

# Evaluating SAM2’s Role in Camouflaged Object Detection: From SAM to SAM2

Lv Tang Bo Li  
 vivo Mobile Communication Co., Ltd, Shanghai, China  
 luckybird1994@gmail.com, libra@vivo.com

## Abstract

*The Segment Anything Model (SAM), introduced by Meta AI Research as a generic object segmentation model, quickly garnered widespread attention and significantly influenced the academic community. To extend its application to video, Meta further develops Segment Anything Model 2 (SAM2), a unified model capable of both video and image segmentation. SAM2 shows notable improvements over its predecessor in terms of applicable domains, promptable segmentation accuracy, and running speed. However, this report reveals a decline in SAM2’s ability to perceive different objects in images without prompts in its auto mode, compared to SAM. Specifically, we employ the challenging task of camouflaged object detection to assess this performance decrease, hoping to inspire further exploration of the SAM model family by researchers. The results of this paper are provided in <https://github.com/luckybird1994/SAMCOD>.*

## 1. Introduction

In recent years, large language models (LLMs) [4,30,34] have sparked a revolution in natural language processing (NLP). These foundational models exhibit remarkable transfer capabilities, extending far beyond their initial training objectives. LLMs showcase robust generalization abilities and excel in a multitude of open-world language tasks, including language comprehension, generation, interaction, and reasoning. Inspired by the success of LLMs, vision foundational models such as CLIP [24], DINOv2 [22], BLIP [16], and SAM [13] have also emerged. The introduction of these foundational models continues to drive researchers’ exploration in the field of computer vision.

Among these foundational models, SAM stands out as an influential model in the domain of image segmentation. Upon its introduction, it quickly receives widespread attention and is utilized across various fields. To further extend SAM’s applicability, SAM2 [25] is introduced, designed to handle both image and video segmentation tasks within a unified architecture. Compared to SAM, SAM2 has significantly improved in terms of promptable segmentation accuracy and running speed, further enhancing the capabilities of the SAM model family.

In this technical report, we use the task of camouflaged object detection (COD) as a case study to analyze the progress and compromises involved in transitioning from SAM to SAM2. We observe the following two points: 1) When the SAM2 model is provided with prompts for segmentation, its performance shows substantial improvement compared to SAM. 2) However, when operating in auto mode, where SAM2 and SAM are both tasked with perceiving all objects in an image without prompts, the performance of SAM2 significantly deteriorates. We hope that our findings will further encourage researchers to explore both SAM and SAM2.

## 2. Experiments

### 2.1. Datasets and Metrics

To validate the performance of SAM and SAM2, we evaluate its performance on three benchmark datasets, containing CAMO [14], COD10K [7], NC4K [19] and MoCA-Mask [3]. We use six widely used metrics: structure-measure ( $S_\alpha$ ) [5], mean E-measure ( $E_\phi$ ) [8], F-measure ( $F_\beta$ ), weighted F-measure ( $F_\beta^w$ ), max F-measure ( $F_\beta^{max}$ ) [20], and mean absolute error (MAE).

Table 1. Comparison results between SAM2 and two state-of-the-art VCOD methods

Methods	MoCA-Mask		
	$F_{\beta}^w$	$S_{\alpha}$	MAE
SLTNet (CVPR2022)	0.357	0.656	0.021
TSP-SAM(CVPR2024)	0.444	0.689	0.008
SAM2	0.691	0.804	0.004

## 2.2. Progress

**Video Task.** One of the biggest advancements of SAM2 over SAM is its application in video tasks. Therefore, we first test the potential of SAM2 in the VCOD task, selecting the MoCA-Mask as the evaluation dataset. Specifically, for the first frame of each video sequence, we randomly select three prompt points based on its corresponding ground truth to identify the target object for segmentation. The video sequence is then input into the SAM2, and the segmentation results are obtained as shown in Table. 1. SAM2 significantly surpasses state-of-the-art VCOD methods SLTNet [3] and TSP-SAM [9].

