

Is SAM 2 Better than SAM in Medical Image Segmentation?

Sourya Sengupta*, Satrajit Chakrabarty*, Ravi Soni

GE HealthCare

ABSTRACT

Segment Anything Model (SAM) demonstrated impressive performance in zero-shot promptable segmentation on natural images. The recently released Segment Anything Model 2 (SAM 2) model claims to have better performance than SAM on images while extending the model’s capabilities to video segmentation. It is important to evaluate the recent model’s ability in medical image segmentation in a zero-shot promptable manner. In this work, we performed extensive studies with multiple datasets from different imaging modalities to compare the performance between SAM and SAM 2. We used two point prompt strategies: (i) single positive prompt near the centroid of the target structure and (ii) additional positive prompts placed randomly within the target structure. The evaluation included 21 unique organ-modality combinations including abdominal structures, cardiac structures, and fetal head images acquired from publicly available MRI, CT, and Ultrasound datasets. The preliminary results, based on 2D images, indicate that while SAM 2 may perform slightly better in a few cases, but it does not in general surpass SAM for medical image segmentation. Especially when the contrast is lower like in CT, Ultrasound images, SAM 2 performs poorly than SAM. For MRI images, SAM 2 performs at par or better than SAM. Similar to SAM, SAM 2 also suffers from over-segmentation issue especially when the boundaries of the to-be-segmented organ is fuzzy in nature.

Keywords: Foundation models, Interactive segmentation, SAM 2, SAM, Medical Imaging

1. DESCRIPTION OF PURPOSE

The recently released Segment Anything Model (SAM) by Meta has shown impressive interactive and promptable image segmentation performance across various computer vision tasks.¹ The original SAM model was trained with a large corpus of training data comprising 11 million image-mask pairs. This extensive training enables it to exhibit efficient, generalizable zero-shot performance on unseen data. While SAM demonstrates remarkable performance on natural images, it is crucial to evaluate the model on medical images, as the contrast, texture, and shapes in medical images differ significantly from those in natural images. Recent efforts have been made to evaluate SAM on medical images, fine-tune SAM with medical images, perform modality-specific fine-tuning, and incorporate novel and diverse prompting strategies to enhance performance.²⁻⁸

Meta has recently released the Segment Anything Model 2 (SAM 2),⁹ an updated version of SAM that performs both promptable 2D image segmentation and video segmentation. This work is dedicated to comparing SAM and SAM 2, specifically on 2D image segmentation. Even though the main novelty of SAM 2 lies in incorporating video segmentation, it is important to evaluate whether it is a better alternative than the original SAM for 2D medical image segmentation. Various click prompt strategies, including both positive and negative prompts, are explored. A total of 12 different organs/pathologies are segmented from eight datasets of three different medical imaging modalities.

2. METHODS

2.1 SAM Model

The Segment Anything Model (SAM) architecture comprises three main components: the image encoder, the prompt encoder, and the mask decoder. The image encoder is based on a Vision Transformer (ViT)¹⁰ architecture. It extracts high-level features from the input images that are then processed by the ViT by dividing them into smaller patches and applying a series of transformer layers to capture the spatial and semantic information.

* denotes equal contribution

The prompt encoder is designed to handle various types of user inputs, such as points, boxes, or text to guide the segmentation process. Prompt encoder processes the prompts and encodes them into a feature space that aligns with the image features extracted by the image encoder. The mask decoder generates the final segmentation prediction. It combines the features from the image encoder and the prompt encoder to produce the final prediction. The mask decoder uses a Two-Way Transformer to integrate the features. It also includes an IoU (Intersection over Union) head, which predicts the quality of the segmentation mask.

