

ofGlasgow



Qianying Liu¹, Xiao Gu², Paul Hendersons¹, Fani Deligianni¹

1. School of Computing Science, University of Glasgow 2. Department of Computing, Imperial College London



Background and Purpose

- MCSC framework
- Semi-supervised learning has demonstrated potential in medical image segmentation by utilizing unlabelled data.
- However, they do not explicitly capture high-level semantic relations between distant regions.
- Jointly train CNN and Transformer
- Regularising their features to be semantically consistent across different scales based on crossed labels.
- Code is available on GitHub (QR Code).

Supervision loss functions

On the output level, two losses:

- 1 supervision loss \mathcal{L}_{sup} (yellow dashed lines in Figure 1) between the segmentation predictions and the limited labelled data.
- 2. cross pseudo supervision loss \mathcal{L}_{cps} (green dashed lines) between the predictions and the pseudo labels in a cross teaching manner.
- On the feature level: multi-scale cross contrastive loss \mathcal{L}_{cl} (black dashed lines) to enhance feature consistency/distinguishability of feature of the same /different categories across the whole data (labelled and unlabelled).



cross pseudo supervision loss (unlabelled data)

 $\mathcal{L}_{cps(cnn)} = \mathcal{L}_{dice}(P^{u}_{cnn}, Y^{u}_{tra}), \quad \mathcal{L}_{cps(tra)} = \mathcal{L}_{dice}(P^{u}_{tra}, Y^{u}_{cnn}).$

- Multi-Scale Contrastive loss (whole data): $\mathcal{L}_{cl} = (\mathcal{L}_{cl_1} + ... + \mathcal{L}_{cl_n})$, each scale \mathcal{L}_{bcl} as \mathcal{L}_{cl_i}
- Balanced contrastive loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{bcl} = -\frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{a_i \in A} \frac{1}{|A_y| - 1} \sum_{p \in A_y \setminus \{i\}} \log \frac{\exp(a_i \cdot a_p / \tau)}{\sum_{j \in Y_A} \frac{1}{|A_j|} \sum_{a_k \in A_j} \exp(a_i \cdot a_k / \tau)},$$

• Total loss function:

$$\mathcal{L}_{cnn} = \mathcal{L}_{sup(cnn)} + w_{cps}\mathcal{L}_{cps(cnn)} + w_{cl}\mathcal{L}_{cl} \qquad \mathcal{L}_{tra} = \mathcal{L}_{sup(tra)} + w_{cps}\mathcal{L}_{cps(tra)} + w_{cl}\mathcal{L}_{cl}$$

Results

- MCSC outperforms SOTA by more than 3.0% in Dice on two benchmarks.
- <u>ACDC</u> 200 short-axis cardiac MRI, left ventricle (LV), myocardium (Myo), and right ventricle (RV).
- <u>Synapse</u>, abdominal CT, aorta, gallbladder, spleen, left/right kidney, liver, pancreas and stomach.

Fig. The overall architecture of our MCSC framework.



| Labelled | Methods | Me DSC↑ | Mean DSC↑ HD↓ | |
|--------------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------|--|
| $70 \cos \alpha (100\%)$ | UNet-FS | 91.7 | 4.0 | |
| 70 cases (100%) | BATFormer [16] | 92.8 | 8.0 | |
| | UNet-LS | 75.9 | 10.8 | |
| | CCT [19] | 84.0 | 6.6 | |
| 7 cases (10%) | CPS [8] | 85.0 | 6.6 | |
| | CTS [17] | 86.4 | 8.6 | |
| | MCSC (Ours) | 89.4 | 2.3 | |
| | UNet-LS | 51.2 | 31.2 | |
| 3 cases (5%) | CCT [19] | 58.6 | 27.9 | |
| | CPS [8] | 60.3 | 25.5 | |
| | CTS [17] | 65.6 | 16.2 | |
| | MCSC (Ours) | 73.6 | 10.5 | |
| | UNet-LS | 26.4 | 60.1 | |
| 1 case | CTS [17] | 46.8 | 36.3 | |
| | MCSC (Ours) | 58.6 | 31.2 | |

Tab. Segmentation results on the ACDC dataset.

| Labelled | Methods | DSC↑ | HD↓ |
|-------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|
| $18 \cos(100 \%)$ | UNet-FS | 75.6 | 42.3 |
| 10 cases(100 %) | nnFormer [39] | 86.6 | 10.6 |
| | UNet-LS | 47.2 | 122.3 |
| | CCT [19] | 51.4 | 102.9 |
| 4 cases(20 %) | CPS [8] | 57.9 | 62.6 |
| | CTS [17] | <u>64.0</u> | <u>56.4</u> |
| | MCSC (Ours) | 68.5 | 24.8 |
| | UNet-LS | 45.2 | 55.6 |
| | CCT [19] | 46.9 | 58.2 |
| 2 cases(10 %) | CPS [8] | 48.8 | 65.6 |
| | CTS [17] | <u>52.0</u> | 63.7 |
| | MCSC (Ours) | 61.1 | 32.6 |

Cross supervised contrastive learning in multi-scale

Labels for a mini-batch

Fig. CST Multi-scale cross supervised contrastive learning. Pseudo labels from cross-teaching (right) and ground-truth, and used to guide contrastive loss.



Pixel-wise feature alignment

Fig. Visualizations on the ACDC.



Ablations

| SCL | DB | CroLab | Balanced | MulSca | Un DSC↑ | et HD↓ | Transf DSC ↑ | ormer HD↓ |
|-----|--------|--------|----------|--------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | \ \ | \ \ | ✓ | | 86.40 87.50 88.23 88.80 | 8.6 7.4 3.4 4.6 | 85.22 86.02 86.13 86.53 | 5.1 4.5 3.2 2.4 |
| 1 | | 1 | ✓ | ✓ | 89.38 | 2.3 | 87.28 | 3.5 |

Tab. Ablation study for the primary components of our model. <u>SCL</u>, supervised local contrastive loss. <u>DB</u>, discard background pixels as anchor. <u>CroLab</u>, cross label information of two models to select contrastive sample. <u>Balanced</u>, average the instances of each class in denominator of SCL. <u>MulSca</u>, multi-scale feature maps.

| Branches | | | Mean | | |
|----------|----|----|------|-----------------------|--|
| 256 | 56 | 28 | DSC↑ | $\text{HD}\downarrow$ | |

| | | | I I | ' |
|--------------|---|--------------|-------|-----|
| 1 | | | 88.80 | 4.6 |
| | 1 | | 88.88 | 4.2 |
| | | \checkmark | 88.39 | 4.5 |
| ✓ | | ✓ | 89.38 | 2.3 |
| 1 | 1 | | 88.92 | 2.9 |
| \checkmark | ✓ | ✓ | 88.35 | 4.3 |
| | | | | |

Tab. Ablation on the choice of feature maps for the multi-scale (ACDC, 7 labelled cases).

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge funding by China Scholarship Council, EPSRC (EP/W01212X/1) and Royal Society (RGS/R2/212199).

Tab. Segmentation results on the Synapse dataset.

Fig. Visualizations on the Synapse.

References

- 1. Xiangde Luo etal. Semi-supervised medical image segmentation via cross teaching between cnn and transformer. Medical Imaging with Deep Learning, 2022.
- 2. Wenguan Wang, etal. Exploring cross-image pixel contrast for semantic segmentation. ICCV, 2021.
- 3. Jianggang Zhu, etal. Balanced contrastive learning for long-tailed visual recognition. CVPR, 2022.





Contact: 2665227L@student.gla.ac.uk