

---

# SEGCOL CHALLENGE: SEMANTIC SEGMENTATION FOR TOOLS AND FOLD EDGES IN COLONOSCOPY DATA

---

A PREPRINT

✉ Xinwei Ju\*<sup>1,2</sup>, ✉ Rema Daher\*<sup>1,2</sup>, ✉ Razvan Caramalau<sup>1,2,3</sup>,  
✉ Baoru Huang<sup>1,2,4</sup>, ✉ Danail Stoyanov<sup>1,2</sup>, ✉ Francisco Vasconcelos<sup>1,2</sup>,

<sup>1</sup>UCL Hawkes Institute, University College London, London W1W 7TY, UK

<sup>2</sup>Department of Computer Science, University College London, London WC1E 6BT, UK

<sup>3</sup>Medtronic, London EC1V 2QY, UK

<sup>4</sup>Department of Computer Science, University Liverpool, Liverpool L69 7ZX, UK

{xinwei.ju.22, rema.daher.20}@ucl.ac.uk

## 1 Introduction

Colorectal cancer (CRC) still remains the second leading cause of cancer-related deaths worldwide. Polyp removal is an effective screening method for CRC, especially at early stages; however, navigating through the colon to detect polyps presents significant challenges. A navigation system, combined with structural information, can assist operators in identifying colon surfaces that have not been thoroughly screened for polyps. Therefore, we propose the Semantic Segmentation for Tools and Fold Edges in Colonoscopy data (SegCol) Challenge to progress the techniques of camera navigation during colonoscopy by localising frequent anatomical landmarks (fold edges) and objects that modify the visualised scene (retractable tools embedded in the endoscope).

Our dataset introduces a novel set of manually annotated pixel-level semantic labels for a subset of images from the EndoMapper dataset [Azagra et al. \[2023\]](#), which contains 96 complete colonoscopy videos. Our images are sampled as batches of 40 consecutive frames in the range 10-12 FPS. Images are labelled with pixel-level masks of 3 instrument classes and 1 class representing the edges of colon folds. No more than one instrument is present at a time (and often no instruments are present). Colon folds are present in the overwhelming majority of images, but not all (e. g. severe camera occlusions). This dataset was part of the SegCol, a part of the Endovis Challenge at MICCAI'24. The Challenge details can be found in <https://www.synapse.org/Synapse:syn54124209/wiki/626563> and validation code in [https://github.com/surgical-vision/segcol\\_challenge](https://github.com/surgical-vision/segcol_challenge).

This dataset focuses on frame-level segmentation of instruments and folds as a first step towards novel ways of performing endoscope localisation and 3D reconstruction within the colon. We aim to explore edge patterns as landmark alternatives to point features in the context of viewpoint and illumination changes and exploit the depth discontinuity information provided by both fold and instrument labels to improve depth perception methods.

## 2 Dataset details

### 2.1 Dataset Sampling

All images are sampled from the EndoMapper dataset as batches of 40 consecutive frames at 10-12 FPS. The sampling of consecutive frames proved fundamental to label and review fold edges consistently across illumination changes. While most frames are sampled during endoscope withdrawal (imaged in air), we also include frames from endoscope insertion (imaged in fluid). We sampled around 150 batches (6000 images) where instruments are present, and 150 batches (6000 images) without any instrument.

---

<sup>1</sup> These authors contributed equally to this work and are co-first authors.

For some videos, EndoMapper includes timestamped free text annotations of the endoscopist comments, including instrument usage. We utilised these timestamps to sample image batches containing instruments. To sample images with clearly visible folds, we also utilised an image-classification CNN to identify “clear” frames Barbed et al. [2022] and sample image batches around them. Each batch will contain at least a few clear and well-lit views of the colon, however, the remaining may present challenges (defocus, occlusion, poor illumination, etc). Finally, a manual review was performed to exclude uninformative batches.

## 2.2 Dataset annotation

Images are labeled with pixel-level masks of 3 instrument classes (captivator, balloon, forceps) and 1 class representing the edges of colon folds.

Fold edges are annotated as 1-pixel thickness contours, precisely delineating natural landmarks where there’s a scene depth discontinuity in the colon anatomy. Edges were first annotated as polyline vertices and then converted to pixel masks. Visibility challenges include occlusion by bubbles, reflections, water, instruments, and very dark regions. Additional annotation challenges are caused when the exact start-end points of edges are ambiguous. Ambiguity was addressed by preserving temporal consistency across 40-frame batches. Extreme cases of inconsistency or ambiguity were not labeled (or deleted during review).

Surgical tools are annotated with dense pixel masks covering diverse instruments, including resection devices, forceps, and balloons, with special attention to intricate shapes, such as thin wires, holes, and tissue occlusions. Visibility challenges include saturated reflections and a small visible area (*e.g.* tip of the instrument in image corner).

The labeling involved an external team of 5 annotators over 3 months. During the first month, the team included a Gastroenterologist to review the labeling workflow. Each batch of 40 frames was assigned to a single annotator. Each labeled batch was reviewed by the authors by either accepting it or raising issues for label correction and subsequent iterative review. All images were labeled at 1440 x 1080 resolution and then down-sampled to 640x480 for release.

