

SQA-SAM: Segmentation Quality Assessment for Medical Images Utilizing the Segment Anything Model*

Yizhe Zhang¹, Shuo Wang², Tao Zhou¹, Qi Dou³, and Danny Z. Chen⁴

¹ Nanjing University of Science and Technology, Nanjing, China

² Digital Medical Research Center, School of Basic Medical Sciences, Fudan University, Shanghai, China

³ The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China

⁴ University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, USA

Abstract. Segmentation quality assessment (SQA) plays a critical role in the deployment of a medical image based AI system. Users need to be informed/alerted whenever an AI system generates unreliable/incorrect predictions. With the introduction of the Segment Anything Model (SAM), a general foundation segmentation model, new research opportunities emerged in how one can utilize SAM for medical image segmentation. In this paper, we propose a novel SQA method, called SQA-SAM, which exploits SAM to enhance the accuracy of quality assessment for medical image segmentation. When a medical image segmentation model (MedSeg) produces predictions for a test image, we generate visual prompts based on the predictions, and SAM is utilized to generate segmentation maps corresponding to the visual prompts. How well MedSeg’s segmentation aligns with SAM’s segmentation indicates how well MedSeg’s segmentation aligns with the general perception of objectness and image region partition. We develop a score measure for such alignment. In experiments, we find that the generated scores exhibit moderate to strong positive correlation (in Pearson correlation and Spearman correlation) with Dice coefficient scores reflecting the true segmentation quality. The code and updates will be made available at github.com/yizhezhang2000/SQA-SAM.

Keywords: Medical Image Segmentation · Segmentation Quality Assessment · Segment Anything Model · Segmentation Quality Control.

1 Introduction

Numerous deep learning (DL) based medical image segmentation models were developed in the last decade, driving state-of-the-art segmentation performance to higher and higher accuracy on test data. It is well-known that when test samples are i.i.d. (independent and identically distributed) drawn from the sample distribution of the training data, modern DL-based segmentation models often

* Work in progress. Email: yizhe.zhang.cs@gmail.com




Fig. 1. Utilizing SAM for assessing segmentation quality for a medical image segmentation task.

perform quite well. But, in real world scenarios, the current best DL models still suffer from unreliable outcomes when encountering unfamiliar samples (those that are not i.i.d. drawn from the sample distribution of the training data). More importantly, there is generally a lack of notion of segmentation quality when a segmentation model provides its predictions, leading to situations where medical practitioners lack confidence in using such medical AI systems in practice.

Recently, more research emphasis has been put on developing trustworthy medical AI systems. Mehrtash et al. [10] investigated the issue of poorly calibrated DL models for medical image segmentation, comparing cross-entropy and Dice loss functions and proposing a model ensemble approach for improved confidence calibration. Zhang et al. [15] proposed a novel evaluation metric that simultaneously examines both confidence calibration and segmentation accuracy to measure the usability and reliability of a medical image segmentation model. Zou et al. [21] contributed a comprehensive review of newly developed segmentation networks with uncertainty estimation mechanisms, exploring diverse methods such as ensemble learning, Bayesian inference, and Monte Carlo dropout. These techniques quantify model uncertainty, enabling informed decision-making and bolstering the overall trustworthiness of medical AI systems.

In this paper, we develop a novel SAM-based quality control approach, called SQA-SAM, for medical image segmentation. Instead of focusing on equipping segmentation networks with new internal uncertainty estimation mechanisms, we propose an external system to evaluate segmentation quality based on test images and the model’s predictions. This system leverages the Segment Anything Model (SAM) [8], a general-purpose foundation segmentation model trained using 11 million images and over 1 billion masks. SAM excels at segmenting objects given point or bounding-box prompts. The medical image segmentation model under investigation (MedSeg) provides point and bounding-box prompts, which can then be used to generate new segmentation masks using SAM. The agreement between MedSeg’s segmentation and SAM’s segmentation indicates how well MedSeg’s segmentation aligns with general perception. This alignment can then be used to derive a score for measuring the quality of MedSeg’s segmentation output. Our experiments show that the scores thus computed exhibit moderate to strong positive correlation (in Pearson correlation and Spearman correlation) with Dice coefficient scores reflecting the true segmentation quality.

