

# Unleashing the Potential of Open-set Noisy Samples Against Label Noise for Medical Image Classification

Zehui Liao<sup>1</sup>, Shishuai Hu<sup>1</sup>, and Yong Xia<sup>1</sup>(✉)

National Engineering Laboratory for Integrated Aero-Space-Ground-Ocean Big Data Application Technology, School of Computer Science and Engineering, Northwestern Polytechnical University, Xi'an 710072, China  
yxia@nwpu.edu.cn

**Abstract.** The challenge of addressing mixed closed-set and open-set label noise in medical image classification remains largely unexplored. Unlike natural image classification where there is a common practice of segregation and separate processing of closed-set and open-set noisy samples from clean ones, medical image classification faces difficulties due to high inter-class similarity which complicates the identification of open-set noisy samples. Moreover, prevailing methods do not leverage the full potential of open-set noisy samples for label noise mitigation, often leading to their exclusion or application of uniform soft labels. To address these issues, we propose an Extended Noise-robust Contrastive and Open-set Feature Augmentation (ENCOFA) framework. ENCOFA includes the Extended Noise-robust Supervised Contrastive (ENSC) Loss, which aids in distinguishing features across classes. The ENSC loss regards open-set noisy samples as an extended class and mitigates label noise by weighting contrastive pairs with label reliability. Furthermore, we develop an Open-set Feature Augmentation (OSFeatAug) module that enriches the features of open-set samples, utilizing the model's extra capacity to prevent overfitting to noisy data. We conducted experiments on a synthetic noisy dataset and a real-world noisy dataset. Our results indicate the superiority of ENCOFA and the effectiveness of leveraging the open-set noisy samples to combat label noise.

**Keywords:** Medical image classification · Open-set label noise · Closed-set label noise.

## 1 Introduction

Deep Neural Networks (DNNs) have significantly enhanced the accuracy of medical image classification tasks [6]. The success of these networks largely hinges on the accuracy of labeled training data. However, the complex nature of medical images, coupled with the considerable expertise required for precise annotation, often leads to the occurrence of label noise in clinical data [15]. This label noise can be categorized into closed-set and open-set types. Closed-set noise occurs

when in-distribution (ID) samples are mislabeled as other known classes, whereas open-set noise involves out-of-distribution (OOD) samples being mislabeled as any of the known classes [21]. Both types of noise can lead to DNNs’ overfitting, which adversely affects their performance and generalization ability [25]. However, the majority of research within the medical context [15,7,26] has overlooked the presence of open-set noise, concentrating primarily on addressing closed-set noise. A recent study [12] has recognized the concurrent presence of both types of noise in medical datasets and proposed a noisy sample reweighting method. Nevertheless, this approach treats both types of noise without distinction, overlooking their inherent differences.

In the realm of natural image classification, prevalent methods distinguish between closed-set and open-set noisy samples and clean ones, addressing each noisy type through specific strategies to mitigate label noise impacts [19,17,24,20,1]. These approaches leverage the distinct characteristics of closed-set and open-set noise, associating the former with high training losses due to DNNs’ tendency to fit these noisy labels at later training stages [16], and the latter with high predictive uncertainty, reflecting DNNs’ lacking knowledge of OOD classes [9,23]. Upon utilizing noisy samples, varied strategies are employed: pseudo-label generation [1,20,17,19,24], sample reweighting [1], and the application of noise-robust loss functions or regularization techniques [14] for closed-set noise; whereas for open-set noise, methods are limited to either discarding these samples [1,17,19] or assigning them soft labels with nearly uniform probabilities across classes [20,24]. Despite their improved performance in natural image domains, these techniques face two notable challenges when applied to medical image classification: firstly, the identification of open-set noisy samples becomes problematic due to the high inter-class similarity inherent to medical images; secondly, the potential benefits of utilizing identified open-set noisy samples to further reduce label noise remain largely unexplored.

