

Vehicular Road Crack Detection with Deep Learning: A New Online Benchmark for Comprehensive Evaluation of Existing Algorithms

Nachuan Ma, Zhengfei Song, Qiang Hu, Chuang-Wei Liu, Yu Han, Yanting Zhang, *Member, IEEE*, Rui Fan, *Senior Member, IEEE*, and Lihua Xie, *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—In the emerging field of urban digital twins (UDTs), advancing intelligent road inspection (IRI) vehicles with automatic road crack detection systems is essential for maintaining civil infrastructure. Over the past decade, deep learning-based road crack detection methods have been developed to detect cracks more efficiently, accurately, and objectively, with the goal of replacing manual visual inspection. Nonetheless, there is a lack of systematic reviews on state-of-the-art (SoTA) deep learning techniques, especially data-fusion and label-efficient algorithms for this task. This paper thoroughly reviews the SoTA deep learning-based algorithms, including (1) supervised, (2) unsupervised, (3) semi-supervised, and (4) weakly-supervised methods developed for road crack detection. Also, we create a dataset called UDTIRI-Crack, comprising 2,500 high-quality images from seven public annotated sources, as the first extensive online benchmark in this field. Comprehensive experiments are conducted to compare the detection performance, computational efficiency, and generalizability of public SoTA deep learning-based algorithms for road crack detection. In addition, the feasibility of foundation models and large language models (LLMs) for road crack detection is explored. Afterwards, the existing challenges and future development trends of deep learning-based road crack detection algorithms are discussed. We believe this review can serve as practical guidance for developing intelligent road detection vehicles with the next-generation road condition assessment systems. The released benchmark UDTIRI-Crack is available at <https://udtiri.com/submission/>.

Index Terms—Road crack, civil infrastructure maintenance, deep learning, computer vision.

I. INTRODUCTION

CRACKS are narrow, dark lines or curves that manifest on the surfaces of solid materials, such as roads and bridges [1]. Road cracks emerge due to the combined effects of water and traffic-related factors [2], such as soil swelling,

foundation shifting, traffic congestion, and the expansion and contraction of materials. Beyond being inconveniences, road cracks substantially undermine the reliability and sustainability of civil infrastructure and pose significant threats to vehicle integrity and driving safety [3]. For instance, in the United Kingdom, poor road surfaces accounted for 12.6% of all traffic accidents in 2020, according to the Department for Transport [4]. Therefore, to lower the risk of structural degradation and traffic accidents, frequent road inspection is necessary [5]. Also, as autonomous vehicle driving becomes increasingly prevalent, it is crucial to ensure road surface health for safely operating of autonomous deployment.

Currently, manual visual inspection is still the dominant method for road crack detection [6]. The locations of road cracks are recorded routinely by civil engineers or qualified inspectors, the process of which is time-consuming, costly, and hazardous [7]. In countries like China or the United States, over 100,000 kilometers of highways require regular testing and maintenance, which demands significant labor costs. Moreover, the detection results are always qualitative and subjective, as decisions depend entirely on personal opinions and expertise. Owing to these concerns, developing intelligent road inspection vehicles equipped with automatic road condition monitoring algorithms becomes an ever-increasing need [8]. As illustrated in Fig. 1, such vehicles have the potential to process road data and detect road cracks with high accuracy, efficiency, and objectivity, helping to reduce labor costs and further improve road maintenance efficiency through online analysis. Therefore, a new review that reflects the recent research trend of automated road crack detection algorithms is needed.

Traditional computer vision-based road crack detection methods utilize image processing-based techniques, including edge-based [9], [10], thresholding-based [11], texture analysis-based [12], wavelet-based [13], and minimal path search-based [14]. While these methods may demonstrate effectiveness in certain simple scenarios, they are sensitive to environmental factors like illumination and weather. The geometric assumptions used in such methods can also be impractical due to the irregular shapes of road cracks.

Fortunately, recent advances in deep learning have led to the extensive use of convolutional neural networks (CNNs) and Transformer-based models for automated road crack detection. Unlike traditional methods with explicit parameters and hand-crafted features, these models use annotated road data to

This research was supported in part by the National Key R&D Program of China under Grant 2023YFE0202400, the Science and Technology Commission of Shanghai Municipal under Grant 22511104500, the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities, and National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 62206046. (*Corresponding author: Rui Fan*)

N. Ma, Z. Song, Q. Hu, C. Liu and R. Fan are with the College of Electronics & Information Engineering, Shanghai Research Institute for Intelligent Autonomous Systems, the State Key Laboratory of Intelligent Autonomous Systems, and Frontiers Science Center for Intelligent Autonomous Systems, Tongji University, Shanghai 201804, China. (e-mail: 2111481@tongji.edu.cn, rui.fan@ieee.org)

Y. Han and Y. Zhang are with the School of Computer Science and Technology, Donghua University, Shanghai 201620, P. R. China. (e-mails: 2232816@mail.dhu.edu.cn, ytzhang@dhu.edu.cn)

L. Xie is with the School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Nanyang Technological University, 50 Nanyang Avenue, Singapore 639798 (e-mail: elhxie@ntu.edu.sg).




Fig. 1: Intelligent road inspection vehicles with automatic road crack detection systems.

learn implicit parameters through back-propagation. They are categorized into three types: (1) image classification networks, which differentiate between crack and non-crack images [15], [16]; (2) object detection networks, which identify cracks at the instance level (location and class) [17], [18]; and (3) semantic segmentation networks, which perform pixel-wise crack detection and have become the preferred approach [19]–[25]. Though semantic segmentation algorithms have shown great potential in accurately detecting cracks, training such algorithms requires extensive human-annotated datasets with meticulous annotations, demanding significant labor and time costs. Therefore, label-efficient deep learning-based methods have been developed, aiming to mitigate or even get rid of the dependence on fine annotated datasets, which can be divided into unsupervised [26], semi-supervised [27], and weakly-supervised [28] methods. Also, in recent years, there has been increasing interest in using depth maps [29] [30] for road crack detection, which can provide essential 3D information that complements image data, enhancing detection performance through data fusion. However, acquiring such data necessitates costly specialized equipment, and effectively integrating multi-modal information remains a challenge in algorithm development.

This paper aims to thoroughly explore the existing deep learning-based algorithms for road crack detection and provide future trends for upcoming research. Besides reviewing algorithms, we curated a high-quality dataset called UDTIRI-Crack as an extended dataset of UDTIRI [31], containing 2,500 high-quality images selected from seven public datasets with various crack types and road surface materials, under diverse scenes and lighting conditions, which has been promoted as

the first extensive online benchmark in this field. We conduct experiments using public general-purpose and crack detection-specific supervised methods on the proposed UDTIRI-Crack, AigleRN [14], and CrackNJ156 [32] datasets to compare the detection accuracy, generalizability, model parameters, and processing speed of them. To the best of our knowledge, this study is the first to comprehensively compare the performance of advanced semantic segmentation-based algorithms in this field. In addition, we explore the feasibility of foundation models and large language models (LLMs) for road crack detection and conducted experiments using the Segment Anything Model (SAM) [33] series and Grounded-SAM [34]. The results indicate that further efforts are needed to adapt them specifically for road crack detection.

The structure of this paper is in the following manner: Sect. II centers on the advanced supervised deep learning-based road crack detection methods. Sect. III reviews the existing label-efficient deep learning-based methods. Sect. IV summarizes public road crack datasets and presents comparison results of public semantic segmentation-based algorithms. Sect. V presents existing challenges and future trends. Sect. VI concludes the paper. The overall outline of the reviewed algorithms is shown in Fig. 2.

II. SUPERVISED DEEP LEARNING-BASED ROAD CRACK DETECTION METHODS

Recent advances in deep learning have elevated deep convolutional neural networks (DCNNs) and Transformer networks as primary tools for road crack detection. Unlike traditional approaches that require explicit parameter settings, DCNNs and Transformer networks typically undergo train-




Fig. 2: The overall outline of the reviewed computer deep learning-based road crack detection methods.

TABLE I: List of selected image classification-based and object detection-based road crack detection methods

Type	Reference	Year	Key method	Description
Image Classification	Kim <i>et al.</i> [35]	2018	AlexNet	Kim <i>et al.</i> [35] trained an enhanced version of AlexNet to classify road image regions, achieving good road crack detection performance.
	Fan <i>et al.</i> [5]	2019	FCN	Fan <i>et al.</i> [5] introduced an FCN model for classifying crack images, supplemented by bilateral filtering and adaptive thresholding for crack area extraction.
	Hou <i>et al.</i> [36]	2021	MobileNet	Hou <i>et al.</i> [36] developed a lightweight network for road crack detection, called MobileCrack, which surpassed MobileNet in performance while requiring roughly one-quarter of the computational load.
	Chen <i>et al.</i> [37]	2022	LeViT	Chen <i>et al.</i> [37] trained a LeViT model [38] for rapid inference in road image classification, outperforming both Vision Transformer (ViT) [39] and ResNet [40] in terms of detection performance and inference speed.
Object Detection	Maeda <i>et al.</i> [41]	2018	SSD	Maeda <i>et al.</i> [41] incorporated Inception-v2 [42] and MobileNet [43] as the backbone into SSD for road crack detection on road images.
	Song <i>et al.</i> [44]	2021	Faster R-CNN	Song <i>et al.</i> [44] trained 20 different Faster R-CNN models with various anchor settings to determine the most suitable configuration for analyzing road images from highways in Xinjiang, China.
	Pham <i>et al.</i> [45]	2022	Faster R-CNN	An extensive comparison of Faster R-CNN models with different backbones and setups conducted by [45] highlighted that the Faster R-CNN (with ResNetXt101 as the backbone) achieved good overall performance.
	Ma <i>et al.</i> [46]	2022	YOLOv3	In Ma <i>et al.</i> [46], a Pavement Crack Generative Adversarial Network (PCGAN) was designed to synthesize realistic crack images for training an improved YOLOv3 network capable of rapid road crack detection in video frames. The proposed model facilitates its implementation in mobile devices and systems mounted on vehicles and UAVs, enabling real-time road crack detection.
	Du <i>et al.</i> [47]	2022	YOLOv5	Du <i>et al.</i> [47] proposed BV-YOLOv5 by integrating the bidirectional feature pyramid network and Varifocal loss into the YOLOv5, which boosted the network's detection capabilities and inference speed for road crack detection.
	Su <i>et al.</i> [48]	2024	MOD-YOLO	Su <i>et al.</i> [48] introduced the Maintaining the Original Dimension-YOLO (MOD-YOLO) to address channel information loss and limited receptive fields in previous YOLO series for road crack detection. It incorporated MODSConv blocks to enhance inter-channel communication in the feature layers, as well as a global receptive field-space pooling pyramid module for improved network's global perception and scale adaptability. Comparisons show that MOD-YOLO outperforms YOLOX [49] in accuracy, efficiency, and generalizability, with fewer parameters and lower computational complexity.

ing via back-propagation using extensive datasets of human-annotated road images [50]. These data-driven road crack detection approaches encapsulate three principal modalities, as delineated in [51]: (1) image classification networks, (2) object detection networks, and (3) semantic segmentation networks. Here, image classification networks are devised to discern

between images containing cracks (positive) and those without (negative), object detection networks aim to recognize cracks at the instance level, and semantic segmentation networks are trained to execute pixel-level (or semantic-level) detection of road images. The ensuing discussion elaborates on each of these algorithmic approaches, and the selected methods are

summarized in Table I, II, and Table III.

