

# Comparative Analysis of Resource-Efficient CNN Architectures for Brain Tumor Classification\*

Md Ashik Khan

Department of Computer Science and Engineering,  
Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur  
West Bengal, India  
aasshhik98@gmail.com

Rafath Bin Zafar Auvee

Department of Computer Science and Engineering,  
Bangladesh Army University of Science and Technology  
Saidpur, Bangladesh  
rafath.auvee@gmail.com

## ABSTRACT

Accurate brain tumor classification in MRI images is critical for timely diagnosis and treatment planning. While deep learning models like ResNet-18, VGG-16 have shown high accuracy, they often come with increased complexity and computational demands. This study presents a comparative analysis of effective yet simple Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) architecture and pre-trained ResNet18, and VGG16 model for brain tumor classification using two publicly available datasets: Br35H:: Brain Tumor Detection 2020 and Brain Tumor MRI Dataset. The custom CNN architecture, despite its lower complexity, demonstrates competitive performance with the pre-trained ResNet18 and VGG16 models. In binary classification tasks, the custom CNN achieved an accuracy of 98.67% on the Br35H dataset and 99.62% on the Brain Tumor MRI Dataset. For multi-class classification, the custom CNN, with a slight architectural modification, achieved an accuracy of 98.09%, on the Brain Tumor MRI Dataset. Comparatively, ResNet18 and VGG16 maintained high performance levels, but the custom CNNs provided a more computationally efficient alternative. Additionally, the custom CNNs were evaluated using few-shot learning (0, 5, 10, 15, 20, 40, and 80 shots) to assess their robustness, achieving notable accuracy improvements with increased shots. This study highlights the potential of well-designed, less complex CNN architectures as effective and computationally efficient alternatives to deeper, pre-trained models for medical imaging tasks, including brain tumor classification. This study underscores the potential of custom CNNs in medical imaging tasks and encourages further exploration in this direction.

## KEYWORDS

Brain Tumor Classification, Convolutional Neural Network, Deep Learning, ResNet18, VGG16, Br35H , Brain Tumor MRI Dataset, Brain Tumor binary-classification CNN , Brain Tumor Multi-class-classification CNN , zero-shot Learning, few-shot Learning


## 1 INTRODUCTION

Brain tumors are a significant health concern that requires accurate and fast diagnosis for optimal treatment. Timely and accurate diagnosis is crucial for effective treatment and improved outcomes. Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) is a powerful diagnostic tool for identifying and classifying brain tumors with greater precision by providing detailed images of brain structures. However, the diagnostic process can be complex and time-consuming, requiring expertise in tumor diagnosis.

\*This work has been accepted at IEEE ICCIT 2024. Please cite the version appearing in the ICCIT proceedings.

In recent years, Deep learning algorithms have changed medical imaging by improving accuracy and efficiency in tumor detection and categorization. By applying these techniques to MRI data, researchers and clinicians can improve healthcare research and provide effective solutions for patients. Deep learning models such as ResNet18 [15] and VGG16 [33] have demonstrated remarkable performance in various image classification tasks. However, these models are often computationally intensive and require substantial resources, which may not be feasible in all clinical settings.

The field of medical imaging has seen a surge in the application of deep learning techniques for various diagnostic tasks. For instance, Ronneberger et al. [28] introduced the U-Net architecture for biomedical image segmentation, which has been widely adopted for its efficiency and accuracy. Similarly, Litjens et al. [23] provided a comprehensive review of deep learning in medical image analysis, highlighting the potential of these methods in improving diagnostic accuracy.



(a) Binary Brain Tumor Sample (b) Multi-class Brain Tumor Sample

Figure 1: Brain Tumor MRI sample images.

In the context of brain tumor classification, several studies have explored the use of deep learning models. For example, Havaei et al. [14] proposed a novel CNN architecture for brain tumor segmentation, demonstrating high accuracy and robustness. Similarly, Pereira et al. [29] developed a deep learning model for brain tumor segmentation and classification, showing promising results in differentiating between various types of brain tumors.

However, the computational demands of these models can be a significant barrier to their widespread adoption, especially in resource-constrained environments. This has led to the development of more efficient architectures. For instance, Howard et al. [17] introduced MobileNets, a family of lightweight CNN models designed for mobile and embedded vision applications. These

models achieve high accuracy with significantly reduced computational complexity, making them suitable for deployment in resource-constrained settings.

This has led to an interest in developing simpler, custom Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) architectures that can deliver comparable performance with reduced computational complexity. Custom CNN architectures can potentially provide a balance between accuracy and computational efficiency, making them suitable for resource-constrained environments. These custom models are particularly advantageous in scenarios where computational resources are limited, as they require fewer parameters and simpler operations compared to their deeper counterparts [14, 17].