To overcome the aforementioned limitations in medical image classification amidst mixed closed-set and open-set label noise, we introduce a novel framework named **Extended Noise-robust Contrastive and Open-set Feature Augmentation (ENCOFA)**. ENCOFA categorizes training samples into clean, closed-set noisy, or open-set noisy groups. It subsequently trains a classification network, consisting of an encoder and a fully connected layer, leveraging these three groups of samples under the supervision of observed labels, generated pseudo labels, and random labels, respectively. Addressing the first limitation, we advocate introducing Supervised Contrastive Learning (SCL) [10], which forms contrastive pairs based on features and their class labels to facilitate intra-class cohesion and inter-class separation. Despite SCL’s efficacy, its inherent oversight of OOD classes and vulnerability to label noise necessitates enhancement. To this end, we propose the Extended Noise-robust Supervised Contrastive (ENSC) Loss, treating detected open-set samples as an extended class and weighting contrastive pairs with label reliability. Concerning the second limitation, we introduce the Open-set Feature Augmentation (OSFeatAug) module, specifically engineered to enrich the identified open-set samples at the feature level. The enriched open-set

samples are used to prevent the model’s overfitting to noisy labels via randomly assigning ID class labels to these open-set samples to exploit the model’s surplus capacity [22]. Our experimental evaluation, conducted on both a synthetic noisy dataset and a real-world noisy dataset, demonstrates the superiority of the ENCOFA framework and the individual efficacy of its constitutive components.

The main contributions are four-fold: (1) we propose a novel ENCOFA framework to combat the mixed closed-set and open-set label noise issue, which has rarely been discussed in medical image classification before; (2) we design the ENSC loss that tolerates label noise and separates features of different classes, covering both ID and OOD; (3) we introduce the OSFeatAug module to enrich the open-set features, thereby preventing the model from overfitting to noisy data; and (4) our ENCOFA outperforms existing methods in handling the mixed closed-set and open-set label noise on medical image classification tasks.

## 2 Method

### 2.1 Problem Formalization and Method Overview


We address a  $K$ -class medical image classification task using a noisy dataset  $D = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ , comprising  $N$  image-label pairs. Here,  $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{C \times H \times W}$  denotes the  $i$ -th image with dimensions  $H \times W$  and  $C$  channels, while  $y_i \in [K] = \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$  represents its observed label. We aim to develop a precise medical image classification model via training on the dataset  $D$ , which comprises clean (CL) samples, closed-set noisy (CN) samples, and open-set noisy (ON) samples.

Our ENCOFA, depicted in Fig. 1, comprises a noise type identifier, an encoder coupled with a fully connected (FC) layer, an OSFeatAug module, and a projector. The framework initiates with a warm-up phase spanning several epochs, which precedes a structured training phase. Within each epoch of the training phase, two principal steps are undertaken. Initially, the noise type identifier classifies samples into CL, CN, and ON types. Subsequently, all samples are processed by the encoder and FC layer, with ON samples undergoing additional enhancement through OSFeatAug module. Supervision is applied to CL, CN, and ON samples using observed labels, generated pseudo labels, and random labels, respectively. Furthermore, ENSC loss is calculated using the output features of the projector. We now delve into the details of each component.

### 2.2 Classification Backbone

ResNet [5] serves as the foundational architecture, incorporating an encoder  $\mathcal{F}_E(\Theta_E)$  and a FC layer  $\mathcal{F}_{FC}(\Theta_{FC})$ , where  $\Theta_E$  and  $\Theta_{FC}$  denote their respective parameters. The encoder contains a single convolutional block and four residual blocks followed by an average pooling layer. Given an input image  $\mathbf{x}_i$ , the encoder derives the feature  $f_i = \mathcal{F}_E(\mathbf{x}_i; \Theta_E)$ , which is then fed into the FC layer and a softmax function  $S$ , yielding the probabilistic output  $p_i = S(\mathcal{F}_{FC}(f_i; \Theta_{FC}))$ .

