

B²Net: Camouflaged Object Detection via Boundary Aware and Boundary Fusion

Junmin Cai, Han Sun^{*}, Ningzhong Liu

^{*}College of Computer Science and Technology
Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Nanjing 210016, China
Email: sunhan@nuaa.edu.cn

Abstract

Camouflaged object detection (COD) aims to identify objects in images that are well hidden in the environment due to their high similarity to the background in terms of texture and color. However, existing most boundary-guided camouflage object detection algorithms tend to generate object boundaries early in the network, and inaccurate edge priors often introduce noises in object detection. Address on this issue, we propose a novel network named B²Net aiming to enhance the accuracy of obtained boundaries by reusing boundary-aware modules at different stages of the network. Specifically, we present a Residual Feature Enhanced Module (RFEM) with the goal of integrating more discriminative feature representations to enhance detection accuracy and reliability. After that, the Boundary Aware Module (BAM) is introduced to explore edge cues twice by integrating spatial information from low-level features and semantic information from high-level features. Finally, we design the Cross-scale Boundary Fusion Module(CBFM) that integrate information across different scales in a top-down manner, merging boundary features with object features to obtain a comprehensive feature representation incorporating boundary information. Extensive experimental results on three challenging benchmark datasets demonstrate that our proposed method B²Net outperforms 15 state-of-art methods under widely used evaluation metrics. Code will be made publicly available.

Keywords: camouflaged object detection, boundary, feature fusion, cross-scale interaction.

I. INTRODUCTION

Camouflage is a survival skill that animals acquire with constant evolution. In order to avoid predators or prey on other animals, animals employ several camouflage skills to make themselves difficult to be identified. Camouflage Object Detection (COD) [1] is an emerging and challenging task, which aims to search and segment camouflaged objects from single image. With its rich history in biology, art, and the military [2], COD also has significant application value in various fields such as locust detection, polyp segmentation [3], marine animal segmentation [4], and recreational art [5]. However, due to the nature of camouflage, characterized by the high intrinsic similarities between candidate objects and

chaotic backgrounds, COD presents greater challenges compared to general object detection tasks.

To tackle this issue, numerous deep learning-based methods have been proposed for camouflaged object detection and have shown great potentials. Fan et al. [6] constructed the COD10K dataset which contains 5066 samples of camouflaged objects and proposed a search-identification network (SINet). SINet first uses a search module to roughly locate the camouflaged object, and then uses an identification module for precise segment. Inspired by the design principles of SINet, a variety of approaches focusing on cross-level feature fusion have been proposed [7], [8]. Although these models have improved camouflaged object detection from a local perspective, they still cannot obtain clear boundaries. In COD, the high similarity between camouflaged objects and their surroundings makes boundary information between the object and the background particularly important. Therefore, the extraction of boundary information is still a key factor.

To overcome the above limitation, researchers have introduced edge cues to enhance the representation of segmentation features [9] [10]. The common practice is to generate an edge prediction at early stage of the network and use it as edge prior to guide the fusion of multi-level segmentation features. However, these methods still suffer from two shortcomings: (1) low-level features that preserve low-frequency texture information are less focused. (2) the importance of the accuracy of the initially generated edge predictions is often overlooked in favor of prioritizing the incorporation of edge priors into segmentation features. Due to the lack of semantics information, edge prediction generated early is prone to lose the integrity of the camouflaged object, which misleads segmentation into erroneous foreground prediction.

To this end, in this paper, we propose a novel network(B²Net) via boundary aware and cross-scale boundary fusion, which explicitly employs edge semantic to enhance the performance of camouflaged object detection. The improved Pyramid Vision Transformer (PVTv2) [11] is adopted as the backbone to extract global contextual information at multiple scales effectively. Then, a residual feature enhanced module(RFEM) is designed to refine the features at each scale. Further, we design a simple yet effective boundary aware

module (BAM), which integrates the low-level local spatial information and high-level global location information to explore edge semantics related to object boundaries under explicitly boundary supervision. Finally, the cross-scale boundary fusion module (CBFM) is introduced to aggregate the edge features with the camouflaged object features gradually from top to bottom to guide the representation learning of COD. Benefiting from the well-designed modules, the proposed B²Net predicts camouflaged objects with fine object structure and boundaries.

