

The 2nd Solution for LSVOS Challenge RVOS Track: Spatial-temporal Refinement for Consistent Semantic Segmentation

Tuyen Tran

Applied Artificial Intelligence Institute, Deakin University, Australia

Team: TXT

t.tran@deakin.edu.au

Abstract. Referring Video Object Segmentation (RVOS) is a challenging task due to its requirement for temporal understanding. Due to the obstacle of computational complexity, many state-of-the-art models are trained on short time intervals. During testing, while these models can effectively process information over short time steps, they struggle to maintain consistent perception over prolonged time sequences, leading to inconsistencies in the resulting semantic segmentation masks. To address this challenge, we take a step further in this work by leveraging the tracking capabilities of the newly introduced Segment Anything Model version 2 (SAM-v2) to enhance the temporal consistency of the referring object segmentation model. Our method achieved a score of 60.40 $\mathcal{J}\&\mathcal{F}$ on the test set of the MeViS dataset, placing 2nd place in the final ranking of the RVOS Track at the ECCV 2024 LSVOS Challenge.

1 Introduction

This technical report details our participation in the 6th LSVOS challenge, which offers two tracks: the VOS (video object segmentation) track and the RVOS (referring video object segmentation) track. This year’s challenge has introduced new datasets, MOSE [3] and MeViS [2], replacing the YouTube-VOS and Referring YouTube-VOS benchmarks used in the past. These new datasets bring more complex scenarios, including disappearing and reappearing objects, small and difficult-to-detect objects, significant occlusions, crowded settings, and longer video durations, making the competition tougher than previous years.

In this work, we focus on the RVOS task. RVOS involves locating target instances throughout an entire video sequence based on a linguistic descriptor. The main challenge of this task, compared to image-based segmentation, is that it requires the machine learning model to understand the temporal relationships within the video. The recently introduced Motion Expression guided Video Segmentation (MeViS) dataset [2] places additional emphasis on the importance of machine learning model’s capability in temporal understanding. Compared to earlier datasets, MeViS is more challenging, as most language expressions in the dataset incorporate motion elements. Motion can occur within short time intervals or over the entire course of a video, requiring the machine learning model

to comprehensively understand multi-modal interactions throughout long-term sequences.

Aware of this challenge, recent works have focused on enhancing the temporal understanding of machine learning models. The latest state-of-the-art in RVOS, DsHmp [6], addresses this issue by separating the referring description into static and motion cues. They then employ a hierarchical motion perception module to interpret the visual information. The long visual tokens are processed hierarchically, enabling improved temporal comprehension. In the RVOS Track of the CVPR 2024 PVUW Challenge [4], the TIME Team [11] proposed a novel approach for referring video object segmentation. They first use a frozen CLIP [12] model for video and language feature extraction. Then, they introduce a query initialization method to generate high quality queries for both frames and videos. Taking a different approach, the Tapall.ai team [5] fine-tuned the current leading RVOS model, MUTR [15], on the MeViS dataset. During inference, they explored various frame sampling strategies to enhance the baseline method. The CASIA IVA team [1] also used MUTR as the base model to extract the initial coarse masks. They then enhanced the consistency of the predicted results by introducing proposal instance masks into the model for query initialization. In the final stage, they utilized the segmentation capabilities of SAM-HQ [8] for spatial refinement.

In this work, we also focus on improving the consistency of segmentation results from the base model. We use SAM-v2 [13] to refine the initial coarse segmentation, not just in the spatial dimension. Instead, we leverage the advanced segmentation and tracking capabilities of SAM-v2 for both spatial and temporal refinement. SAM-v2 is a newly introduced model. In addition to its strong segmentation capabilities, SAM-v2 has demonstrated excellent performance in tracking instances over long videos. We utilize the spatio-temporal masks (i.e., 'masklets') generated by SAM-v2 to enhance the consistency of segmentation masks across both spatial and temporal dimensions. Our solution achieved 53.66 $\mathcal{J}\&\mathcal{F}$ on the validation set and 60.40 $\mathcal{J}\&\mathcal{F}$ on the test set of the MeViS dataset.

