

# MVTec AD — A Comprehensive Real-World Dataset for Unsupervised Anomaly Detection

Paul Bergmann

Michael Fauser

David Sattlegger

Carsten Steger

MVTec Software GmbH

www.mvtec.com

{paul.bergmann, fauser, sattlegger, steger}@mvtec.com

## Abstract

The detection of anomalous structures in natural image data is of utmost importance for numerous tasks in the field of computer vision. The development of methods for unsupervised anomaly detection requires data on which to train and evaluate new approaches and ideas. We introduce the MVTec Anomaly Detection (MVTec AD) dataset containing 5354 high-resolution color images of different object and texture categories. It contains normal, i.e., defect-free, images intended for training and images with anomalies intended for testing. The anomalies manifest themselves in the form of over 70 different types of defects such as scratches, dents, contaminations, and various structural changes. In addition, we provide pixel-precise ground truth regions for all anomalies. We also conduct a thorough evaluation of current state-of-the-art unsupervised anomaly detection methods based on deep architectures such as convolutional autoencoders, generative adversarial networks, and feature descriptors using pre-trained convolutional neural networks, as well as classical computer vision methods. This initial benchmark indicates that there is considerable room for improvement. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first comprehensive, multi-object, multi-defect dataset for anomaly detection that provides pixel-accurate ground truth regions and focuses on real-world applications.

## 1. Introduction

Humans are very good at recognizing if an image is similar to what they have previously observed or if it is something novel or anomalous. So far, machine learning systems, however, seem to have difficulties with such tasks.

There are many relevant applications that must rely on unsupervised algorithms that can detect anomalous regions. In the manufacturing industry, for example, optical inspection tasks often lack defective samples or it is unclear what




Figure 1: Two objects and one texture from the MVTec AD dataset. For each of them, one defect-free image and two images that contain anomalies are displayed. Anomalous regions are highlighted in close-up figures together with their pixel-precise ground truth labels. The dataset contains objects and textures from several domains and covers various anomalies that differ in attributes such as size, color, and structure.

kinds of defects may appear. In active learning systems, structures that are identified as anomalous might indicate the necessity of including a specific image for training. Therefore, it is not surprising that recently a significant amount of interest has been directed towards novelty detection in natural image data using modern machine learning architectures. A number of algorithms have been proposed that test whether a network is able to detect if new input data matches the distribution of the training data. Many of these algorithms, however, focus on classification settings in which the inlier and outlier distributions differ significantly. This is commonly known as outlier detection or one-class-classification. A common evaluation protocol is to arbitrarily label a number of classes from existing object

classification datasets as outlier classes and use the remaining classes as inliers for training. It is then measured how well the trained algorithm can distinguish between previously unseen outlier and inlier samples.

While this classification on an image level is important, it is unclear how current state-of-the-art methods perform on what we call anomaly detection tasks. The problem setting is to find novelties in images that are very close to the training data and differ only in subtle deviations in possibly very small, confined regions. Clearly, to develop machine learning models for such and other challenging scenarios we require suitable data. Curiously, there is a lack of comprehensive real-world datasets available for such scenarios.

Large-scale datasets have led to incredible advances in many areas of computer vision in the last few years. Just consider how closely intertwined the development of new classification methods is with the introduction of datasets such as MNIST [16], CIFAR10 [14], or ImageNet [15].

To the best of our knowledge, no comparable dataset exists for the task of unsupervised anomaly detection. As a first step to fill this gap and to spark further research in the development of methods for unsupervised anomaly detection, we introduce the MVTec Anomaly Detection (MVTec AD or MAD for short) dataset<sup>1</sup> that facilitates a thorough evaluation of such methods. We identify industrial inspection tasks as an ideal and challenging real-world use-case for these scenarios. Defect-free example images of objects or textures are used to train a model that must determine whether an anomaly is present during test time. Unsupervised methods play a significant role here since it is often unknown beforehand what types of defects might occur during manufacturing. In addition, industrial processes are optimized to produce a minimum amount of defective samples. Therefore, only a very limited amount of images with defects is available, in contrast to a vast amount of defect-free samples that can be used for training. Ideally, methods should provide a pixel-accurate segmentation of anomalous regions. All this makes industrial inspection tasks perfect benchmarks for unsupervised anomaly detection methods that work on natural images. Our contribution is twofold:

- We introduce a novel and comprehensive dataset for the task of unsupervised anomaly detection in natural image data. It mimics real-world industrial inspection scenarios and consists of 5354 high-resolution images of five unique textures and ten unique objects from different domains. There are 73 different types of anomalies in the form of defects in the objects or textures. For each defect image, we provide pixel-accurate ground truth regions (1888 in total) that allow to evaluate methods for both one-class classification and anomaly detection.