2 Related Work

We first provide a brief review of related work on segmentation quality assessment, categorized into two groups: methods that utilize labeled samples for training an SQA model and unsupervised methods that require no labeled samples to perform. Next, we present a review of recent methods that employ the Segment Anything Model (SAM) for improving medical image segmentation.

2.1 Training an SQA Model Using Labeled Samples

Huang et al. [6] proposed a learning-based approach for estimating segmentation quality using DL networks; three options were developed for constructing the network, mostly on where the segmentation mask is fused with the features/images in the process of estimating the segmentation quality score. In a similar fashion, Zhou et al. [18] proposed to use two sequential networks for SQA. Devries et al. [4] utilized uncertainty maps to aid the estimation of the quality score; raw images, segmentation maps, and uncertainty maps are combined and fed to a DL-based network for generating a segmentation quality score. Rottmann et al. [12] proposed aggregating the dispersion of softmax probabilities to infer the true segmentation IoU. Rahman et al. [11] proposed using an encoder-decoder architecture to detect segmentation failure cases at the pixel level; multi-scale features from the segmentation network are extracted and fed to the decoder for generating a map that highlights the mis-classified/mis-segmented pixels.

A common problem with learning-based SQA methods arises when test samples are not drawn from exactly the same distribution as the samples used when building the learning-based SQA model. The neural networks for estimating SQA might be familiar with certain types of errors that the segmentation model tends to produce, but when the test samples become unfamiliar, the accuracy of the learning-based SQA methods would drop significantly for assessing the segmentation quality.

2.2 SQA That Requires No Additional Labeled Samples

Zhang et al. [13] presented an extensive survey of unsupervised segmentation quality evaluation methods. The early unsupervised SQA approaches primarily centered around the formulation of manually crafted features, including but not limited to gray-scale differences, intra-region uniformity, busyness, and shapes. These features were employed to gauge segmentation quality in the absence of ground truth labels. Recently, Chen et al. [3] utilized 14 pre-defined metrics under different assumptions to evaluate the quality of cell segmentation. After attaining the evaluation results of the pre-defined metrics, they further performed PCA (Principal Component Analysis) to obtain a single score describing the segmentation quality. Audelan et al. [1] estimated segmentation quality by comparing each segmentation with the output of a probabilistic segmentation model that relies on intensity and smoothness assumptions. While many hand-crafted metrics successfully captured various facets of segmentation quality, it

became evident that, in more realistic and complex scenarios, handcrafted simple measures are inadequate for comprehensive assessment of segmentation quality.

2.3 Utilization of SAM for Medical Image Segmentation

Since the introduction of SAM [8], many attempts have been made in utilizing SAM for medical image segmentation. Ma et al. [9] studied fine-tuning SAM for medical images using a large collection of medical images with segmentation annotations. Huang et al. [7] tested the performance of SAM for medical image segmentation using 53 open-source datasets and showed some limitations of SAM when directly applying it to medical images. Zhou et al. [19] tested the performance of SAM for polyp segmentation and compared it with state-of-the-art polyp segmentation models. Zhang et al. [16] proposed to use SAM for augmenting input images for medical image segmentation. SAM was also used for semi-supervised learning of medical image segmentation [17]. Previous studies demonstrated that SAM can provide a general perception of objectness, making it a valuable tool for improving medical image segmentation performance.

3 Method

3.1 Objective

The ultimate goal of segmentation quality assessment is to generate a score for a given test sample which is equivalent to the true quality score obtained by comparing the segmentation with the ground truth. For example, suppose the Dice coefficient is used for measuring the segmentation quality; the goal would be to generate/predict the Dice coefficient score given segmentation results and their corresponding raw images. Since this goal is very challenging, in this paper, we tackle a slightly easier task: Given a set of test samples with the predicted segmentation maps, generate SQA scores with high linear correlation and rank correlation with the true evaluation metric scores.