Table 2. Promptable segmentation performance of SAM and SAM2.

Methods	Setting	CAMO (250 Images)			COD10K (2026 Images)			NC4K (4121 Images)		
		$F_{\beta}^w$	$S_{\alpha}$	MAE	$F_{\beta}^w$	$S_{\alpha}$	MAE	$F_{\beta}^w$	$S_{\alpha}$	MAE
FSPNet (CVPR2023)	F	0.799	0.856	0.050	0.735	0.851	0.026	0.816	0.879	0.035
NCHIT (CVIU2022)	F	0.652	0.784	0.088	0.591	0.792	0.049	0.710	0.830	0.058
ERRNet (PR2022)	F	0.679	0.779	0.085	0.630	0.786	0.043	0.737	0.827	0.054
SAM (Shikra+SAM)	ZS	0.521	0.652	0.128	0.482	0.657	0.111	0.570	0.689	0.120
SAM2 (Shikra+SAM2)	ZS	0.620	0.716	0.113	0.565	0.708	0.101	0.672	0.760	0.092
SAM (LLAVA+SAM)	ZS	0.520	0.647	0.141	0.552	0.696	0.094	0.591	0.699	0.115
SAM2 (LLAVA+SAM2)	ZS	0.633	0.722	0.114	0.640	0.754	0.078	0.700	0.776	0.085

**Promptable Segmentation.** We further evaluate the performance of the SAM and SAM2 on promptable segmentation. Inspired by the recent study [28], we use MLLMs, Shikra [2] and LLaVA [17] to generate coordinates for camouflaged objects in images. These coordinates are then input into both SAM and SAM2 to produce the corresponding mask results. The performance is shown in Table. 2. it is evident that SAM2’s performance significantly exceeds that of SAM. Moreover, through this approach, the performance of zero-shot CoD methods has the potential to match or surpass fully supervised methods. These findings highlight the advancements made by SAM2.

### 2.3. Compromise

Table 3. Comparison results of SAM and SAM2 in Auto Mode.