**Noise Type Identifier.** A two-component Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM) is employed to analyze the cross-entropy (CE) loss values  $\{l_i^{t-1}\}_{i=1}^N$  from the



**Fig. 1.** Illustration of our ENCOFA framework. It classifies samples as CL, CN, or ON via noise type identifier, processing them through an encoder and FC layer. The features of ON samples are augmented by the OSFeatAug module. Classification loss for CL, CN, and ON samples is calculated based on their respective observed, pseudo, or random labels. Meanwhile, the output features of the projector are used to compute the ENSC loss.

previous epoch, *i.e.*,  $t - 1$  epoch, for all samples. The likelihood of loss  $l_i^{t-1}$  belonging to the lower-mean Gaussian component of GMM represents the probability of sample  $(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)$  being clean. We regard samples whose probability of being clean exceeds a predefined threshold  $\gamma_{CL}$  as clean samples; otherwise, they are regarded as noisy. We then adopt a KNN-based OOD detection method [18] to separate open-set samples from identified noisy ones, utilizing the normalized version of  $\{f_i^{t-1}\}_{i=1}^N$ , where  $f_i^{t-1}$  represents the feature of  $\mathbf{x}_i$  output by the encoder in the previous epoch. For each identified noisy sample, its OOD score is defined as the distance to its  $k$ -th nearest clean sample feature. An OOD threshold,  $\gamma_{ood}$ , is then employed to isolate open-set noisy samples.  $\gamma_{ood}$  is set to the 95th percentile of the clean samples' OOD scores to ensure accurate classification of a significant portion of clean samples. Let  $I = [N]$ ,  $I^{CL}$ ,  $I^{CN}$ ,  $I^{ON}$  denote the index sets for all samples, CL samples, CN samples, and ON samples.

**Classification Loss.** For each clean sample  $(\mathbf{x}_i^{CL}, y_i^{CL})$ , we aim to minimize the CE loss between its prediction  $p_i^{CL}$  and observed label  $y_i^{CL}$ , for each CN sample  $(\mathbf{x}_i^{CN}, y_i^{CN})$  between prediction and generated pseudo label  $\tilde{y}_i^{CN}$ , and for each ON sample  $(\mathbf{x}_i^{ON}, y_i^{ON})$  between prediction and random label  $\tilde{y}_i^{ON} \in [K]$ . The classification loss is calculated by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{cls} &= \mathcal{L}_{cls}^{CL} + \mathcal{L}_{cls}^{CN} + \mathcal{L}_{cls}^{ON} \\ &= \sum_{i \in I^{CL}} \mathcal{L}(y_i^{CL}, p_i^{CL}) + \sum_{i \in I^{CN}} \omega_i^{CN} \mathcal{L}(\tilde{y}_i^{CN}, p_i^{CN}) + \sum_{i \in I^{ON}} \mathcal{L}(\tilde{y}_i^{ON}, p_i^{ON}), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}$  denotes the CE loss. For CN sample  $\mathbf{x}_i^{CN}$  (CN will be omitted henceforth for simplicity), we feed its two weakly augmented views  $\mathbf{x}_i^{v1}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_i^{v2}$  into the backbone and the predictions  $p_i^{v1}$  and  $p_i^{v2}$  are leveraged to generate the pseudo label by  $\bar{y}_i = \left\| \left( (p_i^{v1} + p_i^{v2}) \div 2 \right) \right\|_1$ , where  $\|\cdot\|_1$  means the L1 normalization. However, the pseudo labels are not always correct. Therefore, a second GMM is adopted to fit pseudo-label losses and the probability of pseudo-label loss falling into the lower-mean component (*i.e.*, the reliability of the pseudo label) is used as the weight of loss, *i.e.*,  $\omega_i^{CN}$  for  $\mathcal{L}(\bar{y}_i^{CN}, p_i^{CN})$ .