2 Method

The overall proposed framework is presented in Figure 1. We initially employ SAMv2 to extract spatio-temporal masks containing tracking-related details. Simultaneously, we fine-tune the MUTR model on MeViS to generate initial coarse spatio-temporal masks based on the given video and textual description. We define these coarse masks as $M_c = \{u^t\}_{t=1}^T$, where T is the number of frame in video. The resulting raw masks undergo further refinement in the Spatial-Temporal Refinement Module (Section 2.2) to yield the final segmentation mask with enhanced temporal consistency.

2.1 Video object tracking with textual prompt

Since the original SAM-2 requires initial inputs of either points, boxes, or masks to track visual objects within a video, additional processing steps are necessary




Fig. 1: We first extract the main noun from the given textual query (e.g., "Cat") and use it as input for the *Text-Prompted SAM-2*. This module essentially combines Grounding Dino and SAMv2. Grounding Dino detects all bounding boxes of instances belonging to the specified object category. These boxes are then used as prompt input for the SAMv2 model, resulting in a sequence of spatio-temporal masks. Concurrently, a fine-tuned MUTR model is employed to generate coarse masks from the input video. These initial masks are then subjected to refinement within the Spatial-Temporal Refinement Module, resulting in final segmentation masks with improved temporal consistency.

to construct a video object tracking system using SAM-2 with textual prompt input. First, given a descriptive sentence, we employ a language processing tool Berkeley Neural Parser [9] to extract the main noun (e.g., "Cat", in Figure 1), which designates the target object category for tracking. Subsequently, we utilize the open-vocabulary object detection model, Grounding DINO [10], to extract bounding boxes encompassing the target object. These bounding boxes serve as input prompts for the SAM-2 model. SAM-2 produces a set of spatio-temporal masks, termed 'masklets'. The number of masklets corresponds to the quantity of distinct instances detected for the given object category. Formally, we denote the tracking results from SAM-2 as $M_t = \{v_i^t\}$, where i ranges from 1 to N and t ranges from 1 to T . Here, N represents the number of instances detected for the given object category, and T denotes the number of frames in the input video.

2.2 Spatial-Temporal Refinement for Consistent Semantic Segmentation

The pseudo code is outlined in Algorithm 1. We first divide the entire video, which consists of T frames, into non-overlapping sequences with a window size of W . The proposed module, which takes input as coarse masks M_c and tracked masks M_t , is executed on each sequence individually. With slight abuse of notation, we also will use $M_t = \{v_i^t\}$ with i ranges from 1 to W to denote the tracking results of instance v_i within the window size W . At each time step, we calculate the Fraction of Overlap f_i^t between each tracked instance v_i^t and the coarse segmentation mask u^t :

$$f_i^t = \frac{\text{Intersection}(v_i^t, u^t)}{\text{Area}(v_i^t)}. \quad (1)$$




Fig. 2: Spatial-temporal Refinement Algorithm: We utilize the coarse prediction masks $\{u^t\}$ and tracked masks $\{v_i^t\}$ to construct component combinations C_t for each time step t . In the example shown, during time steps 1, 2, 4, and 5, the coarse prediction from baseline consistently segments only the cat tracked with ID 2 (yellow mask). However, at time step 3, both cats are segmented, resulting in $C_3 = (1, 2)$. To maintain the temporal consistency, we select the most frequent combination, $(2,)$ and apply it to refine all frames within the window size.

f_i^t is calculated as the ratio of the intersection area between the tracked instance v_i^t and the coarse mask u^t to the total area of instance v_i^t . The Fraction of Overlap f_i^t indicates the proportion of instance i at time step t that overlaps with the coarse mask predicted by the MUTR model. If f_i^t exceeds a threshold τ , we infer that instance i is present at time step t and add its index to the component list C_t . As a result, C_t represents the combination of components at the time step t . This process is repeated across all time steps within the window size W , yielding the set $\mathcal{C} = \{C_t\}$, where each element C_t captures the specific combination of components at its respective time step t . We expect that within a given window size, the spatio-temporal masks should remain consistent. Therefore, we select C_{sel} as the combination of components that appears most frequently in the set \mathcal{C} for refinement. The refined spatio-temporal masks $M_r = \{m^t\}$ are derived by composing all instances listed in C_{sel} . If $C_{\text{sel}} = \emptyset$, meaning that the predicted instances from the MUTR model are not included in the tracking output, we retain the original prediction without refinement. We illustrate the behavior of the proposed refinement algorithm with an example in Figure 2.