2.2 SAM 2 Model

The SAM 2 architecture is designed to extend the capabilities of the original SAM by supporting video segmentation and object tracking in temporal sequences. Unlike SAM, which focuses on individual frame segmentation, SAM 2 incorporates several new components to handle video data. These include memory attention, a memory encoder, and a memory bank. The memory attention block uses multiple attention layers to integrate past frame features and predictions, while the memory encoder creates and stores these memories in a memory bank for future reference. This conditioning of frame embeddings on past and future frames allows SAM 2 to maintain temporal coherence across video sequences. Additionally, SAM 2’s prompt encoder and mask decoder can process spatial prompts and iteratively refine segmentation masks. However, for single-frame image segmentation, SAM and SAM 2 behave similarly, with SAM 2 leveraging the same promptable mask decoder to process frame and prompt embeddings as SAM, but without the added temporal conditioning features necessary for video.

2.3 Different Prompting Strategies

For all analyses in the current work, point prompts are explored. They are applied in two different ways:

- Single positive prompt near the centroid of the target structure
- Additional positive prompts placed randomly within the target structure

3. RESULTS

3.1 Datasets

Models are evaluated on multiple publicly available MR (AMOS,¹¹ CHAOS¹²), CT (TotalSegmentatorV2,¹³ AMOS,¹¹ CHAOS¹²), and Ultrasound (CAMUS,¹⁴ HC,¹⁵ FH-PS-AOP¹⁶) datasets. Results are presented for various organs across these datasets (Figure 1 and Figure 2).

Table 1: Descriptions of various medical imaging datasets used for evaluation.

Dataset Name	Modality	Description
AMOS-CT ¹¹	CT	images of multiple abdominal organs
CHAOS-CT ¹²	CT	images of abdominal multi-organs
TotalSegmentatorV2 ¹³	CT	images of multiple human organs
AMOS-MR ¹¹	MRI	images of multiple abdominal organs
CHAOS-MR ¹²	MRI	images of multiple abdominal organs
CAMUS ¹⁴	Ultrasound	cardiac images with multiple structures
FH-PS-AOP ¹⁶	Ultrasound	fetal head images
HC ¹⁵	Ultrasound	fetal head images

3.2 Quantitative Comparison between SAM vs SAM 2

Figure 1 shows a quantitative comparison between SAM and SAM 2 on different datasets of MRI, CT and Ultrasound. The generic trend shows that SAM 2 does not improve SAM’s performance in 2D medical image segmentation. Figure 2 shows a general trend of Dice score for both SAM and SAM 2 with increasing number of prompts. It can be found SAM 2 can surpass the performance of SAM in few cases, especially in higher contrast modality like MR images, but in general for both CT and Ultrasound the performance is lower than SAM. For both CT and MR, the organs segmented were left kidney, right kidney, liver, bladder, gall bladder, spleen, aorta, pancreas, prostate. For Ultrasound images, fetal head, left atrium, and left ventricle endometrium were segmented. The Dice score corresponding to each organ from different datasets were combined and mean value is reported in the plots.




Figure 1: Quantitative comparison of SAM vs. SAM 2 across multiple datasets. Performance metrics are presented for various organs for MRI, CT, and Ultrasound modalities across all datasets.




Figure 2: Performance trends of SAM and SAM 2 with increasing positive prompts.




Figure 3: Qualitative comparison of results on CT, MRI, and Ultrasound structures.

4. NEW OR BREAKTHROUGH WORK TO BE PRESENTED

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to have an extensive study on evaluating performance of SAM vs SAM 2 on a wide variety of medical imaging datasets. The generic trend shows SAM 2 does not perform better than SAM. In some of the cases, performance of SAM 2 drops significantly compared to SAM especially for imaging modalities with lesser contrast like CT and Ultrasound.

5. CONCLUSION

In this work a systematic evaluation study is performed to compare performance of SAM and SAM 2. In future studies a more thorough analysis will be performed with 3D medical images and timelapse videos of bio-imaging.