### 2.3 Extended Noise-robust Supervised Contrastive Loss

Accurate labels are vital for supervised contrastive learning to prevent the undue reduction of distances between features from different classes. Therefore, rectifying the incorrect labels in the training set is crucial prior to computing the ENSC loss. For CN samples, we apply their pseudo labels. Notably, ON samples are categorized into an extended  $K + 1$ -th class, which allows the ENSC loss to differentiate not only between ID classes but also to segregate ID from OOD classes. The refined labels are expressed as  $y'_i \in [K + 1], i \in I$ . Furthermore, the reliability of  $y'_i$  informs the assignment of a weight factor  $\omega_i$  for each sample  $\mathbf{x}_i$ : assigning a weight of 1.0 to both clean and ON samples, while the weighting for CN samples, as discussed previously, enhances the ENSC loss’s capacity to withstand noise, thereby increasing its accuracy. Our ENSC loss is computed by

$$\mathcal{L}_{ensc} = - \sum_{i \in I} \frac{1}{|P(i)|} \sum_{p \in P(i)} \log \frac{\omega_i \omega_p \cdot \exp(z_i \cdot z_p / \tau)}{\sum_{a \in A(i)} \omega_i \omega_a \cdot \exp(z_i \cdot z_a / \tau)}, \quad (2)$$

where  $z_i$  is the output feature of the projector given the  $f_i$ , the projector contains an FC layer followed by a normalization function,  $A_i \equiv I \setminus i$ ,  $P(i) \equiv \{p \in A(i) : y'_p = y'_i\}$ ,  $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^+$  is a scalar temperature parameter.

### 2.4 Open-set Feature Augmentation Module

Within the OSFeatAug module, we enrich ON samples at the feature level to consume the model’s surplus capacity, thereby mitigating overfitting to noisy labels. By examining the channel-wise standard deviation of the normalized version of features  $\{f_i^{t-1}\}_{i=1}^N$ , we designate channels exhibiting standard deviations beneath a specific threshold,  $\gamma_{gen}$ , as general features across all classes. For each  $x_i$  classified as ON within a batch of size  $N_b$ , we calculate the cosine similarity between  $f_i$  and  $f_j$  for  $j \neq i \wedge j \in [N_b]$ , identifying the feature most similar to  $f_i$  as  $f_i^s$ . Subsequently, we substitute the general channels in  $f_i$  with those from  $f_i^s$  for the purpose of augmentation. The augmented feature, denoted as  $\bar{f}_i$ , is then utilized for predictions by the FC layer.

### 2.5 Loss Function

The loss function of our ENCOFA comprises two components: the classification loss  $\mathcal{L}_{cls}$  and the extended noise-robust supervised contrastive loss  $\mathcal{L}_{ensc}$ . These

two loss terms are balanced by a weighting factor  $\lambda$ , as described below.

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{cls} + \lambda * \mathcal{L}_{ensc} \quad (3)$$

### 3 Experiments and Results

#### 3.1 Dataset and Experimental Setup

**Synthetic Noisy Dataset.** The Kather-5k dataset [8] consists of 5,000 class-balanced pathological image patches across eight classes, each measuring  $150 \times 150$  pixels. Classes are tumor epithelium (TUM), simple stroma (s-STR), complex stroma (c-STR), immune cell conglomerates (LYM), normal colon mucosa (NORM), debris (DEB), adipose tissue (ADI), and background tissue (BACK). The first five classes are designated as closed-set, and the last three as open-set [4]<sup>1</sup>. Closed-set samples are split into training, validation, and test sets in a 70%, 10%, and 20% ratio, respectively. Adopting strategies from prior research [2,13], we introduce instance-dependent label noise, altering labels for closed-set noise and images for open-set noise, with probabilities that differ by sample. The noise rate in NoisyKather5k is  $\alpha$ , with  $\beta$  indicating the proportion of open-set noise.

**Real-World Noisy Dataset.** The Diabetic Retinopathy (DR) dataset [3] contains 88,702 fundus images from 44,351 patients, categorized into five classes of DR: Normal, mild, moderate, and severe Non-proliferative DR, and proliferative DR. Label noise, estimated at 30-40%, arises from observer variability among DR classes (*i.e.*, closed-set noise) and mislabeling of other retinal diseases as DR (*i.e.*, open-set noise). Ju et al. [7] re-labeled 57,213 images from the DR dataset, and 917 among them were confirmed by multiple experts, and used as the gold test set. The remainder, 56,296 images with their original DR labels, form the noisy training dataset. Due to a disproportionate number of Normal class samples (42,185), we selected 8,406 Normal cases to create a final training set of 22,517 samples, with 10% designated for validation.