Methods	Pub.	CAMO-Test (250 images)						COD10K-Test (2026 images)						NC4K (4121 images)					
		$S_\alpha$	$E_\phi$	$F_\beta^w$	$F_\beta$	$F_\beta^{max}$	MAE	$S_\alpha$	$E_\phi$	$F_\beta^w$	$F_\beta$	$F_\beta^{max}$	MAE	$S_\alpha$	$E_\phi$	$F_\beta^w$	$F_\beta$	$F_\beta^{max}$	MAE
CNN-Based Models																			
SINet	CVPR'20	0.751	0.771	0.606	0.675	0.706	0.100	0.771	0.806	0.551	0.634	0.676	0.051	0.808	0.871	0.723	0.769	0.775	0.058
C2FNet	IJCAI'21	0.796	0.854	0.719	0.762	0.771	0.080	0.812	0.890	0.686	0.723	0.743	0.036	0.838	0.897	0.762	0.795	0.810	0.049
LSR	CVPR'21	0.787	0.838	0.696	0.744	0.753	0.080	0.804	0.880	0.673	0.715	0.732	0.037	0.840	0.895	0.766	0.804	0.815	0.048
PFNet	CVPR'21	0.782	0.841	0.695	0.746	0.758	0.085	0.800	0.877	0.660	0.701	0.725	0.040	0.829	0.887	0.745	0.784	0.799	0.053
MGL	CVPR'21	0.775	0.812	0.673	0.726	0.740	0.088	0.814	0.851	0.666	0.710	0.738	0.035	0.833	0.867	0.739	0.782	0.800	0.053
JCOD	CVPR'21	0.800	0.859	0.728	0.772	0.779	0.073	0.809	0.884	0.684	0.721	0.738	0.035	0.842	0.898	0.771	0.806	0.816	0.047
TANet	AAAI'21	0.781	0.847	0.678	-	-	0.087	0.793	0.848	0.635	-	-	0.043	-	-	-	-	-	-
BGNet	IJCAI'22	0.813	0.870	0.749	0.789	0.799	0.073	0.831	0.901	0.722	0.753	0.774	0.033	0.851	0.907	<b>0.788</b>	0.820	<b>0.833</b>	0.044
FDCOD	CVPR'22	0.828	0.883	0.748	0.781	0.804	0.068	0.832	<b>0.907</b>	0.706	0.733	0.776	0.033	0.834	0.893	0.750	<b>0.784</b>	0.804	0.051
SegMaR	CVPR'22	0.815	0.874	0.753	0.795	0.803	0.071	0.833	0.899	0.724	0.757	0.774	0.034	0.841	0.896	0.781	0.821	0.826	0.046
ZoomNet	CVPR'22	0.820	0.877	0.752	0.794	0.805	0.066	<b>0.838</b>	0.888	<b>0.729</b>	<b>0.766</b>	<b>0.780</b>	<b>0.029</b>	0.853	0.896	0.784	0.818	0.828	0.043
BSANet	AAAI'22	0.794	0.851	0.717	0.763	0.770	0.079	0.817	0.891	0.699	0.738	0.753	0.034	0.841	0.897	0.771	0.808	0.817	0.048
SINetV2	PAMI'22	0.822	0.882	0.743	0.782	0.801	0.070	0.815	0.887	0.680	0.718	0.752	0.037	0.847	0.903	0.770	0.805	0.823	0.048
FAPNet	TIP'22	0.815	0.865	0.734	0.776	0.792	0.076	0.822	0.887	0.694	0.731	0.758	0.036	0.851	0.899	0.775	0.810	0.825	0.046
C2FNet-ext	TCSVT'22	0.799	0.859	0.730	0.770	0.779	0.077	0.811	0.887	0.691	0.725	0.742	0.036	0.840	0.896	0.770	0.802	0.814	0.048
DGNet	MIR'22	0.839	<b>0.900</b>	0.768	<b>0.806</b>	0.822	<b>0.057</b>	0.822	0.896	0.693	0.728	0.759	0.033	<b>0.854</b>	0.909	0.783	0.813	0.830	<b>0.043</b>
CubeNet	PR'22	0.788	0.838	0.682	0.732	0.750	0.085	0.795	0.865	0.643	0.692	0.715	0.041	-	-	-	-	-	-
ERRNet	PR'22	0.779	0.842	0.679	0.729	0.742	0.085	0.786	0.867	0.630	0.675	0.702	0.043	0.827	0.887	0.737	0.778	0.794	0.054
Transformer-Based Models																			
VST	ICCV'21	0.807	0.848	0.713	0.758	0.777	0.081	0.820	0.879	0.698	0.738	0.754	0.037	0.845	0.893	0.767	0.804	0.817	0.048
UGTR	ICCV'21	0.785	0.822	0.685	0.737	0.753	0.086	0.818	0.852	0.667	0.712	0.742	0.035	0.839	0.874	0.746	0.787	0.807	0.052
ICON	PAMI'22	<b>0.840</b>	0.894	<b>0.769</b>	0.796	<b>0.824</b>	0.058	0.818	0.904	0.688	0.717	0.756	0.033	0.847	<b>0.911</b>	0.784	0.697	0.817	0.045
TPRNet	TVCJ'22	0.807	0.861	0.725	0.772	0.785	0.074	0.817	0.887	0.683	0.724	0.748	0.036	0.846	0.898	0.768	0.805	0.820	0.048
SAM	ICCV'23	0.684	0.687	0.606	0.680	0.681	0.132	0.783	0.798	0.701	0.756	0.758	0.050	0.767	0.776	0.696	0.752	0.754	0.078
SAM2	arXiv'24	0.444	0.401	0.184	0.207	0.219	0.236	0.549	0.521	0.271	0.291	0.292	0.134	0.512	0.482	0.251	0.268	0.269	0.186

Table 4. Comparison of the number of masks predicted by SAM and SAM2.