This study focuses on comparing the custom CNN architectures with pre-trained models such as ResNet18 [15] and VGG16 [33] for the work of classifying brain tumors using two in public datasets available: Br35H: Brain Tumor Detection 2020 [8] and Brain Tumor MRI Dataset [9]. The goal is to see if simpler, less resource-intensive models can achieve competitive accuracy, thereby providing a viable alternative for resource-constrained environments. The study investigates the efficacy of custom CNNs in binary and multi-class classification tasks and compares their results against those obtained from ResNet18 [15] and VGG16 [33] as well as, their performance under few-shot learning conditions, where limited training data is available.

The findings from this study align with other research highlighting the effectiveness of simpler CNN models in various medical imaging tasks (e.g., [20], [30], [36]). This study's result demonstrates the potential of custom CNN architectures in medical imaging, offering a balance between accuracy and computational efficiency.

## 2 RELATED WORKS

Deep learning techniques have revolutionized medical image analysis, including brain tumor classification. Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) have been particularly successful in learning and extracting features from complex datasets, leading to improved diagnostic accuracy and efficiency.

Litjens et al. (2017) [23] and Shen, Wu, and Suk (2017) [32] highlighted the significant advancements in deep learning for medical image analysis. CNNs have demonstrated remarkable performance in lesion detection, organ segmentation, and disease classification, including brain tumors. Pre-trained models, such as ResNet18 [15] and VGG16 [33], have been widely adopted and achieved state-of-the-art results in various image recognition tasks.

In the context of brain tumor classification, custom CNN architectures have gained attention due to their potential for reduced computational complexity and comparable performance to pre-trained models. Recent studies have shown that customized CNNs, when combined with data augmentation and transfer learning techniques, can achieve competitive results with fewer layers and parameters [3].

Popular datasets for brain tumor classification include Br35H: Brain Tumor Detection 2020 [8] and the Brain Tumor MRI Dataset [9]. These datasets provide diverse MRI images with annotations, enabling precise training and evaluation of deep learning models [26]. Several studies have explored the potential of custom CNNs and pre-trained models in medical imaging. For example, Deepak

and Ameer (2019) [11] utilized pre-trained models for brain tumor classification, achieving high accuracy. Similarly, Hemanth et al. (2017) [16] demonstrated the effectiveness of CNNs in brain tumor segmentation.

In brain tumor classification, various techniques have been employed to enhance model performance. Kamnitsas et al. (2017) [19] developed a multi-scale 3D CNN combined with a fully connected Conditional Random Field (CRF) for accurate brain lesion segmentation. Zhou et al. (2019) [37] provided a comprehensive review of deep learning techniques, including CNNs, for brain tumor segmentation, highlighting various approaches and their performance. Myronenko (2018) [27] introduced a novel approach using an autoencoder for regularization in 3D MRI brain tumor segmentation, demonstrating improved performance. Isensee et al. (2018) [18] showed that existing CNN architectures can be effectively used for brain tumor segmentation without the need for new architectures.

Transfer learning and data augmentation techniques have been widely used to enhance the performance of custom CNNs. Wang et al. (2019) [35] utilized cascaded anisotropic CNNs for automatic brain tumor segmentation, achieving high accuracy. Hao et al. (2020) [13] proposed a novel multi-scale CNN approach for automated brain tumor segmentation, further improving model performance.

At the same time, few-shot learning has emerged as a crucial method for training models with limited data, addressing a common constraint in medical imaging. Researchers have applied few-shot learning to brain tumor classification, demonstrating that custom CNNs can effectively learn and generalize even with minimal training data [1]. For instance, Antoniou et al. (2018) [5] developed a few-shot learning approach that significantly improved model performance with limited data in various medical imaging tasks.

In addition to brain tumor classification, deep learning models have been applied to various other medical imaging tasks. Ronneberger et al. (2015) [28] introduced the U-net architecture, which has been widely used for biomedical image segmentation. SanaUllah et al. (2019) [21] developed a novel deep learning-based framework for breast cancer classification, achieving high accuracy with reduced computational complexity.

The effectiveness of CNNs extends beyond brain tumor classification. Saira Charan et al. (2018) [10] demonstrated the use of CNNs for breast cancer detection in mammogram images, achieving significant improvements in classification accuracy. Yu Gu et al. (2018) [12] applied deep learning to lung nodule detection, further highlighting the versatility and potential of CNNs in various medical imaging tasks.

The integration of deep learning techniques in medical imaging has also been explored in the context of organ segmentation. Baid et al. (2021) [7] presented the RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS 2021 benchmark for brain tumor segmentation and radiogenomic classification, showcasing the advancements in this field.

This study builds upon these related works, focusing on the comparative analysis of resource-efficient custom CNNs and their comparison with pre-trained models like ResNet18 [15] and VGG16 [33]. By exploring the potential of few-shot learning for efficient and effective brain tumor classification, this study aims to contribute to the development of practical, computationally efficient models for medical imaging tasks.




Figure 2: Overview of the stages in the methodology: data preparation, model building, training and evaluation, and few-shot learning.