3.2 Utilizing SAM for SQA

Given a test image x , we apply a model f to x to obtain a segmentation map $\hat{y} \in \{0, 1\}^{w \times h \times C}$, where C is the number of classes of the segmentation task, and w and h denote the width and height of the input image. We then extract objects using a connected component (CC) algorithm from \hat{y} . For each class i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, C$, we apply the CC algorithm to the i -th channel of \hat{y} and extract a set of objects corresponding to class i , denoted as $\mathcal{M}_i = \{m_1^i, m_2^i, \dots, m_{p_i}^i\}$, where each m_j^i is a binary mask corresponding to one object, and p_i is the number of objects in the i -th class map. We repeat this process for all the classes and obtain $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2, \dots, \mathcal{M}_C$.

For each object $m_j^i \in \mathcal{M}_i$, we obtain all the pixel locations with pixel values equal to 1, and compute their center point and bounding box. We separately

feed the center point and bounding box as prompts (together with the image x) to SAM, and obtain two binary masks: one induced by the center point prompt (denoted as pm_j^i) and the other induced by the bounding-box prompt (denoted as bm_j^i). We then calculate a score for object m_j^i as $s_j^i = \tau(m_j^i, pm_j^i) + \tau(m_j^i, bm_j^i)$. Here, τ is a segmentation evaluation metric, and by default, we set it as the Dice coefficient metric. We repeat the above process for all the objects in \mathcal{M}_i , for $i = 1, 2, \dots, C$. Finally, we compute an overall segmentation quality score s for the segmentation map \hat{y} as:

$$s = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^C \sum_{j=1}^{p_i} s_j^i}{\sum_{i=1}^C \sum_{j=1}^{p_i} 1}. \quad (1)$$

3.3 Limitations

We should note that the above computed scores do not address errors caused by incorrect class-label assignment. For example, if the segmentation masks are of good quality (e.g., with correct shapes) but the corresponding classes are assigned incorrectly, then the computed score in the above scheme is not able to capture such types of errors, as SAM is class-agnostic in general. Furthermore, if an object of interest is missed in the segmentation output of f , then the computed score would not be able to capture such missed detection cases, since the visual prompts are generated depending on the segmentation output to provide the initial pixel regions.

4 Experiments

We empirically study whether the generated segmentation quality scores have a positive correlation with the Dice coefficient scores (computed by comparing segmentation maps with ground truths). We use two datasets for the experiments, Polyp Segmentation in Endoscopic Images [5] and Retinal OCT Fluid Segmentation (RETOUCH) [2]. Both these two datasets consider only one type of objects (e.g., polyp) and are binary segmentation tasks. We setup a baseline (Model Confidence) which is built upon the pixel-level confidence of the segmentation prediction: We take the max value of the prediction logits (after softmax) for each pixel, and then takes the average confidence across all the pixels for each test sample.

4.1 Polyp Segmentation in Endoscopic Images

On the Polyp Segmentation in Endoscopic Images dataset [5], we utilize the well-trained HSNNet by Zhang et al. [14] for the polyp segmentation experiments. The test set comprises samples from five datasets. For simplicity and clarity, we report the performance of the segmentation quality assessment for all the test samples in one test run.

Table 1. Correlation between SQA scores and true Dice coefficient scores for polyp segmentation (higher numbers indicate better quality assessment performances).

SQA Method	Pearson Corr.	Spearman Corr.
Model Confidence	0.414	0.096
SQA-SAM (ours)	0.518	0.659

Table 2. Accuracy of detecting samples with low Dice coefficient scores on the Polyp Segmentation in Endoscopic Images dataset (higher numbers indicate better performances).