A. Image Classification Networks

Prior to the advent of deep learning technologies, researchers primarily employed classical image processing algorithms to generate hand-crafted visual features, which were then utilized to train machine learning models, such as SVM [52]–[55], RF [56] [57], and AdaBoost (AB) [58] to classify road image patches. Although these machine learning-based road crack detection methods may be effective under some simplistic conditions, they are limited by the inadequacy of feature selection and the labor-intensiveness of manual feature extraction efforts. Moreover, these methods are highly susceptible to noise and generally perform poorly when analyzing road images characterized by poor lighting conditions or complex road textures.

The exceptional feature extraction ability of deep learning networks has promoted their widespread adoption in road crack classification methods [5], [16], [35]–[37], [59], [60], including fully connected network (FCN) [61], Alexnet [15], Xception [62], SENet [63], PNASNet [64], MobileNet [43], *etc.* For instance, [59] [60] used a fixed-size sliding window to separate the entire image into blocks and obtained classification results by applying CNN-based models, showing better robustness and adaptability than using traditional edge-based methods and machine learning methods. An extensive comparison among 30 SoTA image classification CNNs by [16] highlighted that PNASNet provided a good balance between inference speed and detection accuracy. The aforementioned methods suggest the relative simplicity of road crack detection as compared to image classification tasks in other application domains. To obtain details of crack location information, the focus should be evolved to object detection-based and semantic segmentation-based algorithms.

B. Object Detection Networks

Object detection-based road crack detection methods are designed to localize crack areas with bounding boxes, which can be grouped into three types: (1) single shot multi-box detector (SSD)-based, (2) region-based CNN (R-CNN) series-based, and (3) you only look once (YOLO) series-based.

An SSD is constructed from two main elements: the backbone model and the SSD head. The former is typically a deep image classification network tasked with extracting visual features, whereas the latter contains additional convolutional layers for the generation of bounding boxes associated with object classes [41]. However, SSD utilizes predefined aspect ratios and scales for anchor boxes, which greatly restricts its detection performance and generalizability.

Compared to SSD, R-CNN [17], [41], [44], [45], [65]–[68] and YOLO series are more widely used for road crack detection. For instance, [17] deployed the faster R-CNN devised by [69] to detect multi-scale cracks in concrete images. [65] compared the performance of two Faster R-CNNs (with ResNet-101 and ResNet-152 as the backbones, separately) for road crack detection on the dataset introduced in [41]. The experimental results indicated superior performance by

the latter, likely due to its deeper network's ability to learn more abstract features. Complementarily, [68] embraced the Cascade R-CNN [70], which is an extension of Faster R-CNN, to achieve augmented road crack detection performance.

Unlike the R-CNN series that necessitates a separate region proposal generation stage, the YOLO series generally partition the road image into a collection of grids, directly producing class probabilities and offset values for each bounding box ensconced within these grids to detect cracks efficiently [18], [46]–[48], [71]–[76]. For instance, [71] trained an YOLOv2 [77] network with a frozen ResNet-101 backbone for road crack detection, performing well in detecting alligator cracks. Further advancements saw the deployment of YOLOv3 [78] in [72] [73] [18] for road crack detection, which demonstrated superior processing speeds over SSD-based and RCNN-based methods. Recent advancements also include modifications [74] [75] to YOLOv5 [79], which incorporated attention mechanisms and vision Transformer blocks to the backbone of YOLOv5 and performed better than YOLOv4 [80], YOLOv5 and Cascade R-CNN for road crack detection. Nevertheless, object detection-based methods can only recognize road cracks at the instance level, and they are infeasible when pixel-level road crack detection results are desired.

C. Semantic Segmentation Networks

As illustrated in Fig. 2, SOTA semantic segmentation networks for road crack detection can be broadly classified into two categories: (1) single-modal and (2) data-fusion approaches. Single-modal networks generally segment RGB images at the pixel-level with CNN-based and Transformer-based methods, whereas data-fusion networks integrate visual features from multiple types of vision sensor data to achieve a more comprehensive semantic understanding of the environment. A summary of the most representative methods is provided in Table II and Table III.

1) *Single modal-based*: CNN-based semantic segmentation methods designed for road crack detection are mainly developed from basic model architectures, including FCN [61], SegNet [98], U-Net [99], DeepLab [100], *etc.* For instance, [101] and [19] introduced FCN with VGG-19 and VGG-16 [102] as the backbones to detect road cracks, respectively. [103] proposed SDDNET by introducing separable convolutions and dilated convolutions to FCN for real-time crack segmentation. In [104], a U-Net model was trained to detect cracks in concrete road surface, showing better performance than two FCN-based methods [101] [19]. [105] proposed DMA-Net, integrating a multi-scale attention module into the decoder of Deeplabv3+ [106] to generate an attention mask and dynamically assign weights across different feature maps, thereby enhancing road crack detection results. Moreover, to enhance the deployment of crack detection algorithms in practical applications by balancing detection performance with real-time processing requirements, several lightweight CNN-based approaches have been developed. For instance, in [107], edge extraction modules (EEM) based on traditional image processing methods, alongside parallel feature extractor modules (PFM), were devised to capture detailed feature infor-

TABLE II: List of selected supervised single modal-based pixel-wise road crack detection methods

Type	Reference	Year	Key method	Description
CNN-Based	Liu <i>et al.</i> [3]	2019	FCN	Deepcrack [3] incorporated a side-output layer into FCN and adopted condition random fields and guided filtering to obtain accurate crack detection results.
	Zou <i>et al.</i> [1]	2018	SegNet	Zou <i>et al.</i> [1] fused features from various scales of SegNet to learn hierarchical information for enhanced road crack detection performance.
	Han <i>et al.</i> [81]	2021	U-Net	In [81], skip-level round-trip sampling blocks were designed and embedded to U-Net, which can enhance the network's memory of transmitting low-level features in shallow layers for improved road crack detection results.
	Sun <i>et al.</i> [82]	2024	UNet	Sun <i>et al.</i> [82] proposed DUCTNet to detect cracks in road images captured by a UAV, which combines the densely connected structure of UNet++ [83] with the nested structure of U2Net [84] for powerful feature fusion and feature capture capabilities.
	Yang <i>et al.</i> [85]	2019	Deeplab	Yang <i>et al.</i> [85] proposed FPHBN, introducing side networks into the feature pyramid to boost hierarchical feature learning for improved performance in road crack detection.
	Xu <i>et al.</i> [86]	2022	Deeplab	Xu <i>et al.</i> [86] advanced the detection capabilities of Deeplabv3 [87] by implementing a resolution maintain flow and a Stacked Atrous Spatial Pyramid Pooling module, facilitating better feature fusion and spatial information extraction to road cracks.
	Gao <i>et al.</i> [88]	2023	Deeplab	In [88], low-level and high-level feature extractors employing ASPP modules were designed in the encoder to obtain sufficient global and local information from road cracks. Subsequently, skip-connections were adopted in the decoder to effectively fuse high-level and low-level feature maps from the encoder, resulting in enhanced road crack detection performance.
Transformer-Based	Zhang <i>et al.</i> [89]	2023	Small Kernel Convolution	Zhang <i>et al.</i> [89] introduced an Efficient Crack Segmentation Neural Network (ECSNet), specifically designed for rapid real-time road crack detection. This network employs small kernel convolutional layers and parallel max pooling techniques, aimed at reducing model parameters while swiftly extracting crack information.
	Zhu [90]	2024	Hybrid Attention	Zhu [90] proposed a lightweight encoder-decoder network known as RHACrackNet for road crack detection. By designing a novel hybrid attention block and adding residual blocks to the deep layers of the encoder, the network's feature extraction capabilities can be preserved, even with a reduced number of model parameters.
	Guo <i>et al.</i> [91]	2023	SwinTransformer	Guo <i>et al.</i> [91] unified SwinTransformer [92] blocks with multi-layer perception layers for pixel-wise road crack detection, outperforming FCN and Deeplabv3+, particularly in handling challenging images with shadows, dense cracks, and leaves.
Transformer-Based	Kuang <i>et al.</i> [93]	2024	Segformer	Kuang <i>et al.</i> [93] introduced a visual crack prompt (VCP) mechanism, which guides Segformer [94] to focus more intently on high-frequency features of road cracks, resulting in improved detection performance.
	Xu <i>et al.</i> [32]	2022	Transformer, Convolution	A locally enhanced Transformer network (LETNet) was introduced, employing Transformer blocks to model long-range dependencies while integrating convolution-based local enhancement modules to compensate for the loss of local fine-grained features. This design provides a semantically rich feature representation for road crack detection.
	Chen <i>et al.</i> [95]	2022	Transformer, Convolution	Building on the foundation of LETNet, Chen <i>et al.</i> [95] proposed LECSFormer, which incorporated cross-shaped transformer structures and a token shuffle operation to enrich information interaction across different channels, thereby enhancing long-range modeling capabilities for improved detection performance.
	Bai <i>et al.</i> [96]	2023	Transformer, Convolution	To achieve stronger feature representations, Bai <i>et al.</i> [96] developed a dual-encoding path that simultaneously captures global context features from Transformer blocks and local detail information from CNN blocks. Additionally, an interactive attention learning (IAL) strategy was implemented to effectively fuse global and local features, improving the detection of minute details in road cracks.
	Tao <i>et al.</i> [97]	2023	Transformer, Convolution	Tao <i>et al.</i> [97] substituted conventional convolution layers with specially designed dilated residual blocks to learn higher-level and clearer local crack features, while also introducing a boundary awareness module aimed at learning the boundary information of road cracks to refine detection results.

