# Segmentation of Non-Small Cell Lung Carcinomas: Introducing DRU-Net and Multi-Lens Distortion

Soroush Oskouei<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Marit Valla<sup>3,4,5,6</sup>, André Pedersen<sup>3,6,7</sup>, Erik Smistad<sup>1,8</sup>, Vibeke Grotnes Dale<sup>3,5</sup>, Maren Høibø<sup>3,4</sup>, Sissel Gyrid Freim Wahl<sup>5</sup>, Mats Dehli Haugum<sup>5</sup>, Thomas Langø<sup>8,9</sup>, Maria Paula Ramnefjell<sup>10,11</sup>, Lars Andreas Akslen<sup>10,11</sup>, Gabriel Kiss<sup>9,12</sup>, and Hanne Sorger<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Department of Circulation and Medical Imaging, Trondheim, NO-7491, Norway

<sup>2</sup>Levanger hospital, Nord-Trøndelag Health Trust, Clinic of Medicine, Levanger, NO-7600, Norway

<sup>3</sup>Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Department of Clinical and Molecular Medicine, Trondheim, NO-7491, Norway

<sup>4</sup>St. Olavs hospital, Trondheim University Hospital, Clinic of Laboratory Medicine, Trondheim, NO-7030, Norway <sup>5</sup>St. Olavs hospital, Trondheim University Hospital, Department of Pathology, Trondheim, NO-7030, Norway

<sup>6</sup>St. Olavs hospital, Trondheim University Hospital, Clinic of Surgery, Trondheim, NO-7030, Norway

<sup>7</sup>Sopra Steria, Application Solutions, Trondheim, NO-7010, Norway

<sup>8</sup>SINTEF Digital, Department of Health Research, Trondheim, NO-7465, Norway

<sup>9</sup>St. Olavs hospital, Trondheim University Hospital, Research Department, Center for Medical equipment,

Technology, and Innovation, Trondheim, NO-7491, Norway

<sup>10</sup>University of Bergen, Department of Clinical Medicine Centre for Cancer Biomarkers (CCBIO), Bergen, NO-5007, Norway

<sup>11</sup>Haukeland University Hospital, Department of Pathology, Bergen, NO-5020, Norway

<sup>12</sup>Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Department of Computer Science, Trondheim, NO-7491, Norway

\*soroush.oskouei@ntnu.no

# ABSTRACT

Considering the increased workload in pathology laboratories today, automated tools such as artificial intelligence models can help pathologists with their tasks and ease the workload. In this paper, we are proposing a segmentation model (DRU-Net) that can provide a delineation of human non-small cell lung carcinomas and an augmentation method that can improve classification results. The proposed model is a fused combination of truncated pre-trained DenseNet201 and ResNet101V2 as a patch-wise classifier followed by a lightweight U-Net as a refinement model. We have used two datasets (Norwegian Lung Cancer Biobank and Haukeland University Hospital lung cancer cohort) to create our proposed model. The DRU-Net model achieves an average of 0.91 Dice similarity coefficient. The proposed spatial augmentation method (multi-lens distortion) improved the network performance by 3%. Our findings show that choosing image patches that specifically include regions of interest leads to better results for the patch-wise classifier compared to other sampling methods. The qualitative analysis showed that the DRU-Net model is generally successful in detecting the tumor. On the test set, some of the cases showed areas of false positive and false negative segmentation in the periphery, particularly in tumors with inflammatory and reactive changes.

# Introduction

Early diagnosis of lung cancer is crucial for patient survival<sup>1</sup>. Although physical examinations and medical imaging are included in the diagnostic work-up, tissue samples are needed to establish a cancer diagnosis. The histopathological diagnosis including analysis of tumor biomarkers influences therapeutic decisions and should therefore be assessed as accurately and as early as possible<sup>2,3</sup>.

By scanning tissue sections, the resultant whole slide images (WSIs) can be assessed on a computer screen instead of with a regular microscope. Digitization of histopathological sections may increase efficiency compared to conventional microscopy assessment and it allows the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in the analysis of WSIs<sup>4</sup>. AI methods may increase accuracy and speed of image interpretation and have the potential to reduce inter-observer variability and refine clinical decision-making<sup>5–7</sup>. AI can be used for automated tissue classification, identification, and segmentation<sup>8</sup>. Correct segmentation of the tumor is a

necessary step towards computer-assisted tumor analysis and lung cancer diagnosis 9-14.

When working with WSIs, the application of AI models is complicated due to the large size of the images. One approach involves separating the images into several small squares, called patches. A patch-based analysis may, however, lead to loss of broader spatial relationships. Alternatively, the image can be down-sampled, or a hybrid strategy that combines both methods can be used to optimize the analytical balance between detailed resolution and global context. Some of the best-performing AI methods in the analysis of WSIs are deep neural networks<sup>14, 15</sup>. The state-of-the-art in image segmentation tasks is the use of complex neural network architectures such as vision transformers and InternImage<sup>16, 17</sup>. However, these methods require a relatively large amount of data<sup>18</sup>. Transfer learning techniques may also be used to train or fine-tune pre-trained models on new data<sup>19</sup>. Patch-wise classification (PWC) or segmentation approaches may outperform direct segmentation of the tumor in a down-sampled image without dividing it into patches<sup>20</sup>.

Several models have been proposed for tumor segmentation in WSIs<sup>11,21–29</sup>. Zhao *et al.* proposed a novel hybrid deep learning framework for colorectal cancer that uses a U-Net architecture. This model features innovative residual ghost blocks, which include switchable normalization and bottleneck transformers for extracting features.<sup>11</sup>.

The MAMC-Net model introduced a multi-resolution attention module that utilizes pyramid inputs for broader feature information and detail capture<sup>21</sup>. An attention mechanism refines features for segmentation, while a multi-scale convolution module integrates semantic and high-resolution details. Finally, a connected conditional random field ensures accurate segmentation by addressing discontinuities<sup>21</sup>. The authors showcased superior performance of their model on breast cancer metastases and gastric cancer <sup>21</sup>.

DHU-Net combines Swin Transformer and ConvNeXt within a dual-branch hierarchical U-shaped architecture<sup>22,30,31</sup>. This method effectively fuses global and local features by processing WSI patches through parallel encoders, utilizing global-local fusion modules and skip connections for detailed feature integration<sup>22</sup>. The Cross-scale Expand Layer aids in resolution recovery across different scales. The network was evaluated on datasets covering different tumor features and cancer types and achieved higher segmentation results than other tested methods<sup>22</sup>.

Pedersen *et al.* introduced H2G-Net, a cascaded convolutional neural network (CNN) architecture for segmenting breast cancer regions from gigapixel histopathological images<sup>23</sup>. It employs a patch-wise detection stage and a convolutional autoencoder for refinement, demonstrating significant improvements in tumor segmentation. The approach outperformed single-resolution methods, achieving a Dice similarity coefficient (DSC) of  $(0.933\pm0.069)^{23}$ . Its efficiency is underscored by fast processing times and the ability to train deep neural networks without needing to store patches on disk.

