

Prompt Categories Cluster for Weakly Supervised Semantic Segmentation

1st Wangyu Wu
Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University
The University of Liverpool
Suzhou, China
v11dryad@foxmail.com

2nd Xianglin Qiu
Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University
The University of Liverpool
Suzhou, China
Xianglin.Qiu20@student.xjtlu.edu.cn

3rd Siqi Song
Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University
The University of Liverpool
Suzhou, China
Siqi.Song22@student.xjtlu.edu.cn

4th Xiaowei Huang
The University of Liverpool
Liverpool, UK
xiaowei.huang@liverpool.ac.uk

5th Fei Ma[†]
Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University
Suzhou, China
fei.ma@xjtlu.edu.cn

6th Jimin Xiao[†]
Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University
Suzhou, China
jimmin.xiao@xjtlu.edu.cn

Abstract—Weakly Supervised Semantic Segmentation (WSSS), which leverages image-level labels, has garnered significant attention due to its cost-effectiveness. The previous methods mainly strengthen the inter-class differences to avoid class semantic ambiguity which may lead to erroneous activation. However, they overlook the positive function of some shared information between similar classes. Categories within the same cluster share some similar features. Allowing the model to recognize these features can further relieve the semantic ambiguity between these classes. To effectively identify and utilize this shared information, in this paper, we introduce a novel WSSS framework called Prompt Categories Clustering (PCC). Specifically, we explore the ability of Large Language Models (LLMs) to derive category clusters through prompts. These clusters effectively represent the intrinsic relationships between categories. By integrating this relational information into the training network, our model is able to better learn the hidden connections between categories. Experimental results demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach, showing its ability to enhance performance on the PASCAL VOC 2012 dataset and surpass existing state-of-the-art methods in WSSS.

Index Terms—Weakly-Supervised Learning, Semantic Segmentation, GPT-Prompt, Categories Cluster

I. INTRODUCTION

Weakly supervised semantic segmentation (WSSS) utilizes image-level labels to achieve dense pixel segmentation. Recently, many WSSS methods [1]–[4] rely on the Vision Transformer (ViT) architecture [5], since ViT can capture global feature interactions through self-attention blocks. However, the self-attention mechanism in ViT tends to act as a low-pass filter, diminishing input signal variance and leading to over-smoothing of patch tokens [6]. To address this issue, ToCo [7] proposed token contrastive loss for intra-class compactness

[†]Corresponding author

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 62471405, 62331003, 62301451), Suzhou Basic Research Program (SYG202316) and XJTLU REF-22-01-010, XJTLU AI University Research Centre, Jiangsu Province Engineering Research Centre of Data Science and Cognitive Computation at XJTLU and SIP AI innovation platform (YZCXPT2022103).




Fig. 1. (a) In traditional ViT-based WSSS method, only the ViT tokens represent image patches are used for classification. (b) In our PPC, we use GPT to judge the cluster category each image belongs to and generate cluster token that contains shared class information to enhance ViT patch tokens.

and inter-class separability to mitigate over-smoothing CAM. And MCTformer+ [8] proposed a Contrastive-Class-Token module to enhance the learning of discriminative class tokens to better capture the unique properties of each class. However, these methods [6], [9], [10] focus only on identifying differences between different classes, overlooking the positive function of latent information shared among similar categories. We argue that category clustering can find the shared information between categories, and injecting this information into patch tokens can achieve a more accurate semantic representation of image patches. This approach helps alleviate the semantic ambiguity caused by excessive smoothing of patch features in ViT.

To achieve category similarity clustering, we propose an effective approach called *Prompt categories cluster* (PPC, see




Fig. 2. The overall framework of PPC is as follows: First, ViT is used to generate image patch tokens. A category list, covering all categories in the dataset, is processed by GPT to cluster these categories and determine which clusters the input image belongs to. In cluster vector, 1 indicates belonging to the cluster, 0 indicates not belonging, and then the cluster vector is multiplied by a learnable matrix to obtain a cluster token that contains cluster information. The cluster token is concatenated with the patch tokens and input into a HV-BiLSTM to generate refined tokens. Finally, refined tokens are passed through patch classifier to obtain patch predictions, and we perform top-k pooling on the predictions to obtain image predictions and conduct MCE loss with image GT label.