To sum up, our main contributions are as follows:

- 1) For the COD task, we propose a novel boundary-guided network, i.e., B²Net, which excavates and integrates boundary-related edge semantics to boost the performance of camouflaged object detection.
- 2) We carefully design the boundary aware module (BAM) and cross-scale boundary fusion feature module (CBFM) to enhance boundary semantics and explore valuable and powerful feature representation for COD.
- 3) B²Net is validated on three popular COD datasets and achieves the most outstanding performance among 15 COD methods, especially when the camouflaged objects have very blurred boundaries and similar colors/patterns with their backgrounds.

II. RELATED WORK

A. Bio-inspired methods

Recently, bio-inspired methods utilizing deep learning have emerged as the dominant approach in the field of COD. Motivated by how animals hunt in the wild, Fan et al. [6]

designs a search module and an identification module to detect camouflaged objects by simulating the process of animal hunting.

By exploiting the sensory and cognitive mechanisms towards initial detection and predator learning of predation process, Zhang et al. [12] propose a PreyNet, which mimics the two processes of predation, leads to better understanding and significant performance improvement for camouflaged object detection.

Based on the observation that people usually search for camouflaged objects by zooming and out, Pang et al. [13] propose a mixed-scale triplet network to better combines information between multi-scale features explicitly.

B. Edge-guidance methods

In addition to bio-inspired methods, an increasing number of approaches have integrated boundary cues as a means to improve performance.

To further clarify the indistinct boundaries, Sun et al. [9] designs an edge-guidance feature module to embed the edge cues into segmentation features. Zhu et al. [10] utilizes adaptive space normalization to do this in a more effect way. And in order to ensure the accuracy of the generated boundary, Sun et al. [14] designed an edge-aware mirror network which models edge detection and camouflaged object segmentation as a cross refinement process, accompanied by an increase in the complexity of the model.

Different from the existing methods, our method focuses on boundary representation by simply reusing the boundary aware module, without significantly increasing the complexity of the model, thereby improving the accuracy of the model.




Fig. 1. The overall architecture of the proposed B²Net, which consists of three key components, i.e., Residual Feature Enhanced Module (RFEM), Boundary Aware Module (BAM) and Cross-scale Boundary Fusion Module (CBFM).

III. OUR METHOD

A. Overview

Fig. 1. shows the overview of the proposed B²Net, which consists of three kinds of key components including Residual Feature Enhanced Module, Boundary Aware Module, and Cross-scale Boundary Fusion Module.

Specifically, given an input image I , we first adopt the PVTv2 [11] as backbone to extract features at four levels, which can be denoted as $F = \{f_i, i = 1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Then, we feed F into Residual Feature Enhanced Module to extract multi-level edge features with the channel size of 64 denoted as $F' = \{f'_i, i = 1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Then, a boundary aware module (BAM) is applied to excavate initiatory object-related edge semantics ($e1$) from the low-level features, which contain local edge details ($f1, f2$), and the high-level features, which contain global location information ($f4$) under object boundary supervision. After that, multiple Cross-scale Boundary Fusion Module(CBFM) are employed to progressively integrate the edge cues from BAM with multi-level features at each level to guide feature learning in a top-down manner and discover camouflaged objects. Moreover, the output of CBFM will be fed into a new BAM module to obtain more accurate edge semantics ($e2$). Finally, the $e2$ will be concatenated with the output of CBFM and generate the predict map $M_i, i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, and we will adopt the M_1 as the final predict map, which serves as the output of the entire network. Multiple side-out supervised strategies are implemented to boost the COD performance. We will provide the details of each key component below.

B. Residual Feature Enhanced Module

To further enrich the contextual information obtained by PVTv2 at various scales, the Residual Feature Enhanced Module(RFEM) it designed with inspiration from the Inception module and Res2Net block [15]. As shown in Fig. 2, RFEM adopts the 3×3 convolution in parallel while employing residual blocks to enlarge the receptive fields successively. To be more specific, for an input feature f_i , we utilize 4 branches to capture different characterizations. Each branch is equipped with a 1×1 convolution to reduce the number of channels, a 1×3 and 3×1 asymmetric convolution for reducing the computational load. The output of each branch is added to the input of the next branch. The general formulation of the operation is defined as

