



**ENHANCEMENT OF INDIVIDUAL LEAF  
SEGMENTATION FROM COMPLEX  
BACKGROUND USING WATERSHED  
TECHNIQUE**

by

**WAN MAHANI BINTI ABDULLAH  
(1240210754)**

A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

**School of Computer & Communication Engineering**

**UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PERLIS**

2018

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I gratefully acknowledge the support and guidance particularly to my supervisor, Associate Professor Dr. Shahrul Nizam Yaakob who shared the excitement of six years of discovery. Without his thoughtful encouragement and careful supervision, this thesis would never have taken shape.

My appreciation also extends to my mentor and my best friend forever. Associate Professor Dr. Farrah Wong's mentoring and encouragement have been especially valuable.

Finally, I extend my deepest thanks to my husband, Anuar Mohd Ariffin and my kids, Aishah, Awatif, Aiman and Aleeya for supporting and helping me survive all the stress from the beginning and not letting me give up. Not forgetting my parents who had never stopped praying everything goes well.

©This item is protected by original copyright

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>THESIS DECLARATION</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENT</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	<b>x</b>
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>xiv</b>
<b>LIST OF SYMBOLS</b>	<b>xv</b>
<b>ABSTRAK</b>	<b>xvii</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>xviii</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Overview	1
1.2 Problem Statement	4
1.3 Objectives	5
1.4 Scope of the Study	6
1.5 Organization of Thesis	6
<b>CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 Introduction	7
2.2 Automatic Leaf Segmentation	11
2.3 Eliminating Non-Green Background	13

2.3.1	Normalised Difference Index	19
2.3.2	Excess Green Index	19
2.3.3	Excess Red Index	20
2.3.4	Colour Index of Vegetation Extraction	21
2.3.5	Excess Green minus Excess Red Index	21
2.4	Leaf segmentation from complex background	22
2.5	Overview of Watershed Algorithm	28
2.5.1	Different Approaches to Watershed Segmentation	29
2.6	Marker-Controlled Watershed Segmentation	35
2.7	Summary	41
<b>CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY</b>		<b>43</b>
3.1	Introduction	43
3.2	Image Acquisition	44
3.3	Pre-processing Leaf Images	46
3.4	Proposed Algorithm for Modified Excess Green Vegetation Index	48
3.4.1	Unsharp Masking Filter	50
3.4.2	HSV Channel Modification	51
3.5	Proposed Modification of Gradient Image Technique	55
3.6	Proposed Algorithm for Marker-Controlled Watershed Transform	61
3.6.1	The Main Idea of the Algorithm	62
3.6.2	Algorithm to Obtain Foreground and Background Marker	64

3.6.3	Watershed Transform	78
3.6.4	Performance Metric	81
3.7	Summary	82
<b>CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b>		<b>85</b>
4.1	Introduction	85
4.2	Image Acquisition	86
4.3	Performance of Modified Excess Green Vegetation Index	87
4.3.1	Image Enhancement	88
4.3.2	HSV Channel Modification	92
4.3.3	Comparison of the Proposed Algorithm against the Vegetation Index-Based Methods.	98
4.4	Performance of Gradient Image Enhancement	101
4.5	Leaf Segmentation	106
4.5.1	Performance of the Proposed Algorithm to Obtain Foreground Marker	106
4.5.2	Performance of Marker-Controlled Watershed Transform	108
4.5.3	Performance Metrics	109
4.5.4	Successful Rate for Leaf Segmentation	111
4.5.5	Comparison of the Proposed Algorithm against the Existing Watershed Segmentation Methods	113
4.5.6	Performance of the Proposed Leaf Segmentation without Modified Excess Green Vegetation Index	123