One of the most significant challenges in using WSIs for tumor segmentation is still the scarcity of labeled data. The marking of tumor tissue in WSIs by pathology experts is time-consuming, and may be a bottle neck in research. The limited availability of such annotated datasets poses a significant hurdle for the development and application of supervised learning algorithms in tumor segmentation. Given this constraint, alternative computational strategies such as unsupervised or semi-supervised learning methods should be explored. Clustering emerges as a potent tool in this context, allowing for segmentation of tumor regions with little or no need for predefined labels.<sup>24,25</sup>.

Yan *et al.* presented a self-supervised learning method using contrastive learning to process WSIs for tissue clustering<sup>26</sup>. This approach generates discriminative embeddings for initial clustering, refined by a silhouette-based scheme, and extracts features using a multi-scale encoder<sup>26</sup>. It achieved high accuracy in identifying tissues without annotations. Their results show an area under the curve (AUC) of 0.99 and accuracy of approximately 0.93 for distinguishing benign from malignant polyps in a cohort of 20 patients<sup>26</sup>.

Few-shot learning presents a promising way of handling scarcity of labeled data<sup>27,28</sup>. By design, few-shot learning algorithms can learn from a very limited number of labeled examples. This capability is particularly relevant for the classification of small patches, where a small set of labeled examples can guide the learning process. Few-shot learning techniques can generalize from these examples to classify new, unseen patches, facilitating the identification and segmentation of tumor regions<sup>27,28</sup>. Titoriya *et al.* explored few-shot learning to enhance dataset generalization and manageability by utilizing prototypical networks and model agnostic meta learning across four datasets<sup>29</sup>. The design achieved 85% accuracy in a 2-way 2-shot 2-query mode<sup>29</sup>.

In this paper, we propose a new AI model (DRU-Net) for segmenting non-small cell lung carcinomas (NSCLCs). It is an end-to-end approach consisting of a dual head for feature extraction and patch classification followed by a U-Net for refining the segmentation result. The method is trained and tested on a novel in-house dataset of 97 annotated NSCLC WSIs. To increase model performance, we adopted a few shot learning approach during training and added a multi-lens distortion augmentation technique to WSI images.

# Methods

### Cohorts

In this study, two different collections of NSCLCs were used; the Norwegian Lung Cancer Biobank (NLCB) cohort and the Bergen cohort<sup>32, 33</sup>. The NLCB cohort includes histopathological, cytological, biomarker, and clinical follow-up data from patients with suspected lung cancer diagnosed in Central Norway after 2006<sup>34</sup>. Both diagnostic tumor biopsies and sections from surgical lung cancer specimen are available. The distribution of histological subtypes in each dataset is listed in Table 1<sup>35,36</sup>.

The Bergen Cohort comprises 438 surgically treated NSCLC patients diagnosed at Haukeland University Hospital, Bergen, Norway from 1993–2010. In this study, 97 NSCLC cases from the Bergen cohort were included. From both cohorts, 4µm tissue sections were stained with hematoxylin and eosin (HE) and scanned using Olympus BX61VS VS120S5 at x40 magnification.

The sections were deparaffinized, rehydrated in ethanol, and immersed in tap water. Hematoxylin staining was applied and the sections were rinsed in water, and then in ethanol. Sections were then stained with alcoholic eosin. Post-staining, the slides were dehydrated in ethanol, placed in TissueClear, and air-dried<sup>37</sup>.

**Table 1.** Histological subtypes of non-small cell lung carcinoma cases in the Norwegian lung cancer biobank (NLCB) and the Bergen cohort.

| Histological subtype               | NLCB (n) | Bergen cohort - training and validation (n) | Bergen cohort - test (n) |
|------------------------------------|----------|---|--------------------------|
| Adenocarcinoma                     | 16       | 38  | 7                        |
| Squamous cell carcinoma            | 15       | 32  | 10                       |
| Other non-small cell carcinoma     | 11       | 7   | 3                        |
| Total number of whole slide images | 42       | 77  | 20                       |

To conduct a broader study of the proposed augmentation's effect, we utilized the following open datasets: MNIST, Fashion-MNIST, CIFAR-10, and CIFAR-100<sup>38–40</sup>.

#### **Ethical aspects**

All methods were carried out in accordance with relevant guidelines and regulations, and the experimental protocols were approved by the Regional Committee for Medical and Health Sciences Research Ethics (REK) Norway (2013/529, 2016/1156 and 257624). Informed consent was obtained from all subjects and/or their legal guardian(s) for NLCB in accordance with REK 2016/1156. For subjects in the Bergen cohort, exempt from consent was ethically approved by REK (2013/529).

#### Annotations and dataset creations

We used two annotation approaches on WSIs; whole tumor annotation (WTA) and partial selective annotation (PSA). In the WTA approach, pathologists marked the tumor outline in 97 WSIs from the Bergen cohort. Of these WSIs, 51 were used for training, 26 were used for validation, and 20 were used for testing. All WSIs with tissue microarray (TMA) holes were placed in the test set to prevent potential biased training. The remaining WSIs were randomly separated into the training, validation, and test sets.

To reduce time spent by pathologists in making the WTA annotations, initial annotations were first made in 72 cases using two different AI-based segmentation models, i) the H2G-Net model developed for breast cancer segmentation (n=25) and ii) a customized early-stage clustering model based on the corrected annotations from the H2G-Net model (n=47)<sup>23</sup>. Pathologists then manually adjusted the annotated tumor region using the QuPath software<sup>41</sup>. The remaining 25 cases were annotated manually without AI-based segmentation models. A second pathologist reviewed the annotations, and in case of discrepancy, consensus was reached after discussion. The final annotations were exported as binary masks, serving as ground truth.

In the PSA approach, pathologists marked small regions of interest in 42 WSIs from the NLCB cohort. These WSIs were used for training and validation. The marked areas included parts of the invasive tumor, normal alveolar tissue, stromal tissue, immune cells, areas of necrosis, and other non-tumor tissue such as respiratory epithelium, reactive alveolar tissue, cartilage, blood vessels, glands, lymph nodes, and macrophages. The purpose of marking these regions was to save time spent on manual annotations of the whole tumor regions, and to guide the selection of patches intended for use in the patch-wise model's training.

#### **Proposed method**

The pipeline of the proposed model (DRU-Net) has two distinct stages, a patch-wise classification (PWC) stage and a refinement stage. The PWC model was trained on the NLCB cohort using the many-shot method, and the refinement U-Net was trained

on a set of down-sampled WSIs from the Bergen cohort. In the PWC stage, the model assigns probabilities to each patch of the WSIs (excluding the glass) indicating whether the patch contains tumor tissue or non-tumor tissue. The classifier's output provides a preliminary assessment of each patch's nature, based on local features within the patch. The patches are then stitched together to produce a heatmap of the same size as the down-sampled WSIs.



**Figure 1.** Illustration of the proposed DRU-Net model. The patched image is fed into the classifier part. The output of the classifier is combined with a down-sampled WSI as an input for the refinement head.

