Guided Conditional Diffusion Classifier (ConDiff) for Enhanced Prediction of Infection in Diabetic Foot Ulcers

Palawat Busaranuvong, Emmanuel Agu, Deepak Kumar, Shefalika Gautam, Reza Saadati Fard, Bengisu Tulu, Diane Strong

Abstract-Goal: To detect infected wounds in Diabetic Foot Ulcers (DFUs) from photographs, preventing severe complications and amputations. Methods: This paper proposes the Guided Conditional Diffusion Classifier (ConDiff), a novel deep-learning infection detection model that combines guided image synthesis with a denoising diffusion model and distance-based classification. The process involves (1) generating guided conditional synthetic images by injecting Gaussian noise to a guide image, followed by denoising the noise-perturbed image through a reverse diffusion process, conditioned on infection status and (2) classifying infections based on the minimum Euclidean distance between synthesized images and the original guide image in embedding space. Results: ConDiff demonstrated superior performance with an accuracy of 83% and an F1-score of 0.858, outperforming state-of-the-art models by at least 3%. The use of a triplet loss function reduces overfitting in the distance-based classifier. Conclusions: ConDiff not only enhances diagnostic accuracy for DFU infections but also pioneers the use of generative discriminative models for detailed medical image analysis, offering a promising approach for improving patient outcomes.

Index Terms—Diabetic Foot Ulcers, Diffusion Models, Distancebased Image Classification, Generative Models, Wound Infection.

Impact Statement- ConDiff enhances the accuracy of automatic diagnosis of infections in diabetic foot ulcers, offering a promising tool for early detection and improved patient care.

I. INTRODUCTION

C HRONIC wounds, affecting over 6.5 million people or approximately 2% of the U.S. population, represent a significant health issue with healthcare expenses exceeding \$25 billion each year [1], [2]. Among these, Diabetic Foot Ulcers (DFUs) are a prevalent subtype that poses a substantial risk

This work is supported by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) through grant 1R01EB031910-01A1 Smartphone-based wound infection screener by combining thermal images and photographs using deep learning methods. (*Corresponding author: Emmanuel Agu.*)

Palawat Busaranuvong and Shefalika Gautam are with the Data Science Department, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester, MA 01609 USA. Emmanuel Agu, Deepak Kumar, and Reza Saadati Fard are with the Computer Science Department, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester, MA 01609 USA. Bengisu Tulu and Diane Strong are with the Foisie Business School, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester, MA 01609 USA. (e-mail: pbusaranuvong@wpi.edu, emmanuel@wpi.edu, dkumar1@wpi.edu, sgautam@wpi.edu, rsaadatifard@wpi.edu, bengisu@wpi.edu, dstrong@wpi.edu). for patients with diabetes. The commonality of DFUs on lower limbs, especially on the soles of the feet, makes them highly susceptible to infection [3], with an alarming 40% to 80% of cases leading to infection [4]. These infections, often caused by bacteria, can result in severe complications, including cell death, limb amputation, and hospitalization [5]. Given these risks, effective monitoring and early detection of infections are crucial in the management of DFUs to prevent further complications.

The problem: Accurately diagnosing infections in DFUs involves analyzing the wound's bacteriology, and reviewing patient records including clinical history, physical health assessments, and blood tests. However, as clinicians do not always have access to this comprehensive wound information, they often rely on visual inspection to identify signs of infection in DFUs. Visual indicators of infection include increased redness around the ulcer and colored purulent discharge. Moreover, experienced wound experts are not always available, especially in low-resource settings and developing countries. This paper proposes an automated method that uses deep-learning to detect infected DFUs from images.

Prior work: Recently, machine learning methods have achieved impressive performance in various medical image analysis and wound assessment tasks including works by Liu et al. [13], [14] for scoring the healing progress of chronic wounds from photographs based on evidence-based rubrics such as the Photographic Wound Assessment Tool (PWAT). Additionally, State-Of-The-Art (SOTA) machine learning image classification techniques have been proposed for detecting infections from the visual appearance of wounds in photographs [8], [11], [12] without the need for direct wound tests, medical notes, or extensive clinical examinations. Goyal et al. [8] introduced the CNN-Ensemble model, which extracts bottleneck features from Inception-V3, ResNet50, and InceptionResNetV2 that are then classified using an SVM classifier. Goyal et al. [8] also described the DFU infection dataset, in which clinical experts at Lancashire Teaching Hospital in the United Kingdom, used visual inspection to label whether wound images are infected. CNN-Ensemble achieved 72.7% accuracy for binary infection classification of wound images in the DFU infection dataset.

In a subsequent study, Liu et al. [10] reported an impressive accuracy of 99% for wound infection classification by adapting

TABLE I. Summary of prior work on wound infection classification using deep learning						
Specific ML problem	Related Work	Summary of Approach	No. of Target Classes	Dataset	Results	
Wound segmentation and Infection Classification	Wang et al. 2015 [6]	CNN-based: ConvNet + SVM	2 classes (infection and	NYU wound Database	Accuracy: 95.6% PPV: 40% Sensitivity: 31%	
Classification of 7 tissue types including infection	Nejati et al. 2018 [7]	CNN-based: AlexNet + PCA + SVM	no infection)	Private data (data statistics is unknown)	Accuracy 95.6% (Only reported accuracy)	
	Goyal et al. 2020 [8]	CNN-based: Ensemble CNN	2 classes (infection and no infection)	j	Part B DFU	Accuracy: 72.7% PPV: 73.5% Sensitivity: 70.9%
DFU infection classification	Al-Garaawi et al. 2022 [9]	CNN-based: DFU-RGB-TEX-Net		2020 dataset (We also used	Accuracy: 74.2% PPV: 74.1% Sensitivity: 75.1%	
	Liu et al. 2022 [10]	CNN-based: augmentations + EfficientNet		this dataset)	Data leakage when splitting & performing augmentations	
DFU wound ischemia and infection	Yap et al. 2021 [11]	CNN-based: VGG, ResNet, InceptionV3, DenseNet, EfficientNet	4 classes (both infection and ischemia, infection, ischemia, none)	DFUC2021	EfficientNet B0 performance: F1, PPV, SEN = 55% , 57%, 62%	
classification	Galdran et al. 2021 [12]	ViT-based: ViT, DeiT, BiT		infection, ischemia, none)	unuser	BiT performance: F1, PPV, SEN = 61%, 66% , 61%

the EfficientNet model [15], along with data augmentation techniques. However, their high accuracy was in part due to data leakage issues between the training and testing datasets. Specifically, the original DFU infection dataset from Goyal et al. [8] included each wound image in three naturally augmented forms with varying magnifications (see Fig. 1). Liu et al. [10] randomly divided these augmented images between the training and testing sets on a sample-wise basis, which resulted in significant data leakage as the testing set included images that closely resembled augmented versions of the training images.



Fig. 1. Natural data augmentation of an original image with three different magnifications.