**Implementation Details.** For NoisyKather-5k, we utilized ResNet18 as the backbone, with ENCOFA warmed up for 20 epochs and trained for 180 epochs. For the DR dataset, ResNet34 served as the backbone, with ENCOFA warmed up for 10 epochs and trained for 90 epochs. Images were resized to  $224 \times 224$ . The initial learning rate  $lr$  was  $1e-2$  for NoisyKather5k and  $3e-4$  for DR, decaying by a polynomial policy  $lr = lr_0 \times (1 - t/T)^{0.9}$ , where  $t$  is the current epoch and  $T$  is the maximum epoch. The batch size was set to 128 and the Adam optimizer [11] with a weight decay of  $1e-4$  was used for all experiments. The hyper-parameters of ENCOFA are set as  $\gamma_{CL} = 0.98$ ,  $k=200$ ,  $\tau=0.2$ ,  $\gamma_{gen}=0.01$ . All results were reported over three random runs. Both mean and standard deviation are given. The classification accuracy is adopted as the evaluation metric.

<sup>1</sup> This division was based on pathologists' advice and aimed to simulate a scenario where only clinically relevant tissue regions are labeled.

**Table 1.** Test accuracy (% , mean±standard deviation) of our ENCOFA and competing methods on the NoisyKather5k dataset( $\alpha \in [0.2, 0.4]$ ,  $\beta \in [0.25, 0.50, 0.75]$ ).

Method	$\alpha=0.2$			$\alpha=0.4$		
	$\beta=0.25$	$\beta=0.5$	$\beta=0.75$	$\beta=0.25$	$\beta=0.5$	$\beta=0.75$
CE	78.72±0.45	81.44±1.90	84.43±0.72	63.20±1.07	70.08±1.36	76.69±1.72
ILDR [14]	90.72±0.13	89.39±0.98	90.93±0.95	83.73±3.38	86.61±1.55	88.11±0.75
EDM [17]	91.95±0.72	91.09±1.06	90.51±1.88	83.95±2.42	88.05±0.30	89.55±0.72
PNP [20]	91.15±0.20	91.25±0.98	91.68±0.99	77.65±6.99	86.67±2.16	89.33±1.31
PLS [1]	93.60±0.82	93.76±0.39	93.23±1.00	87.47±1.07	90.13±0.87	90.61±0.72
Ours	94.32±0.65	94.45±0.72	94.61±0.92	90.77±0.93	91.52±1.02	92.00±0.89

**Table 2.** Accuracy of noise **type** identifier and **Recall** of **ON** samples (% , mean±standard deviation) of ENCOFA and competitors on NoisyKather5k ( $\alpha=0.4$ ,  $\beta=0.25$ ).

Methods	Type Acc	Recall <sub>ON</sub>
EDM [17]	68.37±2.26	42.96±16.2
PNP [20]	74.32±6.81	00.00±0.00
PLS [1]	76.82±2.70	34.23±15.2
Ours	90.72±1.13	90.17±1.14

**Table 3.** Influence of the identified CL, CN, ON samples on the performance (**Test Accuracy**, **Validation Accuracy** and **Recall** of **ON** samples, % , mean±standard deviation) of  $\mathcal{L}_{cls}$  with  $\mathcal{L}_{ensc}$  validated on NoisyKather5k ( $\alpha=0.4$ ,  $\beta=0.25$ ).

CL	ON	CN	Val Acc	Test Acc	Recall <sub>ON</sub>
✓	✓	✓	55.78±1.75	89.60±0.94	90.13±4.81
✓	✓		55.22±2.18	88.27±1.70	88.91±4.53
✓			53.78±1.03	89.44±0.82	77.43±3.69
			52.22±1.40	82.35±2.91	78.41±4.69