#### Patch-wise classifier

The PWC was constructed by fusing truncated backbones of two architectures, DenseNet201 and ResNet101V2, pre-trained on ImageNet<sup>42</sup>. These networks are used for parallel processing of the input and feature generation (we refer to this PWC model as DR-fused). In our proposed architecture, both DenseNet201 and ResNet101V2 receive the same input, which is the image patch. Each network processes this input concurrently, and after feature extraction, the outputs from both DenseNet201 and ResNet101V2 pass through their respective global average pooling layers. This step compresses the feature representation and is used to prevent overfitting. The compressed features from both networks are then concatenated and fed through the classifier head (Figure 1).

#### Refinement network

Heatmaps are generated from applying the PWC across the WSIs. The resultant heatmaps are then resized and concatenated with a down-sampled version of the WSI ( $1120 \times 1120$  pixels). The fused inputs are then fed to a refinement network, similarly, as proposed in H2G-Net<sup>23</sup>. Using a refinement network allows for adjusting the initial patch-wise predictions based on global WSI-level information.

The proposed refinement network is a simple, lightweight U-Net architecture, specifically tailored to process two image inputs (Figure 1). In this model, the two inputs (down-sampled RGB WSI and the heatmap) are concatenated into a 4-channel image and then processed through multiple convolutional layers with ReLU activation function. The architecture includes standard components such as Conv2D layers, batch normalization, spatial dropout, skip connections, max pooling for down-sampling, and upsampling layers (nearest-neighbor interpolation). The network concludes with a softmax activation function.

#### Data augmentation

To improve model robustness, data augmentation is commonly performed. Data augmentation generates artificial copies of the training data through some predefined algorithm. This allows the training data to better cover the expected data variation. Data augmentation was integrated in the data generation process of the training and the following methods were applied randomly: flipping, rotations (multiples of  $90^{\circ}$ ), multiplicative contrast adjustment, hue, and brightness, and the proposed multi-lens

distortion augmentation method. During the many-shot learning using PSA, we extracted patches by randomly cropping a  $224 \times 224$ -pixel section from each image. Each image appeared only once per epoch, where an epoch is defined as one iteration of all the training data.

#### Multi-lens distortion augmentation

A novel data augmentation method, multi-lens distortion, was developed to simulate several local random lens distortions. This technique aims to allow the model to recognize the important features of the images under a wider range of cell/tissue shapes.

The algorithm uses a fixed number of lenses. For each lens, a random position in the image is selected. A random distortion radius and strength is then used to apply the barrel and/or pincushion distortion effect at the position (Algorithm 1). An example of this augmentation is shown in Figure 2.

Algorithm 1 Multi-Lens Distortion Effect on an Image.

**Input:** *image* - array (Input image of shape  $H \times W \times C$ ) **Input:** *num\_lenses* - int (Number of lenses to apply) **Input:** *radius\_range* - tuple (*min\_radius,max\_radius*) **Input:** *strength\_range* - tuple (*min\_strength,max\_strength*) Output: distorted\_image - array (Image with lens effects applied)  $H, W, C \leftarrow$  shape of *image* distorted image  $\leftarrow$  copy of image Generate grid of pixel indices *yidx*, *xidx* for *image* Generate *num\_lenses* random centers (cx, cy) within  $[image_size[0] - radius, image_size[1] - radius]$ **for**  $i \leftarrow 0$  **to** num lenses -1 **do** radius ← random value within radius\_range strength  $\leftarrow$  random value within strength\_range Calculate the Euclidean distance r from each pixel to the lens center (cx[i], cy[i])Normalize distances: normalized\_ $r \leftarrow \frac{r}{radius}$ Calculate scaling factor:  $scaling_factor \leftarrow max(1 - normalized_r, 0)$ Apply distortion to calculate new pixel positions:  $distorted_y \leftarrow (yidx - cy[i]) \cdot (1 - strength \cdot scaling_factor) + cy[i]$  $distorted_x \leftarrow (xidx - cx[i]) \cdot (1 - strength \cdot scaling_factor) + cx[i]$ Clip *distorted\_y*, *distorted\_x* to image bounds Update *distorted\_image* with pixels from original image at new positions end for **return** *distorted\_image* 



**Figure 2.** Sample effect of the novel augmentation on a patch with overlaid grids to illustrate the effect. a) Original image showing epithelial cells. b) Augmented image with parameters set too high, cell size variation and deformation are visible. c) Augmented image with a medium setting of the parameters.

#### Model training

The PWC network was fine-tuned to adapt to the specific task by freezing the initial layers. The training parameters included: optimizer—Adamax with a learning rate of  $1 \times 10^{-4}$ ; loss function—Categorical Crossentropy; metrics—F<sub>1</sub>-score; batch size—dynamically determined based on the training generator configuration; epochs—up to 200 with early stopping based on validation loss to prevent overfitting.

The refinement network training involved: optimizer—Adam with a learning rate of  $1 \times 10^{-4}$ ; loss function—Dice loss function, optimized for segmentation tasks; metrics—Thresholded Dice score; batch size—2; epochs—up to 300 with early stopping based on validation loss to prevent overfitting; training environment—utilization of GPU and memory growth settings to optimize hardware usage.

In the WTA method, the same set of slides was used for both PWC and segmentation models' training. From the 97 slides, 77 slides were randomly chosen and divided into training and validation sets by a ratio of 1/3 (51 and 26 slides, respectively), while 20 slides (including those with TMA holes) were used for testing.

WSIs in the dataset from the Bergen cohort were divided into tiles (patches) and each tile was fed into the neural network along with the non-tumor/tumor label based on the provided annotation. To create the annotation labels for patches, non-tumor and tumor tiles were assigned the values 0 and 1, respectively. We first used a threshold on color gradients to separate the tissue from the background glass. Any tile that did not include more than 25% tissue was disregarded, meaning that all the input tiles contained less than 75% background glass. Also, a minimum of 5% tumor area was required for a tile to be classified as tumor; and for the non-tumor regions, only tiles with no tumor were assigned. Tiles with less than 5% area of tumor were disregarded.

Using the annotated WSI regions in the NLCB dataset, 40 areas were appointed to the tumor class (labeled as 1) and 50 areas to the non-tumor class (labeled as 0). The selected areas led to the generation of patches in subsequent steps. Specifically, out of 50 areas categorized as non-tumor, 40 clearly lacked tumor characteristics, and 10 showed features slightly above the initially-achieved threshold, as shown in Supplementary Fig. S2. This threshold was established through model training before intentionally creating an imbalance in the dataset. The imbalance was introduced after unsuccessful attempts to enhance model generalizability through various methods, including weighted loss functions, focal loss, threshold adjustment, and sampling strategies.

#### Post-processing

After the segmentation results were received, two post-processing steps were performed. First, small fragments were removed by converting images into grayscale and then to binary format to identify and eliminate fragments smaller than certain size threshold. The threshold was set as the smallest segmentation area annotated in our ground truth. In the second step, an edge smoothing algorithm was applied to enhance image quality. This improvement was achieved through mathematical techniques known as morphological operations, which are commonly used in digital image processing to modify the geometrical structure of images. Specifically, we used a process called morphological opening, which involves an erosion operation followed by a dilation. This sequence helps reduce jagged edges and smooths the boundaries of objects within the image. The operations were performed using a kernel size of  $7 \times 7$ . Additionally, a median blur with a kernel size of  $11 \times 11$  was applied to further smooth the edges. It's important to note that these morphological operations are purely computational methods used to process the digital images and should not be confused with the morphological study of biological tissues.

