Ranking pre-trained segmentation models for zero-shot transferability

Joshua Talks^[0000-0003-4816-4269] and Anna Kreshuk^[0000-0003-1334-6388]

European Molecular Biology Laboratory (EMBL), Meyerhofstraße 1, 69117 Heidelberg, Germany {firstname.lastname}@embl.de

Abstract. Model transfer presents a solution to the challenges of segmentation in the microscopy community, where the immense cost of labelling sufficient training data is a major bottleneck in the use of deep learning. With large quantities of imaging data produced across a wide range of imaging conditions, institutes also produce many bespoke models trained on specific source data which then get collected in model banks or zoos. As the number of available models grows, so does the need for an efficient and reliable model selection method for a specific target dataset of interest. We focus on the unsupervised regime where no labels are available for the target dataset. Building on previous work linking model generalisation and consistency under perturbation, we propose the first unsupervised transferability estimator for semantic and instance segmentation tasks which doesn't require access to source training data or target domain labels. We evaluate the method on multiple segmentation problems across microscopy modalities, finding a strong correlation between the rankings based on our estimator and rankings based on target dataset performance.

Keywords: Transferability · Segmentation · Consistency

1 Introduction

Segmentation is a ubiquitous problem in microscopy image analysis as it plays a key role in the interpretation of biological structures. While modern deep learning methods have significantly improved segmentation accuracy, their practical use remains limited by the need for labour-intensive, pixel-wise annotation of training data. Transfer learning [35] aims to address this problem through re-use of networks trained on other datasets ("source"), either similar to the dataset of current interest ("target") or sufficiently large to sample all possible targets. The latter approach has been prevalent in the analysis of natural images, while in microscopy most practitioners rely on training domain expert models on their own data due to the lack of very large public datasets comparable to [29]. Community efforts such as the BioImage Model Zoo [24] make many such models available to enable transfer learning for microscopy. The growing success of these initiatives introduces a new challenge: how to choose the best model for

2 J. Talks et al.

a given target dataset, when multiple models, trained on the same task but with different settings, architectures, or source data, are available?



Fig. 1. Unsupervised ranking of pre-trained models by the consistency of the model prediction under perturbation of the input data or feature responses.

Qualitative approaches comparing datasets are common practice, but unreliable, as imperceptible differences in source and target dataset distributions, model architectures and training regimes impact likely transfer success [31], [19], [21]. Several quantitative approaches have been proposed for classification and semantic segmentation models in natural and medical images [22,38,26,13], but all of these are supervised, as they aim to select the best model for target dataset fine-tuning. In contrast, unsupervised estimation of zero-shot transferability has received little attention, hindering model re-use and leading to waste of computational resources in inference with sub-optimal pre-trained models. Instance segmentation transferability remains unaddressed even in a supervised setting. The goal of our contribution is to bridge this gap, enabling efficient zero-shot transfer for segmentation models through a systematic, quantitative approach to ranking potential model transfer performance, without requiring access to source training data or annotation of target domain labels.

The model ranking problem can be seen as related to unsupervised domain adaptation (UDA), where a model is fine-tuned to an unlabelled target dataset. Another related problem is posed by domain generalization, where models are trained to better generalize to unseen data, without a specific target dataset in mind. While we aim to estimate rather than improve transferability, we can exploit similar approaches to measuring the model generalizability. Here, consistency-based approaches, such as [7,30,1], potentially satisfy our requirements for an unsupervised estimator and, although originally introduced for classification, could serve as a basis for segmentation model ranking.

Consistency-based approaches measure the change of the model performance upon perturbation, introduced in the input space, similar to data augmentation, or in the feature space, e.g. dropout. Here, another interesting connection can be made: variance of prediction under dropout can be used as a measure of epistemic uncertainty [10,17,15,20]. This measure is needed to produce a calibrated estimate of model confidence, well correlated with its performance. As our ideal transferability estimator also needs to strongly correlate with model performance on target data, epistemic uncertainty estimators can provide inspiration for model ranking methods. Here, we are limited to post-hoc uncertainty estimators such as [17,15,20] as we cannot influence model training. These estimators have previously not been used in the transferability estimation setting. Furthermore, they require supervision as they use target domain labels to calibrate the uncertainty. Still, rich theory behind uncertainty estimators links prediction variance under feature space perturbation with redundancy and robustness of the learned features in the context of the target data [34]. These properties are also strong indicators of a network's transferability potential.

Building on the approaches proposed for model generalization, UDA and uncertainty estimation, we introduce a novel zero-shot transferability estimator for semantic and instance segmentation problems (Fig. 1). The estimator is based on prediction consistency under feature or input space perturbation and does not require access to source training data or target domain labels. We evaluate the estimator on several popular microscopy segmentation problems: cell and nucleus segmentation in light microscopy and mitochondria segmentation in electron microscopy. For all of these, model rankings produced by our estimator are strongly correlated with target dataset performance, providing a simple, but powerful, model selection method for model zoos and practitioners in the field.

