## Raw image space improves single-cell classification in Acute Myeloid Leukemia

# HELMHOLTZ MUNICH

### **Problem Definition and Motivation**



**Motivation:** 



- Myeloid Leukaemia (AML).
- color image space.

#### **Network Architectures and Training**

We use the following models with pretrained weights:

- **ResNet50** [2]: Pretrained on ImageNet dataset.
- ViT [4]: Vision Transformer, pretrained on ImageNet-21k dataset.

$$\mathcal{L}_{ce} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{F}_{i=1}$$

Rao Muhammad Umer, Christian Metak, and Carsten Marr Institute of AI for Health (AIH), Helmholtz Munich, Germany. Contact: raoumer.github.io

#### **Experimental Results**

**Dataset:** We evaluate our approach on the Matek\_19 AML [1] dataset, contains 18, 365 labeled single-cell RGB images (patch size :  $400 \times 400 \times 3$ ) with 15 cell types, and taken from peripheral blood smears of 100 patients diagnosed with AML.

#### **Quantitative Results:**

	sification Results	on testset	(1836 RGB	images, 10 <sup>o</sup>	% of total d
--	--------------------	------------	-----------	-------------------------	--------------

Methods	<b>#Params</b> ↓		<b>Precision</b> ↑	<b>Sensitivity</b>	F1-score↑	Weighted ↑		
		[%]				<b>ROCAUC</b>		
		Fine-tun	e the model la	st layer (Linear	fully connect	ted layer)		
ResNet50 [2]	23.54	85.89	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.95		
KimiaNet [3]	7.00	86.77	0.86	0.87	0.87	0.97		
VIT_B_16 [4]	86.58	90.14	0.89	0.90	0.90	0.98		
		Fine-tune the whole model layers						
ResNet50 [2]	23.54	96.57	0.97	0.97	0.97	1.00		
KimiaNet [3]	7.00	96.73	0.97	0.97	0.97	1.00		
VIT_B_16 [4]	86.58	96.57	0.97	0.97	0.97	1.00		
VIT_B_32 [4]	88.24	95.10	0.95	0.95	0.95	1.00		
VIT_L_16 [4]	304.34	96.19	0.96	0.96	0.96	1.00		
VIT_L_32 [4]	306.55	96.08	0.96	0.96	0.96	1.00		

#### • Classification results with five-fold cross-validation:

N	0.	of	Cla

15

**Precision / Sensitivity / f1-score** 0.992 / 0.989 / 0.990

#### • RGB vs. RAW Classification results comparison on testset (1836 RGB images, 10% of total dataset):

**ResNet50** [2]

Methods	Datasets	Accuracy↑ [%]	<b>Precision</b> ↑	<b>Sensitivity</b> ↑	F1-score↑	Weighted ↑   ROC AUC
ResNet50	RGB space	96.57	0.97	0.97	0.97	1.00
ResNet50	RGB space + Augmentation	96.02	0.96	0.96	0.96	1.00
ResNet50	Raw space	96.84	0.97	0.97	0.97	1.00

itational Cost comparison on testset (1836 RGB images, 10% of total dataset):							
	Methods	Ave. Time↓ [ms]	#Params↓ [M]	FLOPs↓ [G]	#Acts↓ [M]	GPU Mem.↓ [M]	#Conv2d↓
-	ResNet50 [2]	6.81	23.54	4.12	11.11	184.03	53
	KimiaNet [3]	16.44	7.00	2.88	6.90	155.15	120
-	VIT_B_16 [4]	7.78	86.58	17.6	-	466.86	38

#### Conclusions

• We demonstrate the effectiveness of raw image space for WBC classification in the quantitative results. • We conclude that CNN-based classifiers are still better choice than attention-based for limited resource constrains.

#### References

[1] C. Matek, S. Schwarz, K. Spiekermann, and C. Marr, "Human-level recognition of blast cells in acute myeloid leukaemia with convolutional neural networks," *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 2019. [2] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," in CVPR, 2016. [3] A. Riasatian *et al.*, "Fine-tuning and training of densenet for histopathology image representation using tcga diagnostic slides," Medical Image Analysis, 2021.

[4] A. Dosovitskiy *et al.*, "An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale," in *ICLR*, 2020.



#### dataset):

#### CNN\_Matek\_19 [1]

0.952 / 0.939 / -