#### Implementation

Implementation was done in Python 3.8.10. TensorFlow (v2.13.1) was used for model architecture implementation and training<sup>43</sup>. These additional libraries were used for the experiments: pyFAST, OpenCV, NumPy, Pillow, SciPy, scikit-learn, and Matplotlib<sup>44–51</sup>. Trained models were converted to the ONNX format using the tf2onnx library<sup>52</sup>. Converted models were then integrated into FastPathology for deployment<sup>53</sup>. FastPathology is an open-source, user-friendly software developed for deep learning-based digital pathology that offers tools for processing and visualizing WSIs. The source code used to conduct the experiments is made openly available at https://github.com/AICAN-Research/DRU-Net.

#### Experiments

To compare the proposed model (DRU-Net) with other models, the following experiments were carried out: modifications of the previously introduced H2G-Net model on both datasets, DRU-Net with the backbone trained on the Bergen cohort and NLCB, and applying the few-shot and many-shot learning techniques along with clustering (Table 2)<sup>23</sup>.

H2G-Net could be tested as is, and be fine-tuned with five different modifications<sup>23</sup>. First, H2G-Net was tested without any modification, fine-tuning, or additional training, to see whether a model trained for breast cancer tumor delineation can also work for lung cancer. Second, the PWC of the H2G-Net was fine-tuned on annotated NSCLCs from the Bergen cohort, and the original U-Net of H2G-Net was applied on top of the PWC results. Third, the whole model (PWC and U-Net) was fine-tuned on the training data. Then, the same three methods were tested, but with the PWC trained on NLCB instead of the Bergen cohort.

**Table 2.** Methods and experiments carried out with various models on the same 20 WSIs of the test set from the Bergen cohort. Abbreviations: PWC: patch-wise classifier; NLCB: Norwegian Lung Cancer Biobank; FSC: few-shot (with a pre-trained MobileNetV2<sup>54</sup> model) + clustering; MSC: many-shot (with a pre-trained MobileNetV2<sup>54</sup> model) + clustering.

|               | Models  | Modifications                     | Training dataset(s)                                 |
|---------------|---------|-----------------------------------|---|
| (I)           | H2G-Net | _                                 | _   |
| ( <b>II</b> ) | H2G-Net | Fine-tuned PWC                    | Bergen Cohort                                       |
| (III)         | H2G-Net | Fine-tuned U-Net                  | Bergen Cohort                                       |
| ( <b>IV</b> ) | H2G-Net | Fine-tuned PWC and original U-Net | Bergen Cohort                                       |
| (V)           | DRU-Net | —                                 | Bergen Cohort                                       |
| (VI)          | H2G-Net | Fine-tuned PWC                    | NLCB  |
| (VII)         | H2G-Net | Fine-tuned PWC and U-Net          | PWC trained on NLCB, U-Net trained on Bergen Cohort |
| (VIII)        | FSC     | —                                 | NLCB  |
| ( <b>IX</b> ) | MSC     | —                                 | NLCB  |
| <b>(X)</b>    | DRU-Net | —                                 | PWC trained on NLCB, U-Net trained on Bergen Cohort |

An ablation study was performed to evaluate the effect of the proposed multi-lense distortion augmentation. A pre-trained DenseNet121 was tested on four open datasets: MNIST, Fashion-MNIST, CIFAR-10, and CIFAR-100<sup>38–40</sup>. Experiments were repeated with and without this augmentation on the mentioned open datasets by randomly selecting 10% of the training data and the results were compared using Wilcoxon test (Table 4). Both control and test groups included other augmentation techniques such as color adjustments, flipping, rotation, brightness, and contrast augmentations. The effect of this augmentation on the training time was measured using the integrated TensorFlow functions by comparing the time with and without the augmentation and the results were averaged on WSIs and compared between the two<sup>43</sup>.

We also investigated the effect of removing the top-most skip connection of the U-Net refinement model and we calculated the average Hausdorff distances (HDs) for two sets of final segmentation predictions in comparison to a ground truth set. This was done to quantify the effect of removing that skip connection, which was done to reduce the small fragments around the segmentation perimeter.

#### Model evaluation

#### Quantitative model assessment

To quantitatively validate the patch-wise classification performance, precision, recall, and  $F_1$ -score were used<sup>55</sup>. The validation of the final segmentation on WSI-level was performed using DSC and HD<sup>56</sup>.

#### Qualitative model assessment

The qualitative assessment of the segmentation results was conducted by two pathologists using the scoring system described in Table 3. Qualitative assessment was done on the same 20 WSIs of the test set from the Bergen cohort.

| 0               | 1               | 2                | 3                 | 4                 | 5            |
|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| No tumor tissue | Completely      | A large part of  | Most of the       | Most of the       | The whole or |
| in image or     | wrong           | the tumor is not | tumor is          | tumor is          | almost the   |
| segmentation,   | segmentation    | segmented        | correctly         | correctly         | whole tumor  |
| or image not    | of tumor, tumor |                  | segmented, but    | segmented,        | correctly    |
| suitable for    | tissue not      |                  | some false        | only sparse       | segmented    |
| analysis        | segmented       |                  | positive or false | false positive or |              |
|                 |                 |                  | negative areas    | false negative    |              |
|                 |                 |                  |                   | areas             |              |

Table 3. Qualitative evaluation scoring system.

#### Saliency maps

To survey the model's decision-making process and the areas of patches that were most relevant for predicting the tumor class, we employed a method known as gradient-based saliency  $maps^{57-60}$ . This approach operates by computing the gradient of the output class (the class for which we want to understand model sensitivity) with respect to the input image. These gradients

indicate the sensitivity of the output to each pixel in the input image. By highlighting the pixels with the highest gradients, we can visualize the areas that most strongly influenced the model's classification decision. We used six different patches for this test selected from six different WSIs from the Bergen cohort. Patches were chosen to represent true and false positive predictions. Patches with true positive predictions were selected to include various histological features and cell types in each patch to better assess the model's decision process.

# Results

Highest DSC in average on the 20 WSIs of the test set from Bergen cohort was achieved by DRU-Net followed by the H2G-Net with fine-tuned PWC on the Bergen cohort (Figure 3). Similar differences in DSC were observed for the models without the refinement networks (Figure 4).



**Figure 3.** Boxplots of the Dice similarity coefficients (DSCs) of the experiments shown Table 2 on the 20 WSIs of the test set. **I**) original H2G-Net, **II**) H2G-Net with fine-tuned PWC on Bergen cohort, **III**) H2G-Net with fine-tuned U-Net on Bergen cohort, **V**) DRU-Net trained on Bergen Cohort, **VI**) H2G-Net with fine-tuned PWC and U-Net on Bergen cohort, **V**) DRU-Net trained on Bergen Cohort, **VI**) H2G-Net with fine-tuned PWC on NLCB and fine-tuned U-Net on Bergen Cohort, **VIII**) FSC, **IX**) MSC, **X**) DRU-Net with PWC trained on NLCB and U-Net trained on Bergen Cohort.