### 3.2 Comparative Experiments

We compared our ENCOFA to a baseline method and four recent methods on the NoisyKather-5k and DR datasets. The baseline method is a ResNet trained on the noisy dataset by minimizing the CE loss. The competing methods include one method for combating closed-set label noise: Instance-dependent Label Distribution Regularization (ILDR) [14], and three methods for addressing the mixed closed-set and open-set label noise: EvidentialMix (EDM) [17], Probabilistic Noise Prediction (PNP) [20], Pseudo Loss Selection (PLS) [1]. Our ENCOFA distinguishes itself from these methods by notably enhancing the identification accuracy of ON samples through the introduction of the ENSC loss (see Table 2). Furthermore, it effectively unleashes the potential of identified ON samples to mitigate label noise using the OSFeatAug module. The comparison results on the NoisyKather5k dataset are listed in Table 1. The noise rate is set to 0.2 or 0.4, and the proportion of open-set noise ranges from 0.25 to 0.75. Results indicate that our ENCOFA outperforms all competing methods. Especially, in the most difficult case ( $\alpha=0.4$ ,  $\beta=0.25$ ), our ENCOFA performs better than other competitors by a clear margin (90.77% v.s. 87.47%, p-value=0.0163<0.05). We also evaluated our ENCOFA, baseline, and four competitors on the real-world noisy dataset, DR. Results in Table 4 reveals that our ENCOFA also outperforms the best competitor by 2.21% (p-value=0.0463<0.05).

**Table 4. Test Accuracy** (% , mean  $\pm$  standard deviation) of our ENCOFA framework, baseline, and four competing methods on the DR dataset.

Method	Test Acc
CE	46.57 $\pm$ 0.79
ILDR [14]	47.69 $\pm$ 1.43
EDM [17]	52.75 $\pm$ 4.71
PNP [20]	56.20 $\pm$ 0.36
PLS [1]	57.36 $\pm$ 1.04
Ours	59.57 $\pm$ 0.78

**Table 5. Test Accuracy and Validation Accuracy** (% , mean  $\pm$  standard deviation) of the proposed ENCOFA and its two variants and  $\mathcal{L}_{cls}$  and its two variants on the NoisyKather5k dataset ( $\alpha=0.4$ ,  $\beta=0.25$ ).

Method	Val Acc	Test Acc
$\mathcal{L}_{cls} + \mathcal{L}_{ensc} + \text{OSFeatAug}$	57.11 $\pm$ 0.69	90.77 $\pm$ 0.93
$\mathcal{L}_{cls} + \mathcal{L}_{ensc}$	55.78 $\pm$ 1.75	89.60 $\pm$ 0.94
$\mathcal{L}_{cls}$	52.22 $\pm$ 1.40	82.35 $\pm$ 2.91
$\mathcal{L}_{cls}^{CL} + \mathcal{L}_{cls}^{CN} + \mathcal{L}_{cls}^{ON}$ ( $\mathcal{L}_{cls}$ )	52.22 $\pm$ 1.40	82.35 $\pm$ 2.91
$\mathcal{L}_{cls}^{CL} + \mathcal{L}_{cls}^{CN}$	55.89 $\pm$ 3.28	86.93 $\pm$ 1.98
$\mathcal{L}_{cls}^{CL}$	40.89 $\pm$ 2.57	63.20 $\pm$ 1.07

### 3.3 Ablation Analysis

We performed ablation studies on the NoisyKather5k dataset with mixed label noise ( $\alpha = 0.4$ ,  $\beta = 0.25$ ), to assess the contribution of each component within our ENCOFA framework. The evaluation of ENCOFA and its two variants is summarized in Table 5. Here, ‘ $\mathcal{L}_{cls} + \mathcal{L}_{ensc} + \text{OSFeatAug}$ ’ denotes the ENCOFA framework; ‘ $\mathcal{L}_{cls} + \mathcal{L}_{ensc}$ ’ represents ENCOFA without the OSFeatAug module; and ‘ $\mathcal{L}_{cls}$ ’ refers to the model optimized solely with classification loss. The results indicate a notable enhancement in ENCOFA’s performance with the integration of either  $\mathcal{L}_{ensc}$  or the OSFeatAug module. We further assessed the performance of ‘ $\mathcal{L}_{cls}$ ’ and its variants: ‘ $\mathcal{L}_{cls}^{CL}$ ’, which computes the CE loss for all samples using their observed labels; ‘ $\mathcal{L}_{cls}^{CL} + \mathcal{L}_{cls}^{CN}$ ’, applying observed and pseudo labels for clean and noisy samples, respectively; and ‘ $\mathcal{L}_{cls}^{CL} + \mathcal{L}_{cls}^{CN} + \mathcal{L}_{cls}^{ON}$ ’, utilizing observed, pseudo, random labels for CL, CN, ON samples, respectively. However, inaccuracies in distinguishing noise types led to a performance reduction upon adding  $\mathcal{L}_{cls}^{ON}$  due to the misclassification of some clean samples as open-set, which were then incorrectly supervised with random labels. The utility of  $\mathcal{L}_{cls}^{ON}$  became apparent after improving noise type identification accuracy through  $\mathcal{L}_{ensc}$ .