- We conduct a thorough evaluation of current state-of-the-art methods as well as more traditional methods for unsupervised anomaly detection on the dataset. Their performance for both segmentation and classification of anomalous images is assessed. Furthermore, we provide a well-defined way to detect anomalous regions in test images using hyperparameters that are estimated without the knowledge of any anomalous images. We show that the evaluated methods do not perform equally well across object and defect categories and that there is considerable room for improvement.

## 2. Related Work

### 2.1. Existing Datasets for Anomaly Detection

We first give a brief overview of datasets that are commonly used for anomaly detection in natural images and demonstrate the need for our novel dataset. We distinguish between datasets where a simple binary decision between defect and defect-free images must be made and datasets that allow for the segmentation of anomalous regions.

#### 2.1.1 Classification of Anomalous Images

When evaluating methods for outlier detection in multi-class classification scenarios, a common practice is to adapt existing classification datasets for which class labels are already available. The most prominent examples are MNIST [16], CIFAR10 [14], and ImageNet [15]. A popular approach [1, 7, 21] is to select an arbitrary subset of classes, re-label them as outliers, and train a novelty detection system solely on the remaining inlier classes. During the testing phase, it is checked whether the trained model is able to correctly predict whether a test sample belongs to one of the inlier classes. While this immediately provides a large amount of training and testing data, the anomalous samples differ significantly from the samples drawn from the training distribution. Therefore, when performing evaluations on such datasets, it is unclear how a proposed method would generalize to data where anomalies manifest themselves in less significant differences from the training data manifold.

For this purpose, Saleh et al. [22] propose a dataset that contains six categories of abnormally shaped objects, such as oddly shaped cars, airplanes, and boats, obtained from internet search engines that should be distinguished from regular samples of the same class in the PASCAL VOC dataset [8]. While their data might be closer to the training data manifold, the decision is again based on entire images rather than finding the parts of the images that make them novel or anomalous.

<sup>1</sup>[www.mvtec.com/company/research/datasets](http://www.mvtec.com/company/research/datasets)

### 2.1.2 Segmentation of Anomalous Regions

For the evaluation of methods that segment anomalies in images, only very few public datasets are currently available. All of them focus on the inspection of textured surfaces and, to the best of our knowledge, there does not yet exist a comprehensive dataset that allows for the segmentation of anomalous regions in natural images.

Carrera et al. [6] provide NanoTWICE,<sup>2</sup> a dataset of 45 gray-scale images that show a nanofibrous material acquired by a scanning electron microscope. Five defect-free images can be used for training. The remaining 40 images contain anomalous regions in the form of specks of dust or flattened areas. Since the dataset only provides a single kind of texture, it is unclear how well algorithms that are evaluated on this dataset generalize to other textures of different domains.

A dataset that is specifically designed for optical inspection of textured surfaces was proposed during a 2007 DAGM workshop by Wieler and Hahn [28]. They provide ten classes of artificially generated gray-scale textures with defects weakly annotated in the form of ellipses. Each class comprises 1000 defect-free texture patches for training and 150 defective patches for testing. However, their annotations are quite coarse and since the textures were generated by very similar texture models, the variance in appearance between the different textures is quite low. Furthermore, artificially generated datasets can only be seen as an approximation to the real world.

## 2.2. Methods

The landscape of methods for unsupervised anomaly detection is diverse and many approaches have been suggested to tackle the problem [1, 19]. Pimentel et al. [20] give a comprehensive review of existing work. We restrict ourselves to a brief overview of current state-of-the-art methods, focusing on those that serve as baseline for our initial benchmark on the dataset.

### 2.2.1 Generative Adversarial Networks

Schlegl et al. [23] propose to model the manifold of the training data by a generative adversarial network (GAN) [10] that is trained solely on defect-free images. The generator is able to produce realistically looking images that fool a simultaneously trained discriminator network in an adversarial way. For anomaly detection, the algorithm searches for a latent sample that reproduces a given input image and manages to fool the discriminator. An anomaly segmentation can be obtained by a per-pixel comparison of the reconstructed image with the original input.

<sup>2</sup>[www.mi.imati.cnr.it/ettore/NanoTWICE/](http://www.mi.imati.cnr.it/ettore/NanoTWICE/)




Figure 2: Example images for all five textures and ten object categories of the MVTec AD dataset. For each category, the top row shows an anomaly-free image. The middle row shows an anomalous example for which, in the bottom row, a close-up view that highlights the anomalous region is given.