Proposed multi-lens distortion augmentation applied to various datasets resulted in increased  $F_1$ -score overall, this change was statistically significant when applied to our dataset from the NLCB (Table 4). Applying this augmentation technique increased training time by an average of 8%. DSC and patch-wice accuracy were increased when the multi-lens distortion augmentation was used with a strength of magnitude in the range [0.2, 0.4], but higher magnitudes caused a decrease in the performance (Figure 5).

| Table 4. The impact of the multi-lens distortion augmentation technique using different architectures on different datasets with |
|--|
| randomly selecting 10% of the training data. Pairwise tests were performed using Wilcoxon signed-rank tests. The                 |
| augmentation design with the highest $F_1$ -scores row-wise are highlighted in bold.   |

|             |               | F <sub>1</sub> -score |        |                 |
|-------------|---------------|-----------------------|--------|-----------------|
| Model       | Dataset       | wo/aug                | w/aug  | <i>p</i> -value |
| DenseNet121 | MNIST         | 0.9893                | 0.9894 | 0.2311          |
| DenseNet121 | Fashion-MNIST | 0.9043                | 0.9208 | < 0.001         |
| DenseNet121 | CIFAR-10      | 0.8086                | 0.8235 | < 0.001         |
| DenseNet121 | CIFAR-100     | 0.5199                | 0.5581 | 0.0502          |
| H2G-Net     | NLCB          | 0.8299                | 0.8341 | 0.0701          |
| DRU-Net     | NLCB          | 0.8868                | 0.9025 | 0.0241          |



**Figure 4.** Boxplot of the Dice similarity coefficients (DSCs) of the PWC models in experiments listed in Table 2 without the refinement network, only the patch-wise classifier is used to produce these results. **I**) original H2G-Net, **II**) H2G-Net with fine-tuned PWC on Bergen cohort, **V**) DR-fused trained on Bergen Cohort, **VI**) H2G-Net with fine-tuned PWC on NLCB, **X**) DR-fused trained on Bergen Cohort.



**Figure 5.** The impact of the multi-lens distortion augmentation technique using the DRU-Net model. DSC: Dice similarity coefficient. The highlighted regions indicate the variance, and the mean values are shown on the curve.

The original H2G-Net resulted in an average of 0.76 DSC (Figure 3) and 0.66 intersection over union (IOU) scores. On average, 25% of the non-tumor regions around the true tumor outlines were falsely labeled as tumor. When the PWC part of the model was used without refinement, the predictions resulted in 0.64 DSC and 0.61 IOU, showing that the refinement improved the predictions significantly.

Fine-tuned PWC trained and validated on 77 WSIs from the Bergen cohort with direct implementation of pre-trained U-Net

from H2G-Net was tested on 20 WSIs from the Bergen cohort and resulted in an average of 0.83 DSC (median 0.91) (Figure 3) and an average 0.74 IOU scores. Scores were reduced to an average of 0.77 DSC (median of 0.87) and an average of 0.69 IOU when both the U-Net and the PWC were fine-tuned.

The proposed model (DRU-Net) tested on the same 20 WSIs resulted in an average of 0.91 DSC (median 0.93) and 0.81 IOU. Also removing the top skip connection in our U-Net model (DRU-Net) resulted in the average reduction of HD by 4.8%. Figure 6 shows a comparison of the results from various models. Table 5 summarizes various backbones' performance in the patch-wise classifier part of the model.

**Table 5.** Comparison of different backbone architectures for patch-wise classification of lung cancer tissue using the many-shot method. The best-performing architecture per metric is highlighted in bold. Abbreviations: DR: fusion of DenseNet201 (D) and ResNet101V2 (R).

| Architecture              | F <sub>1</sub> -score | Precision | Recall |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------|
| VGG19 <sup>61</sup>       | 0.87                  | 0.86      | 0.87   |
| ResNet101V2 <sup>62</sup> | 0.89                  | 0.89      | 0.89   |
| MobileNetV254             | 0.86                  | 0.86      | 0.86   |
| EfficientNetV263          | 0.89                  | 0.89      | 0.89   |
| InceptionV364             | 0.90                  | 0.89      | 0.91   |
| DenseNet20165             | 0.91                  | 0.91      | 0.91   |
| Proposed DR-fused         | 0.94                  | 0.94      | 0.93   |

We compared the performance of several models on processing a set of 20 WSIs with average dimensions being approximately 108 640 pixels in width and 129 835 pixels in height. H2G-Net and its fine-tuned versions were the fastest models during inference (62 seconds). Although the many-shot and few-shot models had faster training they exhibited slower runtimes, with MSC taking the longest at 167 seconds and DRU-Net at 152 seconds.



**Figure 6.** Sample results of three tested networks. First row: original whole slide images (WSIs), second row: DRU-Net, third row: FSC (Few-shot learning + clustering), fourth row: H2G-Net with fine-tuned patch-wise classifier and original U-Net. Green pixels indicate true positives, White pixels indicate false positives and red pixels indicate false negatives.

Results of saliency map analysis on 6 patches are shown in Figure 7. False positive areas in the saliency maps were partly

explained by areas with reactive pneumocytes, macrophages, and reactive pneumocyte hyperplasia.

The qualitative assessment resulted in an average score of 3.95 out of 5. In 9 of the assessed cases, there were sparse areas in the periphery that the model misclassified.



**Figure 7.** Sample patches (top row) and their overlaid saliency maps (bottom row) where only the patches were given to the PWC model. Note that the saliency map does not indicate malignancy; instead, it shows how different regions of the image influence the classification decision. The colors on the map range from blue, indicating the least influence, to red, which indicates the most influence. Figures **a**, **b**, and **c** show false positive tumor detection. Figures **d**, **e**, and **f** show true positive tumor detection.

## Discussion

In this paper, we introduce a novel AI-based model to segment the outline of NSCLCs. We have incorporated a patchwise classifier, synergistically integrating truncated DenseNet201 and ResNet101V2 architectures, which is enhanced by a segmentation refinement model adopting a streamlined U-Net framework. This composite model demonstrated superior performance over other tested backbones. This study also resulted in a novel dataset comprising annotated NSCLCs and marked regions of interest in WSIs from NSCLCs, including different tissue types. Our results also indicate that the PSA approach yielded more effective training outcomes for the patch-wise classifier than WTA techniques with and without class balancing using tissue clustering.

Our study also demonstrated that the implementation of the multi-lens distortion augmentation technique enhanced classification outcomes across diverse datasets with a limited volume of training data. However, it is important to acknowledge that the effect of this augmentation can vary depending on the data itself. We investigated the effect of the augmentation's strength range on the patch-wise accuracy and refinement network's DSC on WSI-level, concluding that the degree of augmentation applied plays a pivotal role in its impact on the training process. Excessively strong distortion of images could obstruct the model's ability to learn relevant patterns as shown in the impact of the multi-lens distortion augmentation with various strength ranges.

The RGSB-UNet model features a unique hybrid design that combines residual ghost blocks with switchable normalization and a bottleneck transformer<sup>11</sup>. This design focuses on extracting refined features through its complex structure. However, in our study, we found that simpler and more synergistic designs can also effectively extract reliable features.