2 Methods

2.1 Problem Definition

We define a domain \mathcal{D} over an input and output space $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ with an associated marginal distribution P(X) and task t, defined by P(Y|X). During model transfer we apply a source model $m_S: X_S \to Y_S$, trained on data taken from the source domain $D_S: \mathcal{X}_S \times \mathcal{Y}_S$, to a target dataset X_T taken from a target domain $D_T: \mathcal{X}_T \times \mathcal{Y}_T$, where $\mathcal{D}_S \neq \mathcal{D}_T$. Necessarily [11] we assume a transductive transfer setting, where $P(X_S) \neq P(X_T)$ but $t_S = t_T$, meaning the task and output space has not changed. Considering a model bank $\mathcal{M}_S = \{m_S^j\}_{j=1}^N$, where the source domain and training regime for each model can vary, our goal is to rank each m_S^i in terms of their performance on a target task t_T without fine-tuning. We assume access only to the source model m_S^j and an unlabelled set of target data $X_T = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$. For the source models \mathcal{M}_S we consider both black-box models, where we can only access the output, and grey-box models, where we have access to intermediate layers, but cannot retrain them.

2.2 Model Perturbation

Input space perturbations Test-time input data augmentations are applicable to both black-box and grey-box models. Popular transformations for mi-

4 J. Talks et al.

croscopy include additive Gaussian noise, gamma correction and changes in brightness and contrast. The strength of each augmentation can be controlled by its the respective scaling parameter θ_N , θ_B , θ_C and θ_γ .

AdditiveGaussianNoise
$$x' = x + \mathcal{N}(0, \theta_N)$$
 Brightness $x' = x + \theta_B$
Contrast $x' = \mu(x) + \theta_C(x - \mu(x))$ GammaCorrection $x' = x^{\theta_\gamma}$ (1)

Feature Perturbation For grey-box models, perturbations can also be applied directly to features at intermediate layers of the network. Motivated by the findings in [23,20] we used test-time spatial dropout [32] at the bottleneck layer of the networks after the encoder. The dropout rate p_d controls the proportion of feature maps dropped at that layer during an inference run. For a network with L layers and dropout perturbation applied at layer l the prediction is defined as

$$\hat{y} = m_{l \to L} \circ DO(p_d) \circ m_{1 \to l}(x).$$
⁽²⁾

Perturbation strength If the model or the input data is very strongly perturbed, even the best model will become completely inconsistent. At the same time, if the perturbation is too weak, all models will remain perfectly consistent. The correct perturbation strength should allow for model differentiation.

2.3 Consistency-based Transferability Estimator (CTE)

Considering a single target test set $X_T = \{x_T^i\}_{i=1}^{n_T}$, we rank the transfer performance of a set of models $\mathcal{M}_S = \{m_S^j\}_{j=1}^N$ on X_T . For each image x_T^i , the prediction consistency score CTE_i is computed as the mean of the pairwise consistencies between N_{pert} perturbed predictions \hat{y}^p and one unperturbed prediction \hat{y} ,

$$CTE_{i} = \frac{1}{N_{pert}N_{pix}} \sum_{p=1}^{N_{pert}} \sum_{pix=1}^{N_{pix}} consis(\hat{y}_{pix}, \hat{y}_{pix}^{p}).$$
(3)

The consistency score for the transfer $m_S^j \to X_T$ is then calculated as the median over the test set images for robustness with small dataset sizes. Furthermore, to counteract the highly imbalanced ratio of foreground and background classes in microscopy, the pixelwise iterator is limited to the pairwise union of perturbed and unperturbed foreground prediction masks. The final ranking within \mathcal{M}_S is calculated as the descending order of CTE scores of all $m_S^j \to X_T$.

Semantic segmentation consistency metric As the first approach, we propose to extend the Effective Invariance (EI) [7], originally formulated for classification tasks, to semantic segmentation. EI measures the invariance of a single

prediction to test-time perturbations, which for the segmentation task can be formulated as

$$CTE-EI = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \begin{cases} \sqrt{\hat{p}_{i}^{t} \cdot \hat{p}_{i}} & \text{if } \hat{y}_{i}^{t} = \hat{y}_{i} ;\\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$
(4)

where \hat{p} and \hat{y} represent the probabilistic output of a model and its thresholded value, while the superscript t represents the perturbed prediction. We refer to the EI as a "soft" consistency measure as it is based on a probabilistic input. This reliance on good model calibration can lead to issues in a transfer learning setting, where calibration becomes less reliable [25]. We therefore propose another consistency measure, which is based only on the thresholded model output ("hard" consistency). Our measure directly compares the number of pixelwise changes between the perturbed and unperturbed predictions using the Hamming distance normalised by the number of pixels:

Normalized Hamming Distance (NHD) =
$$1 - \frac{\sum (\hat{y}^p \neq \hat{y}) \cap (\hat{y}^p \cup \hat{y})}{\sum (\hat{y}^p \cup \hat{y})}.$$
 (5)

This is equivalent to IoU between the predictions, but considering it as the number of pixel flips gives an intuition of what is being measured.