Fig. 1(b)), leveraging prompts through LLM to extract intrinsic relationships between categories. The motivation stems from the fact that LLM integrate knowledge from various perspectives to account for category similarities, enabling more effective clustering of similar categories and improving the model performance. **Our main contributions are threefold:** (1) We introduce a novel ViT-based framework that incorporates prompt categories alongside current category labels as learnable tokens, enhancing the WSSS approach. (2) We develop an automated clustering method driven by GPT prompts, utilizing the knowledge of Large Language Models (LLMs) to automatically cluster categories, facilitating better information exchange between images of different classes. (3) Our proposed framework demonstrates superior performance compared to other state-of-the-art methods on the segmentation task using the PASCAL VOC 2012 dataset.

II. METHODOLOGY

In this section, we present the overall architecture and main components of our method. We begin by offering an overview of our PPC WSSS framework in Sec.II-A. Subsequently, in Sec.II-B, we present our proposed self-refine Prompt method in detail, it uses GPT to cluster categories with similar features. Finally, in Sec. II-C, we incorporate category cluster information as learnable tokens within the ViT framework during model training. The objective is to enhance the ability of model to learn easily confused similar information within similar classes, thereby improving the quality of pseudo-label and ultimately enhancing semantic segmentation performance.

A. Overall Framework

An overview of our proposed PCC framework is presented in Fig. 2. The network is trained to infer patch-level labels

using tokens formed by concatenating original ViT patch tokens and cluster token as our used tokens for WSSS training. Subsequently, the concated patch tokens are further refined through an HV-BiLSTM module in [11]. Then we use a MLP-based patch classifier to predict patch-to-category labels and generate pseudo-labels. These pseudo-labels are refined using Conditional Random Fields (CRF) [12] to produce the final pseudo-labels. Finally, the refined pseudo-labels are utilized as input to train a DeepLabv2 [13] model, achieving the final semantic segmentation results.

B. Self-Refine Prompt for Cluster

Algorithm 1: Self-Refine category clusters generation

Input : category list l , LLM \mathcal{M} , initial prompt p_{gen} , refine prompt p_{refine} , stop condition $s(\cdot)$

Output: category clusters z_t

```

1  $z_0 = \mathcal{M}(p_{\text{gen}} \parallel l)$ ;
2 for iteration  $t \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$  do
3    $z_{t+1} = \mathcal{M}(p_{\text{refine}} \parallel z_t)$ ;
4   if  $s(z_{t+1}, z_t, \dots, z_0)$  then
5     break;
6 return  $z_t$ ;

```

The motivation for clustering categories stems from our observation that, in previous works, since they expect the distance between different classes to be as large as possible and the distance between same classes to be as small as possible, the model tends to treat the distances between classes as equidistant, regardless of their intrinsic similarities. For example, the model perceives equal distances from “cat” to




Fig. 3. (a) is the refined prompt template; (b) is the initial prompt template; (c) is the samples of category clusters.

both “dog” and “car”. In fact, “cat” and “dog” are more similar to each other, whereas “cat” and “car” are completely different objects. To strengthen the relationships between classes, we abstract more detailed cluster information at the class level. Specifically, we leverage the powerful capabilities of LLMs to assign different cluster tags to these classes. However, due to the inherent instability of LLMs [14], the cluster tags may lack sufficient reliability. To enhance robustness, we designed a self-refining prompt method for clustering categories, as detailed in Algo. 1 and represented by the Category Cluster module in Fig. 2. This module is used to determine which cluster categories the input image belongs to, thereby generating a cluster vector containing clustering information.

In detail, given the list of all categories l in dataset, the initial prompt p_{gen} (Fig. 3(b)) is inputted into GPT-4o represent as \mathcal{M} to generate initial cluster tags of each category. Then we designed a refinement prompt (Fig. 3(a)) to refine the initial cluster tags, and the stop condition is set to terminate the iteration when the prompt results stabilize and remain unchanged after multiple iterations. Fig. 3(c) shows some samples of our generated category clusters by above steps.

C. Category Cluster Tokens for WSSS

To enrich category information, we incorporate clusters as additional tokens within the training framework. These tokens enable the network to better capture similarity information across different categories. Specifically, we concatenate ViT tokens with cluster tokens to form the final input tokens, optimizing the ability of model to leverage inter-class similarities. For instance, compared to the label “car”, the label “cat” is more similar to “dog”. As a result, both cats and dogs fall into clusters such as “animal” or “pet”, reflecting shared contextual characteristics.