$$\text{Bout}_k^i = \begin{cases} \text{Conv}_r(f_i) & k = 1 \\ \text{Conv}_r(f_i \oplus \text{Bout}_{k-1}^i) & k = 2, 3, 4 \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where f_i denotes the i th feature map produced by the backbone network, k is the branch number, Bout_k^i denotes the output of the k th branch, \oplus is element-wise addition, $\text{Conv}_r()$ denotes the stacked convolutional layer mentioned above. After that, we concatenate the outputs of 4 branches

followed by a 1×1 convolution to adjust the channel to 64 and add it to the input feature f_i . Finally, we obtain the output feature $F' = \{f'_i, i = 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ embedded with multi scale information which is computed as

$$f'_i = \text{Conv}(f_i) \oplus \text{Conv}(\text{Cat}_{k=1}^4(\text{Bout}_k^i)), \quad (2)$$

where $\text{Conv}()$ denotes 1×1 convolution, $\text{Cat}_k^4 = 1$ denotes the concatenation of all 4 branches.




Fig. 2. The detailed architecture of the proposed Residual Feature Enhanced Module(RFEM).

C. Boundary Aware Module

Boundary information is of great significance for the segmentation and localization of camouflaged objects. Camouflage images have high resolution in low-level feature regions and can extract boundary information, but they are inevitably interfered with by the boundary information of non-camouflaged objects in the background, resulting in rough image boundaries. To this end, we propose a boundary aware module (BAM) to extract boundary features related to camouflaged objects.

The specific structure of BAM is shown in Fig. 3. Take the BAM that accepts the RFEM as input in Fig. 1. as an example, we first add f'_1 and f'_2 to represent the initial feature f'_{12} , and then we multiply the semantic location information f'_4 and f'_{12} to locate the camouflaged object to avoid interference from other irrelevant features, and then perform 3×3 convolution and skip connections to obtain spatial features with rich spatial information and accurate localization. Finally, we use spatial attention [16] to enhance the feature representation. The following formulas can describe the whole process above:




Fig. 3. The detailed architecture of the proposed Boundary Aware Module(BAM).

$$\begin{cases} f'_{124} &= f'_4 \otimes (f'_1 \oplus f'_2) \\ f''_{124} &= F_{3 \times 3}(F_{3 \times 3}(f'_{124}) \oplus f'_{124}) \\ f^e &= f''_{124} \otimes \sigma(\text{Cov}_{3 \times 3}(\text{MP}(f''_{124}))) \oplus f''_{124} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where $F_{3 \times 3}$ represents 3×3 convolution followed by batch normalization and ReLU activation function. $\text{MP}(\cdot)$ denotes max pooling. $\sigma(\cdot)$ is sigmoid function.

It is worth noting that the BAM module is executed twice, the second time taking the output of the aforementioned CBFM as input to the module to produce a more accurate boundary result, as shown in Fig. 1.

D. Cross-scale Boundary Fusion Module

The Cross-scale Boundary Fusion Module(CBFM) is designed to inject boundary-related edge cues into the representation learning to enhance the feature representation with object structure semantics. And it is known that the scale variation [17] is a crucial issue in object detection since the scales of objects may vary significantly across different scenarios. The low-level features at fine scales are important to the detection of small objects, while the high-level features at coarse scales are more sensitive to large objects. Therefore, the diversity of scale information is of great significance to the detection accuracy. In our approach, we combine CBFM in a top-down manner, progressively aggregating multiple levels of fusion features and discovering camouflaged objects.

As shown in Fig. 4, given the input shallow feature $f'_i, i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and the edge feature f^e , we first perform the element-wise multiplication between them with a 3×3 convolution and a learnable parameter α to obtain the initial fused features f_i^{if} , which can be denoted as:

$$f_i^{\text{if}} = \alpha \cdot (F_{3 \times 3}(f'_i \otimes f^e)) \quad (4)$$

where α is a learnable parameter. $F_{3 \times 3}$ represents 3×3 convolution followed by batch normalization and ReLU activation function.




Fig. 4. The detailed architecture of the proposed Cross-scale Boundary Fusion Module(CBFM).

