Supplementary Material of Gigapixel Whole-Slide Images Classification using Locally Supervised Learning

Jingwei Zhang^{1*}, Xin Zhang^{1*}, Ke Ma², Rajarsi Gupta¹, Joel Saltz¹, Maria Vakalopoulou³, and Dimitris Samaras¹

¹ Stony Brook University, USA ² Snap Inc., USA ³ CentraleSupélec, University of Paris-Saclay, France {jingwezhang, xin.zhang.3, kemma, samaras}@cs.stonybrook.edu {Rajarsi.Gupta, Joel.Saltz}@stonybrookmedicine.edu maria.vakalopoulou@centralesupelec.fr

Table 1. Comparison of training seconds per image on three different sized images. Our method was comparable to the end-to-end (E2E) training.

Image size	8698×7496	12223×10057	23849×10257
E2E	1.6s	2.6s	/
Ours (K=4)	1.6s	3.1s	6.6s
Ours (K=8)	2.2s	4.2s	8.8s

Table 2. Network structures of the reconstruction network R_i , the auxiliary classifier G_i and the classifier H.

Reconstruction R_i	Auxiliary classifier G_i	Classifier H
Bilinear interpolation Conv2d(3x3, 1x1) BatchNorm + ReLU Conv2d(3x3, 1x1)	Conv2d(kernel_size, stride) LayerNorm + ReLU GABMIL pooling Linear(NO. features, 128) ReLU Linear(128, NO. classes)	Conv2d($5 \times 5, 5 \times 5$) LayerNorm + ReLU GABMIL pooling Linear(512, 128) ReLU Linear(128, NO. classes)

^{*} These authors contributed equally to this paper.

2 J. Zhang et al.

Network		RFR model U_i		Classifier A_i	
Hyper-parameters		No. patches	Patch size	kernel_size	stride
K=4	G_1	10	128	9×9	9×9
	G_2	10	64	9×9	9×9
	G_3	10	32	7 imes 7	7×7
K=8	$G_1 \sim G_3$	10	128	9×9	9×9
	$G_4 \sim G_5$	10	64	9×9	9×9
	$G_6 \sim G_7$	10	32	7 imes 7	7×7

Table 3. Hyper-parameters used in our experiments. kernel_size and stride are the corresponding values in Table 2.



Fig. 1. Attention visualization of the GABMIL in the classifier $H(\cdot)$. As the entire image was too large, we picked two regions on each image and showed their local region and attention maps.