
SEGMENT ANYTHING MODEL (SAM) MEETS GLASS: MIRROR AND TRANSPARENT OBJECTS CANNOT BE EASILY DETECTED

Dongsheng Han
Kyung Hee University

Chaoning Zhang*
Kyung Hee University

Yu Qiao
Kyung Hee University

Maryam Qamar
Kyung Hee University

Yuna Jung
Kyung Hee University

SeungKyu Lee
Kyung Hee University

Sung-Ho Bae
Kyung Hee University

Choong Seon Hong
Kyung Hee University

May 2, 2023

ABSTRACT

Meta AI Research has recently released SAM (Segment Anything Model) which is trained on a large segmentation dataset of over 1 billion masks. As a foundation model in the field of computer vision, SAM (Segment Anything Model) has gained attention for its impressive performance in generic object segmentation. Despite its strong capability in a wide range of zero-shot transfer tasks, it remains unknown whether SAM can detect things in challenging setups like transparent objects. In this work, we perform an empirical evaluation of two glass-related challenging scenarios: mirror and transparent objects. We found that SAM often fails to detect the glass in both scenarios, which raises concern for deploying the SAM in safety-critical situations that have various forms of glass.

Keywords Segment Anything Model · Glass · Mirror Object · Transparent Object

1 Introduction

In the past few years, generative AI Zhang et al. [2023a] has caught significant attention with interesting applications like ChatGPT Zhang et al. [2023b], text-to-image Zhang et al. [2023c], text-to-speech Zhang et al. [2023d] and graph generation Zhang et al. [2023e]. A key factor that drives the development of generative AI is foundation model Bommasani et al. [2021] that at inference can generalize to tasks and data distributions different from training. With the success of ChatGPT Zhang et al. [2023b], GPT-3 [Brown et al., 2020] has been widely recognized as one of the most widely recognized foundation models for NLP.

Very recently, Meta AI research team has recently released a segment anything project Kirillov et al. [2023] that introduces a promotable segmentation task for training a vision foundation model. The resulting segment anything model (SAM) has been recognized as the GPT-3 moment for vision. The model was trained on over 1 billion masks on 11 million licensed and privacy-respecting images. It represents a significant step towards achieving cognitive recognition for all objects in the world, aiming to handle interactive segmentation tasks while addressing real-world constraints. Segmentation tasks encompass a wide range of challenging areas, and the detection of transparent objects and mirror regions constitutes one of the most representative and challenging tasks in this field. Given the ubiquitous appearance of such glass objects in daily life and the unique challenges in detecting, localizing, and reconstructing them from color images in computer vision [Lin et al., 2021]. This difficulty is due to the fact that most glass objects exhibit a visual appearance that includes both the transmitted background scene and reflected objects [Maeno et al., 2013] [He et al., 2021], while the visual appearance observed from a mirror surface is entirely from reflected objects. These issues led to many incidents, such as collisions of autonomous mobile robots with transparent front doors or mirror walls and robot arms struggling to grip a transparent bottle.

*Correspondence Author: chaoningzhang1990@gmail.com

In this work, we examine the performance of the SAM foundation model in recognizing and segmenting transparent objects and mirror surfaces and evaluate its segmentation results. We aim to explore the challenges that arise for foundation models in computer vision tasks when dealing with the reflection and refraction phenomena that occur on glass and mirror objects, as well as the faint object boundaries that result from these effects. After extensive testing on large glass and mirror dataset benchmarks, we find that while SAM segments general objects well in natural images well but often fail to detect mirror and transparent objects. Failing to recognize glass can cause serious issues when deploying the vision foundation model in safety-critical setups.

2 Experimental Evaluations

Datasets: As the SAM model is designed to recognize and segment all objects in an image, we select benchmark datasets where only one transparent or mirror object exists in a given scene. This allows us to evaluate the model’s capability to identify and segment these specific objects accurately. We conduct experiments on two glass segmentation datasets GDD [Mei et al., 2020], GSD [Lin et al., 2021] and two mirror segmentation datasets MSD [Yang et al., 2019], PMD [Lin et al., 2020]. GDD contains 2980 training and 936 test images. GSD is transparent object dataset collected and labeled through networking and photography, consisting of 4102 annotated glass images with close-up, medium, and long shots from diverse scenes. MSD is a large mirror segmentation dataset with 4018 images. PMD is the latest mirror segmentation dataset collected from both indoor and outdoor scenes.