TABLE III: List of selected supervised data fusion-based pixel-wise road crack detection methods

Reference	Year	Input	Description
Li <i>et al.</i> [29]	2024	Gray image, Depth maps	Li <i>et al.</i> [29] proposed a double-head U-Net (DHU-Net) incorporating channel attention module and spatial attention module to separately extract features from gray images and depth maps, achieving superior crack detection performance compared to U-Net, SegNet and Deeplabv3.
Jing <i>et al.</i> [30]	2024	Color image, Depth maps	Jing <i>et al.</i> [30] proposed CSF-Cracknet, which integrates color information from RGB images with structural details from depth maps by adaptively adjusting weights across image channels and spatial regions, which can be flexibly deployed at the front end of any semantic segmentation network to enhance road crack detection performance.

mation without resorting to very deep network architectures, thereby significantly reducing trainable parameters.

While CNN-based crack detection algorithms demonstrate commendable performance in road crack detection, they inherently struggle with explicitly modeling long-range dependencies due to the localized nature of convolution operations. This limitation is particularly evident in scenarios involving elongated and narrow cracks, as well as in conditions where there is low contrast between the crack and the road surface. Transformers, with their sequence-to-sequence prediction capabilities and innate global self-attention mechanisms, have emerged as promising alternatives to address these challenges. For instance, [108] introduced CrackFormer, a SegNet-inspired encoder-decoder architecture incorporating self-attention modules to capture extensive contextual information, alongside scaling-attention modules to suppress non-semantic features and enhance semantic ones. Further advancements by [109] enhanced this architecture, employing improved Transformer blocks with local self-attention layers, local feed-forward layers, and skip connections, thereby facilitating more efficient contextual information capture.

However, the exclusive use of Transformer blocks may lead to limited localization abilities due to a deficiency in capturing low-level details. Therefore, the advanced pixel-wise road crack detection algorithms [32], [95]–[97], [110]–[113] tend to adopt a hybrid CNN-Transformer architecture, enabling the integration of both detailed hierarchical spatial information and global long-range contextual information, thereby facilitating precise detection results. For instance, [112] introduced TransUNet [114] for pixel-wise road crack detection, which combines Transformer blocks as a strong encoder with U-Net to enhance fine details by restoring localized spatial information. Further advancing the robustness of TransUNet, [110] developed an external attention block to exploit the dependencies of crack regions across different images. Experimental results indicated [112] [110] can effectively mitigate interferences from shadows and noises.

2) *Data-fusion-based*: The fusion of diverse vision sensor data has emerged as a prominent topic in the field of computer vision and robotics. Specially, RGB and gray images provide detailed insights into road surface texture, while other types of road data can complement this by providing crucial 3D information, polarization light information, thermal distribution, *etc.*, especially for detecting cracks not easily visible in 2D images. For instance, in [115], RGB images and depth maps were combined channel-wise to train a lightweight U-Net, resulting in improved road crack detection performance compared to using a single type of road data. [116] compared two networks designed to fuse RGB images and range images for pixel-wise road crack detection. Experimental results demonstrated that the network performed separate feature extraction on the two types of road data and then fused high-level features outperformed the network directly utilizing the combined image data. However, data-fusion-based road crack detection methods face significant challenges. The complexity and computational demands of processing and integrating these distinct data types require advanced algorithms and considerable processing power, resulting in higher hardware

and software costs.

III. LABEL-EFFICIENT DEEP LEARNING-BASED ROAD CRACK DETECTION METHODS

Although the semantic segmentation algorithms discussed in Section II-C demonstrate significant potential for accurately detecting road cracks at the pixel level, their training necessitates extensive datasets with meticulously detailed human annotations, resulting in considerable labor and time costs. To mitigate this challenge, researchers have developed label-efficient deep learning-based methods for road crack detection, which can be classified into unsupervised, semi-supervised, and weakly-supervised. The selected methods are summarized in Table IV.

Unsupervised road crack detection methods can be divided into image space-based and feature space-based. The core mechanism involves training networks using only healthy road images to develop strong restoration and discrimination capabilities in the image or feature space. During the testing phase, when provided with a damaged road image, the trained network can restore undamaged regions but struggle with reconstructing crack regions. Consequently, the discrepancy between the input damaged image and the restored image can be utilized to generate pixel-wise crack detection results. However, unsupervised road crack detection methods tend to encounter challenges in accurately handling fine details and small anomalies. They may unexpectedly restore tiny cracks to their original appearance, leading to the missed detections, or fail to restore unseen disturbances (watermark digits, shadows, *etc.*), resulting in false detections. Therefore, semi-supervised and weakly-supervised methods, which utilize limited or coarse label information, offer more robust alternatives for road crack detection.

The existing semi-supervised road crack detection algorithms typically use consistency training, combining a small set of labeled road images along with a larger set of unlabeled ones to effectively train a segmentation network to detect cracks. Cross-consistency training enforces prediction invariance under perturbations, enhancing the model's robustness to data distribution changes and improving the detection performance compared to only using supervised learning with limited labeled data.

The typical workflow for weakly-supervised road crack detection algorithms involves three key steps: (1) training a model using coarse labels, such as image-level [120], [122], [123] or bounding box-level [28] annotations, to generate Class Activation Maps (CAMs) [124] or approximate crack locations from neural layers; (2) refining these CAMs or instance-level detection results into pixel-wise pseudo-labels; and (3) using these pseudo-labels to train a semantic segmentation model for pixel-wise road crack detection. For instance, [122] employed the discriminative localization technique to derive CAMs of each image patch and utilized the DenseCRF method [125] to generate pixel-wise pseudo-labels to train a SegNet [98] model for road crack detection. [123] further enhanced the quality of pseudo-labels derived from CAMs by integrating them with segmentation maps obtained through multi-Otsu's thresholding [126].

TABLE IV: List of selected label-efficient deep learning-based road crack detection methods

Type	Reference	Year	Key method	Description
Unsupervised	Yu <i>et al.</i> [117]	2020	Adversarial Image-to-Frequency Transform (AIFT)	In Yu <i>et al.</i> [117], an AIFT architecture was developed. This method uses only healthy road images to derive a transformation model between the image and frequency domains. Road cracks are then detected by comparing the given and generated damaged road images within each domain.
	Ma <i>et al.</i> [26]	2024	Generative Adversarial Network (GAN)	Ma <i>et al.</i> [26] proposed UP-CrackNet, utilizing multi-scale square masks to corrupt healthy road images, and training a GAN restore the corrupted regions by leveraging the semantic context learned from the surrounding uncorrupted regions. In the testing phase, an error map is created by calculating the difference between the input and restored images, enabling pixel-wise crack detection.
Semi-supervised	Wang <i>et al.</i> [118]	2021	Teacher-Student Architecture	Wang <i>et al.</i> [118] introduced a teacher-student architecture. By enforcing the output consistency between the two models under added noise, additional training signals can be extracted from unlabeled data, thereby enhancing the student model's representation for improved road crack detection performance.
	Liu <i>et al.</i> [27]	2024	Cross-Consistency Training (CCT)	In Liu <i>et al.</i> [27], CCT [119] was implemented for semi-supervised road crack detection. This approach leveraged unlabeled data to improve the performance of the main segmentation network by enforcing consistency between the main decoder and auxiliary decoders, where the input of auxiliary decoders are perturbed versions of the main encoder's output.
Weakly-supervised	Al <i>et al.</i> [120]	2023	Multi-scale CAM Generation	In Al <i>et al.</i> [120], the contrast limited adaptive histogram equalization (CLAHE) [121] technique was adopted to mitigate the detrimental effects of uneven illumination on input images, and a multi-scale CAM generation strategy was proposed to produce higher-quality pseudo-labels.
	Zhang <i>et al.</i> [28]	2022	Region Growing, GrabCut algorithm	[28] utilized a region growing algorithm and a GrabCut algorithm to generate pixel-wise pseudo-labels from the bounding box-level detection results.

IV. BENCHMARK ANALYSIS

A. Image-Based Road Crack Datasets

Image-based road crack datasets serve as critical benchmarks, facilitating the rigorous evaluation and comparison of advanced road crack detection algorithms. They can be categorized into three types according to their annotation methods, including image-level, bounding box-level, and pixel-level. For instance, the Concrete Crack Images for Classification (CCI4C) dataset¹ [132] was collected from various locations on the Middle East Technical University campus. 20,000 images with a resolution of 227×227 pixels are categorized into two classes (crack and non-crack) with image-level labels. Tailored for object detection task, the German Asphalt Pavement Distress (GAPs) dataset² [145] was established, consisting of 1,969 images with bounding box-level labels of road cracks, where the image resolution is 1920×1080 pixels. [146] further extended GAPs to 2,468 images and improved the quality of labels using bounding boxes with minimal overlap. To further provide precise location of cracks, the Crack500 [85] dataset³ was collected using a smartphone at the main campus of Temple University and human-annotated with pixel-level labels, containing 500 images of pavement crack of size 2000×1500 pixels. It contains four types of cracks (alligator, longitudinal, transverse, and multifurcate), presenting substantial hurdles for realistic crack detection, due to the presence of obstructions, shadows, and diverse lighting scenarios. Similarly, the DeepCrack [3] dataset⁴ comprises 537

concrete and asphalt surface images with cracks of varying scales and scenes. Each image is captured at a resolution of 544×384 pixels and meticulously human-annotated at the pixel level. As summarized in TABLE V, selected public road crack datasets are detailed with annotation types, names, data volume, image resolutions, and descriptions.