6. DISCLOSURE

This work is original and has not been submitted for publication elsewhere.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Kirillov, E. Mintun, N. Ravi, H. Mao, C. Rolland, L. Gustafson, T. Xiao, S. Whitehead, A. C. Berg, W.-Y. Lo *et al.*, “Segment anything,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 4015–4026.
- [2] J. Ma *et al.*, “Segment anything in medical images,” *Nature Communications*, vol. 15, no. 1, p. 654, 2024.
- [3] H. Ravishankar *et al.*, “Sonosam-segment anything on ultrasound images,” in *International Workshop on Advances in Simplifying Medical Ultrasound*. Springer Nature Switzerland, 2023.

- [4] Y. Huang, X. Yang, L. Liu, H. Zhou, A. Chang, X. Zhou, R. Chen, J. Yu, J. Chen, C. Chen *et al.*, “Segment anything model for medical images?” *Medical Image Analysis*, vol. 92, p. 103061, 2024.
- [5] J. Wu, W. Ji, Y. Liu, H. Fu, M. Xu, Y. Xu, and Y. Jin, “Medical sam adapter: Adapting segment anything model for medical image segmentation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12620*, 2023.
- [6] C. Li, P. Khanduri, Y. Qiang, R. I. Sultan, I. Chetty, and D. Zhu, “Auto-prompting sam for mobile friendly 3d medical image segmentation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.14936*, 2023.
- [7] S. Gong, Y. Zhong, W. Ma, J. Li, Z. Wang, J. Zhang, P.-A. Heng, and Q. Dou, “3dsam-adapter: Holistic adaptation of sam from 2d to 3d for promptable medical image segmentation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.13465*, 2023.
- [8] C. Chen, J. Miao, D. Wu, Z. Yan, S. Kim, J. Hu, A. Zhong, Z. Liu, L. Sun, X. Li *et al.*, “Ma-sam: Modality-agnostic sam adaptation for 3d medical image segmentation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.08842*, 2023.
- [9] N. Ravi, V. Gabeur, Y.-T. Hu, R. Hu, C. Ryali, T. Ma, H. Khedr, R. Rädle, C. Rolland, L. Gustafson *et al.*, “Sam 2: Segment anything in images and videos,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00714*, 2024.
- [10] A. Dosovitskiy, L. Beyer, A. Kolesnikov, D. Weissenborn, X. Zhai, T. Unterthiner, M. Dehghani, M. Minderer, G. Heigold, S. Gelly *et al.*, “An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020.
- [11] Y. Ji, H. Bai, C. Ge, J. Yang, Y. Zhu, R. Zhang, Z. Li, L. Zhanng, W. Ma, X. Wan *et al.*, “Amos: A large-scale abdominal multi-organ benchmark for versatile medical image segmentation,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 35, pp. 36 722–36 732, 2022.
- [12] A. E. Kavur, N. S. Gezer, M. Barış, S. Aslan, P.-H. Conze, V. Groza, D. D. Pham, S. Chatterjee, P. Ernst, S. Özkan *et al.*, “Chaos challenge-combined (ct-mr) healthy abdominal organ segmentation,” *Medical Image Analysis*, vol. 69, p. 101950, 2021.
- [13] J. Wasserthal, H.-C. Breit, M. T. Meyer, M. Pradella, D. Hinck, A. W. Sauter, T. Heye, D. T. Boll, J. Cyriac, S. Yang *et al.*, “Totalsegmentator: robust segmentation of 104 anatomic structures in ct images,” *Radiology: Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 5, no. 5, 2023.
- [14] S. Leclerc *et al.*, “Deep learning for segmentation using an open large-scale dataset in 2d echocardiography,” *IEEE transactions on medical imaging*, vol. 38, no. 9, pp. 2198–2210, 2019.
- [15] T. L. van den Heuvel *et al.*, “Automated measurement of fetal head circumference using 2d ultrasound images,” *PloS one*, vol. 13, no. 8, p. e0200412, 2018.
- [16] Y. Lu *et al.*, “The jnu-ifm dataset for segmenting pubic symphysis-fetal head,” *Data in brief*, vol. 41, p. 107904, 2022.