### 3 METHODOLOGY

Following the example of other successful architectures discussed in the previous section, we use deep learning algorithms to classify brain tumors from two Brain Tumor MRI Datasets. We develop custom Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) architectures and evaluate the performance of them. To find their stand we compare them against pre-trained models. As shown in Figure 2, the methodology has four major stages: data preparation, model building, training and evaluation, and few-shot learning experiments.

#### 3.1 Dataset

- **Br35H :: Brain Tumor Detection 2020**

The Br35H dataset [8], created by Ahmed Hamada, focuses on binary classification problems, consisting of MRI pictures of brain scans with or without brain tumors. The dataset consists of 3000 images, evenly distributed between the brain tumor and no brain tumor categories.

Table 1: The Overview of Brain Tumor MRI Datasets

Dataset	Br35H	Brain Tumor MRI
Classes	2	4
Training Data	2400	5712
Testing Data	600	1311
Total Data	3000	7023

- **Brain Tumor MRI Dataset**

The Brain Tumor MRI Dataset [9], created by Masoud Nickparvar, consists of MRI images categorized into four main classes based on the presence and type of brain tumor:

- **Glioma Tumor:** A type of tumor that originates in the glial cells of the brain, comprising 33% of all primary brain tumors [24].
- **Meningioma Tumor:** A typically slow-growing tumor that forms in the meninges, the protective layers surrounding the brain and spinal cord, accounting for about 30% of all primary brain tumors [25].

- **Pituitary Tumor:** A tumor that develops in the pituitary gland, located at the base of the brain, accounts for 9% to 12% of all primary brain tumors [6].
- **No Tumor:** MRI images with no presence of a brain tumor.

The dataset contains a total of 7023 images, with each class having the following number of images: 1621 glioma, 1645 meningioma, 1757 pituitary, and 2000 no tumor. Notably, the no-tumor class images in this dataset were taken from the Br35H dataset. The images are labeled with clear annotations of their respective tumor types for training and evaluation purposes.




Figure 3: A summary of the training and testing data distribution for the Br35H and Brain Tumor MRI Dataset, along with the class distribution of MRI images within the Brain Tumor MRI Dataset.

#### 3.2 Data Pre-processing

To ensure the data is suitable for training and evaluating our models, we applied several preprocessing steps:

- All images were resized to  $224 \times 224$  pixels to ensure uniformity and reduce computational complexity across the dataset. This size is commonly used for many pre-trained models like ResNet18 [15] and VGG16 [33].
- All images were converted to grayscale and blurred to eliminate noise and improve feature extraction during model training.

- The dataset was split into training and testing sets using an 80/20 split, with a fixed random seed of 42 to ensure reproducibility. Data loaders for both training and testing sets were created, with a batch size of 32. To provide variability during the model training phase, shuffling was enabled for the training set.

### 3.3 CNN Architecture

For the task of brain tumor classification, two custom convolutional neural network (CNN) architectures were developed:

- **Two-layer CNN for binary classification**  
The Brain Tumor binary classification CNN (BTBCNN) consists of the following two layers:
  - Input Layer: Accepts MRI images resized to  $224 \times 224$  pixels.
  - Convolutional Layers: Two convolutional layers with Batch Normalization and ReLU [2] activation functions, followed by max-pooling layers to reduce spatial dimensions.
    - \* Conv1: 32 filters, kernel size  $3 \times 3$ , padding 1
    - \* Conv2: 64 filters, kernel size  $3 \times 3$ , padding 1
  - Fully Connected Layers: One dense layer with ReLU [2] activations followed by a final output layer.
    - \* FC1: 512 units, followed by ReLU activation and dropout (0.5)
    - \* FC2: 1 unit (output layer)

A dropout[34] layer with a rate of 0.5 is applied after the fully connected layer to prevent overfitting. This simple architecture was chosen for binary classification due to the smaller number of classes, allowing the model to learn and generalize effectively without requiring excessive complexity.

- **Three-layer CNN for multi-class classification**  
For the more complex multi-class classification task, a three-layer Brain Tumor Multi-class-classification CNN (BTMCNN) was employed. The additional convolutional layer enhances the model’s capacity to learn intricate features and patterns from the input images, which is essential for distinguishing between more than two classes. The architecture follows a similar design as the BTBCNN, with an extra convolutional layer:
  - Additional Convolutional Layer with Batch Normalization and ReLU activation functions, followed by max-pooling layer.
    - \* Conv3: 128 filters, kernel size  $3 \times 3$ , padding 1

The choice of a dropout rate of 0.5 in both architectures aims to strike a balance between reducing overfitting and maintaining the representation power of the neural networks. This value was selected based on its widespread use and effectiveness in preventing overfitting in various deep-learning applications.

