

RS IMAGE INTERPRETATION FROM A DATA PERSPECTIVE Diversity, Richness, Scalability (DiRS) : On Benchmarking Remote Sensing Image Interpretation

Gui-Song Xia

guisong.xia@whu.edu.cn

School of Computer Science, Wuhan University Institute of Artificial Intelligence, Wuhan University State Key Lab. LIESMARS, Wuhan University

Jun. 1, 2020

Advanced RS Technology



RS technology has significantly improved the earth observation ability.



Applications of RS Images



Interpretation of RS images plays important roles in many real-world applications.



National security



High definition map



Precision agriculture



Smart city



Disaster assessment



Environ. monitoring

Interpretation of RS Images



Current situation: Increasing demands for automatic interpretation



Satellites on-orbit

Variation: difference in spectral, spatial, and temporal properties

Inconsistency: multi-modal, multi-source RS images

Interpretation of RS Images



Current situation: Increasing demands for automatic interpretation



Large volume of images

• Challenge: geometrical shape, textural attribute, structural characteristic ...



Blooming Data-driven methods



Content interpretation: data-driven methods for RS image interpretation.



Motivation



Huge-volume RS images v.s. limited data with labels

- Ever-growing volume of RS images while very few of them are annotated with valuable information.
- The generalization ability of algorithms for RS image interpreting is of great urgency to be strengthened.

Increasing number of datasets with *different purposes and standards*

- Representative and large-scale RS image datasets with accurate annotations are demanded to narrow the gap between algorithm development and real applications.
- There is a **lack of public platforms** for systematic evaluation and fair comparison of different algorithms.



Outline



Research Focus in the Past Decade

- Guidances to Benchmark RS Image Interpretation
- An Example: Million-AID
- Challenges and Perspectives
- Conclusions



A systematic investigation to the literature

- Journals with good reputation: ISPRS J. P&RS, RSE, TGRS ...
- Meta-data for analysis: 5, 827 surveyed articles over the past decade
- Bibliometric analysis: title/topic/keywords ... concerning image interpretation





Meta-data



Bibliometric analysis

Selected journals

Frequency Terms



- Interpretation mainly focus on *classification* tasks (scene, land cover, ...)
- **Change detection**, **segmentation**, and **object detection** occupy prominent positions
- Deep learning and feature extraction play significant roles in RS image interpretation