In our final additional visualization experiment, we included a multi-class dataset of transparent objects called Trans10k [Xie et al., 2020] in addition to the previous benchmark datasets. Trans10k is a dataset of transparent objects categorized into two groups based on objects properties: movable small objects (things) and non-movable objects (stuff).

Implementation Details: We conduct the test using the SAM best pre-trained model VIT-H, which was pre-trained on a large segmentation dataset (SA-1B) and generously provided as open source by Meta AI Research. As SAM does not specify the object categories for segmentation, it outputs all possible objects in the image. To test SAM’s capability to recognize glass and mirror objects, we calculated the Intersection over Union (IoU) between the predicted results and the ground truth for each object outputted by SAM. We then selected the result with the highest IoU with the ground truth for glass objects and used it as the detection result for SAM. We conducted different evaluations based on this result.

Evaluation Metrics: We employed five commonly used evaluation metrics in semantic and glass surface segmentation tasks: Intersection over Union (IoU), pixel accuracy (ACC), weighted F-measure (F_β) Margolin et al. [2014], mean absolute error (MAE), and balance error rate (BER). F_β is a harmonic mean of average precision and average recall defined as follows.

$$F_\beta = \frac{(1 + \beta^2)(Precision \times Recall)}{\beta^2 Precision + Recall}, \quad (1)$$

where β^2 is set to 0.3 as suggested in Achanta et al. [2009]. Mean absolute error (MAE) is widely used in foreground-background segmentation tasks where average pixel-wise error between predicted mask P and ground truth mask G are calculated.

$$MAE = \frac{1}{H \times W} \sum_{i=1}^H \sum_{j=1}^W |P(i, j) - G(i, j)|, \quad (2)$$

where P(i, j) indicates predicted probability at location (i, j). We employ the balance error rate (BER) as an evaluation metric, which takes into account the imbalanced regions in glass and mirror object segmentation tasks. This metric provides a quantitative measure for evaluating the performance of glass surface segmentation.

$$BER = (1 - \frac{1}{2}(\frac{TP}{N_p} + \frac{TN}{N_n})) \times 100, \quad (3)$$

where TP, TN, N_p , and N_n represent the numbers of true positives, true negatives, glass pixels, and non-glass pixels.

2.1 Experiment on glass objects

We compare SAM with the state-of-the-art semantic segmentation, shadow detection, saliency object detection, and glass segmentation methods such as MirrorNet, Translab, GNet, EBLNet as shown in Table 1, 2.

As shown in Table 1 and 2, We observed that the segmentation results of glass objects in two benchmarks were poor for the SAM model.

Method	IoU \uparrow	Acc \uparrow	F_{β} \uparrow	mAE \downarrow	BER \downarrow
PSPNet Zhao et al. [2017]	84.06	0.916	0.906	0.084	8.79
PointRend Kirillov et al. [2020]	86.51	0.933	0.928	0.067	6.50
PiCANet Liu et al. [2018]	83.73	0.916	0.909	0.093	8.26
DSC Hu et al. [2018]	83.56	0.914	0.911	0.090	7.97
BDRAR Zhu et al. [2018]	80.01	0.902	0.902	0.098	9.87
MirrorNet Yang et al. [2019]	85.07	0.918	0.903	0.083	7.67
GDNet Mei et al. [2020]	87.63	0.939	0.937	0.063	5.62
EBLNet He et al. [2021]	88.16	0.941	0.939	0.059	5.58
SAM	48.47	0.732	0.798	0.268	26.08