Challenges: Automated DFU image analyses to detect infection using deep learning methods face several challenges that hinder accurate diagnoses. Firstly, the distinction between images of infected and uninfected wounds is fine-grained [8], exemplified by high inter-class similarity and intra-class variation, which present a challenge to machine learning infec-



Fig. 2. Inference in the ConDiff Classier Framework. Input x_0 is perturbed by noise of strength t_0 . The perturbed input x_{t_0T} is denoised through a reverse diffusion process to synthesize image $\hat{x}_0^{(y_i)}$ conditioned on label y_i . Infection classification is based on the minimum L_2 distance between x_0 and $\hat{x}_0^{(y_i)}$ in embedding space.

tion classifiers. Secondly, wound image datasets often have inconsistent imaging conditions, including variations in camera distance, orientation, and lighting [8]. Lastly, as data collection in clinical environments is expensive and tedious, labeled DFU image datasets are often small, making it challenging to train deep-learning models.

Our approach: This paper presents the Guided Conditional Diffusion Classifier (ConDiff), a novel generative discriminative approach for wound infection classification (see Fig. 2). ConDiff leverages conditional guide image editing with a

generative diffusion model [16], [17] by perturbing an input image with a specific amount of Gaussian noise, and generating new images by using a reverse diffusion process to gradually remove noise from the noise-perturbed input image. ConDiff's diffusion process is conditioned on the state of the wound (no infection (y_1) or infection (y_2)), creating synthetic images reflective of these states. One key importance is the ability of ConDiff to discern and learn similarities between representations of the conditionally generated images \hat{x}_0^y and the original wound image x_0 via an L_2 distance-based classifier in embedding space. The condition that yields the synthetic image that is most similar to the original, is selected as the predictive label. Unlike traditional supervised classification techniques that minimize a binary cross-entropy loss function, ConDiff mitigates overfitting by utilizing the triplet loss function [18], to increase the distances between non-similar image pairs and reduce the distances between similar ones. This work utilizes the DFU infection dataset provided by Goyal et al. [8] (see Table. I). However, to eliminate data leakage between the training and test sets, we have refined our dataset creation and splitting strategy. Using subject-wise splitting, only the second magnified naturally augmented image (refer to Fig. 1) is utilized for each subject.

The main contributions of this paper are:

- We propose the Guided Conditional Diffusion Classifier (ConDiff), an integrated end-to-end framework for classifying infected wound images. The ConDiff framework has 2 main components: (1) Guided diffusion, which injects Gaussian noise into a DFU image and then gradually removes noise from noise-perturbed images conditioned on infection status to synthesize conditional images (2) A distance-based classifier, which predicts an input image's label based on the minimum L_2 distance between original and synthesized images in embedding space. To the best of our knowledge, ConDiff is the first generative discriminative method to analyze fine-grained wound images, advancing the detection of Diabetic Foot Ulcer (DFU) infections.
- In rigorous evaluation on unseen test wound images (148 infected and 103 uninfected) from the DFU infection dataset [8], our ConDiff framework significantly outperformed state-of-the-art baselines, improving on the accuracy and F1-score of wound infection detection by at least 3%.
- We demonstrate that by minimizing the Triplet loss function during training, ConDiff reduces overfitting on a small DFU dataset of 1416 training images.
- Heatmaps generated by Score-CAM [19] are applied to visually illustrate that ConDiff focuses on the correct wound image regions when classifying wound infection status.

II. RELATED WORK

A. Wound Infection Classification with Deep Learning

Two neural network architectures have predominantly been popular for image analyses: Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) and Vision Transformer (ViT) based models. Table. I summarizes prior work on DFU infection classification from wound images. Unlike other prior discriminative approaches that directly predict the probability of each label from wound images, ConDiff utilizes a generative discrimination framework to predict a wound image's infection label based on the guided synthetic image that has the highest similarity to the input image in embedding space.

B. Generative Diffusion Models

Diffusion Models [20], [21] have recently emerged as a new class of generative models, drawing attention for their robustness and high-quality outputs, and presenting an alternative to Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs). In contrast to the adversarial approach used to train GANs, diffusion models incrementally learn to reverse a process that introduces noise into data. This method avoids issues with GANs such as mode collapse, yielding a significantly more stable training process. Diffusion models have shown great potential in various applications including Text-to-Image generation and Imageto-Image translation [16], [22], [23]. A standout quality of diffusion models is their ability to generate highly detailed and varied outputs, which is particularly advantageous in medical imaging. Recent studies have demonstrated the potential of diffusion models to effectively synthesize medical images including detecting and segmenting brain anomalies [24], [25], performing multi-contrast MRI and MRI-CT translations [26], and enhancing the resolution of 3D Brain MRIs [27]. To the best of our knowledge, diffusion models have not previously been applied to wound image analyses.

III. METHODOLOGY

We now expound on the ConDiff framework, its components, theoretical bases, and practical application.

A. Denoising Diffusion Probabilistic Model (DDPM)

DDPM [20] is a generative model that leverages diffusion processes to generate synthetic data. DDPM has two main stages: 1) a forward process and 2) a reverse process. The forward process $q(x_{1:T}|x_0)$ systematically adds Gaussian noise to the data in *T* steps, ultimately transforming the original data into a Gaussian distribution p(z). In the reverse process $p_{\theta}(x_{0:T})$, the model learns to remove this noise iteratively to reconstruct or generate data samples, accomplished using a neural network trained to predict and reverse the noise added at each step.

1) Forward Diffusion Process: Starting with an initial data point $x_0 \sim q(x)$, to which noise is incrementally added over T steps. At each step t, this process is represented as a Gaussian transition in a Markov chain:

$$x_t = \sqrt{1 - \beta_t} x_{t-1} + \sqrt{\beta_t} \varepsilon_t$$
$$q(x_t | x_{t-1}) = \mathcal{N}(x_t; \mu_t = \sqrt{1 - \beta_t} x_{t-1}, \Sigma_t = \beta_t I)$$
(1)

where $\varepsilon_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ represents the Gaussian noise, and $\beta_t < 1$ denotes the variance schedule. Considering $\alpha_t = 1 - \beta_t$ and

 $\bar{\alpha}_t = \prod_{\tau=1}^T \alpha_{\tau}$, a tractable closed-form for sampling at any step *t*, given x_0 can be defined as (Eq. 2).

$$q(x_t|x_0) = \mathcal{N}(x_t; \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_t} x_0, (1 - \bar{\alpha}_t)I)$$
(2)

The entire forward diffusion process can be viewed as a joint posterior distribution: $q(x_{1:T}|x_0) = \prod_{t=1}^{T} q(x_t|x_{t-1})$.