4.5.7	Performance of the Proposed Leaf Segmentation without Proposed Gradient Enhancement	125
4.5.8	Performance of the Proposed Leaf Segmentation without Proposed Foreground Marker	127
4.6	Summary	130
<b>CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION</b>		<b>135</b>
5.1	Contributions	136
5.1.1	Eliminating Non-Green Background Using Proposed MEGVI for Uneven Illumination Images	135
5.1.2	Enhance the Gradient of Touching and Overlapping Edges Using Proposed Gradient Enhancement Technique	137
5.1.3	Automatically Obtain the Foreground and Background Markers In Order to Improve the Segmentation of Individual Leaf from Complex Background	138
5.2	Future Work	140
5.2.1	Dealing with Critical Uneven Illumination	140
5.2.2	Reduce the Sensitivity to Noise	141
5.2.3	Automatic Leaf Identification	142
5.2.4	Automatic Plant Species Identification	142
5.2.5	Segmentation of Different Types of Image	143
<b>REFERENCES</b>		<b>144</b>
<b>LIST OF PUBLICATIONS</b>		<b>156</b>
<b>APPENDICES</b>		<b>157</b>
A	150 Samples of Leaf	157

B	Comparison of PSNR and MSE for Different Types of Filter for Image Enhancement	159
C	Modified Excess Green Vegetation Index	161
D	Comparison of different techniques of green index method	165
E(i)	Comparison of PSNR and MSE for Various Combination of HSV	167
E(ii)	Comparison of PSNR and MSE for Three Different Types of Gradient Operators	177
F	Comparison of Three Different Types of Gradient Enhancement	179
G(i)	Proposed Marker-Controlled Watershed Segmentation	181
G(ii)	Fresh Leaf Samples And Reference Leaf	185
H(i)	Comparison Between Different Types of Watershed Transform	188
H(ii)	Performance of the Proposed Marker-Controlled Watershed Transform Noise Added – 0.05	192
H(iii)	Performance of the Proposed Marker-Controlled Watershed Transform Noise Added – 0.1	196
I(i)	Performance of the Proposed Marker-Controlled Watershed Transform Without MEGVI	200
I(ii)	Performance of the Proposed Marker-Controlled Watershed Transform Without MEGVI – with Noise Level of 0.05	204
I(iii)	Performance of the Proposed Marker-Controlled Watershed Transform Without MEGVI – with Noise Level of 0.1	208
J(i)	Performance of the Proposed Marker-Controlled Watershed Transform Without Gradient Enhancement	212
J(ii)	Performance Proposed Marker-Controlled Watershed Transform Without Gradient Enhancement – with Noise Level of 0.05	216
J(iii)	Performance of the Proposed Marker-Controlled Watershed Transform Without Gradient Enhancement – with Noise Level of 0.1	220
K(i)	Performance of the Proposed Marker-Controlled Watershed Transform Without Foreground Marker	224
K(ii)	Performance of the Proposed Marker-Controlled Watershed Transform Without Foreground Marker – with Noise Level of 0.05	228

©This item is protected by original copyright

## LIST OF TABLES

		<b>PAGE</b>
Table 2.1	Eliminating non-green background	38
Table 2.2	Leaf segmentation from complex background	39
Table 3.1	The summary of the MSE and PSNR values for different types of equation	59
Table 4.1	MSE and PSNR values for difference types of filters	89
Table 4.2	Performance evaluation of different filter types for image enhancement	89
Table 4.3	Comparison of different method for vegetation index	100
Table 4.4	The MSE and PSNR values of several sample images for leaf with complex background	103
Table 4.5	Performance evaluation of different filter types for gradient	103
Table 4.6	Range of correlation values for good and bad segmentation	112
Table 4.7	The leaf segmentation results by the proposed algorithm	112
Table 4.8	Correlation values for several examples of segmented leaf using four difference watershed segmentation approaches	114
Table 4.9	Results comparison for different watershed segmentation algorithm for leaf segmentation	117
Table 4.10	Comparison of the performance for different values of noise levels	122
Table 4.11	Results comparison for proposed leaf segmentation algorithm without MEGVI	123
Table 4.12	Performance of the proposed leaf segmentation algorithm without proposed gradient enhancement	127
Table 4.13	Results comparison for the proposed leaf segmentation algorithm without proposed foreground marker	128