Available Datasets for Interpretation



11

RS scene classification datasets

| Dataset | #Cat. | #Images per cat. | #Instances | Resolution (m) | Image size | GL/IT/SP | Year |
|--------------------|-------|-------------------|------------|----------------|--|--|------|
| UC-Merced | 21 | 100 | 2,100 | 0.3 | 256×256 | $\times \times \times$ | 2010 |
| WHU-RS19 | 19 | 50 to 61 | 1,013 | up to 0.5 | 600×600 | $\times \times \times$ | 2012 |
| RSSCN7 | 7 | 400 | 2,800 | _ | 400×400 | $\times \times \times$ | 2015 |
| SAT-4 | 4 | 89,963 to 178,034 | 500,000 | 1 to 6 | 28×28 | $\times \times \times$ | 2015 |
| SAT-6 | 6 | 10,262 to 150,400 | 405,000 | 1 to 6 | 28×28 | $\times \times \times$ | 2015 |
| BCS | 2 | 1,438 | 2,876 | _ | 600×600 | $\times \times \checkmark$ | 2015 |
| RSC11 | 11 | ~ 100 | 1,232 | ~ 0.2 | 512×512 | $\times \times \times$ | 2016 |
| SIRI-WHU | 12 | 200 | 2,400 | 2 | 200×200 | $\times \times \times$ | 2016 |
| NWPU-RESISC45 | 45 | 700 | 31,500 | 0.2 to 30 | 256×256 | $\times \times \times$ | 2016 |
| AID | 30 | 220 to 420 | 10,000 | 0.5 to 8 | 600×600 | $\times \times \times$ | 2017 |
| RSI-CB256 | 35 | 198 to 1,331 | 24,000 | 0.3 to 3 | 256×256 | $\times \times \times$ | 2017 |
| RSI-CB128 | 45 | 173 to 1,550 | 36,000 | 0.3 to 3 | 128×128 | $\times \times \times$ | 2017 |
| Planet-UAS | 17 | _ | 40,480 | 3 to 5 | 256×256 | \checkmark \checkmark \checkmark | 2017 |
| RSD46-WHU | 46 | 500 to 3,000 | 117,000 | 0.5 to 2 | 256×256 | $\times \times \times$ | 2017 |
| MASATI | 7 | 304 to 1,789 | 7,389 | _ | 512×512 | $\times \times \times$ | 2018 |
| EuroSAT | 10 | 2,000 to 3,000 | 27,000 | 10 | 64×64 | \checkmark \checkmark \checkmark | 2018 |
| PatternNet | 38 | 800 | 30,400 | 0.06 to 4.7 | 256×256 | $\times \times \times$ | 2018 |
| fMoW | 62 | _ | 132,716 | 0.5 | 74×58 to $16,184 \times 16,288$ | \checkmark \checkmark \checkmark | 2018 |
| WiDS Datathon 2019 | 2 | _ | 20,000 | 3 | 256×256 | $\times \times \times$ | 2019 |
| Optimal-31 | 31 | 60 | 1,860 | _ | 256×256 | $\times \times \times$ | 2019 |
| BigEarthNet | 43 | 328 to 217,119 | 590,326 | 10,20,60 | $20 \times 20;60 \times 60;120 \times 120$ | \checkmark \checkmark \checkmark | 2019 |
| CLRS | 25 | 600 | 15,000 | 0.26 to 8.85 | 256×256 | $\times \times \times$ | 2020 |
| MLRSN | 46 | 1,500 to 3,000 | 109,161 | 0.1 to 10 | 256×256 | $\times \times \times$ | 2020 |

