \sum_{c=1}^C \text{Acc}_c^I. \quad (21)$$

5 Experimental Results

The proposed fine-grained metrics are mainly evaluated on two large-scale indoor datasets and one challenging outdoor dataset, and the benchmark results are reported for each dataset.

5.1 Datasets

ScanNet. ScanNet [5] is a large 3D dataset containing 1,513 point clouds of scans from 707 unique indoor scenes. ScanNet contains a variety of spaces such as offices, apartments, and bathrooms. The annotation of the point clouds corresponds to 20 semantic categories plus one for the unannotated space. We adopt the official train-val split, where there are 1205 training scenes and 312 validation scenes.

S3DIS. S3DIS [1] is produced for indoor scene understanding and is widely used in the point cloud semantic segmentation task. S3DIS consists of 3D RGB point clouds of six floors from three different buildings split into individual rooms. Each room is scanned with RGBD sensors and is represented by a point cloud with coordinate information and RGB value. It contains 3D scans of 271 rooms with 13 categories, where area 5 is used for testing and the rest for training.

Semantic3D. Semantic3D [7] is a classic outdoor dataset containing urban and rural scenes. The annotation of the point clouds corresponds to 8 semantic categories, including man-made terrain, natural terrain, high vegetation, low vegetation, buildings, hard scape, scanning artifacts and cars. Semantic3D consists of 15 training scans and 15 test scans.

Table 1: Comparison of segmentation results for different levels of mIoU metrics on the ScanNet.

Method	mIoU ^D (%)	mIoU ^P (%)	mIoU ^C (%)	mIoU ^I (%)
PointNet++ [16]	33.9	46.6	33.1	32.5
PointCNN [11]	45.8	58.1	43.5	42.2
DGCNN [20]	56.3	68.1	62.3	50.3
KPConv [18]	68.4	72.1	66.3	63.5
SparseConvNet [4]	73.6	79.2	71.7	69.8
VMNet [13]	74.6	80.4	71.6	69.2
ConvNet+CBL [24]	76.6	81.2	72.0	71.2
PointTransformerV2 [22]	75.2	80.7	72.5	71.8
OctFormer [19]	76.5	81.4	72.6	71.7

5.2 Evaluations on mIoU

This section calculates the semantic segmentation results of dataset-based metric mIoU^D, point cloud-level metrics mIoU^P and mIoU^C, and instance-level metric mIoU^I on three datasets. The evaluation results are shown in Table 1, 2, and 3, respectively. On the ScanNet and Semantic3D datasets, none of the methods performed optimally on all of the evaluation metrics. Thus it is necessary to evaluate multiple evaluation metrics at the same time in order to conduct a comprehensive evaluation. On the S3DIS dataset, the PointMeta [12] outperforms


Table 2: Comparison of segmentation results for different levels of mIoU metrics on the S3DIS.

Method	mIoU ^D (%)	mIoU ^P (%)	mIoU ^C (%)	mIoU ^I (%)
PointNet [15]	30.7	48.7	30.3	28.6
PointCNN [11]	57.3	67.7	55.0	53.9
DGCNN [20]	60.4	70.3	57.9	55.7
SPGraph [10]	58.0	69.3	56.8	55.9
3D RNN [23]	53.4	65.2	50.9	49.8
JSNet [25]	54.5	67.0	52.6	51.0
VMNet [13]	57.8	67.4	55.1	53.4
ConvNet+CBL [24]	69.4	75.9	66.9	65.2
PointMeta [12]	77.0	81.9	73.2	71.2
Superpoint Transformer [17]	76.0	80.6	72.9	70.1

Table 3: Comparison of segmentation results for different levels of mIoU metrics on the Semantic3D.

Method	mIoU ^D (%)	mIoU ^P (%)	mIoU ^C (%)	mIoU ^I (%)
TMLC-MSR [8]	49.4	65.1	46.5	44.1
PointNet++ [16]	63.1	76.3	60.3	58.1
SnapNet [3]	59.1	74.2	55.4	54.0
SPGraph [10]	76.2	81.5	71.5	68.9
ConvNet+CBL [24]	75.0	80.6	70.5	68.1
ConvPoint [2]	76.5	81.4	72.2	71.7
RandLA-Net [9]	77.4	83.0	74.1	71.0
SCF-Net [6]	77.6	82.7	73.2	71.2

other methods on all metrics. The segmentation results on the point cloud-level mIoU^C and the instance-level mIoU^I are close on the three datasets. Therefore, when the dataset has no instance-level labels, the segmentation result of the point cloud-level mIoU^C can be utilized as a reference.


 Fig. 2: Comparing the rank of mIoU^C with mIoU^D, mIoU^P and mIoU^I on the ScanNet.

In addition, this section contrasts the rank of $mIoU^C$ with the other three metrics across three datasets, as shown in Figure 2, 3 and 4, respectively. It is clear that when the performance of multiple methods is close, the experimental results show local ranking discrepancies on several metrics. Therefore, in order to obtain a more comprehensive evaluation of different segmentation methods, it is required to compare segmentation metrics of varying granularity.