## LIST OF FIGURES

		<b>PAGE</b>
Figure 2.1	Block diagram for basic process of leaf recognition	9
Figure 2.2	An example of leaf in an ideal image and the segmentation in the binary type; (a) leaf in ideal background, (b) segmentation of image (a) from the background	12
Figure 2.3	Block diagram for common watershed transform used for image extraction	23
Figure 2.4	Basic idea of watershed algorithm	29
Figure 2.5	Example of 1-D approach for watershed algorithm	31
Figure 2.6	Basic concept of watershed transform (Ruparelia, 2012)	32
Figure 2.7	Rainfall watershed approach (Ruparelia, 2012)	33
Figure 2.8	Result of using classical watershed algorithm for segmenting leaf from complex background as original image resulting watershed; (a) and (c) are the original image, (b) and (d) are result using classical watershed algorithm for extracting leaf from complex background	34
Figure 3.1	Block diagram describing the overall process of segmenting leaf from complex background.	45
Figure 3.2	Examples of leaves image with complex background	46
Figure 3.3	Flow Chart of Modified Excess Green Vegetation Index	49
Figure 3.4	A few examples of the greenness extraction for various conditions of Saturation and Value channels	53
Figure 3.5	Sobel Mask for $3 \times 3$ matrix	57
Figure 3.6	Comparison of different types of image for obtaining Gradient Image (a) Greenness Image, (b) Gradient Grayscale Image, (c) Gradient SV Image and (d) Proposed Gradient SV Image	59
Figure 3.7	The proposed algorithm for gradient image enhancement	60
Figure 3.8	Example touching and overlapping leaves (a) Touching leaves. (b) overlapping leaves	64

Figure 3.9	Example of dilation process for gray-scale image	68
Figure 3.10	Example of erosion process for gray-scale image	70
Figure 3.11	Effect applying gray-scale dilation and erosion operations to a simple gray-scale image	71
Figure 3.12	The basic morphological reconstruction process in 1-D (Mathworks, 2017)	73
Figure 3.13	Example of foreground marker obtained from different size of structuring element	75
Figure 3.14	Flow chart for the process to obtain foreground marker	77
Figure 4.1	Examples of images for the leaf segmentation	87
Figure 4.2	Performance evaluation of MSE for different types of filters	90
Figure 4.3	Performance evaluation of different types of filtering for image enhancement	90
Figure 4.4	The performance evaluation of different spatial filtering for image enhancement	91
Figure 4.5	Image obtained after image enhancement for HSV channel; (a) before enhancement and (b) after enhancement	92
Figure 4.6	Results obtained after modification of S and V channel (a) H Channel Image, (b) Modified S Channel Image and (c) Modified V Channel Image	93
Figure 4.7	Results obtained for (a) RGB channel and (b) HSV channel after modification of S and V channel	93
Figure 4.8	Results obtained after normalization (a) Red Channel, (b) Green Channel and (c) Blue Channel	94
Figure 4.9	Results obtained for each RGB channel (a) Red Channel, (b) Green Channel and (c) Blue Channel	94
Figure 4.10	(a) Excess Green image, (b) Excess Red image and (c) MEGVI	95
Figure 4.11	The results after (a) applying Otsu thresholding and (b) small pixels removing	95
Figure 4.12	Results obtained after masking to original image (a) Original image and (b) MEGVI with black background	96

Figure 4.13	Results of MEGVI with black background obtained for several types of leaf	97
Figure 4.14	Comparison between standard Vegetation Index-based techniques and Modified Excess Green Vegetation Index (MEGVI) technique	99
Figure 4.15	An example of blurred edges from classical gradient technique; (a) Original image and (b) Gradient image after classical gradient technique	101
Figure 4.16	Comparison between classical and gradient image enhancement techniques; (a) Image using classical gradient image technique and (b) Image using proposed gradient enhancement image technique	102
Figure 4.17	Comparison of different techniques for obtaining gradient image; (a) Original image, (b) Proposed gradient technique, (c) Gradient using Sobel and (d) Gradient using LoG	104
Figure 4.18	Average MSE values for different types of gradient techniques	105
Figure 4.19	Average PSNR values for different types of gradient techniques	105
Figure 4.20	(a) – (h) the sequence of results to obtain foreground marker using proposed algorithm	107
Figure 4.21	Examples of foreground marker for the leaf with complex background	108
Figure 4.22	Several samples of proposed watershed algorithm for leaf segmentation from complex background with the correlation values.	110
Figure 4.23	Example of manually cropped images for leaf of complex background	111
Figure 4.24	Three cases of leaf segmentation (a) good segmentation, (b) good segmentation with approximately less than 2% of non-target leaf is included and (c) bad extraction	112
Figure 4.25	Comparison of difference watershed segmentation algorithms	115
Figure 4.26	Segmented region with the correlation values less than 0 (a) - 0.1629, (b) 0.0025 and (c) -0.1643	116
Figure 4.27	Comparison of leaf segmentation for different types of watershed segmentation technique	116