RS object detection datasets

| Datasets | Annot. | #Cat. | #Instances | #Images | Resolution (m) | Image width | GL/IT/SP | Year |
|---------------------------------|---------|-------|----------------|---------|-------------------|-----------------|------------------------|------|
| TAS | HBB | 1 | 1,319 | 30 | 20 -0 | 792 | ××× | 2008 |
| OIRDS | OBB | 5 | 1,800 | 900 | up to 0.08 | 256 to 640 | ~ ~ ~ | 2009 |
| SZTAKI-INRIA | OBB | 1 | 665 | 9 | | ~ 800 | ××× | 2012 |
| NWPU-VHR10 | HBB | 10 | 3,651 | 800 | 0.08 to 2 | $\sim 1,000$ | $\times \times \times$ | 2014 |
| DLR-MVDA | OBB | 2 | 14,235 | 20 | 0.13 | 5,616 | ××✓ | 2015 |
| UCAS-AOD | OBB | 2 | 14,596 | 1,510 | | $\sim 1,000$ | ××× | 2015 |
| VEDAI | OBB | 9 | 3,640 | 1,210 | 0.125 | 512;1,024 | < × × | 2016 |
| COWC | CP | 1 | 32,716 | 53 | 0.15 | 2,000 to 19,000 | <×× | 2016 |
| HRSC2016 | OBB | 26 | 2,976 | 1,061 | 10-00 | $\sim 1,100$ | $\times \times \times$ | 2016 |
| RSOD | HBB | 4 | 6,950 | 976 | 0.3 to 3 | $\sim 1,000$ | $\times \times \times$ | 2017 |
| CARPK | HBB | 1 | 89,777 | 1,448 | 10 | 1,280 | ××✓ | 2017 |
| SSDD/SSDD+ | HBB/OBB | 1 | 2,456 | 1,160 | 1 to 15 | \sim 500 | ××✓ | 2017 |
| SpaceNet1-6* | Polygon | 1 | 859,982 | | up to 0.3 | | ~ ~ ~ | 2018 |
| LEVIR | HBB | 3 | 11,028 | 22,000 | 0.2 to 1 | 800 | ××× | 2018 |
| VisDrone | HBB | 10 | 54,200 | 10,209 | 11 11 | 2,000 | $\times \times \times$ | 2018 |
| xView | HBB | 60 | 1,000,000 | 1,413 | 0.3 | $\sim 3,000$ | ~×~ | 2018 |
| DOTA-v1.0 | OBB | 15 | 188,282 | 2,806 | up to 0.3 | 800 to 13,000 | $\times \times \times$ | 2018 |
| ITCVD | HBB | 1 | 29,088 | 173 | 0.1 | 3,744;5,616 | ××× | 2018 |
| WHU building dataset | Polygon | 1 | 221,107 | 25,420 | 0.075 to 2.7 | 512 | ××× | 2018 |
| DeepGlobe Building | Polygon | 2 | 302,701 | 24,586 | 0.3 | 650 | ××✓ | 2018 |
| OpenSARShip | Chip | 1 | 11,346 | 41 | ~ 10 | | ~ ~ ~ | 2018 |
| CrowdAI Mapping Challenge | Polygon | 1 | 2,910,917 | 341,058 | | 300 | $\times \times \times$ | 2018 |
| Airbus Ship Detection Challenge | Polygon | 1 | $\sim 131,000$ | 208,162 | 20. | 768 | ××× | 2018 |
| iSAID | Polygon | 15 | 655,451 | 2,806 | up to 0.3 | 800 to 4,000 | ××× | 2019 |
| HRRSD | HBB | 13 | 55,740 | 21,761 | 0.15 to 1.2 | 152 to 10,569 | $\times \times \times$ | 2019 |
| DIOR | HBB | 20 | 192,472 | 23,463 | 0.5 to 30 | 800 | ××× | 2019 |
| DOTA-v1.5 | OBB | 16 | 402,089 | 2,806 | up to 0.3 | 800 to 13,000 | $\times \times \times$ | 2019 |
| SAR-Ship-Dataset | HBB | 1 | 5,9535 | 43,819 | up to 3 | 256 | ××✓ | 2019 |
| AIR-SARShip | HBB | 1 | 2,040 | 300 | 1;3 | 1,000 | ~ ~ ~ | 2020 |
| HRSID | HBB | 1 | 16,951 | 5,604 | 0.5;1;3 | 800 | ××✓ | 2020 |
| RarePlanes | Polygon | 1 | 644,258 | 50,253 | 0.3 | | ~×~ | 2020 |
| DOTA-v2.0 | OBB | 18 | 1,793,658 | 11,268 | up to 0.3 | 800 to 20,000 | ××× | 2020 |