**Analysis of  $\mathcal{L}_{ensc}$ .** We assessed the effects of CL, CN, and ON samples on optimizing  $\mathcal{L}_{ensc}$  in terms of test accuracy and the recall of the extended OOD class ( $Recall_{ON}$ ). Note that noise types of training samples are unavailable during training. Table 3 details the performance of  $\mathcal{L}_{cls}$  with the complete  $\mathcal{L}_{ensc}$ . Results indicate a notable test accuracy improvement when minimizing  $\mathcal{L}_{ensc}$  with only CL samples, while  $Recall_{ON}$  aligns with prior findings. Incorporating the OOD class into  $\mathcal{L}_{ensc}$  calculation significantly enhances  $Recall_{ON}$ . Introducing CN samples with pseudo labels and pairwise weights further boosts both test accuracy and  $Recall_{ON}$ .

## 4 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a new framework, ENCOFA, to combat the mixed label noise for medical image classification tasks. Compared with other methods, our



ENCOFA differs by fully leveraging the detected open-set noisy samples. Specifically, an ENSC loss is introduced to improve the open-set sample identification accuracy and an OSFeatAug module is designed to enrich open-set features to prevent the model from overfitting label noise. Comparative experiments conducted on two noisy datasets demonstrate the superiority of our ENCOFA.

**Acknowledgement.** This work was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 62171377, in part by the Key Technologies Research and Development Program under Grant 2022YFC2009903 / 2022YFC2009900, in part by the Key Research and Development Program of Shaanxi Province, China, under Grant 2022GY-084, and in part by the Innovation Foundation for Doctor Dissertation of Northwestern Polytechnical University under Grant CX2023016.

## References

1. Albert, P., Arazo, E., Krishna, T., O’Connor, N.E., McGuinness, K.: Is your noise correction noisy? PLS: Robustness to label noise with two stage detection. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision. pp. 118–127 (2023)
2. Cheng, D., Liu, T., Ning, Y., Wang, N., Han, B., Niu, G., Gao, X., Sugiyama, M.: Instance-dependent label-noise learning with manifold-regularized transition matrix estimation. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 16630–16639 (2022)
3. Dugas, E., Jared, Jorge, Cukierski, W.: Diabetic retinopathy detection (2015), <https://kaggle.com/competitions/diabetic-retinopathy-detection>
4. Galdran, A., Hewitt, K.J., Ghaffari Laleh, N., Kather, J.N., Carneiro, G., González Ballester, M.A.: Test time transform prediction for open set histopathological image recognition. In: International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention. pp. 263–272. Springer (2022)
5. He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., Sun, J.: Deep residual learning for image recognition. In: Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition. pp. 770–778 (2016)
6. Jiang, H., Diao, Z., Shi, T., Zhou, Y., Wang, F., Hu, W., Zhu, X., Luo, S., Tong, G., Yao, Y.D.: A review of deep learning-based multiple-lesion recognition from medical images: classification, detection and segmentation. *Computers in Biology and Medicine* p. 106726 (2023)
7. Ju, L., Wang, X., Wang, L., Mahapatra, D., Zhao, X., Zhou, Q., Liu, T., Ge, Z.: Improving medical images classification with label noise using dual-uncertainty estimation. *IEEE transactions on medical imaging* **41**(6), 1533–1546 (2022)
8. Kather, J.N., Weis, C.A., Bianconi, F., Melchers, S.M., Schad, L.R., Gaiser, T., Marx, A., Zöllner, F.G.: Multi-class texture analysis in colorectal cancer histology. *Scientific reports* **6**(1), 27988 (2016)
9. Kendall, A., Gal, Y.: What uncertainties do we need in bayesian deep learning for computer vision? *Advances in neural information processing systems* **30** (2017)
10. Khosla, P., Teterwak, P., Wang, C., Sarna, A., Tian, Y., Isola, P., Maschinot, A., Liu, C., Krishnan, D.: Supervised contrastive learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **33**, 18661–18673 (2020)