Figure 4.28	Comparison of success rate for different watershed segmentation algorithm for leaf segmentation	118
Figure 4.29	Example of leaf images using existing methods; (a) Original image, (b) Greeness image, (c) Gradient image, (d) Foreground marker, (e) Watershed ridge lines, (f) Watershed segmentation and (g) Leaf segmentation	119
Figure 4.30	Results for the proposed watershed algorithm with noise level of 0.05	120
Figure 4.31	Results for the proposed watershed algorithm with noise level of 0.1	121
Figure 4.32	Performance of proposed leaf segmentation algorithm without MEGVI; (a) normal image, (b) image of noise level of 0.05 and (c) image of noise level of 0.1	124
Figure 4.33	Performance of proposed leaf segmentation algorithm without proposed gradient enhancement; (a) normal image, (b) image of noise level of 0.05 and (c) image of noise level of 0.1	126
Figure 4.34	Performance of proposed leaf segmentation algorithm without proposed foreground marker; (a) normal image, (b) image of noise level of 0.05 and (c) image of noise level of 0.1	129
Figure 4.35	Summary of the performance of the proposed watershed segmentation when one of the three techniques (MEGVI, gradient enhancement and proposed foreground marker) is not used	130

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ANN	Artificial Neural Network
ASM	Active Shape Models
BPNN	Back Propagation Neural Network
CIVE	Colour Index of Vegetation Extraction
CSS	Curvature Scale Space
ExG	Excess Green Vegetation Index
ExG-ExR	Excess Green minus Excess Red
ExR	Excess Red Vegetation Index
FCM	Fuzzy C-Means
IS	Intelligent Scissors
KNN	K-Nearest Neighbour
LoG	Laplace of Gaussian
MCH	Moving Center Hypersphere
MEGVI	Modified Excess Green Vegetation Index
MLP	Multilayer Perceptron
MMC	Move Median Center
MSE	Mean Squared Error
NDI	Normalised Difference Index
NIR	Near-infrared
PNN	Probalistic Neural Network
PSNR	Peak Signal to Noise Ratio
ROI	Region of interest
SVM	Support Vector Machine

## LIST OF SYMBOLS

$\mu$	mean
$\sigma$	standard deviation
$\theta$	skewness
$\gamma$	kurtosis
$MR_i(f)$	regional minima of a function
$CB$	catchment basin
$CB(f, MR_i)$	catchment basin associated with the regional minima
$DL(f)$	divide line of a function
$f(m, n)$	original image
$f_b(m, n)$	blurred version of the original image
$\alpha$	weighting fraction
$f'(m, n)$	enhanced image
$ \Delta f $	magnitude of vector $\Delta f$
$G_x$	Sobel operator in x direction
$G_y$	Sobel operator in y direction
$P_1, \dots, P_9$	pixels' values for input image with 4 x 4 matrix
$f(x, y)$	digital image function
$b(x, y)$	structuring element
$(f \oplus b)(s, t)$	Gray-scale dilation of 3-D function
$D_f$	domain of $f$
$D_b$	domain of $b$
$(s-x)$ and $(t-y)$	domain of $f$ , and $x$ and $y$ have to be in the domain of $b$
$(f \oplus b)(s)$	Gray-scale dilation of 3-D function
$(f \ominus b)(s, t)$	Gray-scale erosion of 3-D function
$(f \ominus b)(s)$	Gray-scale erosion of 1-D function
$f \circ b$	Morphological opening
$f \bullet b$	Morphological closing
$(f \oplus b)$	Dilation operation
$(f \ominus b)$	Erosion operation
$M_i$	set coordinates points in the regional minima
$P(x, y)$	image function