2) Reverse Diffusion Process: Since the distribution $q(x_0)$ of the underlying data is unknown, analytically reversing the forward diffusion process to get $q(x_{t-1}|x_t)$, is intractable. To manage this, the reverse process is approximated using a neural network-based distribution $p_{\theta}(x_{t-1}|x_t)$, characterized by learnable parameters θ . The reverse process' joint distribution is given by $p_{\theta}(x_{0:T}) = p_{\theta}(x_T) \prod_{t=1}^{T} p_{\theta}(x_{t-1}|x_t)$. Here, the reverse process starts from a Gaussian distribution $p(x_T)$ and follows learned Gaussian transitions defined as:

$$p_{\theta}(x_{t-1}|x_t) = \mathcal{N}(x_{t-1}; \mu_{\theta}(x_t, t), \Sigma_{\theta}(x_t, t))$$
(3)

where μ_{θ} and Σ_{θ} are the neural network's predictions for the mean and variance at each step *t*.

3) Learning Objective: Due to the intractability of exact likelihood computation in this context, a technique adopted from Variational Autoencoders (VAEs) [28] is utilized, focusing on maximizing the Evidence Lower Bound (ELBO) [29].

$$L(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_q \left[\log \frac{p_{\theta}(x_{0:T})}{q(x_{1:T}|x_0)} \right]$$
$$= \mathbb{E}_q \left[-\sum_{t>1} D_{KL} \left(q(x_{t-1}|x_t) \| p_{\theta}(x_{t-1}|x_t) \right) + \log p_{\theta}(x_0|x_1) \right]$$
(4)

Ho et al. [20] further refined the objective function in Eq. 4 to yield a simplified objective function for minimizing the Mean Squared Error (MSE) between the actual and predicted noise (Eq. 5).

$$L_{DM}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbb{E}_{x_0, t, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)} \left[\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(x_t, t)\|_2^2 \right]$$
(5)

Here, $\varepsilon_{\theta}(x_t, t)$ is a denoising U-Net model used for approximating ε from x_t , which aids in determining the mean $\mu_{\theta}(x_t, t)$:

$$\mu_{\theta}(x_t, t) = \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_{t-1}} F_{\theta}(x_t, t) + \sqrt{1 - \bar{\alpha}_{t-1} - \sigma_t^2} \varepsilon_{\theta}(x_t, t)$$
(6)

where
$$F_{\theta}(x_t, t) = \frac{x_t - \sqrt{1 - \bar{\alpha}_t} \varepsilon_{\theta}(x_t, t)}{\sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_t}}$$

and $\sigma_t^2 = \frac{1 - \bar{\alpha}_{t-1}}{1 - \bar{\alpha}_t} \beta_t$ (7)

4) Sampling Process with DDIM: Generating new samples with DDPM is computationally intensive, often requiring about a thousand sampling steps. To address this, Song et al. [21] introduced the Denoising Diffusion Implicit Model (DDIM), which accelerates the sampling process by significantly reducing the number of iterative steps. This is achieved by redefining the diffusion process as a non-Markovian process. Considering the DDPM sampling process in Eq. 3, the latent x_{t-1} can be derived from x_t using the parameterized mean $\mu_{\theta}(x_t, t)$ in Eq. 6

and variances $\Sigma_{\theta}(x_t, t) = \sigma_t^2 I$.

$$x_{t-1} = \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_{t-1}} F_{\theta}(x_t, t) + \sqrt{1 - \bar{\alpha}_{t-1} - \sigma_t^2 \varepsilon_{\theta}(x_t, t)} + \sigma_t z \quad (8)$$

Here, $z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ represents standard Gaussian noise, independent of x_t . In DDIM, setting $\sigma_t = 0$ for all t makes the process deterministic, avoiding the need for a Markov chain and allowing for step-skipping. Eq. 9 expresses the DDIM sampling step. This approach significantly enhances efficiency, generating new samples $10 \times$ to $50 \times$ faster than DDPM.

$$x_{t-1} = \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_{t-1}} F_{\theta}(x_t, t) + \sqrt{1 - \bar{\alpha}_{t-1}} \varepsilon_{\theta}(x_t, t)$$
(9)

B. Conditional Image Generation with Diffusion Models

Prior works have demonstrated that these models can be adapted to conditional generation, where the generated data depends on a given condition or context, such as a class label or a textual description [30], [31]. The simplest implementation method involves introducing the conditioning variable y as an additional input to the denoising network, represented as $\varepsilon_{\theta}(x_t, t, y)$. However, one limitation is that the network may not adequately consider the conditioning variable, sometimes completely overlooking it [29]. To address this, a *guidance scale* is introduced, enhancing the influence of the conditioning variable during sample generation.

1) Classifier-Free Diffusion Guidance: Dhariwal and Nichol [30] introduced Classifier Guidance where the diffusion score $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\theta}(x_t, t, y) = \nabla_{x_t} \log p(x_t) + \omega \nabla_{x_t} \log p(y|x_t)$ includes a classifier $p_{\phi}(y|x_t)$ that must be able to predict the samples with varying degrees of noise x_t . A guidance scale ω controls the weight given to the classifier gradient. To prevent the inclusion of the auxiliary classifier $p_{\phi}(y|x_t)$, Ho et al. [31] later applied Bayes' theorem to reformulate $\nabla_{x_t} \log p(y|x_t)$. Consequently, the Classifier-Free Guidance (CFG) formula is expressed as:

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\theta}(x_t, t, y) = (1 - \omega)\varepsilon_{\theta}(x_t, t) + \omega\varepsilon_{\theta}(x_t, t, y)$$
(10)

To train this guided diffusion model, the label y is incorporated as an additional input in the learning objective (Eq. 5), resulting in Eq. 11.

$$L_{DM}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbb{E}_{x_0, t, y, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)} \left[\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(x_t, t, y)\|_2^2 \right]$$
(11)

C. Guided Conditional Diffusion Classifier (ConDiff)

To complete our ConDiff model, two additional components are now introduced: 1) guided image synthesis and 2) triplet loss for learning similarity.

1) Guided Image Synthesis: We aim to generate conditional images that are guided by original images. Specifically, we seek to synthesize wound images that closely resemble the input image, while also being distinct enough to differentiate between infection and non-infection conditions. We employ a strategy from image synthesis with Stochastic Differential Equations (SDEs) [17], introducing a certain amount of Gaussian noise to the guide image through a forward diffusion process (see Eq. 2). Next, we synthesize conditional images using classifier-free guidance (Sec. III-B). The noise strength



Fig. 3. Synthesizing conditional DFU images using ConDiff. A guide image x_0 is perturbed with Gaussian noises that are then removed progressively using a CFG-DDIM sampling technique (see Algorithm. 1), conditioned on the infection status. This process gradually projects x_0 to guided synthetic images of conditions: $\hat{x}_0^{(y_1)}$ and $\hat{x}_0^{(y_2)}$.

 $t_0 \in (0,1]$ indicates the level of noise added to the original image $x_0 \sim q(x)$:

$$x_{t_0T} = x_0 + \sigma(t_0)z$$
, where $z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ (12)

Here, $\sigma(t_0) = \sqrt{\frac{1-\bar{\alpha}_{t_0T}}{\bar{\alpha}_{t_0T}}}$ is a scalar function determining the noise magnitude, and *T* is the total number of forward diffusion steps. Subsequently, the classifier-free guided DDIM sampling is used to synthesize images, as illustrated in Algorithm 1 and visualized in Fig. 3.