## 2.3 SegCol Challenge

This dataset is released in the context of the SegCol Endovis Challenge (<https://www.synapse.org/Synapse:syn54124209/wiki/626563>), where we organised the data in the following manner:

- A labeled training set of 2,000 images
- A labeled validation set of 560 images
- An unlabeled training dataset of 5,320 images (labels not released)
- A test set of 560 images (data not released)

The total number of labeled samples are 78 batches, divided into 50 for training, 14 for validation, and 14 for testing. The distribution of tools across different sets are show in 1. This breakdown provides an evenly distributed dataset for the three tool categories, facilitating comprehensive model training and evaluation.

Table 1: Distribution of tools across training, validation, and testing sets.

Tool Type	Training Set	Validation Set	Testing Set	Total
Balloon	8	2	2	12
Captivator	9	2	2	13
Forceps	10	3	3	16
Total Batches	50	14	14	78

The SegCol Challenge comprised two tasks:

- Task 1 - Model Design: Participants design segmentation architectures using the labeled training data, with a focus on accurately and robustly segmenting anatomical features and surgical instruments.
- Task 2 - Active Learning: Participants develop sampling strategies to select the most informative 400 frames from the unlabeled training set, addressing the practical challenges of efficient dataset labeling.




Figure 1: SegCol Evaluation Workflow. The flowchart places data preparation on the left block, with Task 1 and Task 2 represented by the upper and lower blocks on the right.

### 3 Baseline model and Evaluation

The evaluation framework is designed to assess the segmentation performance of both anatomical landmarks (fold edges) and surgical instruments. The designed workflow is shown in 1. Given the different nature of these segmentation targets - thin contours for folds versus dense masks for tools - a comprehensive set of metrics was employed to capture various aspects of segmentation quality.

**Metrics:** The evaluation employs five complementary metrics:

1. **Dice Coefficient** measures the overlap between predicted and ground truth segmentations:

$$Dice = \frac{2|X \cap Y|}{|X| + |Y|} = \frac{2TP}{2TP + FP + FN} \quad (1)$$

where  $X$  and  $Y$  are the predicted and ground truth segmentations respectively, and  $TP$ ,  $FP$ ,  $FN$  represent true positives, false positives, and false negatives, respectively.

2. **Average Precision (AP)** captures the trade-off between precision and recall across different thresholds, particularly important for evaluating edge detection:

$$AP = \sum_n (R_n - R_{n-1})P_n \quad (2)$$

where  $P_n$  and  $R_n$  are precision and recall at the  $n$ -th threshold.

3. **Optimal Image Scale (OIS) and Optimal Dataset Scale (ODS)** evaluate edge detection performance:

$$OIS = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \max_t F1(i, t) \quad (3)$$

$$ODS = \max_t \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N F1(i, t) \quad (4)$$

where  $F1(i, t)$  is the F1 score for image  $i$  at threshold  $t$ .

4. **Centerline Dice (CLDice)** specifically addresses the evaluation of thin structures like fold edges:

$$CLDice = \frac{2 \cdot TPR_{cl} \cdot TNR_{cl}}{TPR_{cl} + TNR_{cl}} \quad (5)$$

where  $TPR_{cl}$  and  $TNR_{cl}$  are computed using skeletonized predictions and ground truth.

**Implementation:** The evaluation process consists of several key steps:

1. **Zero-handling:** Special consideration is given to cases where both prediction and ground truth contain no positive pixels, assigning perfect scores to avoid undefined metrics. For each class, such cases were identified using thresholds determined by Youden’s Index on the ROC curve:

$$J = \max_t (TPR(t) - FPR(t)) \quad (6)$$

2. **Multi-class Evaluation:** The framework supports both binary (fold vs. tool) and four-class evaluation (fold and three tool types). For binary evaluation, tool classes are merged through maximum operation:

$$Tool_{binary} = \max(Tool_1, Tool_2, Tool_3) \quad (7)$$

3. **Optimal Threshold Selection:** Inherently, OIS and ODS rely on a set of thresholds (100 thresholds spanning from 0.01 to 0.99). According to the ODS results and the relevant threshold, we determine the optimal threshold, which is then applied to other metrics (i.e., Dice, CLDice, and AP).
4. **Final ranking:** Final rankings are primarily based on mean Average Precision (mAP) across classes, computed as:

$$mAP = \frac{1}{C} \sum_{c=1}^C AP_c \quad (8)$$

where C is the number of classes.

This comprehensive evaluation framework ensures fair comparison across different methods while accounting for the specific challenges of both thin anatomical features and dense tool masks in colonoscopy images.

## References

- Pablo Azagra, Carlos Sostres, Ángel Ferrández, Luis Riazuelo, Clara Tomasini, O. León Barbed, Javier Morlana, David Recasens, Víctor M. Batlle, Juan J. Gómez-Rodríguez, Richard Elvira, Julia López, Cristina Oriol, Javier Civera, Juan D. Tardós, Ana C. Murillo, Angel Lanas, and José M. M. Montiel. Endomapper dataset of complete calibrated endoscopy procedures. *Scientific Data*, 10(1), oct 2023. ISSN 2052-4463. doi:10.1038/s41597-023-02564-7.
- O León Barbed, Cristina Oriol, Pablo Azagra Millán, and Ana C Murillo. Semantic analysis of real endoscopies with unsupervised learned descriptors. In *Medical Imaging with Deep Learning*, 2022.