Fig. 3: Comparing the rank of $mIoU^C$ with $mIoU^D$, $mIoU^P$ and $mIoU^I$ on the S3DIS.




Fig. 4: Comparing the rank of $mIoU^C$ with $mIoU^D$, $mIoU^P$ and $mIoU^I$ on the Semantic3D.

5.3 Evaluations on mAcc

This section reports the semantic segmentation results of dataset-level metric $mAcc^D$, point cloud-level metrics $mAcc^P$ and $mAcc^C$, and instance-level metric $mAcc^I$ on three datasets, as shown in Table 4, 5 and 6, respectively. No method achieves the best result across all metrics on the ScanNet and Semantic3D datasets. On the S3DIS dataset, the PointMeta [12] model outperforms other methods on all metrics. Therefore, it is necessary to simultaneously refer to multiple evaluation metrics of different granularity to carry out comprehensive evaluation.

Table 4: Comparison of segmentation results for different levels of mAcc metrics on the ScanNet.

Method	mAcc ^D (%)	mAcc ^P (%)	mAcc ^C (%)	mAcc ^I (%)
PointNet++ [16]	63.4	70.6	60.2	58.7
PointCNN [11]	71.6	76.1	69.2	68.2
DGCNN [20]	72.3	75.4	68.8	66.2
KPConv [18]	73.1	78.3	71.3	70.2
SparseConvNet [4]	79.1	85.9	77.3	75.8
VMNet [13]	78.6	85.4	77.5	75.9
ConvNet+CBL [24]	81.0	88.9	79.1	78.7
PointTransformerV2 [22]	79.7	88.7	78.5	77.8
OctFormer [19]	81.3	90.2	78.9	77.7

Table 5: Comparison of segmentation results for different levels of mAcc metrics on the S3DIS.

Method	mAcc ^D (%)	mAcc ^P (%)	mAcc ^C (%)	mAcc ^I (%)
PointNet [15]	49.0	61.7	47.6	46.3
PointCNN [11]	63.9	76.0	60.8	59.1
DGCNN [20]	68.4	82.1	67.2	65.8
SPGraph [10]	66.5	81.3	64.5	63.1
3D RNN [23]	65.3	74.2	60.9	58.8
JSNet [25]	61.4	75.1	59.4	57.9
VMNet [13]	63.4	76.8	61.2	60.4
ConvNet+CBL [24]	75.2	87.5	73.2	72.4
PointMeta [12]	86.2	92.9	83.5	80.2
Superpoint Transformer [17]	85.8	90.6	81.6	79.1

Table 6: Comparison of segmentation results for different levels of mAcc metrics on the Semantic3D.

Method	mAcc ^D (%)	mAcc ^P (%)	mAcc ^C (%)	mAcc ^I (%)
TMLC-MSR [8]	68.2	80.6	67.8	66.6
PointNet++ [16]	71.6	81.3	69.8	68.1
SnapNet [3]	75.5	86.2	72.5	70.5
SPGraph [10]	81.9	89.5	78.5	77.3
ConvNet+CBL [24]	82.6	89.9	79.6	77.9
ConvPoint [2]	81.5	90.1	79.9	77.7
RandLA-Net [9]	82.4	91.6	81.0	78.6
SCF-Net [6]	82.8	91.2	80.3	78.0

This section also compares the rank of mAcc^C to the other three metrics across three datasets, as illustrated in Figures 5, 6, and 7, respectively. Figure 7(b) shows that different methods have consistent rankings between the mAcc^P and mAcc^C on Semantic3D dataset. In addition, the segmentation results exhibit local ranking disparities across different metrics when the segmentation

performance of different methods is similar. As a result, the evaluation metrics with different granularity can provide a more comprehensive evaluation.




Fig. 5: Comparing the rank of $mAcc^C$ with $mAcc^D$, $mAcc^P$ and $mAcc^I$ on the ScanNet.




Fig. 6: Comparing the rank of $mAcc^C$ with $mAcc^D$, $mAcc^P$ and $mAcc^I$ on the S3DIS.




Fig. 7: Comparing the rank of $mAcc^C$ with $mAcc^D$, $mAcc^P$ and $mAcc^I$ on the Semantic3D.

6 Conclusion

This paper proposes fine-grained evaluation metrics of semantic segmentation to address the issue that the current evaluation metrics in point cloud semantic segmentation are biased to most categories and large objects. The suggested fine-grained mIoU and mAcc evaluation metrics at the point cloud and instance levels provide a more thorough evaluation of the segmentation algorithms. Various semantic segmentation models are trained and assessed using the suggested metrics on three distinct indoor and outdoor semantic segmentation datasets. Experiments demonstrate that these fine-grained metrics offer greater statistical information and lessen the bias towards large objects.

Acknowledgment

The authors sincerely acknowledge the anonymous reviewers for their insights and comments to further improve the quality of the manuscript. They also would like to thank the participants in the study for their valuable time.