	CAMO (250 Images)	COD10K (2026 Images)	NC4K (4121 Images)
SAM	25472	218508	347728
SAM2	4761	33522	34044

**Auto Mode.** In auto mode, we evaluate the performance of SAM2 and SAM. The evaluation method is similar to that described in the technical report [29], and the comparison includes 22 CoD methods: SINet [7], C2FNet [26], LSR [19], PFNet [21], MGL [32], JCOD [15], TANet [38], BGNet [27], FDCOD [35], SegMaR [12], ZoomNet [23], BSANet [37], SINetV2 [6], FAPNet [36], the extension version of C2FNet [1], DGNet [10], CubeNet [40], ERRNet [11], VST [18], UGTR [31], ICON [39] and TPRNet [33]. The performance is shown in Table 3. From the table, it is apparent that in auto mode, SAM2 seems unable to segment potential camouflaged objects. To further illustrate this point, we have compiled statistics on the number of masks predicted by SAM and SAM2 in each dataset, as shown in Table 4. We can see that the number of masks predicted by SAM is six to ten times that predicted by SAM2. As shown in Fig. 1, for the prediction of masks corresponding to a specific image, SAM2 not only lags significantly behind SAM in terms of quantity, but also in quality.




Figure 1. Masks predicted by SAM and SAM2.

### **3. Conclusion**

This technical report has examined the transition from SAM to SAM2, showcasing both significant advancements and notable limitations. SAM2, an evolution from the foundational SAM, has proven to excel in tasks involving prompt-driven segmentation, where it outperforms SAM with enhanced accuracy and speed, particularly in handling both video and image segmentation. These improvements underscore SAM2's potential as a versatile tool in the evolving landscape of vision-based models. However, our evaluations, particularly through the lens of camouflaged object detection, highlight a critical area where SAM2 lags behind its predecessor: operating in auto mode without prompts. Here, SAM2's performance significantly declines, indicating a reliance on prompts that may limit its utility in scenarios demanding autonomous object recognition. Therefore, we hope continued exploration and refinement of the SAM family, aiming for advancements that retain the strengths of SAM while overcoming the limitations observed in SAM2. By addressing these challenges, we can push the boundaries of what foundational models can achieve in the realm of computer vision.