Available Datasets for Interpretation



RS *semantic segmentation* datasets

| Datasets | #Cat. | #Images | Resolution (m) | #Channels | Image size | GL/IT/SP | Year |
|------------------------------------|-------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|--|------------------------|------|
| Kennedy Space Center | 13 | 1 | 18 | 224 | 512×614 | XVV | 2005 |
| Botswana | 14 | 1 | 30 | 242 | $1,476 \times 256$ | XXX | 2005 |
| Salinas | 16 | 1 | 3.7 | 224 | 512×217 | ××✓ | |
| University of Pavia | 9 | 1 | 1.3 | 115 | 610×340 | ××✓ | |
| Pavia Centre | 9 | 1 | 1.3 | 115 bands | $1,096 \times 492$ | ××✓ | |
| ISPRS Vaihingen | 6 | 33 | 0.09 | IR,R,G,DSM,nDSM | $\sim 2,500 \times 2,500$ | ××✓ | 2012 |
| ISPRS Potsdam | 6 | 38 | 0.05 | IR,RGB,DSM,nDSM | 6,000×6,000 | ~×~ | 2012 |
| Massachusetts Buildings | 2 | 151 | 1 | RGB | $1,500 \times 1,500$ | < < × | 2013 |
| Massachusetts Roads | 2 | 1,171 | 1 | RGB | $1,500 \times 1,500$ | < < × | 2013 |
| Indian Pines | 16 | 1 | 20 | 224 | 145×145 | ~ ~ ~ | 2015 |
| Zurich Summer | 8 | 20 | 0.62 | NIR, RGB | $1,000 \times 1,150$ | ~ ~ ~ | 2015 |
| SPARCS Validation | 7 | 80 | 30 | 11 | $1,000 \times 1,000$ | ~ ~ ~ | 2016 |
| Biome | 4 | 96 | 30 | 11 | $\sim 9,000 \times 9,000$ | ~ ~ ~ | 2017 |
| Inria | 2 | 360 | 0.3 | RGB | $5,000 \times 5,000$ | $\times \times \times$ | 2017 |
| EvLab-SS | 10 | 60 | 0.1 to 2 | RGB | $4,500 \times 4,500$ | ××✓ | 2017 |
| RIT-18 | 18 | 3 | 0.047 | 6 | 9,000×6,000 | ~ ~ ~ | 2017 |
| CITY-OSM | 3 | 1,671 | 0.1 | RGB | $2,500 \times 2,500$ to $3,300 \times 3,300$ | $\times \times \times$ | 2017 |
| Dstl-SIFD* | 10 | 57 | up to 0.3 | up to 16 | \sim 3,350×3,400 | ~×~ | 2017 |
| IEEE GRSS Data Fusion Contest 2017 | 17 | 30 | 1.4 | 9 | 643×666;374×515 | ~ ~ ~ | 2017 |
| IEEE GRSS Data Fusion Contest 2018 | 20 | 1 | 1 | 48 | $4,172 \times 1,202$ | ~ ~ ~ | 2018 |
| Aeroscapes | 11 | 3,269 | | RGB | $720 \times 1,280$ | $\times \times \times$ | 2018 |
| DLRSD | 17 | 2.100 | 0.3 | RGB | 256×256 | $\times \times \times$ | 2018 |
| DeepGlobe Land Cover | 7 | 1,146 | 0.5 | RGB | $2,448 \times 2,448$ | ××✓ | 2018 |
| So2Sat LCZ42 | 17 | 400.673 | 10 | 10 | 32×32 | <×× | 2019 |
| SEN12MS | 33 | 180,662 triplets | 10 to 50 | up to 13 | 256×256 | <×< | 2019 |
| 95-Cloud | 1 | 43,902 | 30 | NIR,RGB | 384×384 | ~×~ | 2019 |
| Shakeel et al. | 1 | 2,682 | 0.3 | RGB | 300×300 | $\times \times \times$ | 2019 |
| ALCD Cloud Masks | 8 | 38 | 10 | RGB | $1,830 \times 1,830$ | ~ ~ ~ | 2019 |
| SkyScapes | 31 | 16 | 0.13 | RGB | 5,616×3,744 | $\times \times \times$ | 2019 |
| DroneDeploy | 7 | 55 | 0.1 | RGB | up to 12,039×13,854 | $\times \times \times$ | 2019 |
| Slovenia LULC | 10 | 940 | 10 | 6 | 5.000×5.000 | ~ ~ ~ | 2019 |
| LandCoverNet | 7 | 1.980 | 10 | NIR.RGB | 256×256 | ~ ~ ~ | 2020 |
| UAVid | 8 | 420 | _ | RGB | $\sim 4.000 \times 2.160$ | ××✓ | 2020 |
| GID | 15 | 150 | 0.8 to 10 | 4 | 6.800×7.200 | ~ ~ ~ | 2020 |
| LandCover.ai | 3 | 41 | 0.25.0.5 | RGB | $9,000 \times 9,500; 4,200 \times 4,700$ | <×× | 2020 |
| Agriculture-Vision | 9 | 94,986 | 0.1:0.15:0.2 | NIR.RGB | 512×512 | XXX | 2020 |
| S2CMC* | 18 | 513 | 20 | 13 | $1,024 \times 1,024$ | ~ ~ ~ | 2020 |