$T_n$	point in $P(x,y)$
$C(M_i)$	set of points in the catchment basin
$C[n]$	the union of flooded catchment basin portions at the stage $n$
$G$	connected component
$C(n)$	combination of foreground and background markers
$MG(n)$	foreground marker
$M(n)$	background marker

©This item is protected by original copyright

## **Peningkatan Segmentasi Daun Individu dari Latar Belakang Kompleks Menggunakan Teknik ‘Watershed’**

### **ABSTRAK**

Dalam penglihatan komputer, kesukaran dalam segmentasi daun dari latar belakang yang kompleks masih memerlukan penyelidikan yang luas. Latar belakang kompleks ini terhasil apabila imej daun ditangkap dalam persekitaran semula jadi. Keadaan sinar matahari yang tidak terkawal menjadikannya sukar untuk mengesan kawasan hijau pada gambar. Walaupun terdapat banyak teknik yang berjaya digunakan untuk segmentasi daun tetapi masalah timbul apabila berhadapan dengan daun yang menyentuh dan bertindih. Oleh kerana daun sasaran dan daun yang tidak dikehendaki mempunyai nilai intensiti yang hampir sama, bahagian kritikal adalah untuk memisahkan daun sasaran yang biasanya menyentuh / bertindih dengan daun lain yang boleh menyebabkan kekeliruan antara sempadan daun bersebelahan. Walaupun teknik ‘watershed’ adalah teknik yang berupaya untuk memisahkan objek menyentuh atau bertindih, malangnya, teknik ‘watershed’ ini bersendirian untuk memisahkan daun individu dari latar belakang yang kompleks membawa kepada ‘over / under segmentation’. Tujuan kajian ini adalah untuk menghapuskan latar belakang kompleks bukan hijau, untuk menambahbaik bahagian tepi di antara objek dalam gambar (tepi yang kabur) di antara daun tunggal dan daun bukan sasaran dan untuk meningkatkan kecekapan ‘watershed marker control’ bagi segmentasi daun tunggal dari latar belakang yang kompleks. Dalam kajian ini, tiga algoritma diperkenalkan untuk membantu dalam memisahkan daun dari latar belakang yang kompleks. Pada peringkat pertama, ‘Modified Excess Green Vegetation Index’ (MEGVI) diperkenalkan untuk mengatasi masalah cahaya yang tidak terkawal dalam menghadkan kawasan bukan hijau. Proses segmentasi daun individu dilakukan dengan proses yang disebut sebagai ‘marker-controlled watershed transform’. ‘Watershed transform’ sebenarnya mempunyai keburukan di mana ‘over / under segmentation’ sering berlaku. Untuk mengatasi masalah ‘over / under segmentation’, dua lagi algoritma telah diperkenalkan dan dapat membantu menyelesaikan masalah tersebut. Oleh kerana daun yang ditangkap di luar biasanya menyentuh / bertindih dengan daun lain, tepi di antara objek dalam imej dipertingkatkan untuk membantu proses segmentasi. Proses segmentasi akan lebih berkesan sekiranya penanda dihasilkan dengan tepat. Dengan menjalankan ketiga-tiga algoritma ini, daun individu yang dikehendaki boleh dibahagikan dengan sempurna tanpa ‘over / under segmentation’. Teknik yang dicadangkan memberikan kejayaan sebanyak 74.1% dari latar belakang kompleks berbanding dengan segmentasi klasik iaitu 0%, normal ‘marker-controlled watershed transform’ sebanyak 13.8% dan segmentasi menggunakan kaedah yang diperkenalkan oleh Xiaodong Tang sebanyak 9.5%. Hasil dari ujikaji ini, MEGVI yang dicadangkan mampu menghapuskan latar belakang bukan hijau dalam pencahayaan yang tidak sekata. Sementara itu, algoritma untuk penambahbaikan tepi di antara objek dalam imej yang dicadangkan memberi hasil yang terbaik untuk meningkatkan tepi di antara objek dalam imej yang menyentuh dan menimpa. Pendekatan ini juga memberi manfaat dalam mewujudkan penanda hadapan untuk objek yang mempunyai bentuk yang tidak teratur. Teknik yang dicadangkan juga dapat mengurangkan ‘over/under segmentation’ apabila ‘watershed transform’ digunakan.