Then we use sequential operations which consist of a 3×3 convolution layer, batch normalization, ReLU activation function, and bilinear upsampling operation on p'_{i+1} to align

their shapes and features and “Concat” them to get fused features. And the sequential operations are also utilized to refine the fused features and obtain the output p_i , the whole process can be formulated as follows:

$$p_i = F_{3 \times 3}(\text{Cat}(\text{UP}(F_{3 \times 3}(p_{i+1})), f_i^{\text{if}})) \quad (5)$$

where p_{i+1} is the output of CBFM_{i+1} , $F_{3 \times 3}$ represents 3×3 convolution followed by batch normalization and ReLU activation function, $\text{Cat}(\cdot)$ represents concatenation function with $\text{dim} = 1$.

E. Loss Function

We employ a combination of loss functions to supervise the output map in our model: Weighted Intersection Over Union L_w^{IOU} and weighted Binary Cross-entropy L_w^{BCE} . IOU in image segmentation is generally responsible for maintaining the structure of the predicted map following the ground truth. Adding a weighting factor to the IOU loss enhances its performance by assigning different weights to the class regions based on their importance in the task. On the other hand, Binary Cross-entropy is the pixel-wise classification, and L_w^{BCE} similarly performs better on complex samples. Combining these losses enables the network to focus more on complex samples, which are expected to rise in the COD.

The L_w^{IOU} and L_w^{BCE} losses are computed on the predictions of three camouflaged object masks $M_i, i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Similarly, to supervise the edge ($e_i, i \in \{1, 2\}$), we use Dice Loss L^{Dice} to improve the edge quality. By incorporating these supervisory signals at different stages into the training process, our proposed model can effectively learn to segment the hidden object in complex scenes. Eq. 6 provides the total loss L_{total} for the network’s supervision.

$$L_{\text{total}} = \sum_{i=1}^3 (L_w^{\text{BCE}}(M_i, G_m) + L_w^{\text{IOU}}(M_i, G_m)) + \sum_{i=1}^2 L^{\text{Dice}}(e_i, G_e). \quad (6)$$

IV. EXPERIMENT

A. Implementation Details

The proposed approach is implemented using PyTorch. The Adam optimizer is employed to update the network parameters. The input images are resized to 352×352 pixels using the bilinear interpolation. The initial learning rate is set to $8e-5$ and a weight decay of 0.1 is used in network training. The batch size is set to 16 and the number of maximum epochs is set to 100. It takes 6 hours to about accomplish the training process on an NVIDIA Titan Xp GPU.

B. Datasets and Evaluation Metrics

TABLE I
FOUR EVALUATION METRICS ARE EMPLOYED IN THIS STUDY, NAMELY $S_\alpha \uparrow$, $F_\beta^o \uparrow$, $E_\phi \uparrow$, AND $M \downarrow$. THE SYMBOLS “ \uparrow ” AND “ \downarrow ” INDICATE THAT LARGER AND SMALLER VALUES ARE BETTER, RESPECTIVELY. THE BEST RESULTS ARE HIGHLIGHTED IN BOLD.

Method	Year	COD10K-Test				Camo-Test				NC4K-Test			
		S_α	E_ϕ	F_β^o	M	S_α	E_ϕ	F_β^o	M	S_α	E_ϕ	F_β^o	M
SINet	2020	0.776	0.864	0.631	0.043	0.745	0.829	0.644	0.092	0.808	0.871	0.723	0.058
PraNet	2020	0.789	0.861	0.629	0.045	0.769	0.837	0.663	0.094	0.822	0.876	0.724	0.059
C2FNet	2021	0.813	0.890	0.686	0.036	0.796	0.864	0.719	0.080	0.838	0.897	0.762	0.049
PFNet	2021	0.800	0.877	0.660	0.040	0.782	0.842	0.695	0.085	0.829	0.887	0.745	0.053
SINet-V2	2022	0.815	0.887	0.680	0.037	0.820	0.882	0.743	0.070	0.847	0.903	0.770	0.048
ZoomNet	2022	0.838	0.911	0.729	0.029	0.82	0.892	0.752	0.066	0.853	0.912	0.784	0.043
BSANet	2022	0.817	0.887	0.696	0.035	0.804	0.860	0.728	0.079	0.842	0.897	0.771	0.048
BGNet	2022	0.831	0.901	0.722	0.033	0.816	0.871	0.751	0.069	0.851	0.907	0.788	0.044
EAMNet	2023	0.839	0.907	0.733	0.029	0.831	0.890	0.763	0.064	0.862	0.916	0.801	0.040
FDNet	2023	0.857	0.918	0.763	0.028	0.836	0.886	0.777	0.066	0.865	0.911	0.803	0.042
FEDER	2023	0.844	0.911	0.748	0.029	0.802	0.873	0.738	0.071	0.847	0.915	0.789	0.044
DGNet	2023	0.822	0.911	0.692	0.033	0.838	0.914	0.768	0.057	0.857	0.922	0.783	0.042
FSPNet	2023	0.851	0.930	0.735	0.026	0.856	0.928	0.799	0.05	0.878	0.937	0.816	0.035
CRINet	2024	0.819	0.903	0.733	0.035	0.810	0.883	0.791	0.072	0.848	0.911	0.811	0.046
LGPNet	2024	0.832	0.899	0.763	0.032	0.817	0.873	0.797	0.070	0.856	0.908	0.827	0.044
Ours	-	0.862	0.934	0.772	0.023	0.866	0.935	0.808	0.048	0.882	0.945	0.829	0.033