Algorithm 1 outlines ConDiff Sampling with CFG-DDIM. In line (1), Gaussian noise of strength t_0 is added to the input image. The reverse process begins from step t_0T to step 1 (line 2). Line (3) applies the modified diffusion model $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\theta}(x_t, t, y)$ following CFG (Eq. 10), and the DDIM sampling process is conducted in line (4).

Algorithm 1 ConDiff Sampling with CFG-DDIM

Require: Guide image: x_0 , class label: y, guidance scale: ω , noise strength: t_0 , and number of diffusion steps: T. 1: $x_{t_0T} = x_0 + \sigma(t_0)z$, where $z \sim \mathcal{N}(0,I)$ 2: **for** $t = t_0T, \dots, 1$ **do** 3: $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\theta}(x_t, t, y) = \omega \epsilon_{\theta}(x_t, t, y) + (1 - \omega) \epsilon_{\theta}(x_t, t)$ 4: $x_{t-1} = \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_{t-1}} \left(\frac{x_t - \sqrt{1 - \bar{\alpha}_t \bar{\epsilon}_{\theta}}}{\sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_t}} \right) + \sqrt{1 - \bar{\alpha}_{t-1}} \tilde{\epsilon}_{\theta}$ 5: **end for** 6: **return** $\hat{x}_0^{(y)}$

2) Learning Similarity with Triplet Loss: Having generated images with different labels, our next goal is to determine which synthesized image is most similar to the guide image x_0 , a sub-problem addressed using the triplet loss function (Eq. 13) introduced in FaceNet [18]. The triplet loss function minimizes the distance between an anchor image $x^{(a)}$ and a positive image $x^{(p)}$ with the same identity while maximizing the distance between the anchor image and a negative image $x^{(n)}$ with a different identity. A neural network $f_{\phi}(x)$ transforms the images into a *d*-dimensional Euclidean space, facilitating similarity measurement.

$$L_{triplet} = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\|f_{\phi}(x^{(a)}) - f_{\phi}(x^{(p)})\|_{2}^{2} - \|f_{\phi}(x^{(a)}) - f_{\phi}(x^{(n)})\|_{2}^{2} + \alpha\right)_{+}\right]$$
(13)

The margin α is set to 1, indicating the desired separation between similar and dissimilar pairs. Consequently, our classifier D_{ϕ} determines the closest conditional synthesized image to the guide image x_0 by comparing their L_2 distance in embedding space (Eq. 14).

$$D_{\phi}(x_0, \hat{x}_0^{(y_1)}, \hat{x}_0^{(y_2)}) = \arg\min_{y_i} \left\{ L_2(f_{\phi}(x_0), f_{\phi}(\hat{x}_0^{(y_i)})) \right\}$$
(14)

3) ConDiff Training Process: The training process is divided into two stages. Stage 1 involves training $\varepsilon_{\theta}(x_t, t, y)$ with the objective expressed in Eq. 11, focusing on noise removal (Algorithm 2). After optimizing $\varepsilon_{\theta}(x_t, t, y)$, conditional images $\hat{x}_0^{(y_1)}$ and $\hat{x}_0^{(y_2)}$ are generated using ConDiff, following the process in Fig. 3 for all DFU images in our dataset. Stage 2 optimizes the embedding network f_{ϕ} to learn the Triplet loss (Eq. 13, Algorithm 3).

Algorithm 2 Jointly training a diffusion model with CFG

Require: diffusion model: ε_{θ} , pairs of guide image and class label: $q(x_0, y)$, probability of unconditional training: p_{uncond} , and number of training steps: *N*.

Ensure: learned ε_{θ}

1: for n = 1, ..., N do

2: Sample a pair of image-label
$$(x_0, y) \sim q(x_0, y)$$

3:
$$y \leftarrow \emptyset$$
 with probability p_{uncond}

- 4: $t \sim \text{Uniform}\{1,\ldots,T\}, \ \varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0,I)$
- 5: $x_t = \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_t} x_0 + \sqrt{1 \bar{\alpha}_t} \varepsilon$
- 6: Take gradient step on $\nabla_{\theta} \| \varepsilon \varepsilon_{\theta}(x_t, t, y) \|^2$

7: **end for**

Algorithm 3 Training a distance-based classifier model with Triplet loss

Require: embedding model: f_{ϕ} , real dataset: D_r , synthetic dataset: D_s , probability of sampling from D_s : p_{gen} , number of epochs: E, and batch size: B.

Ensure: learned f_{ϕ}

- 1: for epoch = 1,..., *E* do 2: for batch = 1,..., $\lceil \text{size}(D_r)/B \rceil$ do
- 3: $(x^{(a)}, x^{(p)}, x^{(n)}) \sim D_r$ (sample *B* triplets)
- 4: $(x^{(p)}, x^{(n)}) \sim D_s$ with probability p_{gen}
- 5: Compute $L_{triplet}$ in Eq. 13.
- 6: Take gradient step on $\nabla_{\phi} L_{triplet}$
- 7: end for
- 8: end for

Training Stage 1: Algorithm 2 details joint training of the unconditional and conditional models. Occasionally, y is set to the unconditional class identifier \emptyset with a probability p_{uncond} , a hyperparameter typically around 10–20% [31]. For each training step, an image x_0 and condition y are sampled from the dataset. The diffusion step t is also sampled from the uniform distribution of $[1, \ldots, T]$. Subsequently, in line (5), a forward diffusion process is performed to add noise to the image x_0 following Eq. 2. The diffusion model parameters θ are then optimized to minimize the MSE between the actual and predicted noise.

Training Stage 2: The embedding model f_{ϕ} is trained in Algorithm 3. In addition to the real DFU dataset D_r , a synthetic dataset D_s is also created from our trained ConDiff model following the sampling process in Algorithm 1. For each iteration, a batch of triplets $(x^{(a)}, x^{(p)}, x^{(n)})$ is sampled from D_r . To increase recognition ability and improve training robustness, $(x^{(p)}, x^{(n)})$ is sampled from D_s with the probability of $p_{gen} = 0.2$. Embedding model parameters ϕ are optimized to minimize the Triplet loss, thus learning to distinguish between similar and dissimilar images effectively.

IV. EXPERIMENTS AND RESULTS

A. Diabetic Foot Ulcer (DFU) Dataset

The DFU Infection Dataset curated by Goyal et al. [8], comprises DFU images collected at the Lancashire Teaching Hospital with the permission of the U.K. National Health Service (NHS). These DFU images were labeled by two DFU specialists (consultant physicians) based on visual inspection, independent of medical notes or clinical tests. The dataset consists of 2,946 augmented patches with infection and 2,946 augmented patches with infection and 2,946 augmented patches with infection. Natural augmentation was performed with varying magnification as illustrated in Fig. 1. All patches have dimensions of $224 \times 224 \times 3$ pixels.