## **Enhancement of Individual Leaf Segmentation from Complex Background Using Watershed Technique**

### **ABSTRACT**

In computer vision, difficulty in leaf segmentation from complex backgrounds still requires extensive research. This complex background is produced when the leaf image is captured in a natural environment. The uncontrolled sunlight conditions make it difficult to detect the green area of the picture. Even though there are many successful techniques used for leaf segmentation but the problem arise when we face with touching and overlapping leaves. Since both the target leaf and unwanted leaves have almost the same intensity values, the critical part is to segment the target leaf which usually touches/overlaps with other leaves which may create the confusion between the boundaries of adjacent leaves. Even though watershed technique is a powerful tool for separating touching or overlapping objects unfortunately, watershed transform itself for separating individual leaf from complex background leads to over/under-segmentation. The aims of this study is to eliminate non-green complex background, to enhance gradient of touching and overlapping edges (blur edges) between single leaf and non-target leaf and to improve the efficiency of watershed marker control for single leaf segmentation from complex background. In this study, three algorithms were introduced to assist in the segmentation of leaves from complex backgrounds. At first stage, Modified Excess Green Vegetation Index' (MEGVI) was introduced to overcome the uncontrolled light problems in limiting non-green areas. Individual leaf segmentation process is done by the proses called marker-controlled watershed transformation. Watershed transforms actually have disadvantages where over/under-segmentation often happens. In order to overcome over/under-segmentation problem, the other two algorithms were introduced and could help to solve the problem. Since leaf captured outside are usually touching/overlapping with other leaves, the edges between the objects in the image are enhanced to aid the segmentation process. The process of segmentation could be more effective if the accurate marker is created. By running these three algorithms, the desired individual leaves can be segmented perfectly without over/under-segmentation. The proposed technique gave 74.1% successful rate of leaf segmentation from complex background as compared to classical watershed segmentation of 0%, normal marker-controlled watershed segmentation, 13.8% and Xiaodong Tang watershed segmentation of 9.5%. From the experimental results, MEGVI is capable to eliminate non-green background in uneven illumination. While, the proposed gradient enhancement gave the best result in order to enhance the gradient image for touching and overlapping objects. A new algorithm to automatically obtain the foreground and background markers was proposed to improve the efficiency of the watershed marker control for single leaf segmentation from complex background. This approach is also benefits in creating foreground marker for irregular objects. The proposed technique also could reduced over-segmentation/under-segmentation when applying watershed transform.

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Overview

Plants are very important organisms in the universe. This is because plants become dependent on other living things. They are plants which boast a remarkable ability to produce their own food through photosynthesis from carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. Furthermore, they provide the basis for the food web. Other living things cannot exist without the existence of plants.

Now a day, the technology has grown rapidly. A computer vision technology is used in order to identify plant species or quality inspection (Razali, 2011). The visualization and the cost is effective as a result of the development of computer technology, processing and analysis (Abdullah et al., 2007). The traditional identification or quality checking is very inefficient (Kiratiratanapruk & Sinthupinyo, 2011). In addition, it extremely depends on human skill and experience which usually contribute to errors. Identification is a process to recognize an object with its appropriate name based on the similarities or differences between two or more elements. Plants identification is the technique used to match a sample plant to a recognized group of one or more populations of an organisms. The practice of identifying plants based on certain characteristics has occurred thousands years ago. The practice has led to the introduction of variety of methods which have been adopted for identification.

The ability to identify plants is very important for some reasons. From the perspective of plant management, this identification helps us to know the identity of the plants. This is because, knowing the identity of plants can determine that the plant is not weeds. In addition, it is also useful for early detection of undesirable new weeds and taking further action to redress the matter or problem. Furthermore, the identification of plant identities also ensures that the plant could only be eaten by us since some of the plants could be poisonous.

A plant can be identified using many features that are available on it. In addition, the features can be used to distinguish between plants, such as flower size, flower colour, flower period, seeds, odor, etc. Among them, leaves are the most popular characteristics for plant species identification since leaves can be found easily almost throughout the year. Furthermore, leaves are easy to capture as image that makes the potential identification commonly through their shape (Cerutti et al., 2013). The other characteristics may be more apparent. Due to that reason, leaves are often the popular characteristic since they are so easily observed.