### 2.2.2 Deep Convolutional Autoencoders

Convolutional Autoencoders (CAEs) [9] are commonly used as a base architecture in unsupervised anomaly detection settings. They attempt to reconstruct defect-free training samples through a bottleneck (latent space). During testing, they fail to reproduce images that differ from the data that was observed during training. Anomalies are de-

	Category	# Train	# Test (good)	# Test (defective)	# Defect groups	# Defect regions	Image side length
Textures	Carpet	280	28	89	5	97	1024
	Grid	264	21	57	5	170	1024
	Leather	245	32	92	5	99	1024
	Tile	230	33	84	5	86	840
	Wood	247	19	60	5	168	1024
Objects	Bottle	209	20	63	3	68	900
	Cable	224	58	92	8	151	1024
	Capsule	219	23	109	5	114	1000
	Hazelnut	391	40	70	4	136	1024
	Metal Nut	220	22	93	4	132	700
	Pill	267	26	141	7	245	800
	Screw	320	41	119	5	135	1024
	Toothbrush	60	12	30	1	66	1024
	Transistor	213	60	40	4	44	1024
	Zipper	240	32	119	7	177	1024
	Total	3629	467	1258	73	1888	-

Table 1: Statistical overview of the MVTec AD dataset. For each category, the number of training and test images is given together with additional information about the defects present in the respective test images.

tected by a per-pixel comparison of the input with its reconstruction. Recently, Bergmann et al. [4] pointed out the disadvantages of per-pixel loss functions in autoencoding frameworks when used in anomaly segmentation scenarios and proposed to incorporate spatial information of local patch regions using structural similarity [27] for improved segmentation results.

There exist various extensions to CAEs such as the variational autoencoders (VAEs) [13] that have been used by Baur et al. [3] for the unsupervised segmentation of anomalies in brain MR scans. Baur et al., however, do not report significant improvements over using standard CAEs. This coincides with the observations made by Bergmann et al. [4]. Nalisnick et al. [17] and Hendrycks et al. [12] provide further evidence that probabilities obtained from VAEs and other deep generative models might fail to model the true likelihood of the training data. Therefore, we restrict ourselves to deterministic autoencoder frameworks in the initial evaluation of the dataset below.

### 2.2.3 Features of Pre-trained Convolutional Neural Networks

The aforementioned approaches attempt to learn feature representations solely from the provided training data. In addition, there exist a number of methods that use feature descriptors obtained from CNNs that have been pre-trained on a separate image classification task.

Napoletano et al. [18] propose to use clustered feature descriptions obtained from the activations of a ResNet-18 [11] classification network pre-trained on ImageNet [15] to distinguish normal from anomalous data. They achieve state-of-the-art results on the NanoTWICE dataset. Being designed for one-class classification, their method only provides a binary decision whether an input image contains an

anomaly or not. In order to obtain a spatial anomaly map, the classifier must be evaluated at multiple image locations, ideally at each single pixel. This quickly becomes a performance bottleneck for large images. To increase performance in practice, not every pixel location is evaluated and the resulting anomaly maps are coarse.

### 2.2.4 Traditional Methods

In addition to the methods described above, we consider two traditional methods for our benchmark. Böttger and Ulrich [5] extract hand-crafted feature descriptors from defect-free texture images. The distribution of feature vectors is modeled by a Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM) and anomalies are detected for extracted feature descriptors for which the GMM yields a low probability. Their algorithm can only be applied to images of regular textures.

In order to obtain a simple baseline for the non-texture objects in the dataset, we consider the variation model [26, Chapter 3.4.1.4]. This method requires a prior alignment of the object contours and calculates the mean and standard deviation for each pixel. This models the gray-value statistics of the training images. During testing, a statistical test is performed for each image pixel that measures the deviation of the pixel’s gray-value from the mean. If the deviation is larger than a threshold, an anomalous pixel is detected.

## 3. Dataset Description

The MVTec Anomaly Detection dataset comprises 15 categories with 3629 images for training and validation and 1725 images for testing. The training set contains only images without defects. The test set contains both: images containing various types of defects and defect-free images. Table 1 gives an overview for each object category. Some example images for every category together with an example defect are shown in Figure 2. We provide further example images of the dataset in the supplementary material. Five categories cover different types of regular (*carpet*, *grid*) or random (*leather*, *tile*, *wood*) textures, while the remaining ten categories represent various types of objects. Some of these objects are rigid with a fixed appearance (*bottle*, *metal nut*), while others are deformable (*cable*) or include natural variations (*hazelnut*). A subset of objects was acquired in a roughly aligned pose (e.g., *toothbrush*, *capsule*, and *pill*) while others were placed in front of the camera with a random rotation (e.g., *metal nut*, *screw*, and *hazelnut*). The test images of anomalous samples contain a variety of defects, such as defects on the objects’ surface (e.g., *scratches*, *dents*), structural defects like distorted object parts, or defects that manifest themselves by the absence of certain object parts. In total, 73 different defect types are present, on average five per category. The defects were manually generated with the aim to produce realistic

anomalies as they would occur in real-world industrial inspection scenarios.