We conducted experiments on four publicly available camouflage object detection benchmark datasets: CAMO [18], CHAMELEON [19], COD10K [6], and NC4K [20]. In this paper, the training sets of CAMO, and COD10K as the model’s training set, with a total of 4,040 images, and other data as the model’s test set.

To present an in-depth evaluation of the performance of COD algorithms, we use five evaluation metrics that are widely used in image segmentation, including Enhanced-measure [21], Structure-measure [22], weighted F-measure [23] and Mean Absolute Error [24] denoted as S_α , E_ϕ , F_β^o and M, respectively.

C. Comparison with State-of-the-Art Methods

We compared our proposed method with 15 state-of-the-art models, including SINet [6], PraNet [3], C2FNet [25], PFNet[26], SINet-v2 [1], ZoomNet [3], BSANet [10], BGNet[9], EAMNet[14], and FDNet [27], FEDER [28], DGNet [29], FSPNet [30], CRINet [31], LGPNet [32].

Quantitative Comparison: We exploit all four metrics to compare with SOTAs. Table I summarizes the results of all methods on three benchmark datasets, where the best ones are highlighted in bold. It is obvious that our method outperforms all other models on three datasets under four evaluation metrics. In particular, while compared with

the second-best FSPNet, our method increases S_α by 0.93%, E_ϕ by 0.68% and F_β^o by 2.5% on average. Compared with the third-best FDNet, our method increases S_α by 2.06%, E_ϕ by 3.67% and F_β^o by 2.67% on average. Overall, our model achieves the best performance based on the available performance statistics and analysis.

Besides, BGNet, BSANet, and EAMNet utilize auxiliary edge or boundary information and still fail to locate camouflaged objects, while our model can effectively locate them and achieve the best performance. This is because our proposed boundary aware module(BAM) and cross-scale boundary fusion module(CBFM), which jointly operate on ambiguous regions, explore effective representation of edge features, significantly improving the performance of COD.

Visual Comparison: From the visual results in Fig. 5, our model outperforms the comparative models in the visual comparison results of the selected collected test samples. Specifically, in the first and second row, the camouflaged objects have similar textures to the background, which poses a severe challenge for identifying them from similar backgrounds. In this case, our model performs better, accurately locating the camouflaged object. From the third to the fifth rows, it can be observed that our model demonstrates certain advantages in detecting elongated objects. Not only in the identification of camouflaged object areas, but also in the




Fig. 5. This section provides a visual comparison between our proposed model and the latest models. Specifically, we show (a) the input image, (b) the ground truth (GT), (c) our method, and (d)–(h) the state-of-the-art models, including BGNet, SINetV2, FAPNet, ZoomNet, and EAMNet. The results demonstrate that our model achieves superior performance to the other compared methods in terms of visual quality.

quality of generated boundaries, it surpasses other models. And in the sixth and seven row, when camouflaged objects are partially occluded, our model can accurately identify multiple segments of camouflaged objects and generate relatively accurate boundaries. Overall, the results demonstrate that our predictions have clearer and more complete object regions, as well as sharper contours, and our model can perform well in detecting camouflaged objects under different challenging scenes.