The MAMC-Net model improves tumor boundary detection by using a conditional random field layer<sup>21</sup>, whereas the DRU-Net model enhances segmentation by fine-tuning a U-Net on a down-sampled image. Both methods achieved good results, but our approach using a U-Net on down-sampled images is faster and still highly efficient. Compared to the MAMC-Net study, our PSA approach used a much smaller dataset and achieved similar results.

Similar to H2G-Net, our proposed model, DRU-Net, also utilizes a cascaded design with the two stages of PWC and refinement and has achieved comparable results<sup>23</sup>. Although H2G-Net uses a lightweight PWC and a relatively heavier U-Net for refinement, DRU-Net performed better with a heavier PWC and a lightweight U-Net. This could be due to less training data available in our case which can require a more complex feature extraction process. Pedersen *et al.* also introduced a balancing technique to ensure a balanced representation of the available categories, which helps minimizing bias toward any specific tissue type or tumor characteristic. In our study, we have also used a clustering-based balancing method to reduce bias during

sampling from our WTA. However, we have also benefited from our PSA approach with the induced imbalance in generated samples to minimize the bias toward tumor labels, which proved to work better in our test dataset.

The decrease in performance after fine-tuning the U-Net layers of the H2G-Net may be due to the relatively small number of annotated WSIs available in our study. Conversely, the DRU-Net network's superior performance under similar conditions suggests the efficacy of the DR-fused network accompanied by a relatively lightweight U-Net architecture in data-scarce scenarios.

The relatively low performance of the original H2G-Net on NSCLCs can be explained by different tissue morphology, growth pattern, and stromal invasions, which can cause misleading during inference<sup>36,66–72</sup>.

In this study, we encountered challenges due to significant class imbalance between the patches derived from the WTA approach. Addressing the resultant low precision, a comprehensive strategy was implemented to improve model accuracy. Key interventions included resampling techniques, both under- and over-sampling, as well as the incorporation of focal loss, which specifically helps to address class imbalance by modulating the loss function to focus on harder-to-classify examples<sup>73</sup>. Furthermore, we explored the clustering of similar tissue types before sampling, the use of a weighted loss function, and adjustments to the decision threshold.

Additionally, in the training phase of the many-shot model using the samples derived from PSA approach, to maximize the model's performance, we deliberately introduced a controlled imbalance which was aimed at optimizing the threshold settings. The deliberate construction of an imbalanced dataset resulted in improved performance. This approach outperformed resampling, under- and over-sampling, focal loss, sampling from clustered tissue types, weighted loss function, and threshold tuning<sup>73</sup>. However, the induced class imbalance, while promising, carries the risk of significant bias. It necessitates careful calibration and continuous monitoring to ensure that the model does not disproportionately favor certain classes or features, leading to skewed results. In our case, the performance was ascertained by testing on an external dataset (the PWC trained using the many-shot method was trained on the NLCB dataset and tested on the 20 slides that were selected for testing from the Bergen cohort).

Our results indicate that refining the PWC heatmap with the suggested refinement networks improves the accuracy of the tested models. However, the main strengths and weaknesses of the models compared to each other directly stem from the training method used for the PWC models. Additionally, combining the two processes seems to improve and reduce the variance in the segmentation DSC values, indicating that the refinement models have learned to understand overall patterns and connections leading to a better segmentation.

The difference observed in the average DSCs between PWC models indicates that PSA can outperform WTA approaches when the amount of data is relatively limited. This is because of the inadequate separability of the features distributions between tumor and non-tumor. In the WTA approach, the method involved annotating entire tumor regions, which often included patches where the feature distributions of tumor and non-tumor tissues overlapped significantly. This overlap resulted in inadequate separability, thereby reducing the discriminatory power of the classification models trained using this approach. Consequently, the distinction between tumor and non-tumor features in these patches became less pronounced, leading to potential misclassifications.

Conversely, the PSA method adopted a more selective approach by targeting patches for annotation based on their discriminative morphology. By focusing on patches where the features of each class (tumor and non-tumor) were distinctly separable, PSA enhanced the model's ability to accurately classify these features. This selective annotation process, effectively increased the inter-class variance while reducing the intra-class variance, thus significantly improving the overall performance of the classification models in distinguishing between tumor and non-tumor tissues under conditions of limited data. In the WTA approach, the mentioned inseparable feature distribution affected the loss function negatively resulting in lower accuracy. This was most likely rooted in the fact that the tumor regions also include other cell types than the invasive epithelial cells. By using histopathological knowledge for selecting areas with the most relevant features in PSA, variation of the features between the two classes could be increased.

Additionally, the study presents evidence that employing few-shot learning in conjunction with a clustering approach can achieve accuracy levels comparable to those reliant on extensive datasets, thereby potentially mitigating the need for large-scale data collection. The few-shot learning approach is preferable when there is a high degree of similarity within each class of tissue types and a clear distinction between the classes in the feature space<sup>74</sup>.

In our few-shot learning method, we introduced a novelty by utilizing an evolutionary optimization technique to determine the optimal number of clusters (classes) to minimize intra-cluster variance and maximize inter-cluster variance prior to training. This method ensures that clusters are optimally configured to reflect the most coherent and meaningful class structures, which is crucial when the available training data is scarce. By focusing on minimizing intra-cluster variance and minimizing inter-cluster similarity, the approach enhances the model's ability to generalize from limited examples, a critical aspect in few-shot scenarios where the risk of overfitting is high. Furthermore, evolutionary algorithms offer robust adaptability and flexibility, enabling the model to effectively handle different types and distributions of data. This pre-training optimization led to more efficient training and improved model performance by grouping patches into different classes.

Qualitative assessment of our results suggests that the DRU-Net model shows limitations in accurately delineating the tumor periphery. This challenge was particularly evident in regions with fibrosis, reactive tissue, or inflammation, where the model tends to produce false positive and false negative segmentations.

In future work, we suggest reducing the model size, incorporating advanced attention-focusing mechanisms, and using a multi-scale patch-wise classifier to better incorporate information at different scales. Employing anomaly detection algorithms might help identify reactive tissue outliers that contribute to false positive classifications. Additionally, Mask R-CNN architectures are highly effective in distinguishing complex patterns that can be used for a better tumor border delineation. Also, implementing Bayesian neural networks can help in predicting tumor boundaries while quantifying the uncertainty of the predictions. To better use the global information, one can also integrate Markov random fields or conditional random fields along with PWC or transformer architectures to help ensure that the segmented areas are not only based on local pixel values. We also suggest Neuro-Fuzzy Systems, which leverage the learning capabilities of neural networks with the reasoning capabilities of fuzzy logic to improve the differentiation between the two classes. To overcome the limited data problem, we can suggest using unsupervised domain adaptation algorithms to leverage annotated data from other histopathology source domains.

# Conclusion

In conclusion, we have introduced DRU-Net for non-small cell lung cancer tumor delineation in WSIs. Our novel AI-based model, which synergistically integrates truncated DenseNet201 and ResNet101V2 with a U-Net based refinement framework, has demonstrated high performance in NSCLCs over various tested methods. The effectiveness of our patch-wise classifier has been significantly enhanced through the incorporation of the multi-lens distortion augmentation technique and PSA strategy. Additionally, employing few-shot learning with optimized clustering could mitigate the need for large datasets.