Given the variability in image quality and annotation accuracy across existing pixel-level annotated road crack datasets, as well as the lack of a dataset that ensures sufficient diversity and balance in crack types and styles, we curated a high-quality dataset named UDTIRI-Crack⁵. This dataset consists of 2,500 images (resolution: 320×320 pixels) sourced from seven public datasets: Crack500 [85], CrackLS315 [1], CrackSC [91], CrackTree260 [131], CRKWH100 [1], DeepCrack537 [3], and ShadowCrack [133]. UDTIRI-Crack includes five common types of road cracks: alligator, longitudinal, transverse, multifurcate, and pit cracks. It also spans a variety of pavement materials, such as concrete and asphalt, and covers diverse scenes and lighting conditions. Additionally, the dataset incorporates various noise factors, including shadows from traffic objects, zebra crossing markings, oil spots, obstructions, fallen leaves, and moss. The UDTIRI-Crack dataset is divided into 1,500 images for training, 400 for validation, and 600 for testing, which has been promoted as

¹<https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/5y9wdsg2zt/2>

²<http://www.tu-ilmeneu.de/neurob/data-sets-code/gaps/>

³<https://github.com/fyangneil/pavement-crack-detection>

⁴<https://github.com/yhilleo/DeepCrack>

⁵<https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/jeffffffsong/udtiri-crack>

TABLE V: Selected public image-based datasets for road crack detection

Type	Dataset	Amount	Resolution	Description
Image-level	SDNET2018 [127]	56,000	256 × 256	SDNET2018 dataset ⁶ was captured using a 16 MP Nikon digital camera at Utah State University, encompassing images of cracks found in concrete bridge decks, roads, and walls, with widths ranging from 0.66 mm to 25 mm.
	CQU-BPDD [128]	60,059	1200 × 900	CQU-BPDD dataset ⁷ was captured by the onboard cameras of a specialized road inspection vehicle operating in various regions of southern China, including seven types of bituminous road cracks, such as transverse, alligator, and longitudinal cracks.
Bounding Box-level	RDD2018 [41]	9,053	600 × 600	RDD2018 dataset ⁸ was collected using a smartphone mounted on a vehicle, comprising 9,053 road damage images with 15,435 instances of road surface damage. The dataset covers seven municipalities in Japan, exhibiting diverse regional characteristics.
	RDD2020 [129]	26,336	600 × 600 720 × 720	RDD2020 dataset ⁹ contains 10,506 images from Japan, 2,829 images from Chile and 7,706 images from India. over 31,000 instances of road damage across four categories are collected: longitudinal cracks, transverse cracks, alligator cracks, and potholes.
	RDD2022 [130]	47,420	512 × 512 600 × 600 720 × 720	RDD2022 dataset ¹⁰ extended [129] by adding road images from Norway, the United States, and China, while maintaining the same four categories of road damage. Vehicle-based systems, including motorcycles, UAVs, and cars, are used as the acquisition equipment.
Pixel-level	CrackTree260 [131]	260	800 × 600	CrackTree260 dataset ¹¹ contains four types of road cracks: alligator, longitudinal, transverse and multifurcate. Some images have shadows, zebra crossing markings, and oil spots.
	CFD [57]	118	480 × 320	CrackForest dataset ¹² (CFD) contains 118 images of road cracks with widths ranging from 1 to 3 mm, presenting a range of illumination conditions, shadows, and stains.
	AigleRN [14]	38	311 × 462	AigleRN dataset ¹³ contains four types of cracks with pixel-level annotations: alligator, longitudinal, transverse, and block. All images are annotated with pixel-level labels and pre-processed to mitigate the influence of non-uniform lighting conditions.
	CRKWH100 [1]	100	512 × 512	CRKWH100 dataset ¹⁴ includes 100 road images captured using a line-array camera under consistent lighting conditions, achieving a ground sampling distance of 1 millimeter.
	CrackLS315 [1]	315	512 × 512	CrackLS315 dataset ¹⁴ was also collected using a line-array camera, at the same ground sampling distance as CRKWH100 dataset.
	Stone331 [1]	331	1024 × 1024	Stone331 dataset ¹⁴ comprises 331 images of stone surfaces with pixel-level annotations, acquired using an area-array camera under visible-light illumination during the stone cutting process. For each image, a mask is generated to delineate the area of the stone surface.
	CCSD [132]	458	608 × 608	Concrete crack segmentation dataset ¹⁵ (CCSD) was collected from various locations at the Middle East Technical University, containing 458 images on the concrete road surface, accompanied by the corresponding alpha maps indicating the presence of cracks.
	ShadowCrack [133]	210	480 × 480	ShadowCrack dataset ¹⁶ was captured using an iPhone XR at a height of 1 to 1.2 meters in Beijing and Changchun, China. It includes shadows cast by various traffic objects and urban features, such as vehicles, pedestrians, trees, and buildings.
	CrackNJ156 [32]	156	1734 × 1734	CrackNJ156 dataset ¹⁷ comprises 156 pavement surface (asphalt, concrete, terrazzo, etc) images, containing cracks under diverse weather, season, and lighting conditions.
	NHA12D [134]	80	1920 × 1080	NHA12D dataset ¹⁸ contains 40 images of concrete road surface and 40 images of asphalt road surface. These images were captured by National Highway's digital survey vehicles on the A12 network in the UK.
CrackSC [91]	197	320 × 480	CrackSC dataset ¹⁹ was collected using an iPhone 8 around Enoree Avenue in Columbia, South Carolina, United States. It focuses on the heavy shadows and dense cracks typically found on local roads, having tree shadows, fallen leaves, and moss.	

the first extensive online benchmark for road crack detection.

B. Implementation Details

To evaluate the detection performance of the existing semantic segmentation methods for road crack detection, we conduct experiments using ten public general-purpose supervised methods and nine crack detection-specific supervised methods on the proposed UDTIRI-Crack dataset. Furthermore, to assess the generalizability of these methods under shadow conditions, diverse weather and season conditions, we extract 100 and 200 image patches (resolution: 320 × 320 pixels) from the AigleRN [14] and CrackNJ156 [32] datasets, respectively. These image patches are used as the test data to evaluate the performance of models trained on the UDTIRI-Crack dataset.

All experiments are conducted on a single NVIDIA RTX 3090 GPU, with models trained for 200 epochs using a

⁶https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/all_datasets/48/

⁷<https://whtang.cn/CQU-BPDD/>

⁸<https://github.com/sekilab/RoadDamageDetector/>

⁹<https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/5ty2wb6vgv/1>

¹⁰<https://figshare.com/articles/dataset/RDD2022>

¹¹<https://1drv.ms/f/s!AitnGm6vRKLtyiQUk3ViLu8L9Wzb>

¹²<https://github.com/cuilimeng/CrackForest-dataset>

¹³https://github.com/Sutadasuto/uvvg19_crack_detection

¹⁴<https://1drv.ms/f/s!AitnGm6vRKLtyiBkxVXw5arGn6R>

¹⁵<https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/jwsn7tfbrp/1>

¹⁶<https://github.com/fanlili666/shadow-crack-dataset>

¹⁷<https://zenodo.org/records/6526409>

¹⁸<https://github.com/ZheningHuang?tab=repositories>

¹⁹<https://github.com/jonguo111/Transformer-Crack>

TABLE VI: Quantitative experimental results of pixel-wise crack detection performance on the proposed UDTIRI-Crack dataset

Mode	Training Strategy	Methods	Precision (%) \uparrow	Recall (%) \uparrow	Accuracy (%) \uparrow	F1-Score (%) \uparrow	IoU (%) \uparrow	AIoU (%) \uparrow	
CNN	General Supervised	BiseNet [135]	72.621	52.328	98.299	60.826	43.705	70.991	
		PSPNet [136]	73.162	53.570	98.332	61.852	44.772	71.541	
		LEDNet [137]	73.973	47.936	98.260	58.174	41.018	69.628	
		DeepLabv3+ [106]	73.965	54.047	98.360	62.457	45.409	71.873	
	Crack Detection-Specific Supervised	ECSNet [89]	77.678	53.584	98.440	63.420	46.434	72.426	
		Deepcrack18 [1]	74.736	58.702	98.457	65.756	48.982	73.708	
		Deepcrack19 [3]	72.831	57.795	98.390	64.448	47.544	72.956	
		SCCDNet [138]	71.294	58.371	98.356	64.189	47.263	72.797	
		Crack-Att [139]	68.790	66.447	98.392	67.598	51.055	74.710	
		CDLN [140]	56.947	82.918	97.986	67.522	50.968	74.456	
		SegDecNet++ [141]	66.185	66.890	98.302	66.536	49.853	74.063	
	Transformer	General Supervised	LM-Net [142]	77.409	62.434	98.592	69.120	52.811	75.690
			SwinTransformer [92]	75.065	65.704	98.583	70.073	53.933	76.246
			SegFormer [94]	58.973	67.097	97.991	62.773	45.744	71.850
TransUnet [114]			68.121	68.108	98.390	68.115	51.647	75.005	
SCTNet [143]			73.930	59.902	98.455	66.181	49.456	73.943	
AFFormer [144]			76.920	63.258	98.593	69.423	53.167	75.869	
Crack Detection-Specific Supervised		LECSFormer [95]	74.711	65.341	98.567	69.712	53.506	76.025	
		CT-crackseg [97]	75.019	66.694	98.599	70.612	54.573	76.574	




Fig. 3: Comparison results of eleven CNN-based and eight Transformer-based supervised semantic segmentation methods in terms of detection performance (IoU), resource consumption (model parameters) and computational complexity (FPS).

batch size of 4. The learning rate was initialized at 0.001 and adjusted dynamically following the poly learning rate scheduling strategy. The Adam optimizer, configured with $\beta_1 = 0.5$ and $\beta_2 = 0.999$, is employed to optimize the networks. To holistically and fairly evaluate the detection performance of the compared methods, we utilize precision, recall, accuracy, intersection over union (IoU), F1-Score, and average intersection over union (AIoU) as quantitative metrics, where AIoU represents the average IoU of crack and background categories. In addition, to comprehensively assess the compared methods' resource consumption and computational

complexity, we further employ model parameters and frames per second (FPS) as quantitative metrics.