RS change detection datasets

| Datasets | #Cat. | #Image pairs | Resolution (m) | #Channels | Image size | GL/IT/SP | Year |
|-------------------------------|-------|--------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|
| SZTAKI AirChange | 2 | 13 | 1.5 | RGB | 952×640 | \times \checkmark \times | 2009 |
| AICD | 2 | 1,000 | 0.5 | 115 | 800×600 | $\times \times \times$ | 2011 |
| Taizhou Data | 4 | 1 | 30 | 6 | 400×400 | ~ ~ ~ | 2014 |
| Kunshan Data | 3 | 1 | 30 | 6 | 800×800 | ~ ~ ~ | 2014 |
| Cross-sensor Bastrop | 2 | 4 | 30,120 | 7,9 | $444 \times 300; 1,534 \times 808$ | ~ ~ ~ | 2015 |
| MtS-WH | 9 | 1 | 1 | NIR, RGB | $7,200 \times 6,000$ | ~ ~ ~ | 2017 |
| Yancheng | 4 | 2 | 30 | 242 | 400×145 | ~ ~ ~ | 2018 |
| GETNET dataset | 2 | 1 | 30 | 198 | 463×241 | XVV | 2018 |
| Urban-rural boundary of Wuhan | 20 | 1 | 4/30 | 4, 9 | 960×960 | ~ ~ ~ | 2018 |
| Hermiston City, Oregon | 5 | 1 | 30 | 242 | 390×200 | ~ ~ ~ | 2018 |
| OSCD | 2 | 24 | 10 | 13 | 600×600 | ~ ~ ~ | 2018 |
| WHU building dataset | 2 | 1 | 0.2 | RGB | $32,507 \times 15,354$ | ~ ~ ~ | 2018 |
| Season-varing dataset | 2 | 16,000 | 0.03 to 0.1 | RGB | 256×256 | $\times \times \times$ | 2018 |
| ABCD | 2 | 16,950 | 0.4 | RGB | $128 \times 128;160 \times 160$ | \times \checkmark \times | 2018 |
| California flood dataset | 2 | 1 | 5,30 | RGB ,11 | 1534×808 | ~ ~ ~ | 2019 |
| López-Fandiño et al. | 5 | 2 | 20 | 224 | $984 \times 740;\ 600 \times 500$ | XVV | 2019 |
| xBD | 6 | 11,034 | up to 0.8 | RGB | $1,024 \times 1,024$ | ~ ~ ~ | 2019 |
| HRSCD | 6 | 291 | 0.5 | RGB | $10,000 \times 10,000$ | ~ ~ ~ | 2019 |
| LEVIR-CD | 2 | 637 | 0.5 | RGB | $1,024 \times 1,024$ | $\times \times \times$ | 2020 |
| SECOND | 30 | 4,214 | 0.5 to 3 | RGB | 512×512 | $\times \times \times$ | 2020 |
| Google Dataset | 2 | 1,067 | 0.55 | RGB | 256×256 | < < × | 2020 |
| Zhang et al. | 2 | 4 | 2;2.4;5.8 | NIR, RGB | 1,431×1,431; 458×559; 1,154×740 | ~ ~ ~ | 2020 |
| Hi-UCD | 9 | 1,293 | 0.1 | RGB | $1,024 \times 1,024$ | _/_/Y | 2020 |
| SpaceNet7 | _ | 24 | 4 | RGB | _ | ~ ~ ~ | 2020 |
| S2MTCP | 2 | 1,520 | up to 10 | 13 | 600×600 | ~ ~ ~ | 2021 12 |

Some Critical Reviews



Categories involved in interpretation

- **Small number** of categories, content interpretation for **specific objects**
- Categories with *equal relationship*, chaotic management for semantic information
- Complex semantic categories and relationships in real applications, e.g., LULC

Dataset annotation

- Nearly all manually annotated by experts, extensive labor remains to relieve
- Visualization for large scale, hyperspectral RS images annotation is demanded
- **Few from** application departments