Table 1: Experimental Comparison on GDD

Method	IoU \uparrow	F_{β} \uparrow	mAE \downarrow	BER \downarrow
BASNetQin et al. [2019]	69.79	0.808	0.106	13.54
MINet Pang et al. [2020]	77.29	0.879	0.077	9.54
BDRARPang et al. [2020]	75.92	0.860	0.081	8.61
PSPNetPang et al. [2020]	7.30	0.834	0.110	10.66
MirrorNet Yang et al. [2019]	74.20	0.828	0.090	10.76
SINet Fan et al. [2020]	77.04	0.875	0.077	9.25
GDNet Mei et al. [2020]	79.01	0.869	0.069	7.72
TransLabXie et al. [2020]	74.05	0.837	0.088	11.35
GlassNet Lin et al. [2021]	83.64	0.903	0.055	6.12
GlassSemNetLin et al.	85.60	0.920	0.044	5.60
SAM	50.60	0.799	0.213	23.91

Table 2: Experimental Comparison on GSD.

As shown in Figure 1 and 4, We find that the SAM model struggle to recognize and segment the boundary regions, particularly when the boundaries of glass objects are distorte by light. These challenges in glass objects segmentation are caused by the fact that transparent surfaces exhibit a visual appearance that includes both the transmitted background scene and any objects behind them, making it difficult to distinguish and accurately segment them from their surroundings. The phenomenon of transmission tends to cause SAM to detect objects behind glass objects, rather than the glass objects themselves.

2.2 Experiment on mirror objects

We compare SAM with the state-of-the-art semantic segmentation, shadow detection, saliency objects detection, and mirror objects segmentation methods such as BDRAR, MirrorNet, EBLNet, PMD-Net, LSA as shown in Table 3, 4.




Figure 1: Sample qualitative comparison results on GDD and GSD.




Figure 2: Sample qualitative comparison results on MSD and PMD.

Method	IoU \uparrow	Acc \uparrow	F_{β} \uparrow	mAE \downarrow	BER \downarrow
ICNet Zhao et al. [2018]	57.25	0.694	0.710	0.124	18.75
DSSHou et al. [2017]	59.11	0.665	0.743	0.125	18.81
RASChen et al. [2018]	60.48	0.845	0.758	0.111	17.60
BDRARZhu et al. [2018]	67.43	0.821	0.792	0.093	12.41
DSCHu et al. [2018]	69.71	0.816	0.812	0.087	11.77
PSPNet Zhao et al. [2017]	68.01	0.922	0.846	0.079	12.08
MirrorNetYang et al. [2019]	78.95	0.935	0.857	0.065	6.39
LSA Guan et al. [2022]	79.85	0.946	0.889	0.055	7.12
EBLNet He et al. [2021]	80.33	0.951	0.883	0.049	8.63
SAM	51.57	0.876	0.817	0.124	23.17

Table 3: Experimental Comparison on MSD

Segmenting mirror objects is a challenging task in semantic segmentation due to their strong reflective properties, which cause them to have a variable appearance. To evaluate the performance of SAM model, we conducted tests on the MSD and PMD benchmark datasets, [Lin et al., 2020].

Through our experiments, we found that the PMD benchmark, with more images of mirrors captured from a distance, offers a clearer view of the boundaries of mirror regions compared to the MSD benchmark, which has more images captured from close range. As shown in Table 4, SAM performs comparably to state-of-the-art methods on the PMD benchmark benchmark. However, as shown in Table3 and Figure2, SAM’s performance on the MSD benchmark is somewhat unsatisfactory, as it tends to segment objects inside the mirror rather than recognizing the mirror itself.

2.3 Additional visualization results

We conducted additional visualization experiments on the glass and mirror object benchmarks to facilitate observation of the results.