Instance Segmentation Metrics "Soft" consistency metrics are not applicable to instance segmentation tasks as no probabilistic output is readily available. In contrast, "hard" consistency measures such as NHD are conceptually close to the Adapted Rand Index (RI) instance segmentation performance measure, which is based on pairwise pixel agreements between instances. We utilise the foreground-restricted Rand Score, defined by [2] as:

Foreground-restricted Rand Scoring
$$(V^{\text{Rand}}) = \frac{\sum_{ij} p_{ij}^2}{\alpha \sum_k s_k^2 + (1-\alpha) \sum_k t_k^2},$$
 (6)

where p_{ij} is the probability that a pixel has the same label in the perturbed prediction and in the unperturbed prediction, t_k is the probability that a pixel has label k in \hat{y} , and s_k is the probability that a pixel has label k in \hat{y}^p .

3 Experiments and Results

3.1 Datasets and Models

We evaluate our approach on a range of publicly available segmentation datasets and tasks. Each segmentation task comes with several datasets; we designate one dataset as target and train models on other datasets as source (one dataset per model). For *Mitochondria Segmentation in Electron Microscopy*, we use four datasets with semantic segmentation groundtruth, stemming from different tissues and electron microscopy modalities: EPFL [18], MitoEM [8] with two subdatasets, Hmito (human brain) and Rmito (rat brain), and VNC [27]. For *Nuclei*

J. Talks et al.

datasets in Light Microscopy, we use fluorescent nuclei datasets for instance and semantic segmentation: Go-Nuclear [33] a 3D stack of Arabidopsis thaliana (only semantic), SBIAD895 [5], SBIAD634 [14] with nuclei images of normal or cancer cells from different tissue origins and sample preparation types (only as target), SBIAD1410 [12] microscopy videos of cell migration processes during fruitfly embryonic development (only as source), BBBC039 [16] high-throughput chemical screen on U2OS cells, DSB2018 Fluorescent subset [4] (only as target), Hoechst [3] a modified U2OS osteosarcoma cell line, HeLaCytoNuc [6] a dataset of HeLa cell nuclei (only as source) and SELMA3D 2024 [9] challenge (only semantic as source). For Cell Datasets in Light Microscopy, we consider dense instance segmentation of cells: FlyWing [9] of a developing fruitfly wing, Ovules [37] with Arabidopsis thaliana ovules, and the PNAS [36] dataset with the Arabidopsis thaliana apical stem cell niche.

We used predefined training/test splits where provided, for other datasets we split roughly 80/20 training to test. The 3D image stacks are tiled into 2D 256×256 patches, 2D images are not tiled. We limit the evaluation to nonempty images and patches. The source models we train use a 2D U-Net [28] architecture, with 3 or 4 layer encoder/decoder. All the networks were trained until convergence with a BCEDice loss and with a mixture of intensity and geometric augmentations as well as DropOut [10]. Importantly these are the same augmentations that were then used to perturb the networks during consistency analysis. For cell segmentation, we additionally compare to two publicly available models from [24], "laid-back-lobster" and "pioneering-rhino" [37].

3.2 Results

In Fig.2, we compare ranking by CTE and direct ranking by performance, using F1 score for semantic models and Mean Average Precision [4] for instance models, across a range of tasks and datasets. For all of these, CTE shows a strong linear and monotonic correlation to performance. Fig.2e-f additionally demonstrates that feature perturbation and input perturbation yield very similar outputs. In Fig.3 we investigate the dependency of CTE on the strength of the perturbation, gradually increasing dropout proportion for feature perturbation from 0.05 to 0.5. The correlation strengths, although very strong perturbations (dropout proportion of p = 0.5) can reduce performance, showing the importance of selecting tolerable, but differentiating perturbations.