All images were acquired using a  $2048 \times 2048$  pixel high-resolution industrial RGB sensor in combination with two bilateral telecentric lenses [26, Chapter 2.2.4.2] with magnification factors of 1:5 and 1:1, respectively. Afterwards, the images were cropped to a suitable output size. All image resolutions are in the range between  $700 \times 700$  and  $1024 \times 1024$  pixels. Since gray-scale images are also common in industrial inspection, three object categories (*grid*, *screw*, and *zipper*) are made available solely as single-channel images. The images were acquired under highly controlled illumination conditions. For some object classes, however, the illumination was altered intentionally to increase variability. We provide pixel-precise ground truth labels for each defective image region. In total, the dataset contains almost 1900 manually annotated regions. Some examples of labels for selected anomalous images are displayed in Figure 1.

## 4. Benchmark

We conduct a thorough evaluation of multiple state-of-the-art methods for unsupervised anomaly detection as an initial benchmark on our dataset. It is intended to serve as a baseline for future methods. Moreover, we provide a well-defined way to detect anomalous regions in test images using hyperparameters that are estimated solely from anomaly-free validation images. We then discuss the strengths and weaknesses of each method on the various objects and textures of the dataset. We show that, while each method can detect anomalies of certain types, none of the evaluated methods manages to excel for the entire dataset.

### 4.1. Evaluated Methods

#### 4.1.1 AnoGAN

For the evaluation of AnoGAN, we use the publicly available implementation on Github.<sup>3</sup> The GAN’s latent space dimension is fixed to 64 and generated images are of size  $128 \times 128$  pixels, which results in relatively stable training for all categories of the dataset. Training is conducted for 50 epochs with an initial learning rate of 0.0002. During testing, 300 iterations of latent space search are performed with an initial learning rate of 0.02. Anomaly maps are obtained by a per-pixel  $\ell^2$ -comparison of the input image with the generated output.

For the evaluation of objects, both training and testing images are zoomed to the input size of  $128 \times 128$  pixels. For textures, we zoom all dataset images to size  $512 \times 512$  and extract training patches of size  $128 \times 128$ . For training, data augmentation techniques are used as described in Section 4.2. During testing, a patchwise evaluation is

performed with a horizontal and vertical stride of 128 pixels. In general, one could also imagine to choose a smaller stride and average the estimated anomaly scores. However, this is not feasible due to the relatively long runtimes of AnoGAN’s latent-space optimization.

#### 4.1.2 L2 and SSIM Autoencoder

For the evaluation of the L2 and SSIM autoencoder on the texture images, we use the same CAE architecture as described by Bergmann et al. [4]. They reconstruct texture patches of size  $128 \times 128$ , employing either a per-pixel  $\ell^2$  loss or a loss based on the structural similarity index (SSIM). For the latter, we find an SSIM window size of  $11 \times 11$  pixels to work well in our experiments. The latent space dimension is chosen to be 100. Larger latent space dimensions do not yield significant improvements in reconstruction quality while lower dimensions lead to degenerate reconstructions.

Since we deem an image size of  $128 \times 128$  too small for the reconstruction of entire objects in the dataset, we extend the architecture used for textures by an additional convolution layer to process object images at resolution  $256 \times 256$ .

For objects, anomaly maps are generated by passing an image through the autoencoder and comparing the reconstruction with its respective input using either per-pixel  $\ell^2$  comparisons or SSIM. For textures, we reconstruct patches at a stride of 30 pixels and average the resulting anomaly maps. Since SSIM does not operate on color images, for the training and evaluation of the SSIM-autoencoder the images are converted to gray-scale. Data augmentation is performed as described in Section 4.2.

#### 4.1.3 CNN Feature Dictionary

We use our own implementation of the CNN feature dictionary proposed by Napolitano et al. [18], which extracts features from the 512-dimensional avgpool layer of a ResNet-18 pretrained on ImageNet. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) is performed on the extracted features to explain 95% of the variance, which typically results in a reduction to a feature vector with around 100 components. For K-means, we vary the number of cluster centers and identify ten cluster centers to be a good value, which agrees with the findings of Napolitano et al. We extract patches of size  $16 \times 16$  for both the textures and objects. Objects are evaluated on image size  $256 \times 256$  and texture images are zoomed to size  $512 \times 512$ . For evaluation, a stride of four pixels is chosen to create a coarse anomaly map. For gray-scale images, the channels are triplicated for ResNet feature extraction since the feature extractor only operates on three-channel input images.