In addition to the custom CNN architectures (BTBCNN and BTMCNN), two well-known pre-trained models, ResNet18 [15] and VGG16 [33], were used for comparison purposes:

- **ResNet18:** ResNet18 is a residual network with 18 layers, which employs residual connections to alleviate the vanishing gradient problem and facilitate the training of deeper networks. It contains 8 basic residual blocks, each consisting of 2 convolutional layers, 2 batch normalization layers, 2 ReLU activation layers, and 1 shortcut connection [15].
- **VGG16:** VGG16, on the other hand, is a convolutional neural network with 16 weight layers, known for its simplicity and effectiveness in various image classification tasks. It comprises 13 convolutional layers, 5 max-pooling layers, and 3 fully connected layers, summing up to 43 layers in total [33].

These models were chosen for their proven performance in image classification tasks, providing a valuable benchmark for evaluating the custom CNN architectures in the context of brain tumor classification.

### 3.4 Training and Evaluation

The Brain Tumor Binary Classification CNN (BTBCNN) and the Brain Tumor Multi-Class Classification CNN (BTMCNN) were trained using carefully selected loss functions and optimizers, along with a comprehensive hyperparameter sweep to ensure optimal performance. The training procedure involved data loading, model training, and evaluation using metrics such as accuracy, precision, recall, and F1-score.

For the binary classification task, BTBCNN was trained using Binary Cross-Entropy Loss with Logits (BCELosswithLogits) [31] as the loss function and the Adam [22] optimizer to update the model weights. For the multi-class classification task, BTMCNN was trained using Cross-Entropy Loss [4] as the loss function and the Adam optimizer. The Cross-Entropy Loss effectively handles multiple classes, while the Adam optimizer ensures efficient and stable training.

A comprehensive hyperparameter sweep using a constant set of Learning rates [0.001, 0.0005, 0.0001, 0.00005] was conducted to identify the optimal learning rate for both tasks. This range of learning rates covers different orders of magnitude, allowing for a balance between fast convergence and stable training. The best-performing learning rate was used for the full fine-tuning of the models.

This structured approach ensured that both models were effectively trained, yielding high performance in brain tumor classification tasks.

### 3.5 Few Shot Learning

To assess the robustness and adaptability of the models in scenarios with limited labeled data, a few-shot learning procedure was employed. This approach involved using the best-performing learning rate identified from the full fine-tuning process and applying it to smaller subsets of the training data. Steps:

- The optimal learning rate from the full fine-tuning process was chosen for the few-shot learning experiments.
- To evaluate the initial performance and adaptability of the models, their accuracy was also assessed without any additional training (zero-shot learning).

- Subsets of the training data were created, ensuring that each subset maintained a balanced representation of every class:
    - 5-shot: Containing 5 samples per class.
    - 10-shot: Containing 10 samples per class.
    - 15-shot: Containing 15 samples per class.
    - 20-shot: Containing 20 samples per class.
    - 40-shot: Containing 40 samples per class.
    - 80-shot: Containing 80 samples per class.
- Table 2 provides a comprehensive overview of the training data subsets used for few-shot learning experiments.
- The models were trained on these reduced datasets using the selected learning rate.

**Table 2: Overview of training data subsets for Few-shot Learning**

Dataset	Samples per Subset					
	5-shot	10-shot	15-shot	20-shot	40-shot	80-shot
Br35H	10	20	30	40	80	160
Brain Tumor MRI	10	20	30	40	80	160
Brain Tumor MRI (Multi-class)	20	40	60	80	160	320

The goal of this procedure was to test the models’ ability to learn and generalize from limited data, simulating real-world scenarios where extensive labeled datasets may not be available. By evaluating the models under these conditions, we can better understand their potential for practical applications in brain tumor classification with limited resources.

## 4 RESULTS & ANALYSIS

### 4.1 Hyperparameter Sweep

The hyperparameter sweep for the binary and multi-class brain tumor classification tasks involved evaluating different learning rates [0.001, 0.0005, 0.0001, 0.00005] to identify the optimal learning rate for each dataset. The following Table 3, 4, 5 and 6 summarize the results of these experiments.

**Table 3: Hyperparameter Sweep Results for Binary Classification Results for Br35H :: Brain Tumor Detection 2020 Dataset**

LR	0.001	0.0005	0.0001	0.00005
TP	307	308	302	300
TN	276	284	280	280
FP	11	3	7	7
FN	6	5	11	13
Precision	96.54%	99.03%	97.73%	97.74%
Recall	98.09%	98.40%	96.50%	95.84%
F1-Score	97.13%	98.71%	97.11%	96.78%
Accuracy	97.17%	<b>98.67%</b>	97.00%	96.67%

The best-performing learning rate for the Br35H dataset was found to be 0.0005, achieving the highest accuracy of 98.67%.

The optimal learning rate for the Brain Tumor MRI dataset was 0.00005, achieving an accuracy of 99.62%. For multi-class classification, the optimal learning rate was 0.0005 with an accuracy of 98.09% highlighted in 5.