Failure Cases: We present a number of typical failure cases in Fig. 6. As can be observed, our model may fail in some

extremely challenging cases, such as tiny object scenarios. This may be because it is more difficult to obtain the object boundary in tiny object scenarios. However, it is worth noting that in these cases, existing state-of-the-art (SOTA) models also face challenges. This indicates that the issue in tiny object scenarios is a difficult problem that researchers in the field are still striving to solve, and there is not yet a widely accepted optimal solution. Nevertheless, our model demonstrates relatively superior performance in these highly challenging scenarios, further validating the effectiveness and potential of our approach.




Fig. 6. Some failure cases of our model and five comparison methods.

TABLE II
QUANTITATIVE EVALUATION FOR ABLATION STUDIES ON THREE DATASETS. THE BEST RESULTS ARE HIGHLIGHTED IN BOLD.

Method	COD10K-Test				Camo-Test				NC4K-Test			
	S_α	E_ϕ	F_β^o	M	S_α	E_ϕ	F_β^o	M	S_α	E_ϕ	F_β^o	M
M1	0.805	0.872	0.711	0.040	0.802	0.866	0.745	0.072	0.812	0.872	0.766	0.053
M2	0.839	0.902	0.752	0.030	0.831	0.899	0.773	0.061	0.839	0.896	0.795	0.044
M3	0.841	0.905	0.751	0.028	0.838	0.906	0.779	0.059	0.848	0.913	0.801	0.041
M4	0.857	0.927	0.766	0.025	0.853	0.931	0.798	0.052	0.871	0.932	0.822	0.035
M5(Ours)	0.862	0.934	0.772	0.023	0.866	0.935	0.808	0.048	0.882	0.945	0.829	0.033

D. Ablation Study

We conduct a set of ablation experiments to verify the effectiveness of the BAM module, the CBFM module and our proposed new architecture in our B²Net. Specifically, the

following five models are mainly involved in our ablation study:

- 1) The Baseline model is composed of the backbone PVTv2 and residual feature enhanced module (RFEM).
- 2) Baseline + BAM (M2): Adding the BAM modules into the Baseline (M1).
- 3) Baseline + CBFM (M3): Adding the CBFM modules into the Baseline (M1). The CBFM module in this case removes the relevant part of edge feature fusion and only takes the features between adjacent layers as input.
- 4) Baseline + CBFM + 1BAM (M4): Adding one BAM module into the Baseline + CBFM (M3). The output of the only BAM module is also the input to the CBFM.
- 5) Baseline + CBFM + 2BAM (M5): The completed model.

Table II lists the quantitative results of different models in the ablation study on three benchmark datasets.

Effectiveness of BAM: From M2 and M1 in the Table II, it can be seen that the adding BAM module could improve overall performance effectively. This owes to BAM's ability to exploit rich spatial fine-grained information from low-level features. Thus, the edge prior extracted by BAM is beneficial to boost detection performance.

Effectiveness of CBFM: This module helps the model extract valid information from the edge feature, thus making the segmentation results more accurate. Compare M2 and M5 in Table II, F_β^o increase by 5.63% in COD10K, and 4.57%

in NC4K. This fully demonstrates the effectiveness of combining CBFM modules in a top-down manner to fuse edge features. Besides, from M1 and M3 in the Table II, it can be seen that the CBFM module itself has a good enhancement effect on features.

Effectiveness of Our Proposed New Architecture: Most of the previous COD methods introduce the boundary tend to generate the boundary results at the early stage of the network, but our method reuses the proposed BAM module after feature fusion to obtain more accurate boundary results.

To further verify the effectiveness of our proposed network, we have conducted experiments where we integrated our boundary reuse strategy into other existing methods, as can be seen in Table 3. These experiments were performed using the same backbone network to provide a direct comparison. The results of these experiments clearly demonstrating the effectiveness of our proposed network. This not only validates our approach but also highlights the improvements achieved by incorporating our boundary reuse strategy.

It also can be seen from M4 and M5 in Table III that the new architecture proposed by us simply and effectively improves the detection performance. Moreover, as can be seen from Fig. 7, the boundary result obtained by the remultiplexed BAM is indeed improved to some extent compared with the boundary graph generated for the first time, which also shows the effectiveness of the CBFM module.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we propose a novel framework via boundary aware and cross-scale boundary fusion, named B²Net. In

TABLE III
THE RESULTS OF APPLYING OUR STRATEGY TO OTHER EXISTING MODELS, "-S" MEANS THE IMPROVE MODELS.