Data Preprocessing: The training, validation and test sets were created using 65%, 15% and 20% of the dataset respectively. To prevent data leakage, subject-wise splitting was utilized, where all images for each case could only belong to one class. As a further measure to prevent data leakage, as shown in Fig. 1, only augmented patches with a $\times 2$ magnification level were utilized. The model achieving the highest accuracy on the validation set (optimal parameter values), was selected for final evaluation on the test (unseen) dataset. Table. II shows the dataset statistics after pre-processing.

# of Patches	
_	

TABLE II. Refined DFU Dataset Statistics

B. Experimental Setup

1) Implementation Details: As outlined in Sec. III-C3, the ConDiff classifier was trained in two distinct stages on an NVIDIA A100 GPU.

Stage 1 - Fine-Tuning the Diffusion Model: First, a Stable Diffusion model pre-trained on the LAION-400M dataset [32], a large collection of 400 million image-text pairs, was retrieved [16]. Its denoising U-Net ε_{θ} was fine-tuned on our wound training set D_r , as described in Algorithm 2. The training involved 10,000 iterations, employing the AdamW optimizer with a learning rate of 1×10^{-5} for fine-tuning.

After training, our ConDiff generator was utilized to synthesize conditional DFU images with the following hyperparameter setting: guidance scale $\omega = 0.75$, noise strength $t_0 = 0.8$, and the number of sampling steps T = 30. These images were synthesized using training images as guide inputs, resulting in a collection of synthetic data D_s , for use in the second stage of training.

Stage 2 - Training the Embedding Network f_{ϕ} : utilized the EfficientNet-B0 neural networks architecture as the backbone. The Euclidean embedding dimension *d* was set to 256. The optimal set of parameters ϕ was obtained from the best model performance on the validation partition. The training was for 50 epochs as described in Algorithm 3, using the AdamW optimizer with a learning rate of 1×10^{-3} .

2) *Evaluation Metrics:* of all models on the DFU dataset were as follows.

<u>Classification metrics</u>: Accuracy, sensitivity, specificity, Positive Predictive Value (PPV), and F1-score were used to evaluate DFU infection classification performance.

Image generation metrics: To evaluate the quality of synthetic images, the Fréchet Inception Distance (FID) score and the Inception Score (IS) were employed. A lower FID indicates more realism and higher quality while a higher IS indicates that the generated images are distinct and diverse.

<u>Clustering metric</u>: DFU images' embedding vectors of uninfected and infected wounds were analyzed using the Silhouette score. It measures how similar data points within the cluster (cohesion) are compared to data points in other clusters (separation). Its value ranges from -1 to 1, where a high value indicates that the object is well-matched to its cluster and poorly matched to neighboring clusters.

3) SOTA Baseline Models: Recent deep learning image classification architectures including CNN and ViT-based models were considered as baselines. Due to the small size of our dataset, the base or tiny version of each model was selected for evaluation.

<u>CNN-based models</u>: ResNet [33] and Inception-V3 [34] were selected as baseline models because Goyal et al. [8] employed them as backbones in the ensemble CNN model for DFU infection classification. DenseNet [35] was selected as Yap et al. [11] found that it achieved the best macro-F1 score in 4-class DFU image classification. EfficientNet [15] was selected as it was the most effective CNN-based model in analyzing wound infections [11], [12].

<u>ViT-based models</u>: ViT [36] and DeiT [37] were explored for for DFU ischemia & infection classification by Galdran et al. [12], achieving a macro-F1 score comparable to the best CNN-based model (EfficientNet). SwinV2 [38] and EfficientFormer [39] were selected as baselines for DFU infection classification because even have not previously been explored for infection classification, they are recent architectures that outperformed previous ViT-based & CNN-based models on ImageNet classification.

4) Score-Weighted Class Activation Mapping (Score-CAM): [19] is a method for interpreting the decision-making process of CNN models in visual tasks. It creates a visual heatmap that reveals which regions of a conditional synthesized image $\hat{x}_0^{(y)}$ the embedding model f_{ϕ} found similar to a guide

TABLE III. Quantitative comparison of ConDiff with SOTA baseline models on test images in the DFU infection dataset							
	Model	Accuracy	F1-score	Sensitivity	Specificity	PPV	Test time
Convolutional	ResNet-18	0.785	0.817	0.817	0.738	0.818	1.01 sec.
Nourol	DenseNet-121	0.733	0.763	0.730	0.738	0.800	4.02 sec.
Networks	Inception-V3	0.733	0.765	0.736	0.728	0.796	2.76 sec.
INCLWOIKS	EfficientNet-B0	0.793	0.810	0.750	0.854	0.881	2.01 sec.
	ViT-Small	0.773	0.801	0.777	0.767	0.827	1.26 sec.
Vision	DeiT-Tiny	0.789	0.828	0.824	0.738	0.819	1.25 sec.
Transformers	SwinV2-Tiny	0.785	0.822	0.878	0.650	0.783	2.51 sec.
	EfficientFormer-L1	0.801	0.833	0.845	0.738	0.822	1.51 sec.
Diffusion	ConDiff (ours)	0.833	0.858	<u>0.858</u>	<u>0.796</u>	<u>0.858</u>	12.55 mins

(input) image x_0 . Score-CAM has the following steps: (1) extracting feature maps A^k from the last convolutional layer L; $A^k = f_{\phi,L}(\hat{x}_0^{(y)})$, (2) generating activation maps that emphasize predictive regions of the image; $M^k = \text{Upsample}(A^k)$, (3) calculating cosine similarity scores between the guide image embedding and the corresponding synthesized images based on the activation maps; $S^k = \text{Similarity}(f_{\phi}(x_0), f_{\phi}(M^k \circ \hat{x}_0^{(y)}))$, and (4) aggregating these activation maps into a comprehensive heatmap, with the weighting determined by the similarity scores $\alpha^k = \frac{\exp(S^k)}{\sum_j \exp(S_j^k)}$; $H_{\text{Score-CAM}} = \text{ReLU}(\sum_k \alpha^k M^k)$.

C. Performance Comparison with SOTA baselines

Table III demonstrates that ConDiff achieves an accuracy of up to 83% and an F1-score of 0.858, outperforming baselines by at least 3% on both metrics while maintaining a balanced trade-off between sensitivity and PPV. Furthermore, ViT-based models achieved performance superior to CNN-based models. This may be due to their ability to use attention mechanisms to capture global dependencies between all input data elements. In contrast, CNN-based models, which apply uniform filters across the entire image, tend to focus on local content and may not be suited to capturing high inter-class similarity and intra-class variation.



Fig. 4. The learning accuracy trajectories of the ConDiff classifier and best-performing CNN-based (EfficientNet-B0) and ViT-based (EfficientFormer-L1) models, on the train and validation sets.