**Table 4: Hyperparameter Sweep Results for Binary Classification on Brain Tumor MRI Dataset**

LR	0.001	0.0005	0.0001	0.00005
TP	904	901	902	901
TN	398	404	403	405
FP	7	1	2	0
FN	2	5	4	5
Precision	99.23%	99.89%	99.78%	100%
Recall	99.78%	99.45%	99.56%	99.45%
F1-Score	99.50%	99.67%	99.67%	99.72%
Accuracy	99.31%	99.54%	99.56%	<b>99.62%</b>

**Table 5: Hyperparameter Sweep Results for Multi-Class Classification on Brain Tumor MRI Dataset**

LR	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1-Score
0.001	97.10%	97.30%	97.20%	97.25%
0.0005	<b>98.09%</b>	98.20%	98.10%	98.15%
0.0001	97.94%	98.00%	97.90%	97.95%
0.00005	97.56%	97.70%	97.60%	97.65%

The precision, recall, and F1-score values presented in table 3, 4 and 5 demonstrate the effectiveness of the chosen learning rates in achieving high performance across the datasets.


**Table 6: Summary of Hyperparameter Sweep Results**

Dataset	Lr = 0.001	Lr=0.0001	Lr=0.0005	Lr=0.00005
Br35H	97.17%	<b>98.67%</b>	97.00%	96.67%
Brain Tumorn MRI	99.31%	99.54%	99.54%	<b>99.62%</b>
Brain Tumor MRI (Multi-class)	97.10%	<b>98.09%</b>	97.94%	97.56%

In the Br35H dataset, BTBCNN with the learning rate of 0.0005 achieved the best accuracy of 98.67% with the highest precision (99.03%), recall (98.40%), and F1-score (98.71%), ensuring minimal false positives and false negatives. Similarly, in the Brain Tumor MRI dataset, the learning rate of 0.00005 showcased exceptional performance with perfect precision (100%) and a high F1-score (99.72%) indicating the BTBCNN’s accurate classification of brain tumors without any false positives. Lastly, for the multi-class Brain Tumor MRI (MAP) dataset, BTMCNN with the learning rate of 0.0005 provided strong performance with high precision (98.20%), recall (98.10%), and F1-score (98.15%), confirming effectiveness in handling multi-class brain tumor classification tasks. This can be observed by the figure 4, which provides a visual representation of the model’s classification accuracy.


### 4.2 Full Fine-Tuning of Custom CNNs and Pretrained Models

Upon examination of Table 7, it becomes apparent that both custom models (BTBCNN & BTMCNN) and pre-trained models (ResNet18 & VGG16) demonstrated excellent performance in brain tumor classification based on full fine-tuning experiments. For binary



**Figure 4: Confusion matrices for binary classification using BTBCNN on the Br35H and Brain Tumor MRI Dataset, and for multi-class classification using BTMCNN on the Brain Tumor MRI Dataset of the Full-Finetuning Experiment.**

classification on the Br35H dataset, BTBCNN achieved an accuracy of 98.67%, while ResNet18 and VGG16 reached 99.33% and 99.50%, respectively. In terms of precision, recall, and F1-score, BTBCNN obtained 99.03%, 98.40%, and 98.71%, whereas ResNet18 and VGG16 had slightly better results. On the Brain Tumor MRI dataset, BTBCNN reached an accuracy of 99.62%, and both ResNet18 and VGG16 achieved 100%. In multi-class classification on the Brain Tumor MRI dataset, BTMCNN had an accuracy of 98.09%, ResNet18 of 99.69%, and VGG16 of 99.39%.



**Figure 5: Performance comparison of custom CNNs (BTBCNN, BTMCNN) and pre-trained models (ResNet18, VGG16) in terms of accuracy, precision, recall, and F1-scores for binary and multi-class classification tasks.**

Figure 5 provides a comprehensive visualization of the consistently high performance achieved by all models across the datasets. When analyzing these results, it is evident that the slight variations in metrics are often within a fraction of a percent, making it challenging to distinguish a clear superior model based solely on these evaluation metrics.

**Table 7: Full Fine-Tuning Accuracies of Custom CNNs (BTBCNN & BTMCNN), Pretrained ResNet18 and Pretrained VGG16**

Dataset	Custom CNN	ResNet 18	VGG16
Br35H	98.67	99.33	99.50
Brain Tumor MRI	99.62	100.00	100.00
Brain Tumor MRI (Multi-class)	98.09	99.69	99.39

The primary advantage of Custom CNNs lies in their simpler architecture and fewer parameters. For instance, BTBCNN has fewer layers and uses only two convolutional layers, while ResNet18 has 18 layers (16 convolutional layers). BTMCNN has only 51, 476, 484 parameters compared to VGG16’s 138, 357, 544. This reduced complexity is further emphasized by the training time comparison for 50 epochs on the Brain Tumor MRI Dataset: BTMCNN, ResNet18, and VGG16 take respectively 550.37, 569.48 and 2474.92 seconds.

To further illustrate the efficiency of custom CNNs, we present the average inference time per batch (for batch size 128) for different models on two datasets: Br35H and Brain Tumor MRI. The inference times are shown in the table 8.