<sup>3</sup>[www.github.com/LeeDoYup/AnoGAN](http://www.github.com/LeeDoYup/AnoGAN)

	Category	AE (SSIM)	AE (L2)	AnoGAN	CNN Feature Dictionary	Texture Inspection	Variation Model
Textures	Carpet	<b>0.43</b>	0.57	0.82	0.89	0.57	-
		<b>0.90</b>	0.42	0.16	0.36	0.61	-
	Grid	0.38	<b>0.57</b>	0.90	0.57	1.00	-
		1.00	<b>0.98</b>	0.12	<b>0.33</b>	0.05	-
	Leather	0.00	0.06	0.91	<b>0.63</b>	0.00	-
		0.92	0.82	0.12	<b>0.71</b>	0.99	-
	Tile	1.00	<b>1.00</b>	0.97	0.97	1.00	-
		0.04	<b>0.54</b>	0.05	0.44	0.43	-
	Wood	0.84	1.00	0.89	<b>0.79</b>	0.42	-
		0.82	0.47	0.47	<b>0.88</b>	1.00	-
Objects	Bottle	<b>0.85</b>	0.70	0.95	1.00	-	1.00
		<b>0.90</b>	0.89	0.43	0.06	-	0.13
	Cable	<b>0.74</b>	0.93	0.98	0.97	-	-
		<b>0.48</b>	0.18	0.07	0.24	-	-
	Capsule	0.78	<b>1.00</b>	0.96	0.78	-	1.00
		0.43	<b>0.24</b>	0.20	0.03	-	0.03
	Hazelnut	1.00	<b>0.93</b>	0.83	0.90	-	-
		0.07	<b>0.84</b>	0.16	0.07	-	-
	Metal nut	1.00	<b>0.68</b>	0.86	0.55	-	0.32
		0.08	<b>0.77</b>	0.13	0.74	-	0.83
Pill	0.92	1.00	<b>1.00</b>	0.85	-	1.00	
	0.28	0.23	<b>0.24</b>	0.06	-	0.13	
Screw	0.95	<b>0.98</b>	0.41	0.73	-	1.00	
	0.06	<b>0.39</b>	0.28	0.13	-	0.10	
Toothbrush	0.75	<b>1.00</b>	1.00	1.00	-	1.00	
	0.73	<b>0.97</b>	0.13	0.03	-	0.60	
Transistor	1.00	<b>0.97</b>	0.98	1.00	-	-	
	0.03	<b>0.45</b>	0.35	0.15	-	-	
Zipper	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.97</b>	0.78	0.78	-	-	
	<b>0.60</b>	<b>0.63</b>	0.40	0.29	-	-	

Table 2: Results of the evaluated methods when applied to the classification of anomalous images. For each dataset category, the ratio of correctly classified samples of anomaly-free (top row) and anomalous images (bottom row) is given. The method with the highest mean of these two values is highlighted in boldface for each texture and object category.

#### 4.1.4 GMM-Based Texture Inspection Model

For the texture inspection model [5], an optimized implementation is available in the HALCON machine vision library.<sup>4</sup> Texture images are downsampled to an input size of  $400 \times 400$  pixels and a four-layer image pyramid is constructed for training and evaluation. The patch size of examined texture regions on each pyramid level is set to  $7 \times 7$  pixels. We use a total of ten randomly selected images from the original training set for training the texture model. Anomaly maps are obtained by evaluating the negative log-likelihood for each image pixel using the trained GMM. The method automatically provides a threshold that can be used to convert continuous anomaly maps to binarized segmentations of anomalous regions.

#### 4.1.5 Variation Model

For the evaluation of object categories using the variation model, we first attempt to align each category using shape-based matching [24, 25]. Since near pixel-accurate align-

ment is not possible for every object in the dataset, we restrict the evaluation of this method to a subset of objects (Table 2). We use 30 randomly selected training images of each object category in its original size to train the mean and variance parameters at each pixel location. All images are converted to gray-scale before evaluation.

Anomaly maps are obtained by computing the distance of each test pixel’s gray value to the predicted pixel mean relative to its predicted standard deviation. As for the GMM-based texture inspection, we use the optimized implementation of the HALCON machine vision library.

## 4.2. Data Augmentation

Since the evaluated methods based on deep architectures are typically trained on large datasets, data augmentation is performed for these methods for both textures and objects. For the texture images, we randomly crop rotated rectangular patches of fixed size from the training images. For each object category, we apply a random translation and rotation. Additional mirroring is applied where the object permits it. We augment each category to create 10000 training patches.

## 4.3. Evaluation Metric

Each of the evaluated methods provides a one-channel spatial map in which large values indicate that a certain pixel belongs to an anomalous region. To obtain a final segmentation result and make a binary decision for each pixel, a threshold must be determined. Only the GMM-based texture inspection provides a suitable threshold out of the box. For all other methods, we propose a well-defined way to estimate the threshold from a set of randomly selected validation images that we exclude from the training set.