NPWU VHR, 800 images, manually annotated



Image source

- Optical images (Google Earth) as data standard since spatial pattern, visual texture, structural information are more concerned (e.g., for scene/object recognition)
- Hyperspectral, SAR images for abnormal object detection by the physical property

Dataset scale

- Limited number, small image patches, performance saturation
- Lack of image variation, sample diversity, and content representation
- weak generalization ability of interpretation algorithms



Multi-modal image source



Simple scenes and complex reality



Outline

Background

Research Focus in the Past Decade

Guidances to Benchmark RS Image Interpretation

An Example: Million-AID

Challenges and Perspectives

Conclusions

Guidances to Benchmark RS II



Alaorithm

Toward real-world scenarios *rather than specific algorithms*

- Model training, testing, and screening for practical applications
- Rich samples with variation in background, scale, imaging conditions, ...

Annotation by application sides rather than algorithm developers

Label images and samples considering practical challenges in applications

Algorithm





Images



DiRS for dataset construction

- **Diversity:** between-/within-class diversity, complementarity of features
- *Richness*: large-scale images, sufficient samples, diverse characteristics
- Scalability: sufficient space for data augmentation, sustainable availability



Geographic Information Integration



Coordinates Collection for RS Image Acquisition

Geographic information utilization

- Rich positional data with millions of point, line, and region objects
- Inherent semantic tags for images of interest, image acquisition by Map API



Searched baseball fields using Google Map API

Geographic Information Integration



Coordinates Collection for RS Image Acquisition

Open source data

- Geographic data with rich semantic information that is timely updated, low-cost and with large amount, e.g., OSM, WikiMapia ...
- Excellent interface for data customization, information aligned with different maps



Elements of interest extracted from OSM

Geographic Information Integration



Coordinates Collection for RS Image Acquisition

Geodatabase integration

- Public geodatabases released by state institutions and communities
- Domain-specific geodatabase that is publicly available



Public geodatabases available for image coordinates collection



Manual Annotation

- Quality guarantee, but labor-intensive and time-consuming
- Hard to meet the scale requirements particularly for data-driven methods

Automatic Annotation

- Reduce the cost of annotation by leveraging learning models
- Bias problem deriving from the initialized data and model capability



Annotated samples



Interactive Annotation

- Annotation with human-computer interaction, semi-automatic annotation
- Guarantee for quality and efficiency, toward large-scale dataset construction



General workflow of Semi-automatic annotation in RS images



- **Rules and Samples:** annotation without ambiguity, specific samples for instructions
- **Training of Annotators:** well-qualified annotators for quality guarantee
- Multi-stage Pipeline: annotation task decomposition
- **Grading and Reward:** mechanism for incompetent/competent annotators
- Multiple Annotations: merge multiple annotations
- Annotation Review: expert/peer review and quality rating
- Spot Check and Assessment: gold data for annotation quality assurance



Outline

Background

Research Focus in the Past Decade

Guidances to Benchmark RS Image Interpretation

An Example: Million-AID

Challenges and Perspectives

Conclusions



Scene Classification

- High-level knowledge expression to RS image contents
- Semantic information recognition to local areas of RS images





Category Organization

Chinese Land Use Classification Criteria





The hierarchical scene category network of Million-AID

8 major categories with 51 sub-categories



Semantic Coordinates Collection

Point coordinates obtained by Google Map API



The points of searched tennis courts shown in Google Earth. We consider the tennis courts as point ground features and the Google Map API is employed for coordinates collection.



Semantic Coordinates Collection

Point coordinates integrated from Geodatabase



The points of wind turbines extracted from USWTDB and integrated in Google Earth. Over 60, 000 objects of wind turbines can be collected from the database.



Semantic Coordinates Collection

Line features extracted from OSM



The river lines within a local area of China collected from OSM and displayed in Google Earth.



Semantic Coordinates Collection

Plane features customized on OSM



The illustration of searching scenes of airports around the world. An airport in OSM contains a large amount of semantic tags, which can be employed to search it with specific key-value attributes.