Method	COD10K-Test				Camo-Test				NC4K-Test			
	S_α	E_ϕ	F_β^o	M	S_α	E_ϕ	F_β^o	M	S_α	E_ϕ	F_β^o	M
BGNet	0.817	0.887	0.696	0.035	0.804	0.86	0.728	0.079	0.842	0.897	0.771	0.048
BGNet-S	0.833	0.905	0.721	0.031	0.827	0.883	0.762	0.072	0.865	0.913	0.785	0.042
BSANet	0.831	0.901	0.722	0.033	0.816	0.871	0.751	0.069	0.851	0.907	0.788	0.044
BSANet-S	0.848	0.922	0.742	0.027	0.833	0.895	0.781	0.061	0.878	0.922	0.801	0.038

particular, The BAM module generates the boundary twice by fusing the spatial information contained in the low-level feature and the semantic information contained in the high-level feature. The cascaded CBFM combines edge features and enhancement features acquired in a top-down manner, facilitating the fusion of information across different scales. Extensive experiments on three benchmark datasets have shown that our B²Net outperforms other state-of-the-art COD methods. In the future, we will investigate compressing our model into a lightweight model suitable for mobile devices and improving its efficiency in real-time applications.




Fig. 7. The visual comparison of the intermediate result e_2 and e_1 , which fully illustrates the effectiveness of our proposed new architecture.

REFERENCES

- [1] Fan, Deng-Ping, Ge-Peng Ji, Ming-Ming Cheng, and Ling Shao. "Concealed object detection." *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 44, no. 10 (2021): 6024-6042.
- [2] Stevens, Martin, and Sami Merilaita. "Animal camouflage: current issues and new perspectives." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 364, no. 1516 (2009): 423-427.
- [3] Fan, Deng-Ping, 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*, pp. 263-273. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020.
- [4] Li, Lin, Bo Dong, Eric Rigall, Tao Zhou, Junyu Dong, and Geng Chen. "Marine animal segmentation." *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology* 32, no. 4 (2021): 2303-2314.
- [5] Chu, Hung-Kuo, Wei-Hsin Hsu, Niloy J. Mitra, Daniel Cohen-Or, Tien-Tsin Wong, and Tong-Yee Lee. "Camouflage images." *ACM Trans. Graph.* 29, no. 4 (2010): 51-1.
- [6] Fan, Deng-Ping, 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*, pp. 2777-2787. 2020.
- [7] Chen, Geng, Si-Jie Liu, Yu-Jia Sun, Ge-Peng Ji, Ya-Feng Wu, and Tao Zhou. "Camouflaged object detection via context-aware cross-level fusion." *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology* 32, no. 10 (2022): 6981-6993.
- [8] Zhai, Wei, Yang Cao, HaiYong Xie, and Zheng-Jun Zha. "Deep texon-coherence network for camouflaged object detection." *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia* 25 (2022): 5155-5165.
- [9] Sun, Yujia, Shuo Wang, Chenglizhao Chen, and Tian-Zhu Xiang. "Boundary-guided camouflaged object detection." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.00794* (2022).
- [10] Zhu, Hongwei, Peng Li, Haoran Xie, Xuefeng Yan, Dong Liang, Dapeng Chen, Mingqiang Wei, and Jing Qin. "I can find you! boundary-guided separated attention network for camouflaged object detection." In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 3608-3616. 2022.
- [11] Wang, Wenhai, Enze Xie, Xiang Li, Deng-Ping Fan, Kaitao Song, Ding Liang, Tong Lu, Ping Luo, and Ling Shao. "Pvt v2: Improved baselines with pyramid vision transformer." *Computational Visual Media* 8, no. 3 (2022): 415-424.
- [12] Zhang, Miao, Shuang Xu, Yongri Piao, Dongxiang Shi, Shusen Lin, and Huchuan Lu. "Preynet: Preying on camouflaged objects." In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM international conference on multimedia*, pp. 5323-5332. 2022.
- [13] Pang, Youwei, Xiaoqi Zhao, Tian-Zhu Xiang, Lihe Zhang, and Huchuan Lu. "Zoom in and out: A mixed-scale triplet network for camouflaged object detection." In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 2160-2170. 2022.
- [14] Sun, Dongyue, Shiyao Jiang, and Lin Qi. "Edge-aware mirror network for camouflaged object detection." In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo (ICME)*, pp. 2465-2470. IEEE, 2023.
- [15] Gao, Shang-Hua, Ming-Ming Cheng, Kai Zhao, Xin-Yu Zhang, Ming-Hsuan Yang, and Philip Torr. "Res2net: A new multi-scale backbone architecture." *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 43, no. 2 (2019): 652-662.
- [16] Woo, Sanghyun, Jongchan Park, Joon-Young Lee, and In So Kweon. "Cbam: Convolutional block attention module." In *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, pp. 3-19. 2018.
- [17] Pang, Youwei, 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*, pp. 9413-9422. 2020.
- [18] Le, Trung-Nghia, Tam V. Nguyen, Zhongliang Nie, Minh-Triet Tran, and Akihiro Sugimoto. "Anabranch network for camouflaged object segmentation." *Computer vision and image understanding* 184 (2019): 45-56.
- [19] Skurowski, Przemysław, Hassan Abdulameer, J. Błaszczczyk, Tomasz Depta, Adam Kornacki, and P. Kozieł. "Animal camouflage analysis: Chameleon database." *Unpublished manuscript* 2, no. 6 (2018): 7.
- [20] Lv, Yunqiu, Jing Zhang, Yuchao Dai, Aixuan Li, Bowen Liu, Nick Barnes, and Deng-Ping Fan. "Simultaneously localize, segment and rank the camouflaged objects." In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 11591-11601. 2021.
- [21] Fan, Deng-Ping, Ge-Peng Ji, Xuebin Qin, and Ming-Ming Cheng. "Cognitive vision inspired object segmentation metric and loss function." *Scientia Sinica Informationis* 6, no. 6 (2021): 5.
- [22] Fan, Deng-Ping, Ming-Ming Cheng, Yun Liu, Tao Li, and Ali Borji. "Structure-measure: A new way to evaluate foreground maps." In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pp. 4548-4557. 2017.
- [23] Margolin, Ran, Lihi Zelnik-Manor, and Ayellet Tal. "How to evaluate foreground maps?." In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 248-255. 2014.