For every category, we define a minimum defect area that a connected component in the thresholded anomaly map must have to be classified as a defective region. For each evaluated method, we then successively segment the anomaly maps of the anomaly-free validation set with increasing thresholds. This procedure is stopped when the area of the largest anomalous region on the validation set is just below the user-defined area and the threshold that yielded this segmentation is used for further evaluation.

Given this threshold, we evaluate the performance of each method when applied to both the anomaly classification and segmentation task. For the classification scenario, we compute the accuracy of correctly classified images for anomalous and anomaly-free test images. To assess segmentation performance, we evaluate the relative per-region overlap of the segmentation with the ground truth. To get an additional performance measure that is independent of the determined threshold, we compute the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (ROC AUC). We define the true positive rate as the percentage of pixels that were correctly classified as anomalous across an evaluated

<sup>4</sup>[www.mvtec.com/products/halcon](http://www.mvtec.com/products/halcon)




Figure 3: Qualitative anomaly segmentation results for AnoGAN (a), Autoencoders (b), the CNN Feature Dictionary (c), the Texture Inspection Model (d) and the Variation Model (e). For each evaluated method, the top row shows an image for which the method worked well and the bottom row illustrates failure cases. The ground-truth defect region is outlined in red, while the detection result generated by the respective method is shown in green.

	Category	AE (SSIM)	AE (L2)	AnoGAN	CNN Feature Dictionary	Texture Inspection	Variation Model
Textures	Carpet	<b>0.69</b>	0.38	0.34	0.20	0.29	-
		0.87	0.59	0.54	0.72	<b>0.88</b>	-
	Grid	<b>0.88</b>	0.83	0.04	0.02	0.01	-
		<b>0.94</b>	0.90	0.58	0.59	0.72	-
	Leather	0.71	0.67	0.34	0.74	<b>0.98</b>	-
Objects	Tile	0.78	0.75	0.64	0.87	<b>0.97</b>	-
		0.04	<b>0.23</b>	0.08	0.14	0.11	-
	Wood	0.59	0.51	0.50	<b>0.93</b>	0.41	-
		0.36	0.29	0.14	0.47	<b>0.51</b>	-
	Bottle	0.73	0.73	0.62	<b>0.91</b>	0.78	-
Objects	Bottle	0.15	<b>0.22</b>	0.05	0.07	-	0.03
		<b>0.93</b>	0.86	0.86	0.78	-	0.82
	Cable	0.01	0.05	0.01	<b>0.13</b>	-	-
		0.82	<b>0.86</b>	0.78	0.79	-	-
	Capsule	0.09	<b>0.11</b>	0.04	0.00	-	0.01
		<b>0.94</b>	0.88	0.84	0.84	-	0.76
	Hazelnut	0.00	<b>0.41</b>	0.02	0.00	-	-
		<b>0.97</b>	0.95	0.87	0.72	-	-
	Metal Nut	0.01	<b>0.26</b>	0.00	0.13	-	0.19
		<b>0.89</b>	0.86	0.76	0.82	-	0.60
Pill	0.07	<b>0.25</b>	0.17	0.00	-	0.13	
	<b>0.91</b>	0.85	0.87	0.68	-	0.83	
Screw	0.03	<b>0.34</b>	0.01	0.00	-	0.12	
	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.96</b>	0.80	0.87	-	0.94	
Toothbrush	0.08	<b>0.51</b>	0.07	0.00	-	0.24	
	0.92	<b>0.93</b>	0.90	0.77	-	0.68	
Transistor	0.01	<b>0.22</b>	0.08	0.03	-	-	
	<b>0.90</b>	0.86	0.80	0.66	-	-	
Zipper	0.10	<b>0.13</b>	0.01	0.00	-	-	
	<b>0.88</b>	0.77	0.78	0.76	-	-	

Table 3: Results of the evaluated methods when applied to the segmentation of anomalous regions. For each dataset category, the relative per-region overlap (top row) and the ROC AUC (bottom row) are given. The best performing method is highlighted in boldface.

dataset category. The false positive rate is the percentage of pixels that were wrongly classified as anomalous.

#### 4.4. Results

Evaluation results for the classification of anomalous images and segmentation of anomalous regions are given for all methods and dataset categories in Tables 2 and 3, respectively. None of the methods manages to consistently perform well across all object and texture classes.

Looking at the five texture categories as a whole, none of the evaluated methods emerges as a clear winner. Considering only the ROC AUC, the CNN Feature Dictionary manages to perform the most consistently.

For the ten object categories, the autoencoder architectures achieve the best results. Which one of these two performs better depends on the object under consideration. The L2 autoencoder achieves better per-region overlap values, indicating that the estimation of the anomaly threshold may have worked better for this method.

