# Supplementary Material for Masking Strategies for Background Bias Removal in Computer Vision Models

Ananthu Aniraj<sup>\*1,3,4,5</sup> Cassio F. Dantas<sup>2,3,5</sup> Dino Ienco<sup>2,3,5</sup> Diego Marcos<sup>1,3,4,5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Inria <sup>2</sup>Inrae <sup>3</sup>University of Montpellier <sup>4</sup>LIRMM <sup>5</sup>UMR-Tetis

{ananthu.aniraj, diego.marcos}@inria.fr {cassio.fraga-dantas, dino.ienco}@inrae.fr

#### **1. Binary Segmentation**

### **1.1. Training Details**

We fine-tuned a semantic segmentation model pretrained on the ADE20k [6] dataset on the FG-BG masks provided by the CUB dataset [5].

The training settings are exactly the same as the original Mask2Former paper [1]. We tested models with the ResNet50 and the Swin-Tiny [3] Backbones and trained both models for a total of 16000 epochs with the AdamW [4] optimizer

#### **1.2. Evaluation Metrics**

We used the Mean Dice Score [2] to evaluate the segmentation quality of the FG-BG segmentation models.

The Dice score is calculated using the equation given below.

$$Dice = \frac{2 \times |X \cap Y|}{|X| + |Y|} \tag{1}$$

Here X is the set of predicted pixels of a specific class from a model and Y is the pixels belonging to the ground truth. A higher dice score indicates higher segmentation quality.

#### **1.3. Evaluation Results**

Model	Backbone	CUB(%)		Waterbird(%)	
		BG	Bird	BG	Bird
Mask2Former	Swin-T	99.42	96.05	98.74	91.84
Mask2Former	ResNet50	99.43	96.12	98.72	91.81
Table 1. Evaluation Results - Binary Segmentation					

The results of the evaluation are given in Table 1. From the table, we see that the model generalizes very well to both the in-distribution CUB and OOD Waterbirds test set.

We chose the model with the Swin-Tiny backbone as it performed better overall.

## References

- B. Cheng, I. Misra, A. G. Schwing, A. Kirillov, and R. Girdhar. Masked-attention Mask Transformer for Universal Image Segmentation. In *CVPR*, 2022. 1
- [2] L. R. Dice. Measures of the Amount of Ecologic Association Between Species. *Ecology*, 26(3):297–302, 1945.
- [3] Z. Liu, Y. Lin, Y. Cao, H. Hu, Y. Wei, Z. Zhang, S. Lin, and B. Guo. Swin Transformer: Hierarchical Vision Transformer using Shifted Windows. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 9992–10002, 2021. 1
- [4] I. Loshchilov and F. Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. 7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019, 2019. 1
- [5] P. Welinder, S. Branson, T. Mita, C. Wah, F. Schroff, S. Belongie, and P. Perona. Caltech-UCSD Birds 200. Technical Report CNS-TR-2010-001, California Institute of Technology, 2010. 1
- [6] B. Zhou, H. Zhao, X. Puig, S. Fidler, A. Barriuso, and A. Torralba. Scene parsing through ADE20K dataset. In *Proceedings - 30th IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2017*, volume 2017-Janua, pages 5122– 5130, 2017. 1

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding Author