## References

- [1] Geng Chen, Si-Jie Liu, Yu-Jia Sun, Ge-Peng Ji, Ya-Feng Wu, and Tao Zhou. Camouflaged object detection via context-aware cross-level fusion. *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. Video Technol.*, 32(10):6981–6993, 2022. 3
- [2] Keqin Chen, Zhao Zhang, Weili Zeng, Richong Zhang, Feng Zhu, and Rui Zhao. Shikra: Unleashing multimodal llm’s referential dialogue magic. *CoRR*, abs/2306.15195, 2023. 2
- [3] Xuelian Cheng, Huan Xiong, Deng-Ping Fan, Yiran Zhong, Mehrtaash Harandi, Tom Drummond, and Zongyuan Ge. Implicit motion handling for video camouflaged object detection. In *CVPR*, pages 13854–13863. IEEE, 2022. 1, 2
- [4] Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, et al. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(240):1–113, 2023. 1
- [5] Deng-Ping Fan, Ming-Ming Cheng, Yun Liu, Tao Li, and Ali Borji. Structure-measure: A new way to evaluate foreground maps. In *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision, ICCV 2017, Venice, Italy, October 22-29, 2017*, pages 4558–4567. IEEE Computer Society, 2017. 1
- [6] Deng-Ping Fan, Ge-Peng Ji, Ming-Ming Cheng, and Ling Shao. Concealed object detection. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 44(10):6024–6042, 2022. 3
- [7] Deng-Ping Fan, Ge-Peng Ji, Guolei Sun, Ming-Ming Cheng, Jianbing Shen, and Ling Shao. Camouflaged object detection. In *Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recog.*, pages 2774–2784. IEEE, 2020. 1, 3
- [8] Deng-Ping Fan, Ge-Peng Ji, Xuebin Qin, and Ming-Ming Cheng. Cognitive vision inspired object segmentation metric and loss function. *SCIENTIA SINICA Informationis*, 2021. 1
- [9] Wenjun Hui, Zhenfeng Zhu, Shuai Zheng, and Yao Zhao. Endow sam with keen eyes: Temporal-spatial prompt learning for video camouflaged object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 19058–19067, 2024. 2
- [10] Ge-Peng Ji, Deng-Ping Fan, Yu-Cheng Chou, Dengxin Dai, Alexander Liniger, and Luc Van Gool. Deep gradient learning for efficient camouflaged object detection. *Int. J. Autom. Comput.*, 20(1):92–108, 2023. 3
- [11] Ge-Peng Ji, Lei Zhu, Mingchen Zhuge, and Keren Fu. Fast camouflaged object detection via edge-based reversible re-calibration network. *Pattern Recognit.*, 123:108414, 2022. 3
- [12] Qi Jia, Shuilian Yao, Yu Liu, Xin Fan, Risheng Liu, and Zhongxuan Luo. Segment, magnify and reiterate: Detecting camouflaged objects the hard way. In *CVPR*, pages 4703–4712. IEEE, 2022. 3
- [13] Alexander Kirillov, Eric Mintun, Nikhila Ravi, Hanzi Mao, Chloe Rolland, Laura Gustafson, Tete Xiao, Spencer Whitehead, Alexander C Berg, Wan-Yen Lo, et al. Segment anything. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.02643*, 2023. 1
- [14] Trung-Nghia Le, Tam V. Nguyen, Zhongliang Nie, Minh-Triet Tran, and Akihiro Sugimoto. Anabranch network for camouflaged object segmentation. *Comput. Vis. Image Underst.*, 184:45–56, 2019. 1
- [15] Aixuan Li, Jing Zhang, Yunqiu Lv, Bowen Liu, Tong Zhang, and Yuchao Dai. Uncertainty-aware joint salient object and camouflaged object detection. In *CVPR*, pages 10071–10081. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE, 2021. 3
- [16] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Caimeing Xiong, and Steven C. H. Hoi. BLIP: bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation. In *Int. Conf. Mach. Learn.*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 12888–12900. PMLR, 2022. 1
- [17] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *CoRR*, abs/2304.08485, 2023. 2
- [18] Nian Liu, Ni Zhang, Kaiyuan Wan, Ling Shao, and Junwei Han. Visual saliency transformer. In *ICCV*, pages 4702–4712. IEEE, 2021. 3
- [19] Yunqiu Lv, Jing Zhang, Yuchao Dai, Aixuan Li, Bowen Liu, Nick Barnes, and Deng-Ping Fan. Simultaneously localize, segment and rank the camouflaged objects. In *Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recog.*, pages 11591–11601. IEEE, 2021. 1, 3
- [20] Ran Margolin, Lihi Zelnik-Manor, and Ayellet Tal. How to evaluate foreground maps. In *2014 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2014, Columbus, OH, USA, June 23-28, 2014*, pages 248–255. IEEE Computer Society, 2014. 1
- [21] Haiyang Mei, Ge-Peng Ji, Ziqi Wei, Xin Yang, Xiaopeng Wei, and Deng-Ping Fan. Camouflaged object segmentation with distraction mining. In *Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recog.*, pages 8772–8781. IEEE, 2021. 3
- [22] Maxime Oquab, Timothée Darcet, and etc at. Théo Moutakanni. Dinov2: Learning robust visual features without supervision. *CoRR*, 2023. 1
- [23] Youwei Pang, Xiaoqi Zhao, Tian-Zhu Xiang, Lihe Zhang, and Huchuan Lu. Zoom in and out: A mixed-scale triplet network for camouflaged object detection. In *Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recog.*, pages 2150–2160. IEEE, 2022. 3
- [24] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *Int. Conf. Mach. Learn.*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021. 1
- [25] Nikhila Ravi, Valentin Gabeur, Yuan-Ting Hu, Ronghang Hu, Chaitanya Ryali, Tengyu Ma, Haitham Khedr, Roman Rädle, Chloe Rolland, Laura Gustafson, Eric Mintun, Junting Pan, Kalyan Vasudev Alwala, Nicolas Carion, Chao-Yuan Wu, Ross Girshick, Piotr Dollár, and Christoph Feichtenhofer. Sam 2: Segment anything in images and videos. *arXiv preprint*, 2024. 1