However, since ViT-based models can be overfitted on our relatively small training dataset (illustrated in Fig. 4(Right)), they are not entirely suitable for infection classification. In contrast, the EfficientNet-B0 model is less susceptible to overfitting than the EfficientFormer-L1 model, which led us to select EfficientNet-B0 as the embedding network f_{0} in the

ConDiff classifier. Consequently, as shown in Fig. 4(Left), ConDiff effectively mitigates overfitting, which is attributed to the classifier's use of the Triplet loss function to learn to distinguish between similar and dissimilar images based on Euclidean distances in embedding space. The main ConDiff's trade-off is its computational time during inference. Table III shows that ConDiff takes around 12-13 minutes to analyze the 251 test images using an NVIDIA A100 GPU while traditional classification models take less than 4 seconds on the same device. The longer inference time is because the ConDiff classifier iterates to synthesize the guided conditional images and measure their similarities to the input image.



(a) Uninfected DFUs misclassified by ConDiff Classifier



(b) Infected DFUs misclassified by ConDiff Classifier

Fig. 5. Examples of incorrectly classified DFU images for infection by our ConDiff Classifier.

1) Exploring mis-classifications: Fig. 5(a)-(b) show misclassified cases. The uninfected DFUs in Fig. 5(a) resemble infected wounds exhibiting characteristics such as a large reddish area or darkening of the wound, possibly caused by poor lighting conditions. The misclassified examples in Fig. 5(b) are due to the small size of the wounds and ambiguous features, such as a somewhat dried appearance, which confuses the infection classifier.

2) Explaining image embedding similarity with Score-CAM: Fig. 6 presents Score-CAM visualizations that elucidate similarities the embedding model perceives between conditional synthesized images and their corresponding guide images x_0 . Areas highlighted in red on the Score-CAM heatmaps shown in Fig. 6, denote regions that the ConDiff classifier identified as having a high degree of similarity to x_0 . For instance, Fig. 6(a) illustrates that the classifier recognizes similar features in a



(c) Misclassified uninfected wound as infected.

(d) Misclassified infected wound as uninfected.

Fig. 6. Visualization of ConDiff predictions with corresponding Score-CAM images computed from the ConDiff's embedding model f_{ϕ} . Each sub-figure shows an example with the guide image (x_0), conditional synthesized images representing uninfected $\hat{x}_0^{(y_1)}$ and infected $\hat{x}_0^{(y_2)}$ states, and their respective Score-CAM overlays indicate regions with similar features to x_0 .

synthesized uninfected image and the guide image, as indicated by the presence of a red spot in the heatmap. Conversely, the heatmap corresponding to the generated image conditioned on DFU infection does not reveal substantial similarity, except for a marginal overlap in the background at the top-right corner. Similarly, Fig. 6(b) depicts accurate infection detection, where the embedding model f_{ϕ} concentrates on the necrotic tissue evident in both x_0 and $\hat{x}_0^{(y_2)}$. Nonetheless, the classifier is not infallible. Examples of misclassifications are demonstrated in Fig. 6(c)-(d), where the embedding model incorrectly assesses a synthesized image conditioned on a different class as being more similar to the guide image, an error attributable to the high inter-class similarity in embedding space.



Fig. 7. t-SNE plot of train image embedding computed by f_{ϕ} .

3) Visualizing image embedding: To further investigate the information gained from the embedding space, a t-SNE plot of train image embeddings is created, as shown in Fig. 7. It is observed that infected and uninfected wounds are separated into two distinct clusters. The Silhouette score of 0.586 is relatively high, indicating well-separated clusters.

D. Additional Experiments

1) Effects of different sampling methods on infection classification: We compared the DFU infection classification performance when two different sampling approaches were applied to ConDiff; (1) DDIM sampling and (2) CFG-DDIM sampling. Table. IV shows that using CFG-DDIM sampling (Algorithm 1) significantly outperforms DDIM sampling in infection classification. This is because the guided generated images between 2 labels by DDIM are not different enough to make D_{ϕ} in Eq. 14 determine which of the synthesized images is most similar to the input image.

TABLE IV. Comparison of DFU infection classification by ConDiff Classifier with various sampling methods.

Method	Acc	F1	SEN	SPEC	PPV
DDIM	0.603	0.635	0.581	0.641	0.699
CFG-DDIM	0.833	0.858	0.858	0.796	0.858

2) Effects of noise strengths t_0 on infection classification: Having demonstrated the efficacy of the CFG-DDIM reverse process in enabling the D_{ϕ} network to accurately predict infection status from a DFU image, this section focuses on experiments involving adding varying noise strengths t_0 to the input images. For these experiments, the guidance scale ω , the control hyperparameter, was fixed at 7.5.

TABLE V. Quantitative comparison of the result of DFU infection classification on the test data by ConDiff Classifier with different strengths t_0 of perturbed noise.

	t_0	Acc	F1	SEN	SPEC	PPV
	0.5	0.721	0.761	0.757	0.670	0.767
	0.6	0.721	0.757	0.736	0.699	0.779
	0.7	0.773	0.800	0.770	0.777	0.832
	0.8	0.833	0.858	0.858	0.796	0.858
	0.9	0.809	0.829	0.791	0.835	0.873

Table V highlights the significant role of perturbed noise in image synthesis. As the noise strength t_0 increases, the



Fig. 8. (Left) L_2 norm squared between $\hat{x}_0^{(y_1)}$ and $\hat{x}_0^{(y_2)}$ plot with respect to initial noise perturbation steps t_0 , (Right) illustration of conditional synthesized images of ConDiff + CFG-DDIM sampling: $\omega = 7.5$ with various t_0 initialization. As t_0 increases, the difference in image level between conditional generated images becomes larger.

guided synthesized images corresponding to different labels exhibit greater divergence, facilitating more straightforward predictions by our distance-based classifier D_{ϕ} . However, when t_0 is increased beyond certain thresholds, the distances between input images and their respective guided synthesized counterparts become excessively large for both labels. This increase in distance diminishes the distinguishability of D_{ϕ} . Classification with t_0 values ranging from 0.1 to 0.4 was excluded from our analysis, as depicted in Fig. 8 (Left), where it is shown that the average difference in the L_2 norm squared between the two guided synthetic images $\hat{x}_0^{(y_1)}$ and $\hat{x}_0^{(y_2)}$ is relatively small. Fig. 8 (Right) presents examples of conditional synthetic images generated by ConDiff + CFG-DDIM sampling across different t_0 values.

TABLE VI. Quality measurement of conditional synthesized images by generative models.