C. Comparison Results

The public general-purpose supervised methods utilized for comparison include four CNN-based (BiseNet [135], PSPNet [136], LEDNet [137], DeepLabv3+ [106]) and six Transformer-based (LM-Net [142], SwinTransformer [92], SegFormer [94], TransUnet [114], SCTNet [143], AFFormer [144]) models. The public road crack detection-specific supervised methods utilized for comparison include seven CNN-

TABLE VII: Quantitative experimental results of pixel-wise crack detection performance on the AigleRN dataset [14]

Mode	Training Strategy	Methods	Precision (%) \uparrow	Recall (%) \uparrow	Accuracy (%) \uparrow	F1-Score (%) \uparrow	IoU (%) \uparrow	AIoU (%) \uparrow
CNN	General Supervised	BiseNet [135]	51.930	27.181	99.016	35.685	21.717	60.365
		PSPNet [136]	49.797	30.787	98.994	38.050	23.495	61.243
		LEDNet [137]	46.214	26.389	98.953	33.594	20.188	59.569
		DeepLabv3+ [106]	59.131	44.943	99.135	51.070	34.291	66.711
	Crack Detection-Specific Supervised	ECSNet [89]	67.145	46.927	99.237	55.244	38.164	68.698
		Deepcrack18 [1]	66.291	70.187	99.342	68.183	51.726	75.532
		Deepcrack19 [3]	71.502	59.303	99.354	64.834	47.966	73.658
		SCCDNet [138]	80.847	56.591	99.430	66.579	49.901	74.664
		Crack-Att [139]	61.637	74.493	99.278	67.458	50.895	75.084
		CDLN [140]	52.604	87.651	99.083	65.749	48.974	74.025
		SegDecNet++ [141]	64.358	68.533	99.303	66.380	49.678	74.488
		LM-Net [142]	81.923	65.292	99.507	72.668	57.070	78.287
		SwinTransformer [92]	81.637	16.143	99.122	26.956	15.577	57.349
		SegFormer [94]	59.104	67.741	99.206	63.129	46.123	72.661
Transformer	General Supervised	TransUnet [114]	59.607	25.330	99.078	35.552	21.619	60.347
		SCTNet [143]	67.085	15.765	99.077	25.530	14.633	56.854
		AFFormer [144]	73.455	20.238	99.126	31.733	18.859	58.991
		LECSFormer [95]	63.742	66.123	99.282	64.910	48.050	73.664
		CT-crackseg [97]	92.393	45.012	99.411	60.533	43.403	71.406
		Crack Detection-Specific Supervised	LECSFormer [95]	63.742	66.123	99.282	64.910	48.050
	CT-crackseg [97]	92.393	45.012	99.411	60.533	43.403	71.406	

TABLE VIII: Quantitative experimental results of pixel-wise crack detection performance on the CrackNJ156 dataset [32]

Mode	Training Strategy	Methods	Precision (%) \uparrow	Recall (%) \uparrow	Accuracy (%) \uparrow	F1-Score (%) \uparrow	IoU (%) \uparrow	AIoU (%) \uparrow
CNN	General Supervised	BiseNet [135]	31.812	33.848	96.008	32.798	19.616	57.792
		PSPNet [136]	29.165	38.699	95.531	33.263	19.949	57.715
		LEDNet [137]	42.596	30.108	96.821	35.279	21.418	59.105
		DeepLabv3+ [106]	37.466	31.897	96.508	34.458	20.815	58.645
	Crack Detection-Specific Supervised	ECSNet [89]	38.797	36.410	96.517	37.566	23.127	59.803
		Deepcrack18 [1]	32.269	31.041	96.140	31.643	18.795	57.450
		Deepcrack19 [3]	31.982	35.369	95.975	33.590	20.185	58.060
		SCCDNet [138]	21.522	39.264	94.132	27.803	16.146	55.106
		Crack-Att [139]	42.843	40.439	96.733	41.606	26.267	61.481
		CDLN [140]	18.274	59.664	91.160	27.979	16.265	53.635
		SegDecNet++ [141]	34.843	49.244	95.889	40.810	25.636	60.733
		LM-Net [142]	38.330	39.892	96.423	39.095	24.297	60.339
		SwinTransformer [92]	32.769	53.267	95.510	40.576	25.452	60.446
		SegFormer [94]	23.930	54.829	93.684	33.318	19.989	56.786
Transformer	General Supervised	TransUnet [114]	36.703	54.350	95.989	43.816	28.054	61.990
		SCTNet [143]	36.568	45.026	96.170	40.359	25.281	60.700
		AFFormer [144]	45.281	43.354	96.862	44.296	28.449	62.636
		LECSFormer [95]	36.418	44.338	96.170	39.990	24.992	60.557
		CT-crackseg [97]	42.585	46.632	96.655	44.517	28.631	62.620
		Crack Detection-Specific Supervised	LECSFormer [95]	36.418	44.338	96.170	39.990	24.992
	CT-crackseg [97]	42.585	46.632	96.655	44.517	28.631	62.620	

based (ECSNet [89], Deepcrack18 [1], Deepcrack19 [3], SCCDNet [138], Crack-Att [139], CDLN [140], SegDecNet++ [141]), and two Transformer-based (LECSFormer [95], CT-crackseg [97]) models. The comparative results of these methods on the proposed UDTIRI-Crack dataset are presented both quantitatively and qualitatively in Table VI, Fig. 3, and Fig. 4, respectively. The results clearly demonstrate that crack detection-specific methods tend to outperform general-purpose methods, primarily due to the incorporation of novel network modules specifically tailored to address the unique challenges of road crack detection. Specifically, Crack-Att [139] and CT-crackseg [97] achieve the highest detection performance among crack detection-specific CNN-based and Transformer-based methods, respectively, with 5.646 – 10.037% and 0.640 – 8.829% improvement in IoU compared to general-purpose CNN-based and Transformer-based methods, respectively. The results reveal the effectiveness of the designed parallel attention mechanism and multi-scale feature map merging technique from Crack-Att, as well as the designed

dilated residual blocks and boundary awareness module from CT-crackseg for refined road crack detection performance. Notably, CT-crackseg achieves an improvement of 3.518%, 3.014%, 1.864% in IoU, F1-Score, and AIoU over Crack-Att, further demonstrating the superiority of the hybrid CNN-Transformer architecture. This architecture effectively integrates detailed hierarchical spatial information with global long-range contextual information, enabling more precise and robust crack detection results.

Apart from detection capability, the model's resource consumption and computational complexity are also crucial considerations when embedding it into intelligent road inspection vehicles. To quantitatively evaluate these aspects, we use model parameters and FPS as metrics. The results presented in Fig. 3 indicate that ECSNet [89] has the smallest model size with 0.256 million parameters, while Deepcrack19 [3] achieves the highest FPS at 276.695. Nonetheless, none of the evaluated public models successfully balance road crack detection accuracy, model size, and real-time performance.




Fig. 4: Examples of experimental results of the compared methods on the proposed UDTIRI-Crack dataset: (a) ECSNet [89]; (b) Deepcrack18 [1]; (c) Deepcrack19 [3]; (d) SCCDNet [138]; (e) Crack-Att [139]; (f) CDLN [140]; (g) SegDecNet++ [141]; (h) LM-Net [142] (i) SwinTransformer [92]; (j) SegFormer [94]; (k) TransUnet [114]; (l) SCTNet [143]; (m) LECSFormer [95]; (n) CT-crackseg [97]. The true-positive, false-positive, and false-negative pixels are shown in green, blue, and red, respectively.

To further assess the generalizability of the compared methods, we evaluated their detection performance on the AigleRN [14] and CrackNJ156 [32] datasets, with all models trained on the proposed UDTIRI-Crack dataset. The quantitative results, presented in Table VII and Table VIII, indicate that methods specifically designed for crack detection generally exhibit better generalizability than general-purpose methods. This suggests that the specialized modules developed for this task are more effective at capturing the feature information of road cracks. Notably, the results in Table VII demonstrated the robustness of LM-Net [142] in road crack detection under shadow conditions. However, on the CrackNJ156 dataset, the top-performing CT-crackseg model achieved an IoU of only 28.631%. This is attributed to the variations in weather, season,

and lighting conditions between the images in CrackNJ156 and those in UDTIRI-Crack. These findings highlight that existing supervised road crack detection algorithms still lack robust generalizability across diverse scenarios.

V. EXISTING CHALLENGES AND FUTURE TRENDS

A. Insufficient Dataset Amount and Label Quality

Although there exist some public datasets for road crack detection methods, compared with public natural scene datasets, such as more than 14 million sample data in the ImageNet dataset [147], the amount and diversity of them is far from sufficient. As supervised deep learning-based road crack detection models demand a substantial quantity of labeled




Fig. 5: Examples of Grounded-SAM [34] on the AigleRN [14], CrackNJ156 [32], and proposed UDTIRI-Crack datasets: (a) Input road image; (b) Pixel-level label; (c) Results with text prompt “crack”; (d) Results with text prompt “damage”; (e) Results with text prompt “fissure”; (f) Results with text prompt “gap”; (g) Results with text prompt “road crack”; (h) Results with text prompt “split”;

data to learn abundant feature information, establishing large-scale labeled road crack datasets is an existing challenge. Advanced image generation methods, such as generative adversarial networks (GAN) [148] and diffusion models [149], can be introduced to produce manifold and excessive road crack data. In addition, the annotation quality of existing datasets varies greatly, especially for pixel-level annotations used in semantic segmentation-based methods, which affects the stability and sustainability of model training. Combining automatic annotation tools with manual refinement will be better to provide high-quality labels. Furthermore, establishing online benchmarks covering diverse scenarios, road surface materials, and crack types, is an imperative contribution to the development of road safety assessment research in the future.