- [26] Yujia Sun, Geng Chen, Tao Zhou, Yi Zhang, and Nian Liu. Context-aware cross-level fusion network for camouflaged object detection. In *Int. Joint Conf. Artif. Intell.*, pages 1025–1031. ijcai.org, 2021. 3
- [27] Yujia Sun, Shuo Wang, Chenglizhao Chen, and Tian-Zhu Xiang. Boundary-guided camouflaged object detection. In *Int. Joint Conf. Artif. Intell.*, pages 1335–1341. ijcai.org, 2022. 3
- [28] Lv Tang, Peng-Tao Jiang, Zhihao Shen, Hao Zhang, Jinwei Chen, and Bo Li. Chain of visual perception: Harnessing multimodal large language models for zero-shot camouflaged object detection. In *ACM Multimedia 2024*, 2024. 2
- [29] Lv Tang, Haoke Xiao, and Bo Li. Can sam segment anything? when sam meets camouflaged object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.04709*, 2023. 3
- [30] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023. 1
- [31] Fan Yang, Qiang Zhai, Xin Li, Rui Huang, Ao Luo, Hong Cheng, and Deng-Ping Fan. Uncertainty-guided transformer reasoning for camouflaged object detection. In *Int. Conf. Comput. Vis.*, pages 4126–4135. IEEE, 2021. 3
- [32] Qiang Zhai, Xin Li, Fan Yang, Chenglizhao Chen, Hong Cheng, and Deng-Ping Fan. Mutual graph learning for camouflaged object detection. In *Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recog.*, pages 12997–13007. IEEE, 2021. 3
- [33] Qiao Zhang, Yanliang Ge, Cong Zhang, and Hongbo Bi. Tprnet: camouflaged object detection via transformer-induced progressive refinement network. *The Visual Computer*, pages 1–15, 2022. 3
- [34] Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, et al. Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01068*, 2022. 1
- [35] Yijie Zhong, Bo Li, Lv Tang, Senyun Kuang, Shuang Wu, and Shouhong Ding. Detecting camouflaged object in frequency domain. In *Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recog.*, pages 4494–4503. IEEE, 2022. 3
- [36] Tao Zhou, Yi Zhou, Chen Gong, Jian Yang, and Yu Zhang. Feature aggregation and propagation network for camouflaged object detection. *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, 31:7036–7047, 2022. 3
- [37] Hongwei Zhu, Peng Li, Haoran Xie, Xuefeng Yan, Dong Liang, Dapeng Chen, Mingqiang Wei, and Jing Qin. I can find you! boundary-guided separated attention network for camouflaged object detection. In *AAAI*, pages 3608–3616. AAAI Press, 2022. 3
- [38] Jinchao Zhu, Xiaoyu Zhang, Shuo Zhang, and Junnan Liu. Inferring camouflaged objects by texture-aware interactive guidance network. In *AAAI*, pages 3599–3607. AAAI Press, 2021. 3
- [39] Mingchen Zhuge, Deng-Ping Fan, Nian Liu, Dingwen Zhang, Dong Xu, and Ling Shao. Salient object detection via integrity learning. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 45(3):3738–3752, 2023. 3
- [40] Mingchen Zhuge, Xiankai Lu, Yiyu Guo, Zhihua Cai, and Shuhan Chen. Cubenet: X-shape connection for camouflaged object detection. *Pattern Recognit.*, 127:108644, 2022. 3