Method	IoU \uparrow	F_{β} \uparrow	mAE \downarrow	Acc \uparrow
CPNET Yu et al. [2020]	56.36	0.734	0.051	94.85
GloRe Chen et al. [2019]	61.25	0.774	0.044	95.61
BDRARZhu et al. [2018]	58.43	0.7433	0.043	95.66
PSPNet Zhao et al. [2017]	60.44	0.806	0.039	96.13
MirrorNet Yang et al. [2019]	62.50	0.778	0.041	96.27
PMD-Net Lin et al. [2020]	62.40	0.827	0.055	96.80
LSA Guan et al. [2022]	66.84	0.844	0.049	96.82
SAM	64.75	0.861	0.0525	94.75

Table 4: Experimental Comparison on PMD




Figure 3: Some challenging scenarios involving objects categorized as glass "things" and "stuff" in the Trans10k test sets resulted in poor testing results. Please zoom in to see the details.




Figure 4: Some bad testing results obtain from challenging scenarios that involve glass objects.

In contrast to the previous visualizations, we present the detection results of all objects in the predicted images of glass and mirror objects. To enhance the visibility of the results obtained from the demonstration, we applied a pseudo-binary technique to improve the clarity of the output results. Our output images are generated as pseudo-binary images, where the predicted regions of objects are represented in shades of gray, and the non-object regions are displayed as black. Furthermore, if overlapping objects are detected, the corresponding overlapping regions will be entirely displayed as white.

As shown in Figures 3 and 4, when recognizing glass objects, the SAM model successfully identified objects behind the transparent ones, but failed to recognize the glass objects themselves. And many regions inside the glass were not segmented as any object, resulting in these regions being unlabeled and displayed as black areas. In Figure 5 the model correctly identified most objects reflected in the mirror, but neglected to recognize the mirror itself.

3 Conclusion

This work is the first of its kind to perform a comprehensive study on whether SAM can segment glass-related objects. We find that SAM often fails to detect transparent objects. On two benchmark datasets, the performance of SAM is significantly worse than those models that are specifically trained to detect transparent objects.

References

Chaoning Zhang, Chenshuang Zhang, Sheng Zheng, Yu Qiao, Chenghao Li, Mengchun Zhang, Sumit Kumar Dam, Chu Myaet Thwal, Ye Lin Tun, Le Luang Huy, et al. A complete survey on generative ai (aigc): Is chatgpt from




Figure 5: Some bad testing results obtain from challenging scenarios that involve mirror objects.

gpt-4 to gpt-5 all you need? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11717*, 2023a.

Chaoning Zhang, Chenshuang Zhang, Chenghao Li, Yu Qiao, Sheng Zheng, Sumit Kumar Dam, Mengchun Zhang, Jung Uk Kim, Seong Tae Kim, Jinwoo Choi, et al. One small step for generative ai, one giant leap for agi: A complete survey on chatgpt in aigc era. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.06488*, 2023b.

Chenshuang Zhang, Chaoning Zhang, Mengchun Zhang, and In So Kweon. Text-to-image diffusion models in generative ai: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.07909*, 2023c.

Chenshuang Zhang, Chaoning Zhang, Sheng Zheng, Mengchun Zhang, Maryam Qamar, Sung-Ho Bae, and In So Kweon. A survey on audio diffusion models: Text to speech synthesis and enhancement in generative ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.13336*, 2023d.

Mengchun Zhang, Maryam Qamar, Taegoo Kang, Yuna Jung, Chenshuang Zhang, Sung-Ho Bae, and Chaoning Zhang. A survey on graph diffusion models: Generative ai in science for molecule, protein and material. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.01565*, 2023e.

Rishi Bommasani, Drew A Hudson, Ehsan Adeli, Russ Altman, Simran Arora, Sydney von Arx, Michael S Bernstein, Jeannette Bohg, Antoine Bosselut, Emma Brunskill, et al. On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258*, 2021.

Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.

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.

Jiaying Lin, Zebang He, and Rynson WH Lau. Rich context aggregation with reflection prior for glass surface detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 13415–13424, 2021.

Kazuki Maeno, Hajime Nagahara, Atsushi Shimada, and Rin-ichiro Taniguchi. Light field distortion feature for transparent object recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 2786–2793, 2013.

Hao He, Xiangtai Li, Guangliang Cheng, Jianping Shi, Yunhai Tong, Gaofeng Meng, Véronique Prinet, and LuBin Weng. Enhanced boundary learning for glass-like object segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 15859–15868, 2021.

