

University of Nottingham

> Data-Hungry Models: Deep Learning of Phenotypes in Crop Plants

Dr. Michael Pound University of Nottingham



## Introduction

- Deep learning for fast and accurate recovery of plant traits
  - Traits drive downstream tasks
- Case studies from my work and our lab:
  - Classification
  - Segmentation
  - Localisation
- Recent work in techniques for more challenging images
- Some thoughts about where we go from here over the next few years





### **About Us**

- We use image-analysis, machine learning and deep learning to drive research in Bioscience
- We focus on the development of new techniques and deep network architectures
- My research often focuses on segmentation and object localisation





# **Capturing Plant Traits - An Example Problem**

### RootNav

- In 2014 we released RootNav
- Aims to quickly quantify 2D root images in a variety of growth conditions
- Accuracy is a primary focus

 High-throughput root traits can inform modelling approaches, as well as drive genomic studies such as GWAS and QTL





# An Example Problem - RootNav

- RootNav is semi-automatic
- Usually users must identify root tips themselves







## **Representation Learning**

- Deep learning has the potential to automate many of these detection processes
- Convolutional networks use convolution and pooling layers learn a feature representation
- A final neural network makes a decision based on these features





## Shoot and Root Features

### Classification of shoot and root features





## Shoot and Root Features

Accuracy of the classifier is very high, with all classes >95%



Feature	<b>Correctly Classified</b>	Misclassified	Accuracy (%)
Root Tip	2904	73	97.5
Root Negative	5687	65	98.9
Total/Average	8591	138	98.4



Feature	Correctly Classified	Misclassified	Accuracy (%)
Leaf Tip	2225	113	95.2
Leaf Base	2299	52	97.8
Ear Tip	686	15	97.9
Ear Base	765	23	97.1
Shoot Negative	6110	136	97.8
Total/Average	12085	339	97.3



## Localisation

- Use a sliding window approach
- We identified 12 of 14 root QTLs previously identified manually
- Useful features but noisy





Deep machine learning provides state-of-the-art performance in image-based plant phenotyping. Gigascience 2017





# 2D output - > segmentation, regression

- A sliding window does not enforce consistency between neighbouring pixels or regions
- Encoder-decoder networks are designed to return 2D output



# 2D Segmentation

### RootNav 2

 Automatic segmentation of roots, and localisation of tips and seed locations



RootNav 2.0: Deep learning for automatic navigation of complex plant root architectures. GigaScience 2019





# Transfer Learning

- Transfer learning to refine a network to new image types
- Our original dataset was 3000 images, this one is 200 images





# Multi-task Learning

 Heatmap regression to predict both the locations of spikes (spike tips) and the individual spikelets



Multi-task classification of awned phenotypes



## **Multi-task Learning**



Spike counting: 95%

Spikelet counting: 99%

Awn identification: 99%

Deep Learning for Multi-task Plant Phenotyping. ICCVW 2017

mpnd.uk/iccv17



# **Other Applications**

 On large images the approach can easily be run on smaller tiles









### Harder Images

 Many standard techniques are based on common image datasets, more challenging data can pose a problem





- Common to split an image into smaller tiles, and process these sequentially
- This often loses context







- We save memory by splitting an image into small manageable tiles
- We restore context by sharing information between tiles







36% Memory

27% Memory



#### Standard network vs a tiled approach

	Accuracy		VRAM (GB)	
DeepLab V3+	Val (%)	<b>Test</b> (%)	Train	Test
Standard	76.2	75.6	1.94 (1.0)	1.18 (1.0)
XT(ours)	75.0	74.1	0.70 (0.361)	1.00 (0.847)
Tiled(ours)	74.7	72.7	0.69 (0.356)	0.95 (0.805)

#### Tile size performance

Tile Size	<b>Dice</b> (%)	Resolution	Train VRAM (GB)
No tiling	81.6	$1024 \times 1024$	8.43
$512 \times 512 \text{ XT}$	81.6	$1024 \times 1024$	3.31
$256 \times 256 \text{ XT}$	79.8	$1024 \times 1024$	2.52
$128 \times 128 \text{ XT}$	78.0	$1024 \times 1024$	2.32
$512 \times 512 \text{ XT}$	80.5	$2048 \times 2048$	7.70
$256 \times 256 \text{ XT}$	78.6	$2048 \times 2048$	6.41
$512 \times 512 \mathrm{XT}$	-	$3072 \times 3072$	-
$256 \times 256 \text{ XT}$	78.0	$3072 \times 3072$	11.9

# Higher Dimensions – Xray µCT







Ground Truth

Fine Detail

Larger Receptive Field



## Xray µCT

- The network jointly learns two input resolutions
- In essence this is another multi-task learning approach

Low Resolution Branch



*Three dimensional root CT segmentation using multi-resolution encoder-decoder networks. IEEE Transactions on Image Processing 2020* 





### Xray µCT

- Multi-resolution benefits from both views
- Hard negative mining further increases performance











### **Current Challenges**

- Modern computer vision and deep learning is not without its problems – particularly in challenging areas like Bioimaging
- Annotation is time consuming
- Bioimages are often much larger (spatial / dimensions) than CNNs are designed for
- Hardware cost is still a barrier for entry at least for training
- The problem of generality



### **Data Annotation**

- Many tools exist for fast data annotation but they tend to be quite general and slower for specific tasks
  - Unsupervised learning avoids annotation
  - Active learning reduces annotation time
  - Gaze-based solutions for easier annotation
  - Synthetic data for training





### **Data Annotation**

- Many tools exist for fast data annotation but they tend to be quite general and slower for specific tasks
  - Unsupervised learning avoids annotation
  - Active learning reduces annotation time
  - Gaze-based solutions for easier annotation
  - Synthetic data for training





### **Data Annotation**

- Many tools exist for fast data annotation but they tend to be quite general and slower for specific tasks
  - Unsupervised learning avoids annotation
  - Active learning reduces annotation time
  - Gaze-based solutions for easier annotation
  - Synthetic data for training





### **Data Annotation**

- Many tools exist for fast data annotation but they tend to be quite general and slower for specific tasks
  - Unsupervised learning avoids annotation
  - Active learning reduces annotation time
  - Gaze-based solutions for easier annotation
  - Synthetic data for training



*Giuffrida et al., ARIGAN: Synthetic Arabidopsis Plants using Generative Adversarial Networks. ICCVW 2017* 



### **Training on Challenging Data**

- Bioscience has an abundance of hard data problems
- Larger images require more computational resources, and become a barrier for entry and reproducibility
- Problem areas are volumetric and multi/hyperspectral

- Techniques exist to make trained networks efficient during inference
- Efficient training has seen very little work most are case specific





### **Data and Model Sharing - Generalisability**

- Deep learning still has a problem of generalisation
  - Models trained on one dataset will likely lose accuracy on another
  - Lab to field often requires retraining
- Large and varied datasets are important
  - Datasets such as the Global Wheat Challenge comprise varied images from around the world
- Providing access to trained models and code is a key part of this research



### Conclusions

- Al is transforming the speed and accuracy of our plant phenotyping efforts
- Deep networks are powerful, but often the best performance comes from new architectures and techniques
- There now must be a renewed focus on collection and annotation of data, and model sharing

michael.pound@nottingham.ac.uk

Acknowledgements **Tony Pridmore** Andrew French Reza Soltaninejad Eze Benson Robail Yasrab Aaron Jackson Darren Wells Jonathan Atkinson Michael Wilson



University of Nottingham

# Many thanks!