References

1. Armeni, I., Sener, O., Zamir, A.R., Jiang, H., Brilakis, I., Fischer, M., Savarese, S.: 3d semantic parsing of large-scale indoor spaces. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 1534–1543 (2016)
2. Boulch, A.: Convpoinc: Continuous convolutions for point cloud processing. *Computers & Graphics* **88**, 24 – 34 (2020)
3. Boulch, A., Guerry, J., Le Saux, B., Audebert, N.: Snapnet: 3d point cloud semantic labeling with 2d deep segmentation networks. *Computers & Graphics* **71**, 189–198 (2018)
4. Choy, C., Gwak, J., Savarese, S.: 4d spatio-temporal convnets: Minkowski convolutional neural networks. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 3075–3084 (2019)
5. Dai, A., Chang, A.X., Savva, M., Halber, M., Funkhouser, T., Niessner, M.: ScanNet: Richly-annotated 3d reconstructions of indoor scenes. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 2432–2443 (2017)
6. Fan, S., Dong, Q., Zhu, F., Lv, Y., Ye, P., Wang, F.Y.: Scf-net: Learning spatial contextual features for large-scale point cloud segmentation. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 14504–14513 (2021)
7. Hackel, T., Savinov, N., Ladicky, L., Wegner, J.D., Schindler, K., Pollefeys, M.: Semantic3d. net: A new large-scale point cloud classification benchmark. arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.03847 (2017)
8. Hackel, T., Wegner, J.D., Schindler, K.: Fast semantic segmentation of 3d point clouds with strongly varying density. *ISPRS annals of the photogrammetry, remote sensing and spatial information sciences* **3**, 177–184 (2016)

9. Hu, Q., Yang, B., Xie, L., Rosa, S., Guo, Y., Wang, Z., Trigoni, N., Markham, A.: Randla-net: Efficient semantic segmentation of large-scale point clouds. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 11108–11117 (2020)
10. Landrieu, L., Simonovsky, M.: Large-scale point cloud semantic segmentation with superpoint graphs. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition. pp. 4558–4567 (2018)
11. Li, Y., Bu, R., Sun, M., Wu, W., Di, X., Chen, B.: Pointcnn: Convolution on x-transformed points. pp. 820–830 (2018)
12. Lin, H., Zheng, X., Li, L., Chao, F., Wang, S., Wang, Y., Tian, Y., Ji, R.: Meta architecture for point cloud analysis. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 17682–17691 (2023)
13. Liu, Y., Fan, B., Meng, G., Lu, J., Xiang, S., Pan, C.: Densepoint: Learning densely contextual representation for efficient point cloud processing. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision. pp. 5239–5248 (2019)
14. Nguyen, A., Le, B.: 3d point cloud segmentation: A survey. In: 2013 6th IEEE conference on robotics, automation and mechatronics (RAM). pp. 225–230. IEEE (2013)
15. Qi, C.R., Su, H., Mo, K., Guibas, L.J.: Pointnet: Deep learning on point sets for 3d classification and segmentation. In: Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition. pp. 652–660 (2017)
16. Qi, C.R., Yi, L., Su, H., Guibas, L.J.: Pointnet++: Deep hierarchical feature learning on point sets in a metric space. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems. pp. 5105–5114 (2017)
17. Robert, D., Raguét, H., Landrieu, L.: Efficient 3d semantic segmentation with superpoint transformer. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision. pp. 17195–17204 (2023)
18. Thomas, H., Qi, C.R., Deschaud, J.E., Marcotegui, B., Goulette, F., Guibas, L.J.: Kpconv: Flexible and deformable convolution for point clouds. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision. pp. 6411–6420 (2019)
19. Wang, P.S.: Octformer: Octree-based transformers for 3d point clouds. *ACM Transactions on Graphics* **42**(4), 1–11 (2023)
20. Wang, Y., Sun, Y., Liu, Z., Sarma, S.E., Bronstein, M.M., Solomon, J.M.: Dynamic graph cnn for learning on point clouds. *ACM Transactions on Graphics* **38**(5), 1–12 (2019)
21. Wang, Z., Berman, M., Rannen-Triki, A., Torr, P., Tuia, D., Tuytelaars, T., Gool, L.V., Yu, J., Blaschko, M.: Revisiting evaluation metrics for semantic segmentation: Optimization and evaluation of fine-grained intersection over union. pp. 60144–60225 (2024)
22. Wu, X., Lao, Y., Jiang, L., Liu, X., Zhao, H.: Point transformer v2: Grouped vector attention and partition-based pooling. pp. 33330–33342 (2022)
23. Ye, X., Li, J., Huang, H., Du, L., Zhang, X.: 3d recurrent neural networks with context fusion for point cloud semantic segmentation. In: Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision. pp. 403–417 (2018)
24. Zhao, H., Jiang, L., Jia, J., Torr, P.H., Koltun, V.: Point transformer. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision. pp. 16259–16268 (2021)
25. Zhao, L., Tao, W.: Jsnet: Joint instance and semantic segmentation of 3d point clouds. In: Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence. vol. 34, pp. 12951–12958 (2020)