Haiyang Mei, Xin Yang, Yang Wang, Yuanyuan Liu, Shengfeng He, Qiang Zhang, Xiaopeng Wei, and Rynson WH Lau. Don’t hit me! glass detection in real-world scenes. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3687–3696, 2020.

Xin Yang, Haiyang Mei, Ke Xu, Xiaopeng Wei, Baocai Yin, and Rynson WH Lau. Where is my mirror? In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 8809–8818, 2019.

Jiaying Lin, Guodong Wang, and Rynson WH Lau. Progressive mirror detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3697–3705, 2020.

- Enze Xie, Wenjia Wang, Wenhai Wang, Mingyu Ding, Chunhua Shen, and Ping Luo. Segmenting transparent objects in the wild. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XIII 16*, pages 696–711. Springer, 2020.
- Ran Margolin, Lihi Zelnik-Manor, and Ayellet Tal. How to evaluate foreground maps? In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 248–255, 2014.
- Radhakrishna Achanta, Sheila Hemami, Francisco Estrada, and Sabine Susstrunk. Frequency-tuned salient region detection. In *2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1597–1604. IEEE, 2009.
- Hengshuang Zhao, Jianping Shi, Xiaojuan Qi, Xiaogang Wang, and Jiaya Jia. Pyramid scene parsing network. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2881–2890, 2017.
- Alexander Kirillov, Yuxin Wu, Kaiming He, and Ross Girshick. Pointrend: Image segmentation as rendering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 9799–9808, 2020.
- Nian Liu, Junwei Han, and Ming-Hsuan Yang. Picanet: Learning pixel-wise contextual attention for saliency detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3089–3098, 2018.
- Xiaowei Hu, Lei Zhu, Chi-Wing Fu, Jing Qin, and Pheng-Ann Heng. Direction-aware spatial context features for shadow detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 7454–7462, 2018.
- Lei Zhu, Zijun Deng, Xiaowei Hu, Chi-Wing Fu, Xuemiao Xu, Jing Qin, and Pheng-Ann Heng. Bidirectional feature pyramid network with recurrent attention residual modules for shadow detection. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 121–136, 2018.
- Xuebin Qin, Zichen Zhang, Chenyang Huang, Chao Gao, Masood Dehghan, and Martin Jagersand. Basnet: Boundary-aware salient object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 7479–7489, 2019.
- Youwei Pang, Xiaoqi Zhao, Lihe Zhang, and Huchuan Lu. Multi-scale interactive network for salient object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 9413–9422, 2020.
- Deng-Ping Fan, Ge-Peng Ji, Guolei Sun, Ming-Ming Cheng, Jianbing Shen, and Ling Shao. Camouflaged object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2777–2787, 2020.
- Jiaying Lin, Yuen Hei Yeung, and Rynson WH Lau. Exploiting semantic relations for glass surface detection. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Hengshuang Zhao, Xiaojuan Qi, Xiaoyong Shen, Jianping Shi, and Jiaya Jia. Icnet for real-time semantic segmentation on high-resolution images. In *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, pages 405–420, 2018.
- Qibin Hou, Ming-Ming Cheng, Xiaowei Hu, Ali Borji, Zhuowen Tu, and Philip HS Torr. Deeply supervised salient object detection with short connections. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3203–3212, 2017.
- Shuhan Chen, Xiuli Tan, Ben Wang, and Xuelong Hu. Reverse attention for salient object detection. In *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, pages 234–250, 2018.
- Huankang Guan, Jiaying Lin, and Rynson WH Lau. Learning semantic associations for mirror detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5941–5950, 2022.
- Changqian Yu, Jingbo Wang, Changxin Gao, Gang Yu, Chunhua Shen, and Nong Sang. Context prior for scene segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 12416–12425, 2020.
- Yunpeng Chen, Marcus Rohrbach, Zhicheng Yan, Yan Shuicheng, Jiashi Feng, and Yannis Kalantidis. Graph-based global reasoning networks. In *CVPR*, pages 433–442, 2019.