The pipeline of our method is illustrated in Fig. 2. The input image X with dimensions $\mathbb{R}^{h \times w \times 3}$ is inputted to ViT encoder to get patch tokens $F_v \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times e}$, where $s = (n/d)^2$ represents the number of tokens and e is the dimension of each token. In practice, images are resized to the same h and w , so $n = h = w$ here and d is the patch size. We design a cluster vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^L$ to indicate which clusters X belongs to, each element $u_i \in \{0, 1\}$ indicates the presence (1) or absence (0) of cluster category i , with L representing the number of all cluster categories. A learnable matrix $G \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times H}$ maps the

cluster vector u to cluster token $F_c \in \mathbb{R}^H$, which is computed as follows:

$$F_c = u^T \cdot G. \quad (1)$$

Then we connect F_c to each patch token, so that we can get the concated tokens $F_{in} \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times (e+H)}$. It allows the WSSS framework to better perceive cluster information, further enhancing the overall segmentation performance.

We use HV-BiLSTM to refine the concated tokens F_{in} to get identical dimensions refined tokens $F_{out} \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times (e+H)}$. Given the feature maps F_{out} , we further introduce a one-layer MLP patch classifier with weight matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{(e+H) \times C}$, with C representing the total number of classes. Employing MLP and SoftMax operations, we derive predictions $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times C}$ from the patch classifier:

$$Z = \text{softmax}(F_{out}W), \quad (2)$$

the variable Z represents the patch predictions for semantic segmentation. These patch predictions are required to be transformed into image class predictions, facilitating the utilization of image-level labels for network supervision. This conversion is crucial to ensure accurate loss computation and alignment of predictions with the image-level labels. We use Top-K pooling to get the image class predictions p_c of class c :

$$p_c = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \text{Top-k}(Z_j^c) \quad \text{and} \quad j \in \{1, \dots, s\}, \quad (3)$$

in which $\text{Top-k}(\cdot)$ represents selecting top k patches with highest prediction values of class c . This ensures that the final image predictions are not dominated by any anomalous patch.

We minimize multi-label classification prediction error (MCE) between the predicted image labels p_c and image ground truth label y_c :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{MCE} &= \frac{1}{C} \sum_{c \in C} BCE(y_c, p_c) \\ &= -\frac{1}{C} \sum_{c \in C} y_c \log(p_c) + (1 - y_c) \log(1 - p_c), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where C represents the classes within the dataset and BCE is the binary cross-entropy loss.

During the inference stage, we use the patch classifier to get patches softmax class predictions Z . Subsequently, an interpolation algorithm is applied on Z to get the pixel softmax predictions of the input image. Finally, argmax operation is applied on interpolated Z along C dimension to get the class pseudo label of each pixel.

III. EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we describe the experimental setting, including dataset, evaluation metrics and implementation details. We then compare our method with state-of-the-art approaches on PASCAL VOC 2012 [15]. Finally, we perform ablation studies to validate the effectiveness of our proposed method.




Fig. 4. Visualization of segmentation results on the val set of PASCAL VOC.

A. Experimental Settings

Dataset and Evaluated Metric. We conducted our experiments on the Pascal VOC 2012 dataset [15], which includes 20 categories plus a background class. Typically, this dataset is augmented with the SBD dataset [16], resulting in a total of 10,582 images with image-level annotations for training and 1,449 images for validation. For performance metric, we use mean Intersection-Over-Union (mIoU).

Implementation Details. In our experiments, we utilize the ViT-B/16 model as encoder. Images are resized to 384×384 during training [17], and we divide the image to 24×24 patches with patch size 16. The model is trained with a batch size of 16 and for a maximum of 50 epochs using two NVIDIA 4090 GPUs. We employ the Adam optimizer and schedule the learning rate as follows: a learning rate of 10^{-3} for the initial two epochs, followed by training with a learning rate of 10^{-4} until convergence. The Top-K pooling maintain $k = 6$ during training. During inference, the input images are scaled to 960×960 . For the semantic segmentation stage, we employed DeepLab V2 [13] to train the model through dense pixel pseudo labels we get before. Finally, we refine the segmentation results using CRF [12].

TABLE I
PSEUDO LABEL PERFORMANCE COMPARISON

method	Pub.	Backbone	mIoU
SIPE [18]	CVPR22	ResNet50	58.6
USAGE [19]	ICCV23	ResNet38	72.8
FPR [20]	ICCV23	ResNet38	68.5
ToCo [21]	CVPR23	ViT-B/16	70.5
SFC [22]	AAAI24	ViT-B/16	73.7
PPC	Ours	ViT-B/16	74.8

B. Comparison with State-of-the-arts

Comparison of Pseudo labels. Our PPC method effectively utilizes shared information between similar categories to help model better distinguish similar classes to alleviate semantic ambiguity between these classes. As shown in Tab. I, our approach has a significant superiority compared with the current SOTA methods in pseudo-label quality.