SQA Method	Bottom 25%	Bottom 50%
Model Confidence	49.1%	50.8%
SQA-SAM (ours)	68.2%	75.9%

Table 1 reports the SQA scores computed by our proposed SQA-SAM method, showing a moderate to strong correlation with the Dice coefficient scores computed by comparing the segmentation results against ground truths. Furthermore, we assess the accuracy of using the SQA scores to detect samples with Dice coefficient scores in the bottom $k\%$ among all the test samples. In Table 2, we show the accuracy of the SQA scores in detecting samples of poor segmentation quality (with low Dice coefficient scores) when setting $k\%$ as 25% and 50%. Additionally, we investigate whether SAM can enhance segmentation output by replacing the output of HSNet with SAM’s output. We find that 266 out of 798 samples receive improvement in segmentation quality (in Dice coefficient) after using SAM’s segmentation maps instead of HSNet’s output, but the other 532 samples actually exhibit degradation in segmentation quality. This demonstrates that simply utilizing SAM’s output to replace the original segmentation model’s output may not consistently result in improved segmentation output, echoing previous findings in [19].

4.2 Retinal OCT Fluid Segmentation

RETOUCH [2] is a benchmark and challenge dataset for designing and evaluating algorithms for detecting and segmenting various types of fluids in retinal optical coherence tomography (OCT) images. It provides representative OCT data across different retinal diseases, OCT vendors, and fluid types. We train the UNet++ model [20] using the training set of this dataset and use the test set with images from the “SPECTRALIS OCT” vendor for testing the performances of quality assessment methods. Table 3 shows that our QA-SAM method yields scores with a moderate to strong correlation with the true Dice coefficient scores. Table 4 shows the detection accuracy of using the segmentation quality scores to detect test samples with poor segmentation quality.

Table 3. Correlation between SQA scores and true Dice coefficient scores for retinal OCT fluid segmentation (higher numbers indicate better quality assessment performances).

SQA Method	Pearson Corr.	Spearman Corr.
Model Confidence	0.211	0.229
SQA-SAM (ours)	0.611	0.710

Table 4. Accuracy of detecting samples with low Dice coefficient scores on the RE-TOUCH dataset (higher numbers indicate better performances).

SQA Method	Bottom 25%	Bottom 50%
Model Confidence	32.7%	59.3%
SQA-SAM (ours)	67.3%	74.8%

5 Conclusions

In this paper, we proposed a new effective method, SQA-SAM, which utilizes the Segment Anything Model (SAM) for segmentation quality assessment on medical images. SAM provides a fruitful way to examine how well segmentation results align with the general perception, and such alignment can indicate the segmentation quality. Experiments on two medical image segmentation tasks demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed method. Further research will be conducted on more medical image segmentation tasks and datasets, and on further refining and extending the proposed SQA method.

References

1. Benoît Audelan and Hervé Delingette. Unsupervised quality control of segmentations based on a smoothness and intensity probabilistic model. *Medical Image Analysis*, 68:101895, 2021.
2. Hrvoje Bogunović, Freerk Venhuizen, Sophie Klimscha, Stefanos Apostolopoulos, Alireza Bab-Hadiashar, Ulas Bagci, Mirza Faisal Beg, Loza Bekalo, Qiang Chen, Carlos Ciller, et al. RETOUCH: The retinal OCT fluid detection and segmentation benchmark and challenge. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, 38(8):1858–1874, 2019.
3. Haoran Chen and Robert F Murphy. Evaluation of cell segmentation methods without reference segmentations. *Molecular Biology of the Cell*, 34(6):ar50, 2023.
4. Terrance DeVries and Graham W Taylor. Leveraging uncertainty estimates for predicting segmentation quality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.00502*, 2018.
5. Deng-Ping Fan, Ge-Peng Ji, Tao Zhou, Geng Chen, Huazhu Fu, Jianbing Shen, and Ling Shao. PraNet: Parallel reverse attention network for polyp segmentation. In *International conference on medical image computing and computer-assisted intervention*, pages 263–273. Springer, 2020.
6. Chao Huang, Qingbo Wu, and Fanman Meng. QualityNet: Segmentation quality evaluation with deep convolutional networks. In *2016 Visual Communications and Image Processing (VCIP)*, pages 1–4. IEEE, 2016.