In Computer Vision, many researches have been produced since the past decade. The research based on leaves features have are produced in order to help botanists and non-experts in plants identification. The technology is useful in providing imaging-based automatic analysis in various areas such as medical, agriculture and many more. Besides the leaf features such as leaf shape and leaf margin, the plants have a variety of other botanic features. Therefore, the identification of plant can be performed from several characteristics including flower colour, flower size, their odor, venation pattern, inflorescence and others. Since leaves of various types of plants are unique which are

different from each other based on a number of characteristics, therefore leaves can be popular features in order to perform plant identification. Therefore, to identify the plant species, leaf recognition is the best and easiest way compared to other criteria.

Thus, leaf segmentation is an essential step for automatic leaf recognition and plant identification. One-dimensional gray image histogram is not enough in order to select the threshold value in traditional approach (Han & Huang, 2010). According to the previous studies, the process of leaf segmentation are limited to plant leaf images in plain/ideal background. However, it is still a very challenging task to extract a single leaf from images with complicated background such as with some interference and overlaps between two adjacent leaves (Rong et al., 2014; Wijethunga et al., 2008). The complex background in this context refers to an image captured outdoor in natural scene. The image of the target leaf, with complex background, may be touching or overlapping with other leaves. Due to that, the problem arises when dealing with objects of uniform intensity (Kazanov, 2004). The complex background may also consist of soil, residue, branches etc. (Guru & Mallikarjuna, 2010). Therefore, the process of target leaf segmentation could be a difficult and challenging task (Pahikkala et al., 2015; Anjomshoae et al., 2014).

The watershed transform is a powerful technique for image segmentation (GurvinderKaur & LakhwinderKaur, 2013; Hsieh et al., 2006). The technique has been widely used in many fields since it is simple, intuitive technique. It is fast and can be parallelized (Grau et al., 2004). But, this technique itself has brought over a very bad segmentation (Acharjya, Santra & Ghoshal, 2013; Acharjya et al., 2013; Zghal & Masmoudi, 2010; Salman, 2006; Smolka, 2005; Noor et al., 1999). The controversy over

the drawback of classical watershed has raged for many years. Therefore Meyer proposed marker-controlled watershed transform in order to overcome the problem of over-segmentation. However, for segmenting individual leaf from complex background, this technique still produces over/under-segmentation. Recent developments in leaf segmentation from complex background using marker-controlled watershed segmentation have shown the need for improvement. Most studies of leaf segmentation still require post-processing to improve the condition of the extracted image. This makes the time to segment the leaves longer and the need of extra features or information. Therefore, it motivates the author to extract the leaves from complex background without going through post-processing or refinement stage.

## **1.2 Problem Statement**

Leaf segmentation is an important step for automatic leaf classification and plant identification. But it is still a very challenging task to extract a single leaf from images with complicated background. The single leaf to be segmented is referred to the biggest/perfect leaf captured from outdoor. The existence of the soil, residues and most challenging problem which is touching/overlapping with other leaves could be considered as the complex background. Even though there are many successful techniques used for leaf segmentation but the problem arises when we face touching and overlapping leaves. Since both the target leaf and unwanted leaves have almost the same intensity values, the critical part is to segment the target leaf which usually touches/overlaps with other leaves which may create the confusion between the boundaries of adjacent leaves. However, the

previous research involved combination of two or more methods to successfully segment individual leaf from complex background. Even though watershed transform is a powerful technique to separate touching or overlapping objects (Singh, & Bawa, 2013; Xu et al., 2011; Gonzalez et al., 2008), but watershed transform itself in order to segment target leaf from complex background leads to over-segmentation. (Andrade et al., 1997)

### **1.3 Objectives**

The main objective of the study is to segment individual leaf from complex background. These are tasks to be carried to achieve the main objective.

- a) To eliminate non-green complex background.
- b) To enhance gradient of touching and overlapping edges (blur edges) between single leaf and non-target leaf.
- c) To improve the efficiency of watershed marker control for single leaf segmentation from complex background.