Improvements in Segmentation Results. To assess our method, we train DeepLab V2 with generated pseudo labels

TABLE II
SEMANTIC SEGMENTATION PERFORMANCE COMPARISON

Model	Pub.	Backbone	Val
MCTformer [23]	CVPR22	DeiT-S	61.7
SIPE [18]	CVPR22	ResNet50	58.6
ViT-PCM [5]	ECCV22	ViT-B/16	69.3
TSCD [24]	AAAI23	MiT-B1	67.3
SAS [25]	AAAI23	ViT-B/16	69.5
FPR [20]	ICCV23	ResNet38	70.0
SFC [22]	AAAI24	ViT-B/16	71.2
IACD [26]	ICASSP24	ViT-B/16	71.4
PPC	Ours	ViT-B/16	72.2

and compare the segmentation results on validation set of PASCAL VOC with previous state-of-the-art methods in Tab. II. Our PPC shows significant performance improvement. The qualitative segmentation results as shown in Fig. 4 also show our method can get more accurate segmentation results.

TABLE III
ABLATION STUDIES ON THE IMPACT OF CLASS ADDITIONAL TOKEN AND CLUSTER ADDITIONAL TOKEN

original-framework	class additional token	cluster additional token	mIoU
✓			68.6%
✓	✓		69.8%
✓		✓	72.2%

C. Ablation Studies

To verify the effectiveness of additional cluster token, We conduct some ablation studies in Tab. III. Firstly, we concatenate the class token of ViT to the patch tokens, which show about 1.2% improvement compared with original ViT framework which only use patch tokens. It proves the importance of adding class related information to the patch token. However, the class token can only provide information about itself, which can not assist the model in identifying similar information between classes. In our work, we incorporated cluster information, which is generated by GPT-prompt, as additional tokens to the patch token, achieving a 3.6% improvement in mIoU in the validation set. This strongly demonstrates the effectiveness of our proposed cluster token and proves the importance of learning shared features within similar classes.

IV. CONCLUSION

In this work, we propose a PPC approach for WSSS. Unlike previous frameworks that rely on single image inputs, we utilize GPT prompts to generate category clusters, effectively representing the similarity information between classes. Additionally, we incorporate the generated cluster information as additional tokens into the existing framework to further enhance the perception of similar classes. By applying these two components to a robust baseline, we achieve SOTA results in WSSS using only image labels.