B. Inadequate Detection and Real-Time Performance

From the comparison results in Table VI and Fig.4, it can be seen that even the best-performing public method still struggles to accurately detect road cracks, with evident instances of false positives and missed detections. Based on the experimental results and literature review, three key research directions for model improvement can be identified: (1) develop CNN-Transformer hybrid architectures that effectively integrate the detailed hierarchical spatial information captured by CNN with the global long-range contextual information provided by Transformer blocks; (2) design boundary refinement modules to improve the model’s ability to accurately detect and delineate crack boundaries; (3) propose multi-scale feature extraction and prediction fusion training strategies to enhance the network’s robustness and adaptability.

Moreover, as illustrated in Fig. 3, there is a notable absence of public methods that achieve an optimal balance between road crack detection accuracy and real-time performance. A promising research direction lies in developing lightweight models that maintain relatively high detection performance while reducing model parameters and enhancing processing speed. Such advancements would reduce computational resource requirements and improve cost-effectiveness, thereby ensuring the economic feasibility of automatic road crack detection technology.

C. High-Dependence on Fine-annotated Dataset

Most existing cutting-edge road crack detection methods remain predominantly supervised, and the training process relies on massive human-annotated labels. The creation of such fine labels demands professional expertise and entails significant labor and time expenditure. To fill this gap, it is crucial to develop label-efficient road crack detection methods that substantially reduce annotation efforts and costs. While existing relevant methods have shown some promise, there remains a need for more advanced and comprehensive solutions. For example, unsupervised methods such as [26] face challenges in accurately detecting tiny cracks and can be disrupted by small anomalies. Weakly-supervised methods [123], [120] require manual parameter tuning, which limits their practical applicability.

D. Limited Model Generalizability

The comparison results in Table VII and Table VIII indicate that, although crack detection-specific supervised meth-




Fig. 6: Examples of SAM series results on the AigleRN [14], CrackNJ156 [32], and proposed UDTIRI-Crack datasets: (a) Input road image; (b) Pixel-level label; (c) Results from SAM [33]; (d) Results from SAM2 [150]; (e) Results from semantic SAM [151].

ods demonstrate better generalizability compared to general-purpose supervised methods, their performance significantly deteriorates in the presence of scene variations and noise interference. This limitation is primarily attributed to the insufficient size of available datasets and the inherent dependence of supervised training methods on labeled data. To address this limitation, foundation models and LLMs (such as SAM [33] series and Grounded-SAM [34]), which demonstrate strong generalizability across diverse image types, present a promising direction. We evaluate SAM, SAM2 [150], and semantic SAM [151] on the AigleRN [14], CrackNJ156 [32], and proposed UDTIRI-Crack datasets, respectively. Also, we evaluate the performance of Grounded-SAM on the three datasets by employing six distinct textual prompts: “crack”, “damage”, “fissure”, “gap”, “road crack”, and “split”. However, the qualitative results shown in Fig.5 and Fig. 6 indicate that directly introducing the existing foundation models and LLMs fails to achieve the desired road crack detection results, instead producing segmentation results limited to objects or road areas within the images, or even interpreting the entire input image as the output. This highlights the necessity of fine-tuning the SAM series and Grounded-SAM to adapt them specifically for road crack detection tasks. Furthermore, integrating label-efficient training strategies with sufficient road data generated by advanced image synthesis techniques can enhance the adapted models, enabling more robust and generalized detection performance for road cracks.

VI. CONCLUSION

This paper provides a comprehensive review of SoTA deep learning-based road crack detection algorithms, from single-modal supervised methods to the emerging realm of data-fusion supervised, and label-efficient methods. We propose

UDTIRI-Crack, the first extensive online benchmark in this field, alongside the AigleRN and CrackNJ156 datasets to evaluate the detection performance, generalizability, and computational efficiency of public SoTA semantic segmentation-based algorithms for road crack detection. The experimental results indicate that a promising research direction involves developing lightweight models that maintain relatively high detection performance while reducing model complexity and enhancing processing speed. Given the reliance of supervised semantic segmentation-based methods on massive human-annotated datasets, the creation of which demands significant labor and time costs, designing advanced label-efficient road crack detection methods becomes an escalating demand. Moreover, leveraging foundation models and LLMs for their robust generalizability in this field necessitates further adaptation and the development of tailored training strategies.

REFERENCES

- [1] Q. Zou *et al.*, “Deepcrack: Learning hierarchical convolutional features for crack detection,” *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 1498–1512, 2018.
- [2] J. S. Miller *et al.*, “Distress identification manual for the long-term pavement performance program,” United States. Federal Highway Administration. Office of Infrastructure Research and Development, Tech. Rep., 2003.
- [3] Y. Liu *et al.*, “Deepcrack: A deep hierarchical feature learning architecture for crack segmentation,” *Neurocomputing*, vol. 338, pp. 139–153, 2019.
- [4] “Road safety statistics,” *Department for Transport*, 2020.
- [5] R. Fan *et al.*, “Road crack detection using deep convolutional neural network and adaptive thresholding,” in *2019 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 474–479.
- [6] R. Fan and M. Liu, “Road damage detection based on unsupervised disparity map segmentation,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 21, no. 11, pp. 4906–4911, 2020.
- [7] R. Fan *et al.*, “Pothole detection based on disparity transformation and road surface modeling,” *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 29, pp. 897–908, 2019.
- [8] R. Fan *et al.*, “Rethinking road surface 3-d reconstruction and pothole detection: From perspective transformation to disparity map segmentation,” *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 52, no. 7, pp. 5799–5808, 2022.
- [9] G. Zhao *et al.*, “Anisotropic clustering on surfaces for crack extraction,” *Machine Vision and Applications*, vol. 26, pp. 675–688, 2015.
- [10] A. Ayenu-Prah and N. Attoh-Okine, “Evaluating pavement cracks with bidimensional empirical mode decomposition,” *EURASIP Journal on Advances in Signal Processing*, vol. 2008, pp. 1–7, 2008.
- [11] T. Yamaguchi *et al.*, “Image-based crack detection for real concrete surfaces,” *IEEE Transactions on Electrical and Electronic Engineering*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 128–135, 2008.
- [12] Y. Hu and C. Zhao, “A novel LBP based methods for pavement crack detection,” *Journal of Pattern Recognition Research*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 140–147, 2010.
- [13] J. Zhou *et al.*, “Wavelet-based pavement distress detection and evaluation,” *Optical Engineering*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 027 007–027 007, 2006.
- [14] R. Amhaz *et al.*, “Automatic crack detection on two-dimensional pavement images: An algorithm based on minimal path selection,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 17, no. 10, pp. 2718–2729, 2016.
- [15] A. Krizhevsky *et al.*, “Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks,” *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 60, no. 6, pp. 84–90, 2017.
- [16] J. Fan *et al.*, “Deep convolutional neural networks for road crack detection: Qualitative and quantitative comparisons,” in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Imaging Systems and Techniques (IST)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [17] Y.-J. Cha *et al.*, “Autonomous structural visual inspection using region-based deep learning for detecting multiple damage types,” *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, vol. 33, no. 9, pp. 731–747, 2018.