- [24] Perazzi, Federico, Philipp Krähenbühl, Yael Pritch, and Alexander Hornung. "Saliency filters: Contrast based filtering for salient region detection." In *2012 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 733-740. IEEE, 2012.
- [25] Sun, Yujia, Geng Chen, Tao Zhou, Yi Zhang, and Nian Liu. "Context-aware cross-level fusion network for camouflaged object detection." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.12555* (2021).
- [26] Mei, Haiyang, Ge-Peng Ji, Ziqi Wei, Xin Yang, Xiaopeng Wei, and Deng-Ping Fan. "Camouflaged object segmentation with distraction mining." In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 8772-8781. 2021.
- [27] Song, Yuxuan, Xinyue Li, and Lin Qi. "Camouflaged Object Detection with Feature Grafting and Distractor Aware." In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo (ICME)*, pp. 2459-2464. IEEE, 2023.
- [28] He, Chunming, Kai Li, Yachao Zhang, Longxiang Tang, Yulun Zhang, Zhenhua Guo, and Xiu Li. "Camouflaged object detection with feature decomposition and edge reconstruction." In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 22046-22055. 2023.
- [29] Wang, Qingwei, Jinyu Yang, Xiaosheng Yu, Fangyi Wang, Peng Chen, and Feng Zheng. "Depth-aided camouflaged object detection." In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pp. 3297-3306. 2023.
- [30] Huang, Zhou, Hang Dai, Tian-Zhu Xiang, Shuo Wang, Huai-Xin Chen, Jie Qin, and Huan Xiong. "Feature shrinkage pyramid for camouflaged object detection with transformers." In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 5557-5566. 2023.
- [31] Ge, Yanliang, Junchao Ren, Qiao Zhang, Min He, Hongbo Bi, and Cong Zhang. "Camouflaged object detection via cross-level refinement and interaction network." *Image and Vision Computing* 144 (2024): 104973.
- [32] Tong, Jinghui, Yaqiu Bi, Cong Zhang, Hongbo Bi, and Ye Yuan. "Local to global purification strategy to realize collaborative camouflaged object detection." *Computer Vision and Image Understanding* 241 (2024): 103932.