- Scene Image Acquisition
 - Image block produced by line, point, and plane data



The acquisition of RS scene images based on the collected geographic point, line and area data. **Points**: centers of scene blocks. **Lines**: sampled by intervals. **Planes**: sampled by mesh grids.



A Glimpse of Comparison

Million-AID: DiRS, better approximate real applications



- ➤ Categories: 21
- ➢ Image size: 256x256
- Resolution: ~ 0.3m
- Number of images: 2100



- ➤ Categories: 19
- ➢ Image size: 600x600
- Resolution: 0.2 ~ 10m
- ➢ Number of images: 950



- Categories: 51
- Image size: 110~30,000
- \succ Resolution: 0.2 ~ 153m
- > Number of images: 1M



Outline

Background

- Research Focus in the Past Decade
- Guidances to Benchmark RS Image Interpretation
- An Example: Million-AID
- Challenges and Perspectives
- Conclusions

Challenges and Perspectives



How to speed up the annotation process?

Visualization technology for RS image Annotation

- Hyperspectral images: band selection, dimension reduction, clustering?...
- *Large-scale images:* how to display?
- **SAR images:** images/signal expression with physical means?

Annotation Efficiency

- Annotation tools: professional tools for RS image annotation
- Noisy annotations: noise cleansing, performance impact, noise tolerant algorithms
- **Cooperation with application departments:** from production data to benchmarks?



Speed up the annotation process

Annotation tools for image dataset construction

| No. | Name | Year | Description |
|-----|---|------|---|
| 1 | LabelMe | 2008 | An online image annotation tool that supports various annotation primitives, including polygon, rectangle, circle, line and point. |
| 2 | Video Annotation Tool from Irvine, California (VATIC) | 2012 | An online tool that efficiently scaling up video annotation with crowdsourced marketplaces (<i>e.g.</i> , AMT). |
| 3 | LabelImg | 2015 | A popular graphical image annotation application that labels objects in images with bounding boxes. |
| 4 | Visual Object Tagging Tool (VOTT) | 2017 | An open source annotation and labeling tool for image and video assets, extensible for importing/exporting data to local or cloud storage providers, including Azure Blob Storage and Bing Image Search. |
| 5 | Computer Vision Annotation Tool (CVAT) | 2018 | A universal data annotation approach for both individuals and teams, supporting large-scale semantic annotation for scene classification, object detection and image segmentation. |
| 6 | Image Tagger 20 | | An open source online platform to create and manage image data and diverse labels (<i>e.g.</i> , bounding box, polygon, line and point), with friendly support for collaborative image labeling. |
| 7 | Polygon RNN++ | 2018 | A deep learning-based annotation strategy, producing polygonal annotation of objects segmentation interactively using humans-in-the-loop. |
| 8 | Makesence.AI | 2019 | An open source and online image annotation platform, using different artificial model to give recommendations as well as automate repetitive and tedious labeling activities. |
| 9 | VGG Image Annotator (VIA) | 2019 | A simple and standalone manual annotation software for image and video, providing rich labels like point, line, polygon as well as circle and ellipse without project management. |



Outline

Background

- Research Focus in the Past Decade
- Guidances to Benchmark RS Image Interpretation
- An Example: Million-AID
- Challenges and Perspectives

Conclusions



A review of annotated datasets for RS image interpretation

- Covering literature published over the past decade
- A systematic review of the existing RS image datasets concerning the current mainstream of RS image interpretation tasks

Guidances to build RS image benchmarks

- DiRS: on creating benchmark datasets for RS image interpretation
- A picture of coordinates collection, methodology for RS image dataset construction

An example for dataset construction : Million-AID

• A large-scale benchmark dataset for RS image scene classification





FANKS 导翻题



School of Computer Science, Wuhan University Institute of Artificial Intelligence, Wuhan University State Key Lab. LIESMARS, Wuhan University Gui-Song Xia (guisong.xia@whu.edu.cn)