11. Kingma, D.P., Ba, J.: Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In: International Conference on Learning Representations (2015)
12. Kurian, N.C., Varsha, S., Bajpai, A., Patel, S., Sethi, A.: Improved histology image classification under label noise via feature aggregating memory banks. In: 2022 IEEE 19th International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging (ISBI). pp. 1–5. IEEE (2022)
13. Li, Y., Han, H., Shan, S., Chen, X.: Disc: Learning from noisy labels via dynamic instance-specific selection and correction. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 24070–24079 (2023)
14. Liao, Z., Hu, S., Xie, Y., Xia, Y.: Instance-specific label distribution regularization for learning with label noise. arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08380 (2022)
15. Liao, Z., Xie, Y., Hu, S., Xia, Y.: Learning from ambiguous labels for lung nodule malignancy prediction. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging* **41**(7), 1874–1884 (2022)
16. Liu, S., Niles-Weed, J., Razavian, N., Fernandez-Granda, C.: Early-learning regularization prevents memorization of noisy labels. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **33**, 20331–20342 (2020)
17. Sachdeva, R., Cordeiro, F.R., Belagiannis, V., Reid, I., Carneiro, G.: Evidentialmix: Learning with combined open-set and closed-set noisy labels. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision. pp. 3607–3615 (2021)
18. Sun, Y., Ming, Y., Zhu, X., Li, Y.: Out-of-distribution detection with deep nearest neighbors. In: International Conference on Machine Learning. pp. 20827–20840. PMLR (2022)
19. Sun, Z., Hua, X.S., Yao, Y., Wei, X.S., Hu, G., Zhang, J.: CRSSC: salvage reusable samples from noisy data for robust learning. In: Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Multimedia. pp. 92–101 (2020)
20. Sun, Z., Shen, F., Huang, D., Wang, Q., Shu, X., Yao, Y., Tang, J.: PNP: Robust learning from noisy labels by probabilistic noise prediction. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 5311–5320 (2022)
21. Wang, Y., Liu, W., Ma, X., Bailey, J., Zha, H., Song, L., Xia, S.T.: Iterative learning with open-set noisy labels. In: Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition. pp. 8688–8696 (2018)
22. Wei, H., Tao, L., Xie, R., An, B.: Open-set label noise can improve robustness against inherent label noise. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **34**, 7978–7992 (2021)
23. Wimmer, L., Sale, Y., Hofman, P., Bischl, B., Hüllermeier, E.: Quantifying aleatoric and epistemic uncertainty in machine learning: Are conditional entropy and mutual information appropriate measures? In: Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence. pp. 2282–2292. PMLR (2023)
24. Yao, Y., Sun, Z., Zhang, C., Shen, F., Wu, Q., Zhang, J., Tang, Z.: Jo-src: A contrastive approach for combating noisy labels. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition. pp. 5192–5201 (2021)
25. Zhang, C., Bengio, S., Hardt, M., Recht, B., Vinyals, O.: Understanding deep learning (still) requires rethinking generalization. *Communications of the ACM* **64**(3), 107–115 (2021)
26. Zhang, H., Chen, L., Gu, X., Zhang, M., Qin, Y., Yao, F., Wang, Z., Gu, Y., Yang, G.Z.: Trustworthy learning with (un) sure annotation for lung nodule diagnosis with ct. *Medical Image Analysis* **83**, 102627 (2023)