REFERENCES

- [1] Hyeokjun Kweon and Kuk-Jin Yoon, "From sam to cams: Exploring segment anything model for weakly supervised semantic segmentation," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024, pp. 19499–19509.
- [2] Jianjian Yin, Zhichao Zheng, Yulu Pan, Yanhui Gu, and Yi Chen, "Semi-supervised semantic segmentation with multi-reliability and multi-level feature augmentation," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 233, pp. 120973, 2023.
- [3] Qi Chen, Yun Chen, Yuheng Huang, Xiaohua Xie, and Lingxiao Yang, "Region-based online selective examination for weakly supervised semantic segmentation," *Information Fusion*, vol. 107, pp. 102311, 2024.
- [4] Zinuo Li, Xuhang Chen, Chi-Man Pun, and Xiaodong Cun, "High-resolution document shadow removal via a large-scale real-world dataset and a frequency-aware shadow erasing net," in *ICCV*, 2023, pp. 12449–12458.
- [5] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al., "An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020.
- [6] Jianjian Yin, Ningkan Peng, Yi Chen, Zhichao Zheng, Yanhui Gu, and Junsheng Zhou, "Class-level multiple distributions representation are necessary for semantic segmentation," in *International Conference on Database Systems for Advanced Applications*. Springer, 2024, pp. 340–351.
- [7] Namuk Park and Songkuk Kim, "How do vision transformers work?," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.06709*, 2022.
- [8] Lian Xu, Mohammed Bennamoun, Farid Boussaid, Hamid Laga, Wanli Ouyang, and Dan Xu, "Mctformer+: Multi-class token transformer for weakly supervised semantic segmentation," *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 2024.
- [9] Mingxian Li, Hao Sun, Yingtie Lei, Xiaofeng Zhang, Yihang Dong, Yilin Zhou, Zimeng Li, and Xuhang Chen, "High-fidelity document stain removal via a large-scale real-world dataset and a memory-augmented transformer," in *WACV*, 2024.
- [10] Xiaojiao Guo, Xuhang Chen, Shenghong Luo, Shuqiang Wang, and Chi-Man Pun, "Dual-hybrid attention network for specular highlight removal," in *ACM MM*, 2024, pp. 10173–10181.
- [11] Simone Rossetti, Damiano Zappia, Marta Sanzari, Marco Schaerf, and Fiara Pirri, "Max pooling with vision transformers reconciles class and shape in weakly supervised semantic segmentation," in *European conference on computer vision*. Springer, 2022, pp. 446–463.
- [12] Philipp Krähenbühl and Vladlen Koltun, "Efficient inference in fully connected crfs with gaussian edge potentials," in *Int. Conf. Neur. Info. Process. Sys.*, 2011, vol. 24.
- [13] Liang-Chieh Chen, Yukun Zhu, George Papandreou, Florian Schroff, and Hartwig Adam, "Encoder-decoder with atrous separable convolution for semantic image segmentation," in *Eur. Conf. Comput. Vis.*, 2018, pp. 801–818.
- [14] Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, Sarah Wiegrefe, Uri Alon, Nouha Dziri, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Yiming Yang, et al., "Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, 2024.
- [15] Mark Everingham, Luc Van Gool, Christopher KI Williams, John Winn, and Andrew Zisserman, "The pascal visual object classes (VOC) challenge," *Int. J. Comput. Vis.*, vol. 88, pp. 303–338, 2010.
- [16] Bharath Hariharan, Pablo Arbeláez, Lubomir Bourdev, Subhransu Maji, and Jitendra Malik, "Semantic contours from inverse detectors," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Comput. Vis.*, 2011, pp. 991–998.
- [17] Alexander Kolesnikov and Christoph H Lampert, "Seed, expand and constrain: Three principles for weakly-supervised image segmentation," in *Eur. Conf. Comput. Vis.*, 2016, pp. 695–711.
- [18] Qi Chen, Lingxiao Yang, Jian-Huang Lai, and Xiaohua Xie, "Self-supervised image-specific prototype exploration for weakly supervised semantic segmentation," in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recog.*, 2022, pp. 4288–4298.
- [19] Zelin Peng, Guanchun Wang, Lingxi Xie, Dongsheng Jiang, Wei Shen, and Qi Tian, "Usage: A unified seed area generation paradigm for weakly supervised semantic segmentation," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Comput. Vis.*, 2023, pp. 624–634.
- [20] Liyi Chen, Chenyang Lei, Ruihuang Li, Shuai Li, Zhaoxiang Zhang, and Lei Zhang, "Fpr: False positive rectification for weakly supervised semantic segmentation," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Comput. Vis.*, 2023, pp. 1108–1118.
- [21] Lixiang Ru, Heliang Zheng, Yibing Zhan, and Bo Du, "Token contrast for weakly-supervised semantic segmentation," in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recog.*, 2023, pp. 3093–3102.
- [22] Xinqiao Zhao, Feilong Tang, Xiaoyang Wang, and Jimin Xiao, "Sfc: Shared feature calibration in weakly supervised semantic segmentation," in *AAAI Conf. Artif. Intell.*, 2024, vol. 38, pp. 7525–7533.
- [23] Lian Xu, Wanli Ouyang, Mohammed Bennamoun, Farid Boussaid, and Dan Xu, "Multi-class token transformer for weakly supervised semantic segmentation," in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recog.*, 2022, pp. 4310–4319.
- [24] Rongtao Xu, Changwei Wang, Jiayi Sun, Shibiao Xu, Weiliang Meng, and Xiaopeng Zhang, "Self correspondence distillation for end-to-end weakly-supervised semantic segmentation," in *AAAI Conf. Artif. Intell.*, 2023, vol. 37, pp. 3045–3053.
- [25] Sangtae Kim, Daeyoung Park, and Byonghyo Shim, "Semantic-aware superpixel for weakly supervised semantic segmentation," in *AAAI Conf. Artif. Intell.*, 2023, vol. 37, pp. 1142–1150.
- [26] Wangyu Wu, Tianhong Dai, Xiaowei Huang, Fei Ma, and Jimin Xiao, "Image augmentation with controlled diffusion for weakly-supervised semantic segmentation," in *IEEE Int. Conf. Acoust. Speech Signal Process.* IEEE, 2024, pp. 6175–6179.