- [18] Y. Du *et al.*, "Pavement distress detection and classification based on yolo network," *International Journal of Pavement Engineering*, vol. 22, no. 13, pp. 1659–1672, 2021.
- [19] C. V. Dung *et al.*, "Autonomous concrete crack detection using deep fully convolutional neural network," *Automation in Construction*, vol. 99, pp. 52–58, 2019.
- [20] J. Huyen *et al.*, "CrackU-Net: A novel deep convolutional neural network for pixelwise pavement crack detection," *Structural Control and Health Monitoring*, vol. 27, no. 8, p. e2551, 2020.
- [21] Z. Qu *et al.*, "A crack detection algorithm for concrete pavement based on attention mechanism and multi-features fusion," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 23, no. 8, pp. 11 710–11 719, 2021.
- [22] T. Chen *et al.*, "Pavement crack detection and recognition using the architecture of segnet," *Journal of Industrial Information Integration*, vol. 18, p. 100144, 2020.
- [23] J. Liu *et al.*, "Automated pavement crack detection and segmentation based on two-step convolutional neural network," *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, vol. 35, no. 11, pp. 1291–1305, 2020.
- [24] A. A. Zhang *et al.*, "Intelligent pixel-level detection of multiple distresses and surface design features on asphalt pavements," *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, vol. 37, no. 13, pp. 1654–1673, 2022.
- [25] G. Zhu *et al.*, "A lightweight encoder–decoder network for automatic pavement crack detection," *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 2023.
- [26] N. Ma *et al.*, "Up-cracknet: Unsupervised pixel-wise road crack detection via adversarial image restoration," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 2024.
- [27] X. Liu *et al.*, "Semi-supervised semantic segmentation using cross-consistency training for pavement crack detection," vol. 25, no. 6, pp. 1368–1380, 2024.
- [28] H. Zhang *et al.*, "Investigation of pavement crack detection based on deep learning method using weakly supervised instance segmentation framework," *Construction and Building Materials*, vol. 358, p. 129117, 2022.
- [29] P. Li *et al.*, "Cnn-based pavement defects detection using grey and depth images," *Automation in Construction*, vol. 158, p. 105192, 2024.
- [30] J. Jing *et al.*, "Self-adaptive 2d3d image fusion for automated pixel-level pavement crack detection," *Automation in Construction*, vol. 168, p. 105756, 2024.
- [31] S. Guo, J. Li, Y. Feng, D. Zhou, D. Zhang, C. Chen, S. Su, X. Zhu, Q. Chen, and R. Fan, "Udtiri: An online open-source intelligent road inspection benchmark suite," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 2024.
- [32] Z. Xu *et al.*, "Pavement crack detection from ccd images with a locally enhanced transformer network," *International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation*, vol. 110, p. 102825, 2022.
- [33] A. Kirillov *et al.*, "Segment anything," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 4015–4026.
- [34] T. Ren *et al.*, "Grounded sam: Assembling open-world models for diverse visual tasks," 2024.
- [35] B. Kim and S. Cho, "Automated vision-based detection of cracks on concrete surfaces using a deep learning technique," *Sensors*, vol. 18, no. 10, p. 3452, 2018.
- [36] Y. Hou *et al.*, "Mobilecrack: Object classification in asphalt pavements using an adaptive lightweight deep learning," *Journal of Transportation Engineering, Part B: Pavements*, vol. 147, no. 1, p. 04020092, 2021.
- [37] Y. Chen *et al.*, "A fast inference vision transformer for automatic pavement image classification and its visual interpretation method," *Remote Sensing*, vol. 14, no. 8, p. 1877, 2022.
- [38] B. Graham *et al.*, "Levit: a vision transformer in convnet's clothing for faster inference," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 2021, pp. 12 259–12 269.
- [39] A. Dosovitskiy *et al.*, "An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020.
- [40] K. He *et al.*, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [41] H. Maeda *et al.*, "Road damage detection and classification using deep neural networks with smartphone images," *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, vol. 33, no. 12, pp. 1127–1141, 2018.
- [42] C. Szegedy *et al.*, "Rethinking the inception architecture for computer vision," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 2818–2826.
- [43] A. G. Howard *et al.*, "MobileNets: Efficient convolutional neural networks for mobile vision applications," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.04861*, 2017.
- [44] L. Song and X. Wang, "Faster region convolutional neural network for automated pavement distress detection," *Road Materials and Pavement Design*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 23–41, 2021.
- [45] V. Pham *et al.*, "Road damage detection and classification with detectron2 and faster r-cnn," in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 5592–5601.
- [46] D. Ma *et al.*, "Automatic detection and counting system for pavement cracks based on psgan and yolo-mf," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 23, no. 11, pp. 22 166–22 178, 2022.
- [47] F.-J. Du and S.-J. Jiao, "Improvement of lightweight convolutional neural network model based on yolo algorithm and its research in pavement defect detection," *Sensors*, vol. 22, no. 9, p. 3537, 2022.
- [48] P. Su *et al.*, "Mod-yolo: Rethinking the yolo architecture at the level of feature information and applying it to crack detection," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 237, p. 121346, 2024.
- [49] Z. Ge *et al.*, "YOLOX: Exceeding YOLO series in 2021," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.08430*, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.08430>
- [50] Y. LeCun *et al.*, "Deep learning," *nature*, vol. 521, no. 7553, pp. 436–444, 2015.
- [51] R. Fan *et al.*, *Autonomous Driving Perception*. Springer Nature, 2023.
- [52] R. Kapela *et al.*, "Asphalt surfaced pavement cracks detection based on histograms of oriented gradients," in *2015 22nd International Conference Mixed Design of Integrated Circuits & Systems (MIXDES)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 579–584.
- [53] M. Gavilán *et al.*, "Adaptive road crack detection system by pavement classification," *Sensors*, vol. 11, no. 10, pp. 9628–9657, 2011.
- [54] Y. Sari *et al.*, "Road crack detection using support vector machine (svm) and otsu algorithm," in *2019 6th International Conference on Electric Vehicular Technology (ICEVT)*, 2019, pp. 349–354.
- [55] C. Chen *et al.*, "Pavement crack detection and classification based on fusion feature of lbp and pca with svm," *International Journal of Pavement Engineering*, vol. 23, no. 9, pp. 3274–3283, 2022.
- [56] L. Cui *et al.*, "Pavement distress detection using random decision forests," in *Data Science: Second International Conference, ICDS 2015, Sydney, Australia, August 8-9, 2015, Proceedings 2*. Springer, 2015, pp. 95–102.
- [57] Y. Shi *et al.*, "Automatic road crack detection using random structured forests," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 17, no. 12, pp. 3434–3445, 2016.
- [58] A. Cord and S. Chambon, "Automatic road defect detection by textual pattern recognition based on adaboost," *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 244–259, 2012.
- [59] Y.-J. Cha *et al.*, "Deep learning-based crack damage detection using convolutional neural networks," *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 361–378, 2017.
- [60] L. Zhang *et al.*, "Road crack detection using deep convolutional neural network," in *2016 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 3708–3712.
- [61] J. Long *et al.*, "Fully convolutional networks for semantic segmentation," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 3431–3440.
- [62] F. Chollet, "Xception: Deep learning with depthwise separable convolutions," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2017, pp. 1251–1258.
- [63] J. Hu *et al.*, "Squeeze-and-excitation networks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 7132–7141.
- [64] C. Liu *et al.*, "Progressive neural architecture search," in *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, 2018, pp. 19–34.
- [65] W. Wang *et al.*, "Road damage detection and classification with faster r-cnn," in *2018 IEEE international conference on big data (Big data)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 5220–5223.
- [66] F. Kortmann *et al.*, "Detecting various road damage types in global countries utilizing faster r-cnn," in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 5563–5571.
- [67] C. Gou *et al.*, "Pavement crack detection based on the improved faster-rcnn," in *2019 IEEE 14th International Conference on Intelligent Systems and Knowledge Engineering (ISKE)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 962–967.
- [68] T. Shen and M. Nie, "Pavement damage detection based on cascade r-cnn," in *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Computer Science and Application Engineering*, 2020, pp. 1–5.

- [69] S. Ren *et al.*, “Faster R-CNN: Towards real-time object detection with region proposal networks,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 28, 2015.
- [70] Z. Cai and N. Vasconcelos, “Cascade r-cnn: Delving into high quality object detection,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 6154–6162.
- [71] V. Mandal *et al.*, “Automated road crack detection using deep convolutional neural networks,” in *2018 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 5212–5215.
- [72] M. Nie and C. Wang, “Pavement crack detection based on yolo v3,” in *2019 2nd international conference on safety produce informatization (IICSPI)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 327–330.
- [73] H. Tsuchiya *et al.*, “A method of data augmentation for classifying road damage considering influence on classification accuracy,” *Procedia Computer Science*, vol. 159, pp. 1449–1458, 2019.
- [74] K. Guo *et al.*, “A pavement distresses identification method optimized for yolov5s,” *Scientific Reports*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 3542, 2022.
- [75] X. Xiang *et al.*, “An improved yolov5 crack detection method combined with transformer,” *IEEE Sensors Journal*, vol. 22, no. 14, pp. 14 328–14 335, 2022.
- [76] W. Xiang *et al.*, “Road disease detection algorithm based on yolov5s-dsg,” *Journal of Real-Time Image Processing*, vol. 20, no. 3, p. 56, 2023.
- [77] J. Redmon and A. Farhadi, “Yolo9000: better, faster, stronger,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2017, pp. 7263–7271.
- [78] —, “Yolov3: An incremental improvement,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.02767*, 2018.
- [79] G. J. *et al.*, “Yolov5 by ultralytics,” <https://github.com/ultralytics/yolov5>, 2020, gitHub repository.
- [80] A. Bochkovskiy *et al.*, “Yolov4: Optimal speed and accuracy of object detection,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.10934*, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.10934>
- [81] C. Han *et al.*, “Crackw-net: A novel pavement crack image segmentation convolutional neural network,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 23, no. 11, pp. 22 135–22 144, 2021.
- [82] L. Sun *et al.*, “Ductnet: An effective road crack segmentation method in uav remote sensing images under complex scenes,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 2024.
- [83] Z. Zhou *et al.*, “Unet++: Redesigning skip connections to exploit multiscale features in image segmentation,” *IEEE transactions on medical imaging*, vol. 39, no. 6, pp. 1856–1867, 2019.
- [84] X. Qin *et al.*, “U2-net: Going deeper with nested u-structure for salient object detection,” *Pattern recognition*, vol. 106, p. 107404, 2020.
- [85] F. Yang *et al.*, “Feature pyramid and hierarchical boosting network for pavement crack detection,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 1525–1535, 2019.
- [86] Z. Xu *et al.*, “Pixel-level pavement crack detection using enhanced high-resolution semantic network,” *International Journal of Pavement Engineering*, vol. 23, no. 14, pp. 4943–4957, 2022.
- [87] L.-C. Chen, “Rethinking atrous convolution for semantic image segmentation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.05587*, 2017.
- [88] Z. Gao *et al.*, “Synergizing low rank representation and deep learning for automatic pavement crack detection,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 24, no. 10, pp. 10 676–10 690, 2023.
- [89] T. Zhang *et al.*, “Ecsnet: An accelerated real-time image segmentation cnn architecture for pavement crack detection,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 2023.
- [90] G. Zhu *et al.*, “A lightweight encoder–decoder network for automatic pavement crack detection,” *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, vol. 39, no. 12, pp. 1743–1765, 2024.
- [91] F. Guo *et al.*, “Pavement crack detection based on transformer network,” *Automation in Construction*, vol. 145, p. 104646, 2023.
- [92] Z. Liu *et al.*, “Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 2021, pp. 10 012–10 022.
- [93] S. Kuang *et al.*, “An universal crack detection framework for intelligent road-perceptive vehicles,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 2024.
- [94] E. Xie *et al.*, “Segformer: Simple and efficient design for semantic segmentation with transformers,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 34, pp. 12 077–12 090, 2021.
- [95] J. Chen *et al.*, “Refined crack detection via lecsformer for autonomous road inspection vehicles,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 2022.
- [96] S. Bai *et al.*, “Dmf-net: A dual-encoding multi-scale fusion network for pavement crack detection,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 2023.
- [97] H. Tao, B. Liu, J. Cui, and H. Zhang, “A convolutional-transformer network for crack segmentation with boundary awareness,” in *2023 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 86–90.
- [98] V. Badrinarayanan *et al.*, “Segnet: A deep convolutional encoder-decoder architecture for image segmentation,” *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 39, no. 12, pp. 2481–2495, 2017.
- [99] O. Ronneberger *et al.*, “U-net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation,” in *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention (MICCAI)*. Springer, 2015, pp. 234–241.
- [100] L.-C. Chen *et al.*, “Semantic image segmentation with deep convolutional nets and fully connected crfs,” in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2015.
- [101] X. Yang, H. Li, Y. Yu, X. Luo, T. Huang, and X. Yang, “Automatic pixel-level crack detection and measurement using fully Convolutional Network,” *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, vol. 33, no. 12, pp. 1090–1109, 2018.
- [102] K. Simonyan and A. Zisserman, “Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556*, 2014.
- [103] W. Choi and Y.-J. Cha, “SDDNet: Real-time crack segmentation,” *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 67, no. 9, pp. 8016–8025, 2019.
- [104] Z. Liu *et al.*, “Computer vision-based concrete crack detection using u-net fully convolutional networks,” *Automation in Construction*, vol. 104, pp. 129–139, 2019.
- [105] X. Sun *et al.*, “DMA-Net: Deeplab with multi-scale attention for pavement crack segmentation,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 23, no. 10, pp. 18 392–18 403, 2022.
- [106] L.-C. Chen *et al.*, “Encoder-decoder with atrous separable convolution for semantic image segmentation,” in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2018, pp. 801–818.
- [107] O. Al-maqtari *et al.*, “Lightweight yet effective: A modular approach to crack segmentation,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, pp. 1–12, 2024.
- [108] H. Liu *et al.*, “Crackformer: Transformer network for fine-grained crack detection,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 2021, pp. 3783–3792.
- [109] H. Liu, J. Yang *et al.*, “Crackformer network for pavement crack segmentation,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 24, no. 9, pp. 9240–9252, 2023.
- [110] J. Fang *et al.*, “External attention based transunet and label expansion strategy for crack detection,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 23, no. 10, pp. 19 054–19 063, 2022.
- [111] S. Xiao *et al.*, “Pavement crack detection with hybrid-window attentive vision transformers,” *International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation*, vol. 116, p. 103172, 2023.
- [112] E. A. Shamsabadi *et al.*, “Vision transformer-based autonomous crack detection on asphalt and concrete surfaces,” *Automation in Construction*, vol. 140, p. 104316, 2022.
- [113] W. Wang and C. Su, “Automatic concrete crack segmentation model based on transformer,” *Automation in Construction*, vol. 139, p. 104275, 2022.
- [114] J. Chen *et al.*, “Transunet: Transformers make strong encoders for medical image segmentation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.04306*, 2021.
- [115] J. Guan *et al.*, “Automated pixel-level pavement distress detection based on stereo vision and deep learning,” *Automation in Construction*, vol. 129, p. 103788, 2021.
- [116] S. Zhou and W. Song, “Crack segmentation through deep convolutional neural networks and heterogeneous image fusion,” *Automation in Construction*, vol. 125, p. 103605, 2021.
- [117] J. Yu *et al.*, “Unsupervised pixel-level road defect detection via adversarial image-to-frequency transform,” in *2020 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1708–1713.
- [118] W. Wang and C. Su, “Semi-supervised semantic segmentation network for surface crack detection,” *Automation in Construction*, vol. 128, p. 103786, 2021.
- [119] Y. Ouali *et al.*, “Semi-supervised semantic segmentation with cross-consistency training,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2020, pp. 12 674–12 684.
- [120] Z. Al-Huda *et al.*, “Weakly supervised pavement crack semantic segmentation based on multi-scale object localization and incremental