Model	FID Score \downarrow	IS ↑
ConDiff + DDIM	2.917	3.662
ConDiff + CFG-DDIM, $\omega = 3$	3.779	3.669
ConDiff + CFG-DDIM, $\omega = 7.5$	5.068	3.885
Conditional GAN [40]	11.201	2.965

3) Evaluation of Conditional Image Synthesis: Previously, in Sec. IV-D1, it was established that CFG-DDIM sampling is more effective for distance-based classification. Nevertheless, realistic DFU images can still be generated using the DDIM sampling method. Table VI reveals that image synthesis using ConDiff + DDIM results in the lowest FID score, indicating that the distribution of synthesized images closely resembles that of real data. However, the Inception Score (IS) for the ConDiff + DDIM approach is lower than the ConDiff + CFG-DDIM approach. This finding aligns with Ho et al.'s experiment [31], which highlights a trade-off between FID and IS. In our context, the IS reflects the ease of differentiating between conditional synthesized images. Consequently, the ConDiff Classifier using the DDIM sampling approach underperforms relative to the CFG-DDIM sampling approach, as seen in Table IV. This is attributed to the challenge in label clarification due to the lower IS. Note that IS is not significantly different

across our diffusion models because the IS metric considers not only the clarity but also the diversity of synthesized images, as shown in Fig. 9. Additionally, the experiment employed the popular conditional GAN approach [40] for generating DFU images conditioned on infection status, providing a comparison to diffusion methods. The results indicate that the quality of synthesized images using the conditional GAN is inferior to those produced by diffusion methods.

V. DISCUSSION

Summary of Findings: The ConDiff classifier outperforms other deep learning models in detecting infections in DFU images by minimizing Triplet loss instead of binary crossentropy, enabling it to effectively match input images with the most similar conditionally synthesized images in embedding space.

Overfitting Mitigation: ConDiff's training strategy in *Training Stage 2*, involving triplet loss, not only enhances its performance but also reduces overfitting by learning to discern between infected and uninfected wounds in the dataset.

CFG-DDIM Integration: When applying CFG-DDIM for the sampling process, ConDiff outperforms the standard DDIM method in infection classification. This is significant because, despite DDIM's proven efficiency in generating DFU-like images, CFG-DDIM's guidance-label-influenced image generation aligns better with ConDiff's distance-based classification.

Score-CAM enhances ConDiff's Interpretability: As shown in Figure 6, ConDiff focuses on wound features critical for accurately predicting infection status in its decision-making.

Limitation: ConDiff's major drawback is its high computational cost during inference, taking 3-4 seconds per image on an NVIDIA A100 GPU, in contrast to less than 0.02 seconds for other models. This is due to its generative discriminative approach, which synthesizes conditional images for each input by gradually removing noise through a reverse diffusion process. The Stability AI research group has recently found a way to overcome this limitation by reducing the number of sampling steps to just one step when generating conditional images by leveraging the adversarial diffusion distillation technique [41].



(a) cGAN generation: FID = 11.201, IS = 2.966



(b) ConDiff, DDIM sampling method: FID = 2.917, IS = 3.662



(c) ConDiff, CFG-DDIM sampling method with $\omega = 3$: F1D = 3.779, IS = 3.669



(d) ConDiff, CFG-DDIM sampling method with $\omega = 7.5$: FID = 5.068, IS = 3.885

Fig. 9. Guided Image Generation. Condition on the label: (Left) uninfected wound and (Right) infected wound.

<u>Future Work</u>: The potential of the embedding network f_{ϕ} in transforming DFU images into meaningful vectors suggests future research in more efficient prediction approaches. Exploring multi-modal data, including thermal images or generative medical notes from Large Language Models (LLMs), could enhance the classification capabilities of deep-learning models. The ConDiff classifier might also be applied to other medical imaging tasks and other wound types, such as classifying pressure injury severity [42].

VI. CONCLUSION

This study introduced the Guided Conditional Diffusion classifier (ConDiff), a new framework for classifying Diabetic Foot Ulcer (DFU) infections from wound images. Outperforming traditional models by at least 3%, ConDiff achieves up to 83% accuracy and an F1-score of 0.858. Its unique approach utilizes Triplet loss instead of standard cross-entropy minimization, enhancing robustness and reducing overfitting. This is especially important in medical imaging where datasets are often small. ConDiff employs a forward diffusion process, to add a specific amount of Gaussian noise into input images, and a reverse diffusion with classifier-free guidance to iteratively refine these images for classification based on the closest Euclidean distance in an embedding space. The ConDiff's effectiveness suggests significant potential in improving DFU management, particularly in regions with limited medical resources. Its precise, real-time infection detection could play a crucial role in early DFU infection identification, reducing serious complications such as limb amputation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research was performed using computational resources supported by the Academic & Research Computing group at Worcester Polytechnic Institute.

REFERENCES

- K. Järbrink, G. Ni, H. Sönnergren, A. Schmidtchen, C. Pang, R. Bajpai, and J. Car, "The humanistic and economic burden of chronic wounds: a protocol for a systematic review. syst rev. 2017; 6 (1): 15."
- [2] C. K. Sen, G. M. Gordillo, S. Roy, R. Kirsner, L. Lambert, T. K. Hunt, F. Gottrup, G. C. Gurtner, and M. T. Longaker, "Human skin wounds: a major and snowballing threat to public health and the economy," *Wound repair and regeneration*, vol. 17, no. 6, pp. 763–771, 2009.
- [3] S. J. Landis, "Chronic wound infection and antimicrobial use," Advances in skin & wound care, vol. 21, no. 11, pp. 531–540, 2008.
- [4] J.-L. Richard, A. Sotto, and J.-P. Lavigne, "New insights in diabetic foot infection," World journal of diabetes, vol. 2, no. 2, p. 24, 2011.
- [5] J. L. Mills Sr, M. S. Conte, D. G. Armstrong, F. B. Pomposelli, A. Schanzer, A. N. Sidawy, G. Andros, S. for Vascular Surgery Lower Extremity Guidelines Committee *et al.*, "The society for vascular surgery lower extremity threatened limb classification system: risk stratification based on wound, ischemia, and foot infection (wifi)," *Journal of vascular surgery*, vol. 59, no. 1, pp. 220–234, 2014.
- [6] C. Wang, X. Yan, M. Smith, K. Kochhar, M. Rubin, S. M. Warren, J. Wrobel, and H. Lee, "A unified framework for automatic wound segmentation and analysis with deep convolutional neural networks," in 2015 37th annual international conference of the ieee engineering in medicine and biology society (EMBC). IEEE, 2015, pp. 2415–2418.
- [7] H. Nejati, H. A. Ghazijahani, M. Abdollahzadeh, T. Malekzadeh, N.-M. Cheung, K.-H. Lee, and L.-L. Low, "Fine-grained wound tissue analysis using deep neural network," in 2018 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP). IEEE, 2018, pp. 1010–1014.
- [8] M. Goyal, N. D. Reeves, S. Rajbhandari, N. Ahmad, C. Wang, and M. H. Yap, "Recognition of ischaemia and infection in diabetic foot ulcers: Dataset and techniques," *Computers in biology and medicine*, vol. 117, p. 103616, 2020.