## References

- 1. Rami-Porta, R. Future perspectives on the TNM staging for lung cancer. Cancers 13, 1940 (2021).
- Lim, C. *et al.* Biomarker testing and time to treatment decision in patients with advanced nonsmall-cell lung cancer. *Annals Oncol.* 26, 1415–1421 (2015).
- **3.** Woodard, G. A., Jones, K. D. & Jablons, D. M. Lung cancer staging and prognosis. *Lung cancer: treatment research* 47–75 (2016).
- Hanna, M. G. *et al.* Implementation of digital pathology offers clinical and operational increase in efficiency and cost savings. *Arch. pathology & laboratory medicine* 143, 1545–1555 (2019).
- Bera, K., Schalper, K. A., Rimm, D. L., Velcheti, V. & Madabhushi, A. Artificial intelligence in digital pathology—new tools for diagnosis and precision oncology. *Nat. reviews Clin. oncology* 16, 703–715 (2019).
- 6. Sakamoto, T. *et al.* A narrative review of digital pathology and artificial intelligence: focusing on lung cancer. *Transl. Lung Cancer Res.* 9, 2255 (2020).
- 7. Niazi, M. K. K., Parwani, A. V. & Gurcan, M. N. Digital pathology and artificial intelligence. *The lancet oncology* 20, e253–e261 (2019).
- 8. Kurc, T. *et al.* Segmentation and classification in digital pathology for glioma research: challenges and deep learning approaches. *Front. neuroscience* 14, 27 (2020).
- 9. Ho, D. J. et al. Deep multi-magnification networks for multi-class breast cancer image segmentation. Comput. Med. Imaging Graph. 88, 101866 (2021).
- Qaiser, T. *et al.* Fast and accurate tumor segmentation of histology images using persistent homology and deep convolutional features. *Med. image analysis* 55, 1–14 (2019).
- Zhao, T., Fu, C., Tie, M., Sham, C.-W. & Ma, H. RGSB-UNet: Hybrid Deep Learning Framework for Tumour Segmentation in Digital Pathology Images. *Bioengineering* 10, 957 (2023).
- Viswanathan, V. S., Toro, P., Corredor, G., Mukhopadhyay, S. & Madabhushi, A. The state of the art for artificial intelligence in lung digital pathology. *The J. pathology* 257, 413–429 (2022).
- 13. Wang, S. et al. Artificial intelligence in lung cancer pathology image analysis. Cancers 11, 1673 (2019).
- Davri, A. *et al.* Deep Learning for Lung Cancer Diagnosis, Prognosis and Prediction Using Histological and Cytological Images: A Systematic Review. *Cancers* 15, 3981 (2023).

- Cheng, J., Huang, K. & Xu, J. Computational pathology for precision diagnosis, treatment, and prognosis of cancer. *Front. Medicine* 10, 1209666 (2023).
- 16. Ranftl, R., Bochkovskiy, A. & Koltun, V. Vision transformers for dense prediction. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 12179–12188 (2021).
- Wang, W. et al. Internimage: Exploring large-scale vision foundation models with deformable convolutions. In Proceedings
  of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 14408–14419 (2023).
- 18. Park, N. & Kim, S. How do vision transformers work? arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.06709 (2022).
- Kassani, S. H., Kassani, P. H., Wesolowski, M. J., Schneider, K. A. & Deters, R. Deep transfer learning based model for colorectal cancer histopathology segmentation: A comparative study of deep pre-trained models. *Int. J. Med. Informatics* 159, 104669 (2022).
- 20. Lin, H. et al. ScanNet: A Fast and Dense Scanning Framework for Metastastic Breast Cancer Detection from Whole-Slide Image. In 2018 IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV), 539–546, DOI: 10.1109/WACV. 2018.00065 (2018).
- **21.** Zeng, L. *et al.* MAMC-Net: an effective deep learning framework for whole-slide image tumor segmentation. *Multimed. Tools Appl.* 1–21 (2023).
- 22. Wang, L. *et al.* DHUnet: Dual-branch hierarchical global–local fusion network for whole slide image segmentation. *Biomed. Signal Process. Control.* **85**, 104976 (2023).
- 23. Pedersen, A. *et al.* H2G-Net: A multi-resolution refinement approach for segmentation of breast cancer region in gigapixel histopathological images. *Front. Medicine* 9, 971873 (2022).
- Albusayli, R. *et al.* Simple non-iterative clustering and CNNs for coarse segmentation of breast cancer whole-slide images. In *Medical Imaging 2021: Digital Pathology*, vol. 11603, 100–108 (SPIE, 2021).
- 25. Chelebian, E., Avenel, C., Ciompi, F. & Wählby, C. DEPICTER: Deep representation clustering for histology annotation. *Comput. Biol. Medicine* 108026 (2024).
- 26. Yan, J., Chen, H., Li, X. & Yao, J. Deep contrastive learning based tissue clustering for annotation-free histopathology image analysis. *Comput. Med. Imaging Graph.* 97, 102053 (2022).
- 27. Deuschel, J. et al. Multi-prototype few-shot learning in histopathology. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international* conference on computer vision, 620–628 (2021).
- **28.** Shakeri, F. *et al.* FHIST: a benchmark for few-shot classification of histological images. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.00092* (2022).
- 29. Titoriya, A. K. & Singh, M. P. Few-Shot Learning on Histopathology Image Classification. In 2022 International Conference on Computational Science and Computational Intelligence (CSCI), 251–256 (IEEE, 2022).
- **30.** Liu, Z. *et al.* Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 10012–10022 (2021).
- **31.** Liu, Z. et al. A ConvNet for the 2020s. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, 11976–11986 (2022).
- 32. Hatlen, P. Lung cancer-influence of comorbidity on incidence and survival: The Nord-Trøndelag Health study (2014).
- Ramnefjell, M., Aamelfot, C., Helgeland, L. & Akslen, L. A. Vascular invasion is an adverse prognostic factor in resected non-small-cell lung cancer. *Apmis* 125, 197–206 (2017).
- 34. Hatlen, P., Grønberg, B. H., Langhammer, A., Carlsen, S. M. & Amundsen, T. Prolonged survival in patients with lung cancer with diabetes mellitus. *J. Thorac. Oncol.* 6, 1810–1817 (2011).
- 35. Yoh Watanabe, M. TNM classification for lung cancer. Ann Thorac Cardiovasc. Surg 9 (2003).
- 36. Travis, W. The 2015 WHO classification of lung tumors. Der Pathol. 35, 188–188 (2014).
- **37.** Valla, M. *et al.* Molecular subtypes of breast cancer: long-term incidence trends and prognostic differences. *Cancer Epidemiol. Biomarkers & Prev.* **25**, 1625–1634 (2016).
- Deng, L. The MNIST Database of Handwritten Digit Images for Machine Learning Research. *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.* 29, 141–142 (2012).
- **39.** Xiao, H., Rasul, K. & Vollgraf, R. Fashion-MNIST: a Novel Image Dataset for Benchmarking Machine Learning Algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.07747* (2017).