3 Experiment

3.1 Implementation details

We used open-source models from SAM-2 and Grounding DINO for tracking objects in video based on textual prompts. For fine-tuning MUTR, we followed

Algorithm 1 Spatial-Temporal Refinement for Consistent Segmentation.**Input:**

- Coarse segmentation masks $M_c = \{u^t\}_{t=1}^W$,
- Tracked masks $M_t = \{v_i^t\}_{i=1, t=1}^{N, W}$

Output:

- Refined mask $M_r = \{m^t\}_{t=1}^W$

```

1 for  $t = 1$  to  $W$  do
2   foreach  $v_i^t$  do
3     Calculate  $f_i^t$  // Refer to equation 1
4     if  $f_i^t > \tau$  then Add  $i$  to  $C_t$ ;
5   end
6 end
7 Set  $C_{\text{sel}}$  as the combination that appears most frequently in  $\{C_t\}$ 
8 Obtain the refined mask  $M_r = \{m^t\}_{t=1}^W$  by composing all instances included in  $C_{\text{sel}}$ 

```

the approach in [5], utilizing MUTR’s weights that were trained on both the image [7], and video [14] referring datasets. We fine-tuned MUTR for three epochs using four NVIDIA A100 GPUs, each with 40GB of VRAM. When refining the initial coarse masks, we selected a window size W of 15 and a threshold τ of 0.8.

3.2 Quantitative results

Main results: The main results is present in Table 1. Our method achieve 60.40 $\mathcal{J}\&\mathcal{F}$ in the test set of RVOS Track at the ECCV 2024 LSVOS Challenge. placing the 2nd position in the leader board

Place	Team	$\mathcal{J}\&\mathcal{F}$	\mathcal{J}	\mathcal{F}
1	times	62.57	58.98	66.15
2	tuyentx	<u>60.40</u>	<u>60.40</u>	<u>63.78</u>
3	Jasonshelter0	60.36	56.88	63.85
4	SaBoTaGe	60.36	56.89	63.83
5	BBBiiinnn	60.36	56.88	63.84
6	bdc	60.28	56.82	63.74

Table 1: Quantitative results on the MeViS test set.

Ablation study: We conducted an ablation study on the MeViS validation set in Table 2. Using the coarse masks from MUTR resulted in a score of 48.38 $\mathcal{J}\&\mathcal{F}$ on the validation set. Incorporating tracked masks obtained from SAM-2 notably improved performance, with a window size of 15 yielding the best results.

Method	Baseline	$W = 5$	$W = 10$	$W = 15$	$W = 20$
$\mathcal{J}\&\mathcal{F}$	48.38	50.16	52.20	<u>53.66</u>	51.33

Table 2: Ablations on MeViS validation set.

3.3 Qualitative results




Fig. 3: Qualitative results on the MeViS validation set: We present examples to showcase the effectiveness of the proposed approach. The baseline is initial coarse masks obtained from MUTR. It is shown that while the baseline can produce accurate masks for short periods of time, it struggles to maintain consistency over longer periods. By utilizing the tracking capabilities of SAM-2, we refine the initial coarse masks to achieve improved consistency across both spatial and temporal dimensions.

We showcase qualitative results in Figure 3, which illustrates the ability of the proposed method to enhance the temporal consistency of semantic segmentation compared to the baseline model.

