

Abstract

Surface defect detection is the main part of quality control in the production industry. Traditional defect inspection is usually performed manually under the supervision of skilled workers. These manual visual methods have various limitations including low efficiency, lack of accuracy, high labor costs, slow verification speed, largely time-wasting, and poor precision for long-term industrial applications. On the other hand, automated approaches [1, 2, 3, 4] have been proposed for this purpose using Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN). In this work, we propose a novel approach to classify surface defects using Convolutional Autoencoder (AE) and CNN. Our approach requires small amount of data for training compared to only using CNN.

Dataset

Dataset :- KolektorSDD [6]

The dataset consists of 400 images. There are 52 defective images and 348 non-defective images. The raw images were different resolutions from 1240 x 500 pixels to 1270 x 500 pixels.

Samples of non-defective images

Samples of defective images

Training

Testing

Total



Contraction of the second s	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
State of the second	The second s
CARLES & CONTRACTOR	5 7 1 1 S 1 S 1 S 1
And Anna and Provide and	And Prove on the
Contract of the South of the	1. No. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10
	State of the second second
A STATE OF A STATE OF A STATE OF A STATE	the second second second
the second se	1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -
Contraction of the second second	NO
A CONTRACT OF	the second se
and an inclusion where	Carrier and Annual States, Spinster,
the second s	
	4.5427 345 345 345 345 345
	1.20 million 40.00
ALC STREAM AND A STREAM AND A STREAM	ALC: 100 - 100 - 100
Card Co. R. State Co. State	CALL COLUMN THE A
A PART AND A REAL	
A REAL PROPERTY AND A REAL PROPERTY.	2.4.1.2.4.1.2.2.1.2.2.1.2.2.1.1.2.2.1.2.2.2.2
100 - The 1-SE 50.0.19	- 740-0 STATE
a second and all and the second	and the second se
AND MADE AND AND AND AND AND AND	1
Contraction Contraction and	
215 - C - C - C - S - S - S - S - S - S - S	and the second
A REAL PROPERTY AND A REAL	ALC: ALC: ALC: ALC: ALC: ALC: ALC: ALC:
the second s	
and the second states and the second	
11 Westerney and the second second	C. S. Constanting of the second
AND A REAL PROPERTY AND A REAL	
AND AND ADDRESS OF ADDRES	and the second second second
CO. C. A. C. S. S. S. S. S. S. S.	Contraction of the second s
A CONTRACTOR OF THE OWNER O	
THE REPORT OF THE PARTY OF	
and the second se	
Construction Construction	S.P. Service and Street Street
Strate and second as the second	C HONE THE STOCK STREET
	a California March 1997
2 State (a) State (b)	 A. M. M.
the second s	1.1.2. T 2.1.8 (2) (1) (2)
A STREET AND A STREET	
State Property and the second second	C27827 7967 C273
Party and the second second	C. 201. 4 7. 40 1 1 3
111 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
And the second	and the second second
LOLOLAND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND	10140 March 2016 1
12 14 16 22 BOD ST	1
5-14 A	Sector and the sector
States and the second second	Sector and a sector of the
PERSONAL PROPERTY.	CONTRACTOR OF THE OWNER
	and the second

Number of Images	Number of defect images	Number of non- defect images
321	42	279
79	10	69
400	52	348

Conclusion

352 x 128

- In this study, we proposed a novel methodology to detect defects using Convolutional AE and CNN. Our approach can be trained with small number of labeled training data.
- We have applied Autoencoder to enhance the images and the CNN model for the classification process. Based on the experimental results, subtracted images & concatenated images (with the Autoencoder model) are performed better than original images (without using the Autoencoder model) with the proposed CNN architecture. The model performance was improved using data augmentation techniques.
- Better results were given by enhanced images using Autoencoder than original images. Enhanced images lead to achieving good results from a small CNN model with a small dataset. Therefore, the proposed approach saved the computational cost and time.
- We were able to gain 100% accuracy from this methodology.

SURFACE DEFECT RECOGNITION USING **AUTOENCODER BASED CONVOLUTIONAL NEURAL NETWORK**

Senanayake K., and Siyamalan M. Department of Computer Science, University of Jaffna {ykaveesenanayake@gmail.com, siyam@univ.jfn.ac.lk}











CNN Architecture



References

1) Zhou, S., Chen, Y., Zhang, D., Xie, J. and Zhou, Y., "Classification of Surface Defects on Steel sheet using Convolutional Neural Networks." In Materiali in Tehnologije/Materials and Technology, ISSN 1580-2949. 2017.