Table 3 shows that a high ROC AUC does not necessarily coincide with a high per-region overlap of the segmentation for the estimated threshold. In these cases, the ROC AUC shows that the anomaly maps successfully represent anomalies in the images but the segmentation nevertheless fails due to bad estimation of the threshold. This highlights the difficulty in trying to find a good threshold based solely on a set of anomaly-free images. In a supervised setting, i.e., with knowledge of a set of anomalous images, this estimation might often be an easier task.

We now discuss for each method its overall evaluation result and provide examples for both failure cases and images for which the methods worked well (Figure 3).

#### 4.4.1 AnoGAN

We observe a tendency of GAN training to result in mode collapse [2]. The generator then often completely fails to reproduce a given test image since all latent samples generate more or less the same image. As a consequence, AnoGAN has great difficulties with object categories for which the objects appear in various shapes or orientations in the dataset. It performs better for object categories that contain less variations, such as *bottle* and *pill*. This can be seen in Figure 3a, where AnoGAN manages to detect the crack on the pill. However, it fails to generate small details on the pill such as the colored speckles, which it also detects as anomalies. For the category *carpet*, AnoGAN is unable to model all the subtle variations of the textural pattern, which results in a complete failure of the method as can be seen in the bottom row of Figure 3a.

#### 4.4.2 L2 and SSIM Autoencoder

We observe stable training across all dataset categories with reasonable reconstructions for both the SSIM and L2 autoencoder. Especially for the object categories of the dataset, both autoencoders outperform all other evaluated methods in the majority of cases. For some categories, however, both autoencoders fail to model small details, which results in rather blurry image reconstructions. This is especially the case for high-frequency textures, which appear, for example, in *tile* and *zipper*. The bottom row of Figure 3b shows that for *tile*, the L2 autoencoder, in addition to the cracked surface, detects many false positive regions across the entire image. A similar behavior can be observed for the SSIM autoencoder.

#### 4.4.3 CNN Feature Dictionary

As a method proposed for the detection of anomalous regions in textured surfaces, the feature dictionary based on CNN features achieves satisfactory results for all textures except *grid*. Since it does not incorporate additional information about the spatial location of the extracted features, its performance degenerates when evaluated on objects. Figure 3c demonstrates good anomaly segmentation performance for *carpet* with only few false positives, while the color defect on *metal nut* is only partially found.

#### 4.4.4 GMM-Based Texture Inspection Model

Specifically designed to operate on texture images, the GMM-based texture inspection model performs well across most texture categories of the dataset. On *grid*, however, it cannot achieve satisfactory results due to many small defects for which its sensitivity is not high enough (Figure 3d).

Furthermore, since it only operates on gray-scale images, it fails to detect most color-based defects.

#### 4.4.5 Variation Model

For the variation model, good performance can be observed on *screw*, *toothbrush*, and *bottle*, while it yields comparably bad results for *metal nut* and *capsule*. This is mostly due to the fact that the latter objects contain certain random variations on the objects' surfaces, which prevents the variation model from learning reasonable mean and variance values for most of the image pixels. Figure 3e illustrates this behavior: since the imprint on the capsule can appear at various locations, it will always be misclassified as a defect.

### 5. Conclusions

We introduce the MVTEC Anomaly Detection dataset, a novel dataset for unsupervised anomaly detection mimicking real-world industrial inspection scenarios. The dataset provides the possibility to evaluate unsupervised anomaly detection methods on various texture and object classes with different types of anomalies. Because pixel-precise ground truth labels for anomalous regions in the images are provided, it is possible to evaluate anomaly detection methods for both image-level classification as well as pixel-level segmentation.

Several state-of-the-art methods as well as two classical methods were thoroughly evaluated on this dataset. The evaluations provide a first benchmark on this dataset and show that there is still considerable room for improvement.

It is our hope that the proposed dataset will stimulate the development of new unsupervised anomaly detection methods.

### References

- [1] J. An and S. Cho. Variational Autoencoder based Anomaly Detection using Reconstruction Probability. Technical report, SNU Data Mining Center, 2015.
- [2] M. Arjovsky and L. Bottou. Towards Principled Methods for Training Generative Adversarial Networks. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.
- [3] C. Baur, B. Wiestler, S. Albarqouni, and N. Navab. Deep Autoencoding Models for Unsupervised Anomaly Segmentation in Brain MR Images. In A. Crimi, S. Bakas, H. Kuijff, F. Keyvan, M. Reyes, and T. van Walsum, editors, *Brain-lesion: Glioma, Multiple Sclerosis, Stroke and Traumatic Brain Injuries*, pages 161–169, Cham, 2019. Springer International Publishing.
- [4] P. Bergmann, S. Löwe, M. Fauser, D. Sattlegger, and C. Steger. Improving Unsupervised Defect Segmentation by Applying Structural Similarity to Autoencoders. In A. Tremeau, G. Farinella, and J. Braz, editors, *14th International Joint Conference on Computer Vision, Imaging and Computer*