7. Yuhao Huang, Xin Yang, Lian Liu, Han Zhou, Ao Chang, Xinrui Zhou, Rusi Chen, Junxuan Yu, Jiongquan Chen, Chaoyu Chen, et al. Segment Anything Model for medical images? *Medical Image Analysis*, page 103061, 2023.
8. Alexander Kirillov, Eric Mintun, Nikhila Ravi, Hanzi Mao, Chloe Rolland, Laura Gustafson, Tete Xiao, Spencer Whitehead, Alexander C. Berg, Wan-Yen Lo, Piotr Dollár, and Ross Girshick. Segment anything. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.02643*, 2023.
9. Jun Ma and Bo Wang. Segment anything in medical images. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12306*, 2023.
10. Alireza Mehrtash, William M Wells, Clare M Tempany, Purang Abolmaesumi, and Tina Kapur. Confidence calibration and predictive uncertainty estimation for deep medical image segmentation. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, 39(12):3868–3878, 2020.
11. Quazi Marufur Rahman, Niko Sünderhauf, Peter Corke, and Feras Dayoub. FSNet: A failure detection framework for semantic segmentation. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 7(2):3030–3037, 2022.
12. Matthias Rottmann, Pascal Colling, Thomas Paul Hack, Robin Chan, Fabian Hüger, Peter Schlicht, and Hanno Gottschalk. Prediction error meta classification in semantic segmentation: Detection via aggregated dispersion measures of softmax probabilities. In *2020 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, pages 1–9. IEEE, 2020.
13. Hui Zhang, Jason E Fritts, and Sally A Goldman. Image segmentation evaluation: A survey of unsupervised methods. *Computer Vision and Image Understanding*, 110(2):260–280, 2008.
14. Wenchao Zhang, Chong Fu, Yu Zheng, Fangyuan Zhang, Yanli Zhao, and Chiu-Wing Sham. HSNet: A hybrid semantic network for polyp segmentation. *Computers in Biology and Medicine*, 150:106173, 2022.
15. Yizhe Zhang, Suraj Mishra, Peixian Liang, Hao Zheng, and Danny Z Chen. Usable region estimate for assessing practical usability of medical image segmentation models. In *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*, pages 173–182. Springer, 2022.
16. Yizhe Zhang, Tao Zhou, Shuo Wang, Peixian Liang, Yeja Zhang, and Danny Z Chen. Input augmentation with SAM: Boosting medical image segmentation with segmentation foundation model. In *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention Workshops*, pages 129–139. Springer, 2023.
17. Yizhe Zhang, Tao Zhou, Shuo Wang, Ye Wu, Pengfei Gu, and Danny Z Chen. SamDSK: Combining Segment Anything Model with domain-specific knowledge for semi-supervised learning in medical image segmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.13759*, 2023.
18. Leixin Zhou, Wenxiang Deng, and Xiaodong Wu. Robust image segmentation quality assessment. In *Medical Imaging with Deep Learning*, 2020.
19. Tao Zhou, Yizhe Zhang, Yi Zhou, Ye Wu, and Chen Gong. Can SAM segment polyps? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.07583*, 2023.
20. Zongwei Zhou, Md Mahfuzur Rahman Siddiquee, Nima Tajbakhsh, and Jianming Liang. UNet++: A nested U-Net architecture for medical image segmentation. In *Deep Learning in Medical Image Analysis and Multimodal Learning for Clinical Decision Support, the 4th International DLMIA Workshop and 8th International ML-CDS Workshop*, pages 3–11, 2018.

21. Ke Zou, Zhihao Chen, Xuedong Yuan, Xiaojing Shen, Meng Wang, and Huazhu Fu. A review of uncertainty estimation and its application in medical imaging. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.08119*, 2023.