- 40. Krizhevsky, A., Hinton, G. et al. Learning Multiple Layers of Features from Tiny Images (2009).
- 41. Bankhead, P. et al. QuPath: Open source software for digital pathology image analysis. Sci. reports 7, 1–7 (2017).
- **42.** Deng, J. *et al.* ImageNet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In 2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, 248–255 (Ieee, 2009).
- **43.** Abadi, M. *et al.* TensorFlow: Large-Scale Machine Learning on Heterogeneous Systems (2015). Software available from tensorflow.org.
- **44.** Smistad, E., Bozorgi, M. & Lindseth, F. FAST: framework for heterogeneous medical image computing and visualization. *Int. J. computer assisted radiology surgery* **10**, 1811–1822 (2015).
- **45.** Smistad, E., Østvik, A. & Pedersen, A. High performance neural network inference, streaming, and visualization of medical images using FAST. *IEEE Access* **7**, 136310–136321 (2019).
- 46. Bradski, G. The OpenCV Library. Dr. Dobb's J. Softw. Tools (2000).
- 47. Clark, A. Pillow (pil fork) documentation (2015).
- 48. Harris, C. R. et al. Array programming with NumPy. Nature 585, 357–362, DOI: 10.1038/s41586-020-2649-2 (2020).
- **49.** Virtanen, P. *et al.* SciPy 1.0: Fundamental Algorithms for Scientific Computing in Python. *Nat. Methods* **17**, 261–272, DOI: 10.1038/s41592-019-0686-2 (2020).
- 50. Pedregosa, F. et al. Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python. J. Mach. Learn. Res. 12, 2825–2830 (2011).
- 51. Hunter, J. D. Matplotlib: A 2d graphics environment. Comput. Sci. & Eng. 9, 90–95, DOI: 10.1109/MCSE.2007.55 (2007).
- 52. ONNX. Convert TensorFlow, Keras, Tensorflow, js and Tflite models to ONNX (2024).
- **53.** Pedersen, A. *et al.* FastPathology: An open-source platform for deep learning-based research and decision support in digital pathology. *IEEE Access* **9**, 58216–58229 (2021).
- 54. Sandler, M., Howard, A., Zhu, M., Zhmoginov, A. & Chen, L.-C. MobileNetV2: Inverted Residuals and Linear Bottlenecks. In Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, 4510–4520 (2018).
- **55.** Goutte, C. & Gaussier, E. A probabilistic interpretation of precision, recall and F-score, with implication for evaluation. In *European conference on information retrieval*, 345–359 (Springer, 2005).
- **56.** Kim, H. *et al.* Quantitative evaluation of image segmentation incorporating medical consideration functions. *Med. physics* **42**, 3013–3023 (2015).
- **57.** Patro, B. N., Lunayach, M., Patel, S. & Namboodiri, V. P. U-CAM: Visual Explanation using Uncertainty based Class Activation Maps. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 7444–7453 (2019).
- **58.** Simonyan, K., Vedaldi, A. & Zisserman, A. Deep inside convolutional networks: Visualising image classification models and saliency maps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6034* (2013).
- **59.** Zeiler, M. D. & Fergus, R. Visualizing and understanding convolutional networks. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2014: 13th European Conference, Zurich, Switzerland, September 6-12, 2014, Proceedings, Part I 13,* 818–833 (Springer, 2014).
- **60.** Sundararajan, M., Taly, A. & Yan, Q. Axiomatic attribution for deep networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, 3319–3328 (PMLR, 2017).
- **61.** Simonyan, K. & Zisserman, A. Very Deep Convolutional Networks for Large-Scale Image Recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556* (2014).
- **62.** 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*, 770–778 (2016).
- **63.** Tan, M. & Le, Q. EfficientNetV2: Smaller Models and Faster Training. In *International conference on machine learning*, 10096–10106 (PMLR, 2021).
- 64. Szegedy, C., Vanhoucke, V., Ioffe, S., Shlens, J. & Wojna, Z. Rethinking the Inception Architecture for Computer Vision. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2818–2826 (2016).
- **65.** Huang, G., Liu, Z., Van Der Maaten, L. & Weinberger, K. Q. Densely Connected Convolutional Networks. In *Proceedings* of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, 4700–4708 (2017).
- 66. Menon, A., Singh, P., Vinod, P. & Jawahar, C. Exploring Histological Similarities Across Cancers From a Deep Learning Perspective. *Front. Oncol.* 12, 842759 (2022).

- 67. Kashima, J., Kitadai, R. & Okuma, Y. Molecular and Morphological Profiling of Lung Cancer: A Foundation for "Next-Generation" Pathologists and Oncologists. *Cancers* 11, 599 (2019).
- 68. Petersen, I. The morphological and molecular diagnosis of lung cancer. Deutsches Ärzteblatt Int. 108, 525 (2011).
- **69.** Inamura, K. Lung cancer: understanding its molecular pathology and the 2015 WHO classification. *Front. oncology* **7**, 193 (2017).
- **70.** Zhao, S. *et al.* Single-cell morphological and topological atlas reveals the ecosystem diversity of human breast cancer. *Nat. Commun.* **14**, 6796 (2023).
- **71.** Binder, A. *et al.* Morphological and molecular breast cancer profiling through explainable machine learning. *Nat. Mach. Intell.* **3**, 355–366 (2021).
- 72. Tan, P. H. et al. The 2019 WHO classification of tumours of the breast. Histopathology (2020).
- 73. Lin, T.-Y., Goyal, P., Girshick, R., He, K. & Dollár, P. Focal loss for dense object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, 2980–2988 (2017).
- 74. Qi, Y., Sun, H., Liu, N. & Zhou, H. A Task-Aware Dual Similarity Network for Fine-Grained Few-Shot Learning. In *Pacific Rim International Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 606–618 (Springer, 2022).

# Acknowledgements

We extend our gratitude to Borgny Ytterhus for her contributions to this project.

# Author contributions statement

SO created the proposed model and augmentation, conducted the experiments, and wrote the main text. MV prepared the data, checked and confirmed the annotations, conducted the qualitative assessments, and helped with the histopathological aspects of the experiments. AP assisted with the technical and programming aspects of the work. ES provided guidelines for programming and technical aspects of the work. SGFD collected and quality-checked all histopathology samples from the NLCB archive. VGD annotated the slides, helped with the histopathological aspects of the experiments, and conducted the qualitative assessments. MH reviewed and provided feedback on the paper. MDH annotated the slides and helped with the histopathological aspects of the experiments and methods. MPR contributed in the preparation of the Bergen cohort, reviewed and provided feedback on the paper. LAA contributed in the preparation of the Bergen cohort, reviewed and provided feedback on the paper. GK provided guidelines for experiments and technical aspects of the work. HS was project leader, provided funding and supervision over the whole work and guidelines for the clinical aspects of the work. All authors reviewed, revised, and approved the manuscript.

# Data availability

The datasets generated and/or analysed during the current study are not publicly available due to the sensitive nature of personal medical data from patients who may still be alive.

# **Conflict of Interest**

There is no conflict of interest to report.