**Table 8: Average Inference Time per Batch (Milliseconds) for Different Models**

Dataset	Model	Average Inference Time per Batch (Milliseconds)
Br35H	BTBCNN	0.9
	BTMCNN	1.2
	ResNet18	3.8
	VGG16	2.8
Brain Tumor MRI	BTBCNN	0.9
	BTMCNN	1.4
	ResNet18	4.0
	VGG16	2.8

These results demonstrate that custom CNNs, such as BTBCNN and BTMCNN, have significantly lower inference times compared to ResNet18 and VGG16. This efficiency makes custom CNNs a viable option for tasks where computational resources are limited or where faster training and inference times are desired.

In conclusion, while pre-trained models like ResNet18 and VGG16 show slightly higher accuracies and metrics, custom CNNs like BTBCNN and BTMCNN offer significant advantages in terms of simplicity, efficiency, and resource usage. These advantages make

custom CNNs particularly suitable for environments with limited computational resources or where faster training and inference times are critical. By balancing accuracy with computational efficiency, custom CNNs provide a practical alternative to deeper, pre-trained models in medical imaging tasks, particularly in brain tumor classification.


### 4.3 Few-shot Learning

Few-shot learning experiments were conducted to assess the robustness and adaptability of the custom CNNs (BTBCNN & BTMCNN). From Table 9 it is observed that 0-shot results show bias, while 5-shot to 80-shot demonstrate the custom CNN’s strength and adaptability. The bias observed in 0-shot results can be attributed to the model’s lack of exposure to the target dataset, causing it to rely on its initial random weights. The results indicate significant improvements in accuracy as the number of training samples increases, showcasing the effectiveness of our few-shot learning approach. For the BTBCNN model on the Brain Tumor Detection Dataset, the accuracy increased from 52.00% to 80.17% with an 80-shot dataset, representing a total improvement of 28.17%. Notable jumps occur between 0-shot to 10-shot (11.50%) and 10-shot to 15-shot (4.33%). Similarly, the BTBCNN model on the Brain Tumor MRI Dataset showed an accuracy increase from 69.11% to 89.78% with an 80-shot dataset, representing a total improvement of 20.67%. The most significant improvement is seen from 0-shot to 10-shot (13.80%), with steady but smaller gains beyond 20-shot. The BTMCNN model on the Brain Tumor MRI Dataset demonstrated the highest improvement, increasing accuracy from 22.88% to 78.03% with an 80-shot dataset, representing a total improvement of 55.15%. The largest improvement is between 5-shot and 10-shot (31.66%), showing substantial learning capability with limited data. These findings underscore the robustness and adaptability of our custom CNNs, making them suitable for brain tumor classification tasks in real-world scenarios where labeled data might be limited. The models’ ability to achieve high accuracy even with minimal training samples highlights the efficiency of our few-shot learning approach, particularly in the early stages.

**Table 9: Overview of Few-shot Learning Results for BTBCNN and BTMCNN**

Model	Dataset	0-shot	5-shot	10-shot	15-shot	20-shot	40-shot	80-shot
BTBCNN	Br35H	52.00%	52.17%	63.67%	68.00%	70.83%	76.83%	80.17%
	Brain Tumor MRI	69.11%	69.11%	82.91%	82.07%	85.05%	89.32%	89.78%
BTMCNN	Brain Tumor MRI	22.88%	31.50%	63.16%	68.57%	70.40%	72.77%	78.03%

Figure 6 shows the progressive improvement in BTBCNN and BTMCNN accuracy as training samples increase. Both models demonstrate significant accuracy jumps from 0-shot to 10-shot. After 20 shots, the improvements become more linear, suggesting a diminishing return on accuracy gains as more data is introduced. This states the models’ exceptional ability to adapt and learn effectively from limited data even without pretraining.



**Figure 6: Comparison of Different Few-shot Learning Accuracies of Custom CNNs**

## 5 CONCLUSION

This study successfully developed and evaluated custom convolutional neural networks (BTBCNN and BTMCNN) to classify brain tumors. Our findings show that these customized models maintaining a simpler design, achieve competitive accuracy compared to well-established architectures such as ResNet18 [15] and VGG16 [33] while offering substantial benefits in terms of computational efficiency. The Custom CNNs provide competitive accuracy in brain tumor classification. Their simpler design offers faster training and quicker inference times. They can be effectively adapted for tasks with limited data availability. The slight performance difference is offset by the advantages of faster training and inference times. However, this study has several limitations. The research relied on two publicly available datasets, which may not fully represent the diverse characteristics of brain tumors across different patient populations and imaging technologies. The models’ simplicity, while advantageous for computational efficiency, might restrict their ability to detect complex and nuanced features essential for intricate tumor classifications or diverse imaging scenarios.