2) Tao, X., Zhang, D., Ma, W., Liu, X. and Xu, D., "Automatic Metallic Surface Defect Detection and Recognition with Convolutional Neural Networks." In Applied Sciences 8, no. 9: 1575. 2018.

Zhang, Z., Lv, C., Sun, M. and Wang, Z., "Reliable and Robust Weakly Supervised Attention Networks for Surface Defect Detection." In 2020 7th International Conference on Dependable Systems and Their Applications (DSA) (pp. 407-414). IEEE. 2020.

4) Li, Y., Chen, Y., Gu, Y., Ouyang, J., Wang, J. and Zeng, N., "A Lightweight Fully Convolutional Neural Network of High Accuracy Surface Defect Detection." In International Conference on Artificial Neural Networks (pp. 15-26). Springer, Cham. 2020.

5) Li, Y. and Li, J., "An End-to-End Defect Detection Method for Mobile Phone Light Guide Plate via Multitask Learning." In IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement, 70, pp.1-13. 2021.

6) https://www.vicos.si/resources/kolektorsdd/

•*•	The hype	erpa	ara
	consists	of	3
	connecte	ed la	аує

Dropout layers	Batch size	Accuracy (Concatenated images)	Accuracy (Subtracted images)	Accuracy (Original images)
0.7, 0.5	8	94.28%	93.55%	50.00%
0.7, 0.5	32	93.55%	93.55%	84.28%
-	16	95.00%	93.55%	74.28%
0.7	16	94.28%	94.28%	89.28%
0.5	16	92.83%	89.28%	88.55%
0.7, 0.5	16	98.55%	94.28%	89.28%

Effect of data augmentation with concatenated images to train the CNN model. With Data /

Number of convolutional layers	Accuracy (With concatenated images)	Accuracy (With original images)
3	98.55%	50.00%
4	96.38%	85.00%
5	100.00%	95.00%
6	96.38%	95.00%
7	99.28%	95.00%

	With Cond	at
100.00%		
90.00%		-
80.00%		
70.00%		
60.00%		
50.00%		
40.00%		
30.00%		
20.00%		
10.00%		
0.00%		
	3	4
	Number of Co	nvo
	100.00% 90.00% 80.00% 60.00% 50.00% 40.00% 30.00% 20.00% 0.00%	With Cond 100.00% 90.00% 80.00% 70.00% 60.00% 50.00% 40.00% 30.00% 20.00% 10.00% 33 Number of Co

Confusion matrix for the best classification result					
		Predicted	l Classes		
		Non-defective	Defective		
Actual Classes	Non-defective	69	0		
	Defective	0	10		

•••	Different evaluation measures					
	Number of convolutional layers in the CNN model	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1_Score	
	3	98.55%	0.8333	1	0.9091	
	4	96.38%	0.6667	1	0.8000	
	5	100.00%	1.0000	1	1.0000	
	6	96.38%	0.6667	1	0.8000	
	7	99.28%	0.9091	1	0.9524	

Comparison with similar approaches on the KolektorSDD dataset.

Approach	Accuracy (%)	F1_score (%)
Zhang et al., (2020) [3]	99.33	98.04
Li et al., (2020) [4]	98.74	98.97
Li et al., (2021) [5]	99.16	96.77
Ours	100.00	100.00



Experiments & Results

ameters were fine-tuned of the CNN model which convolutional layers (32, 32, 64) and 3 fully yers (512, 256, 2).

Augmentation	Without Data Augmentation
8.55%	97.83%

Effect of the number of convolutional layers in the CNN model.

tenated Ir	nages		Accuracy	100.00% - 90.00% - 80.00% - 70.00% - 60.00% -	Wit	h Origir	nal Imag	ges •	•	
			Overall /	40.00% - 30.00% - 20.00% - 10.00% -	•					
5 olutional lay	6 ers in the	7 CNN model		0.0074 N	3 umber o	4 f Convolu	5 tional lay	6 ers in the	7 CNN mod	el