4 Conclusion

In this work, we present a simple yet effective method for segmenting instances in video based on a referring description. We build upon the baseline by leveraging the tracking capabilities of the SAM-2 model to enhance the temporal consistency of the segmentation results. By incorporating tracking information from an external model, we partially address the limitations in long-term temporal understanding seen in current state-of-the-art methods for this challenging task. Although the improved performance over baselines in both quantitative and qualitative evaluations demonstrates the effectiveness of our approach, it also highlights the need for end-to-end models with enhanced long-term understanding.

References

1. Cao, B., Zhang, Y., Lin, X., He, X., Zhao, B., Liu, J.: 2nd place solution for mevis track in cvpr 2024 pvuw workshop: Motion expression guided video segmentation. ArXiv [abs/2406.13939](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.13939) (2024), <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:270619525> 2
2. Ding, H., Liu, C., He, S., Jiang, X., Loy, C.C.: MeViS: A large-scale benchmark for video segmentation with motion expressions. In: ICCV (2023) 1
3. Ding, H., Liu, C., He, S., Jiang, X., Torr, P.H., Bai, S.: MOSE: A new dataset for video object segmentation in complex scenes. In: ICCV (2023) 1
4. Ding, H., Liu, C., Wei, Y., Ravi, N., He, S., Bai, S., Torr, P., Miao, D., Li, X., He, Z., et al.: Pvuw 2024 challenge on complex video understanding: Methods and results. arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.17005 (2024) 2
5. Gao, M., Luo, J., Yang, J., Han, J., Zheng, F.: 1st place solution for mevis track in cvpr 2024 pvuw workshop: Motion expression guided video segmentation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.07043 (2024) 2, 5
6. He, S., Ding, H.: Decoupling static and hierarchical motion perception for referring video segmentation. In: CVPR (2024) 2
7. Kazemzadeh, S., Ordonez, V., Matten, M., Berg, T.: Referitgame: Referring to objects in photographs of natural scenes. In: Proceedings of the 2014 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP). pp. 787–798 (2014) 5
8. Ke, L., Ye, M., Danelljan, M., Liu, Y., Tai, Y.W., Tang, C.K., Yu, F.: Segment anything in high quality. In: NeurIPS (2023) 2
9. Kitaev, N., Cao, S., Klein, D.: Multilingual constituency parsing with self-attention and pre-training. In: Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. pp. 3499–3505. Association for Computational Linguistics, Florence, Italy (Jul 2019). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P19-1340>, <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P19-1340> 3
10. Liu, S., Zeng, Z., Ren, T., Li, F., Zhang, H., Yang, J., Li, C., Yang, J., Su, H., Zhu, J., et al.: Grounding dino: Marrying dino with grounded pre-training for open-set object detection. arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.05499 (2023) 3
11. Pan, F., Fang, H., Lu, X.: 3rd place solution for mevis track in cvpr 2024 pvuw workshop: Motion expression guided video segmentation. ArXiv [abs/2406.04842](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.04842) (2024), <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:270357712> 2

12. Radford, A., Kim, J.W., Hallacy, C., Ramesh, A., Goh, G., Agarwal, S., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Mishkin, P., Clark, J., et al.: Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In: International conference on machine learning. pp. 8748–8763. PMLR (2021) [2](#)
13. Ravi, N., Gabeur, V., Hu, Y.T., Hu, R., Ryali, C., Ma, T., Khedr, H., Rädle, R., Rolland, C., Gustafson, L., Mintun, E., Pan, J., Alwala, K.V., Carion, N., Wu, C.Y., Girshick, R., Dollár, P., Feichtenhofer, C.: Sam 2: Segment anything in images and videos. arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00714 (2024), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.00714> [2](#)
14. Seo, S., Lee, J.Y., Han, B.: Urvos: Unified referring video object segmentation network with a large-scale benchmark. In: Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XV 16. pp. 208–223. Springer (2020) [5](#)
15. Yan, S., Zhang, R., Guo, Z., Chen, W., Zhang, W., Li, H., Qiao, Y., Dong, H., He, Z., Gao, P.: Referred by multi-modality: A unified temporal transformer for video object segmentation. In: Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence. vol. 38, pp. 6449–6457 (2024) [2](#)