Overall, the custom CNNs (BTBCNN and BTMCNN) present a balanced approach, achieving high accuracy with minimal complexity. This makes them a viable and efficient solution for brain tumor classification, particularly in resource-constrained settings. They offer a promising alternative for practical applications in medical image analysis.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. Achmamad, F. Ghazouani, and S. Ruan. 2022. Few-shot learning for brain tumor segmentation from MRI images. In *2022 16th IEEE International Conference on Signal Processing (ICSP)*. 489–494. doi: 10.1109/ICSP56322.2022.9965315.
- [2] Abien Fred Agarap. 2018. Deep Learning using Rectified Linear Units (ReLU). (mar 2018). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1803.08375>.
- [3] A. M. Al-Zoghby, E. M. K. Al-Awadly, A. Moawad, N. Yehia, and A. I. Ebada. 2023. Dual deep cnn for tumor brain classification. *Diagnostics* 13, 12 (jun 2023), 2050. <https://doi.org/10.3390/diagnostics13122050>.
- [4] Valeria Andrieva and Nadiia Shvai. 2021. Generalization of Cross-Entropy Loss Function for Image Classification. *Mohyla Mathematical Journal* 3 (jan 2021), 3–10. 10.18523/2617-7080320203-10.
- [5] Antreas Antoniou, Amos Storkey, and Harrison Edwards. 2017. Data augmentation generative adversarial networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.04340* (2017).