- [9] N. Al-Garaawi, R. Ebsim, A. F. Alharan, and M. H. Yap, "Diabetic foot ulcer classification using mapped binary patterns and convolutional neural networks," *Computers in biology and medicine*, vol. 140, p. 105055, 2022.
- [10] Z. Liu, J. John, and E. Agu, "Diabetic foot ulcer ischemia and infection classification using efficientnet deep learning models," *IEEE Open Journal of Engineering in Medicine and Biology*, vol. 3, pp. 189–201, 2022.
- [11] M. H. Yap, B. Cassidy, J. M. Pappachan, C. O'Shea, D. Gillespie, and N. D. Reeves, "Analysis towards classification of infection and ischaemia of diabetic foot ulcers," in 2021 IEEE EMBS International Conference on Biomedical and Health Informatics (BHI). IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–4.
- [12] A. Galdran, G. Carneiro, and M. A. G. Ballester, "Convolutional nets versus vision transformers for diabetic foot ulcer classification," in *Diabetic Foot Ulcers Grand Challenge*. Springer, 2021, pp. 21–29.
- [13] Z. Liu, E. Agu, P. Pedersen, C. Lindsay, B. Tulu, and D. Strong, "Comprehensive assessment of fine-grained wound images using a patchbased cnn with context-preserving attention," *IEEE open journal of engineering in medicine and biology*, vol. 2, pp. 224–234, 2021.
- [14] Z. Liu, E. Agu *et al.*, "Chronic wound image augmentation and assessment using semi-supervised progressive multi-granularity efficientnet," *OJEMB*, 2023.
- [15] M. Tan and Q. Le, "Efficientnet: Rethinking model scaling for convolutional neural networks," in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2019, pp. 6105–6114.
- [16] R. Rombach, A. Blattmann, D. Lorenz, P. Esser, and B. Ommer, "Highresolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models," in *Proceedings* of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, 2022, pp. 10684–10695.
- [17] C. Meng, Y. He, Y. Song, J. Song, J. Wu, J.-Y. Zhu, and S. Ermon, "Sdedit: Guided image synthesis and editing with stochastic differential equations," arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.01073, 2021.
- [18] F. Schroff, D. Kalenichenko, and J. Philbin, "Facenet: A unified embedding for face recognition and clustering," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2015, pp. 815– 823.
- [19] H. Wang, Z. Wang, M. Du, F. Yang, Z. Zhang, S. Ding, P. Mardziel, and X. Hu, "Score-cam: Score-weighted visual explanations for convolutional neural networks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference* on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops, 2020, pp. 24–25.
- [20] J. Ho, A. Jain, and P. Abbeel, "Denoising diffusion probabilistic models," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 33, pp. 6840– 6851, 2020.
- [21] J. Song, C. Meng, and S. Ermon, "Denoising diffusion implicit models," arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.02502, 2020.
- [22] L. Zhang, A. Rao, and M. Agrawala, "Adding conditional control to text-to-image diffusion models," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 3836–3847.
- [23] A. Nichol, P. Dhariwal, A. Ramesh, P. Shyam, P. Mishkin, B. McGrew, I. Sutskever, and M. Chen, "Glide: Towards photorealistic image generation and editing with text-guided diffusion models," arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.10741, 2021.
- [24] J. Wyatt, A. Leach, S. M. Schmon, and C. G. Willcocks, "Anoddpm: Anomaly detection with denoising diffusion probabilistic models using simplex noise," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 650–656.
- [25] J. Wu, R. Fu, H. Fang, Y. Zhang, Y. Yang, H. Xiong, H. Liu, and Y. Xu, "Medsegdiff: Medical image segmentation with diffusion probabilistic model," arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.00611, 2022.
- [26] M. Özbey, O. Dalmaz, S. U. Dar, H. A. Bedel, Ş. Özturk, A. Güngör, and T. Çukur, "Unsupervised medical image translation with adversarial diffusion models," *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, 2023.
- [27] J. Wang, J. Levman, W. H. L. Pinaya, P.-D. Tudosiu, M. J. Cardoso, and R. Marinescu, "Inversesr: 3d brain mri super-resolution using a latent diffusion model," in *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*. Springer, 2023, pp. 438–447.
- [28] D. P. Kingma and M. Welling, "Auto-encoding variational bayes," arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114, 2013.
- [29] C. M. Bishop and H. Bishop, "Deep neural networks," in *Deep Learning: Foundations and Concepts*. Springer, 2023, pp. 171–207.
- [30] P. Dhariwal and A. Nichol, "Diffusion models beat gans on image synthesis," Advances in neural information processing systems, vol. 34, pp. 8780–8794, 2021.
- [31] J. Ho and T. Salimans, "Classifier-free diffusion guidance," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.12598*, 2022.

- [32] C. Schuhmann, R. Vencu, R. Beaumont, R. Kaczmarczyk, C. Mullis, A. Katta, T. Coombes, J. Jitsev, and A. Komatsuzaki, "Laion-400m: Open dataset of clip-filtered 400 million image-text pairs," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.02114*, 2021.
- [33] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision* and pattern recognition, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [34] C. Szegedy, W. Liu, Y. Jia, P. Sermanet, S. Reed, D. Anguelov, D. Erhan, V. Vanhoucke, and A. Rabinovich, "Going deeper with convolutions," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2015, pp. 1–9.
- [35] G. Huang, Z. Liu, L. Van Der Maaten, and K. Q. Weinberger, "Densely connected convolutional networks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2017, pp. 4700–4708.
- [36] A. Dosovitskiy, L. Beyer, A. Kolesnikov, D. Weissenborn, X. Zhai, T. Unterthiner, M. Dehghani, M. Minderer, G. Heigold, S. Gelly *et al.*, "An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020.
- [37] H. Touvron, M. Cord, M. Douze, F. Massa, A. Sablayrolles, and H. Jégou, "Training data-efficient image transformers & distillation through attention," in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 10347–10357.
- [38] Z. Liu, H. Hu, Y. Lin, Z. Yao, Z. Xie, Y. Wei, J. Ning, Y. Cao, Z. Zhang, L. Dong *et al.*, "Swin transformer v2: Scaling up capacity and resolution," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2022, pp. 12009–12019.
- [39] Y. Li, G. Yuan, Y. Wen, J. Hu, G. Evangelidis, S. Tulyakov, Y. Wang, and J. Ren, "Efficientformer: Vision transformers at mobilenet speed," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 12934– 12949, 2022.
- [40] M. Mirza and S. Osindero, "Conditional generative adversarial nets," arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.1784, 2014.
- [41] A. Sauer, D. Lorenz, A. Blattmann, and R. Rombach, "Adversarial diffusion distillation," arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.17042, 2023.
- [42] B. Ay, B. Tasar, Z. Utlu, K. Ay, and G. Aydin, "Deep transfer learningbased visual classification of pressure injuries stages," *Neural Computing* and Applications, vol. 34, no. 18, pp. 16157–16168, 2022.