- Graphics Theory and Applications*, volume 5: VISAPP, pages 372–380, Setúbal, 2019. Scitepress.
- [5] T. Böttger and M. Ulrich. Real-time Texture Error Detection on Textured Surfaces with Compressed Sensing. *Pattern Recognition and Image Analysis*, 26(1):88–94, 2016.
- [6] D. Carrera, F. Manganini, G. Boracchi, and E. Lanzarone. Defect Detection in SEM Images of Nanofibrous Materials. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, 13(2):551–561, 2017.
- [7] R. Chalapathy, A. K. Menon, and S. Chawla. Anomaly Detection using One-Class Neural Networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.06360*, 2018.
- [8] M. Everingham, S. M. A. Eslami, L. Van Gool, C. K. I. Williams, J. Winn, and A. Zisserman. The Pascal Visual Object Classes Challenge: A Retrospective. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 111(1):98–136, Jan. 2015.
- [9] I. Goodfellow, Y. Bengio, and A. Courville. *Deep Learning*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2016.
- [10] I. Goodfellow, J. Pouget-Abadie, M. Mirza, B. Xu, D. Warde-Farley, S. Ozair, A. Courville, and Y. Bengio. Generative Adversarial Nets. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2672–2680, 2014.
- [11] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun. Deep Residual Learning for Image Recognition. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- [12] D. Hendrycks, M. Mazeika, and T. Dietterich. Deep Anomaly Detection with Outlier Exposure. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [13] D. P. Kingma and M. Welling. Auto-Encoding Variational Bayes. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2014.
- [14] A. Krizhevsky and G. Hinton. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. Technical report, University of Toronto, 2009.
- [15] A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and G. E. Hinton. ImageNet Classification with Deep Convolutional Neural Networks. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems - Volume 1*, pages 1097–1105, 2012.
- [16] Y. LeCun, L. Bottou, Y. Bengio, and P. Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 86(11):2278–2324, 1998.
- [17] E. Nalisnick, A. Matsukawa, Y. W. Teh, D. Gorur, and B. Lakshminarayanan. Do Deep Generative Models Know What They Don’t Know? *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [18] P. Napoletano, F. Piccoli, and R. Schettini. Anomaly Detection in Nanofibrous Materials by CNN-Based Self-Similarity. *Sensors*, 18(1):209, 2018.
- [19] P. Perera and V. M. Patel. Learning Deep Features for One-Class Classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.05365*, 2018.
- [20] M. A. Pimentel, D. A. Clifton, L. Clifton, and L. Tarassenko. A review of novelty detection. *Signal Processing*, 99:215–249, 2014.
- [21] L. Ruff, R. Vandermeulen, N. Goernitz, L. Deecke, S. A. Siddiqui, A. Binder, E. Müller, and M. Kloft. Deep One-Class Classification. In J. Dy and A. Krause, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 4393–4402. PMLR, 2018.
- [22] B. Saleh, A. Farahdi, and A. Elgammal. Object-Centric Anomaly Detection by Attribute-Based Reasoning. *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 787–794, 2013.
- [23] T. Schlegl, P. Seeböck, S. M. Waldstein, U. Schmidt-Erfurth, and G. Langs. Unsupervised Anomaly Detection with Generative Adversarial Networks to Guide Marker Discovery. In *International Conference on Information Processing in Medical Imaging*, pages 146–157. Springer, 2017.
- [24] C. Steger. Similarity Measures for Occlusion, Clutter, and Illumination Invariant Object Recognition. In B. Radig and S. Florczyk, editors, *Pattern Recognition*, volume 2191 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 148–154, Berlin, 2001. Springer-Verlag.
- [25] C. Steger. Occlusion, Clutter, and Illumination Invariant Object Recognition. In *International Archives of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing*, volume XXXIV, part 3A, pages 345–350, 2002.
- [26] C. Steger, M. Ulrich, and C. Wiedemann. *Machine Vision Algorithms and Applications*. Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, 2nd edition, 2018.
- [27] Z. Wang, A. C. Bovik, H. R. Sheikh, and E. P. Simoncelli. Image quality assessment: from error visibility to structural similarity. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 13(4):600–612, 2004.
- [28] M. Wieler and T. Hahn. Weakly Supervised Learning for Industrial Optical Inspection. Online: [resources.mpi-inf.mpg.de/conference/dagm/2007/prizes.html](https://resources.mpi-inf.mpg.de/conference/dagm/2007/prizes.html). Accessed 2018-11-16.