- [6] American Brain Tumor Association. 2021. *Pituitary Tumors*. [Online]. Available: <https://www.abta.org/tumor-types/pituitary-tumors>.
- [7] U. Baid, S. Ghodasara, S. Mohan, M. Bilello, E. Calabrese, E. Colak, et al. 2021. The RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS 2021 Benchmark on Brain Tumor Segmentation and Radiogenomic Classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.02314* (2021). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2107.02314>
- [8] Br35H: Brain Tumor Detection 2020. 2020. *Brain Tumor Detection 2020*. [Online]. Available: <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/ahmedhamada0/brain-tumor-detection>.
- [9] Brain Tumor MRI Dataset. 2021. *Brain Tumor MRI Dataset*. [Online]. Available: Brain Tumor MRI Dataset.
- [10] Saira Charan, Muhammad Jaleed Khan, and Khurram Khurshid. 2018. Breast cancer detection in mammograms using convolutional neural network. In *2018 International Conference on Computing, Mathematics and Engineering Technologies (iCoMET)*. 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICOMET.2018.8346384>
- [11] S Deepak and PM Ameer. 2019. Brain tumor classification using deep CNN features via transfer learning. *Computers in biology and medicine* 111 (2019), 103345.
- [12] Yu Gu, Xiaoqi Lu, Lidong Yang, Baohua Zhang, Dahua Yu, Ying Zhao, Lixin Gao, Liang Wu, and Tao Zhou. 2018. Automatic lung nodule detection using a 3D deep convolutional neural network combined with a multi-scale prediction strategy in chest CTs. *Computers in Biology and Medicine* 103 (2018), 220–231. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.combiomed.2018.10.011>
- [13] Jinglong Hao, Xiaoxi Li, and Yanxia Hou. 2020. Magnetic Resonance Image Segmentation Based on Multi-Scale Convolutional Neural Network. *IEEE Access* 8 (2020), 65758–65768. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2964111>
- [14] M. Havaei, A. Davy, D. Warde-Farley, A. Biard, A. Courville, Y. Bengio, C. Pal, P.M. Jodoin, and H. Larochelle. 2017. Brain tumor segmentation with Deep Neural Networks. *Medical Image Analysis* 35 (Jan 2017), 18–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.media.2016.05.004> Epub 2016 May 19.
- [15] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. 2015. Deep Residual Learning for Image Recognition. *CoRR* abs/1512.03385 (dec 2015). <http://arxiv.org/abs/1512.03385>.
- [16] D. Jude Hemanth, J. Anitha, Antoanela Naaji, Oana Geman, Daniela Elena Popescu, and Le Hoang Son. 2019. A Modified Deep Convolutional Neural Network for Abnormal Brain Image Classification. *IEEE Access* 7 (2019), 4275–4283. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2018.2885639>
- [17] Andrew G. Howard, Menglong Zhu, Bo Chen, Dmitry Kalenichenko, Weijun Wang, Tobias Weyand, Marco Andreetto, and Hartwig Adam. 2017. MobileNets: Efficient Convolutional Neural Networks for Mobile Vision Applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.04861* (2017). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1704.04861>
- [18] Fabian Isensee, Philipp Kickingereder, Wolfgang Wick, Martin Bendszus, and Klaus H Maier-Hein. 2019. No New-Net: Training Neural Networks to Segment Brain Tumors Without New Network Architectures. In *Brainlesion: Glioma, Multiple Sclerosis, Stroke and Traumatic Brain Injuries: 4th International Workshop, BrainLes 2018, Held in Conjunction with MICCAI 2018, Granada, Spain, September 16, 2018, Revised Selected Papers, Part II 4*. Springer, 234–244.
- [19] Konstantinos Kamnitsas, Christian Ledig, Virginia FJ Newcombe, John P Simpson, Andrew D Kane, David K Menon, et al. 2017. Efficient multi-scale 3D CNN with fully connected CRF for accurate brain lesion segmentation. *Medical Image Analysis* 36 (2017), 61–78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.media.2016.10.004>
- [20] Baris Kayalibay, Grady Jensen, and Patrick van der Smagt. 2017. CNN-based Segmentation of Medical Imaging Data. In *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention (MICCAI)*. 123–130.
- [21] Sana Ullah Khan, Naveed Islam, Zahoor Jan, Ikram Ud Din, and Joel J. P. C. Rodrigues. 2019. A novel deep learning based framework for the detection and classification of breast cancer using transfer learning. *Pattern Recognition Letters* 125 (2019), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patrec.2019.03.022>
- [22] Diederik Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization. *International Conference on Learning Representations* (dec 2014). <https://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6980>.
- [23] Geert Litjens, Thijs Kooi, Babak Ehteshami Bejnordi, Arnaud Arindra Adiyoso Setio, Francesco Ciompi, Mohsen Ghafoorian, Jeroen A.W.M. van der Laak, Bram van Ginneken, and Clara I. Sánchez. 2017. A Survey on Deep Learning in Medical Image Analysis. *Med Image Anal.* 42 (feb 2017), 60–88. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1702.05747>.
- [24] Johns Hopkins Medicine. 2021. *Gliomas*. [Online]. Available: <https://www.hopkinsmedicine.org/health/conditions-and-diseases/gliomas>.
- [25] Johns Hopkins Medicine. 2021. *Meningioma grading*. [Online]. Available: <https://www.hopkinsmedicine.org/health/conditions-and-diseases/meningioma-grading>.
- [26] B. H. Menze et al. 2015. The Multimodal Brain Tumor Image Segmentation Benchmark (BRATS). *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging* 34, 10 (oct 2015), 1993–2024. doi: 10.1109/TMI.2014.2377694.
- [27] Andriy Myronenko. 2019. 3D MRI brain tumor segmentation using autoencoder regularization. In *Brainlesion: Glioma, Multiple Sclerosis, Stroke and Traumatic Brain Injuries: 4th International Workshop, BrainLes 2018, Held in Conjunction with MICCAI 2018, Granada, Spain, September 16, 2018, Revised Selected Papers, Part II 4*. Springer, 311–320.
- [28] Philipp Fischer Olaf Ronneberger and Thomas Brox. 2015. U-Net: Convolutional Networks for Biomedical Image Segmentation. *Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention – MICCAI 2015* (2015), 234–241. [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-24574-4\\_28](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-24574-4_28)
- [29] Sérgio Pereira, Adriano Pinto, Victor Alves, and Carlos A. Silva. 2016. Brain Tumor Segmentation Using Convolutional Neural Networks in MRI Images. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging* 35, 5 (2016), 1240–1251. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TMI.2016.2538465>
- [30] Aijaz Ahmad Reshi, Furqan Rustam, Arif Mehmood, Abdulaziz Alhossan, Ziyad Alrabiah, Ajaz Ahmad, Hessa Alsuwailem, and Gyu Sang Choi. 2021. An Efficient CNN Model for COVID-19 Disease Detection Based on X-Ray Image Classification. *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience* 2021, Article ID 6621607 (jan 2021), 13. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/6621607>.
- [31] Usha Ruby and Vamsidhar Yendapalli. 2020. Binary cross entropy with deep learning technique for image classification. *International Journal of Advanced Trends in Computer Science and Engineering* 9 (apr 2020). 10.30534/ijatcse/2020/175942020.
- [32] Dinggang Shen, Guorong Wu, and Heung-Il Suk. 2017. Deep Learning in Medical Image Analysis. *Annu. Rev. Biomed. Eng.* 19 (jun 2017), 221–248. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-bioeng-071516-044442>.
- [33] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. 2014. Very Deep Convolutional Networks for Large-Scale Image Recognition. *CoRR* abs/1409.1556 (sep 2014). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1409.1556>.
- [34] Nitish Srivastava, Geoffrey Hinton, Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2014. Dropout: A Simple Way to Prevent Neural Networks from Overfitting. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 15 (jun 2014), 1929–1958.
- [35] Guotai Wang, Wenqi Li, Sébastien Ourselin, and Tom Vercauteren. 2019. Automatic Brain Tumor Segmentation Based on Cascaded Convolutional Neural Networks With Uncertainty Estimation. *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience* 13 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fncom.2019.00056>
- [36] J. Zhang, M. Liu, and D. Shen. 2017. Detecting Anatomical Landmarks From Limited Medical Imaging Data Using Two-Stage Task-Oriented Deep Neural Networks. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* 26, 10 (oct 2017), 4753–4764. doi: 10.1109/TIP.2017.2721106.
- [37] Tongxue Zhou, Su Ruan, and Stéphane Canu. 2019. A review: Deep learning for medical image segmentation using multi-modality fusion. *Array* 3-4 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.array.2019.100004>