- annotation refinement,” *Applied Intelligence*, vol. 53, no. 11, pp. 14 527–14 546, 2023.
- [121] S. M. Pizer, “Contrast-limited adaptive histogram equalization: Speed and effectiveness stephen m. pizer, r. eugene johnston, james p. ericksen, bonnie c. yankaskas, keith e. muller medical image display research group,” in *Proceedings of the first conference on visualization in biomedical computing, Atlanta, Georgia*, vol. 337, 1990, p. 2.
- [122] Z. Dong *et al.*, “Patch-based weakly supervised semantic segmentation network for crack detection,” *Construction and Building Materials*, vol. 258, p. 120291, 2020.
- [123] J. König *et al.*, “Weakly-supervised surface crack segmentation by generating pseudo-labels using localization with a classifier and thresholding,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 23, no. 12, pp. 24 083–24 094, 2022.
- [124] B. Zhou *et al.*, “Learning deep features for discriminative localization,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2016, pp. 2921–2929.
- [125] P. Krähenbühl and V. Koltun, “Efficient inference in fully connected crfs with gaussian edge potentials,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 24, 2011.
- [126] N. Otsu *et al.*, “A threshold selection method from gray-level histograms,” *Automatica*, vol. 11, no. 285–296, pp. 23–27, 1975.
- [127] M. Maguire *et al.*, “Sdnet2018: A concrete crack image dataset for machine learning applications,” 2018.
- [128] W. Tang *et al.*, “An iteratively optimized patch label inference network for automatic pavement distress detection,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 23, no. 7, pp. 8652–8661, 2021.
- [129] D. Arya *et al.*, “Rdd2020: An annotated image dataset for automatic road damage detection using deep learning,” *Data in brief*, vol. 36, p. 107133, 2021.
- [130] D. Arya, H. Maeda *et al.*, “Rdd2022: A multi-national image dataset for automatic road damage detection,” *Geoscience Data Journal*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 846–862, 2024.
- [131] Q. Zou *et al.*, “Cracktree: Automatic crack detection from pavement images,” *Pattern Recognition Letters*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 227–238, 2012.
- [132] Ç. F. Özgenel, “Concrete crack segmentation dataset,” *Mendeley Data*, vol. 1, p. 2019, 2019.
- [133] L. Fan *et al.*, “Pavement defect detection with deep learning: A comprehensive survey,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 2023.
- [134] Z. Huang *et al.*, “Nha12d: A new pavement crack dataset and a comparison study of crack detection algorithms,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01198*, 2022.
- [135] C. Yu *et al.*, “Bisenet: Bilateral segmentation network for real-time semantic segmentation,” in *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, 2018, pp. 325–341.
- [136] H. Zhao *et al.*, “Pyramid scene parsing network,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 2881–2890.
- [137] Y. Wang *et al.*, “Lednet: A lightweight encoder-decoder network for real-time semantic segmentation,” in *2019 IEEE international conference on image processing (ICIP)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1860–1864.
- [138] H. Li *et al.*, “Sccdnet: A pixel-level crack segmentation network,” *Applied Sciences*, vol. 11, no. 11, p. 5074, 2021.
- [139] N. Xu *et al.*, “Crack-att net: Crack detection based on improved u-net with parallel attention,” *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, vol. 82, no. 27, pp. 42 465–42 484, 2023.
- [140] P. Manjunatha *et al.*, “Crackdenselinknet: a deep convolutional neural network for semantic segmentation of cracks on concrete surface images,” *Structural Health Monitoring*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 796–817, 2024.
- [141] D. Tabernik *et al.*, “Automated detection and segmentation of cracks in concrete surfaces using joined segmentation and classification deep neural network,” *Construction and Building Materials*, vol. 408, p. 133582, 2023.
- [142] Z. Lu *et al.*, “Lm-net: A light-weight and multi-scale network for medical image segmentation,” *Computers in Biology and Medicine*, vol. 168, p. 107717, 2024.
- [143] Z. Xu *et al.*, “Scnet: Single-branch cnn with transformer semantic information for real-time segmentation,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 38, no. 6, 2024, pp. 6378–6386.
- [144] B. Dong *et al.*, “Head-free lightweight semantic segmentation with linear transformer,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 37, no. 1, 2023, pp. 516–524.
- [145] M. Eisenbach *et al.*, “How to get pavement distress detection ready for deep learning? a systematic approach,” in *2017 international joint conference on neural networks (IJCNN)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 2039–2047.
- [146] R. Stricker *et al.*, “Improving visual road condition assessment by extensive experiments on the extended gaps dataset,” in *2019 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–8.
- [147] J. Deng *et al.*, “Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database,” in *2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. Ieee, 2009, pp. 248–255.
- [148] I. Goodfellow *et al.*, “Generative adversarial networks,” *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 63, no. 11, pp. 139–144, 2020.
- [149] J. Ho *et al.*, “Denosing diffusion probabilistic models,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, 2020, pp. 6840–6851.
- [150] N. Ravi *et al.*, “Sam 2: Segment anything in images and videos,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00714*, 2024.
- [151] F. Li *et al.*, “Semantic-sam: Segment and recognize anything at any granularity,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.04767*, 2023.

Nachuan Ma is currently pursuing his Ph.D. degree at Tongji University with a research focus on visual perception techniques for autonomous driving.

Zhengfei Song is currently pursuing his B.E. degree at Tongji University with a research focus on computer vision and deep learning.

Qiang Hu is currently pursuing his B.E. degree at Tongji University with a research focus on computer vision techniques for autonomous driving.

Chuang-Wei Liu is currently pursuing his Ph.D. degree at Tongji University with a research focus on computer vision techniques for autonomous driving.

Yu Han is currently pursuing his M.S. degree at Donghua University with a research focus on computer vision.

Yanting Zhang (Member, IEEE) received her Ph.D. degree in the School of Information and Communication Engineering from Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications in 2020. She is currently an Associate Professor in the School of Computer Science and Technology at Donghua University. Her research interests include computer vision and video/image processing.

Rui Fan (Senior Member, IEEE) received his Ph.D. degree in Electrical and Electronic Engineering from the University of Bristol in 2018. He is currently a Full Professor with the College of Electronics & Information Engineering and the Shanghai Research Institute for Intelligent Autonomous Systems at Tongji University. His research interests include computer vision, deep learning, and robotics.

Lihua Xie (Fellow, IEEE) received the Ph.D. degree in Electrical Engineering from the University of Newcastle, Australia, in 1992. Since 1992, he has been a Professor and Director at the Center for Advanced Robotics Technology Innovation in the School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering at Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. Dr. Xie’s research interests include robust control and estimation, networked control systems, multi-agent networks, and unmanned systems.