For quantitative evaluation, we use Kendall tau (K_{τ}) for pairwise agreements between rankings, Pearson correlation coefficient (P_r) for linear correlation between rankings and Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (S_{ρ}) for the strength and direction of monotonic relationship between rankings. Tab. 1 shows the performance of CTE for semantic segmentation, comparing the "hard" consistency score (CTE-NHD), the "soft" consistency score (CTE-EI), and CCFV[38] - the current state-of-the-art for supervised, fine-tuned transferability estimation in medical segmentation tasks. Despite having access to labels, CCFV underperforms compared to consistency-based approaches. This can perhaps be



Fig. 2. Correlation between CTE and segmentation performance. In (a)-(d) each point represents a source model, while the colours represent the target datasets. In (e)-(f) we compare feature vs. input perturbations, each colour showing a different source model. Straight lines are fitted by least squares. All of the reported consistency scores are calculated based on a single pair of perturbed and non-perturbed inference runs. We clearly observe a strong linear and monotonic relationship.

explained by its aim to estimate fine-tuned rather than zero-shot transferability. Feature space perturbations on average outperform input space perturbations, while also benefiting from the conceptual simplicity of dropout as opposed to domain-suitable image transformations. Note, that although we used the same perturbations as data augmentations in training, they still perturb the predictions sufficiently to produce a correct consistency-based ranking. CTE-EI performs slightly worse than the "hard" score which can be explained by its reliance on good model calibration which can deteriorate in transfer learning setting [25].

	CTE-NHD (Feat)			CTE-NHD (Input)			CTE-EI (Feat)			CCFV		
Target	$\mathbf{K}_{ au}$	$\mathbf{S}_{ ho}$	$\mathbf{P_r}$	$\mathbf{K}_{ au}$	$\mathbf{S}_{ ho}$	$\mathbf{P_r}$	\mathbf{K}_{τ}	$\mathbf{S}_{ ho}$	$\mathbf{P_r}$	$\mathbf{K}_{ au}$	$\mathbf{S}_{ ho}$	$\mathbf{P_r}$
Mito Avg. Mito Std.	$\begin{array}{c} 1.00\\ 0.00 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.00\\ 0.00 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.98\\ 0.02 \end{array}$	$\begin{vmatrix} 1.00 \\ 0.00 \end{vmatrix}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.00\\ 0.00 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.99 \\ 0.01 \end{array}$	$\begin{vmatrix} 1.00 \\ 0.00 \end{vmatrix}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.00\\ 0.00 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.98\\ 0.01 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.33 \\ 0.54 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.38\\ 0.63\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.36\\ 0.68\end{array}$
Nuclei Avg. Nuclei Std.	0.83 0.07	0.92 0.06	$0.80 \\ 0.14$	$\begin{vmatrix} 0.73 \\ 0.11 \end{vmatrix}$	$0.85 \\ 0.09$	0.96 0.04	$\begin{vmatrix} 0.78 \\ 0.11 \end{vmatrix}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.88\\ 0.07 \end{array}$	$0.91 \\ 0.09$	$\begin{vmatrix} 0.28 \\ 0.26 \end{vmatrix}$	$0.33 \\ 0.33$	$0.33 \\ 0.22$

Table 1. Semantic segmentation scores averaged over target datasets: Mito ($\mathcal{M}_S=3$) over 4 target datasets, Nuclei ($\mathcal{M}_S=7$) over 5 target datasets



Fig. 3. Effect of the perturbation strength. Each symbol represents a strength of dropout perturbation applied at test time to calculate the consistency, where p is the proportion of feature layers zeroed at the bottleneck layer of the source model. Each colour represents a different source model, all of which are transferred to a single target task. Straight lines are fitted to each set of a single perturbation strength, highlighting the conservation of a good ranking across a wide range of perturbation strengths.

Tab. 2 shows the CTE performance for instance segmentation, across tasks and datasets. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to address this problem, so no baseline comparison can be made. Kendall tau score is slightly lower than the other evaluation statistics, probably caused by its sensitivity to pairwise rank inversion between very closely ranked models.

Table 2. Instance segmentation scores averaged over target datasets: Cells ($\mathcal{M}_S=5$) over 3 target datasets, Nuclei ($\mathcal{M}_S=5$) over 5 target datasets.

	CTE	$-V^{Rand}$ ((Feat)	CTE-V ^{Rand} (Input)				
Target	$\mathbf{K}_{ au}$	$\mathbf{S}_{ ho}$	$\mathbf{P_r}$	$\mathbf{K}_{ au}$	$\mathbf{S}_{ ho}$	$\mathbf{P_r}$		
Cells Avg. Cells std.	0.87 0.23	0.93 0.12	0.84 0.12	$\begin{array}{c c} 0.54 \\ 0.22 \end{array}$	$0.57 \\ 0.16$	$0.45 \\ 0.43$		
Nuclei Avg. Nuclei std.	0.76 0.26	$0.80 \\ 0.25$	0.85 0.06	0.69 0.22	$\begin{array}{c} 0.80\\ 0.16\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.77 \\ 0.18 \end{array}$		

Both Tab. 1 and Tab. 2 show the results from a single perturbation run compared to a single unperturbed inference run. In our experiments, averaging over multiple perturbation runs did not provide any advantage. Limiting inference to two runs makes the approach computationally lightweight and fast, which is especially important in a model bank setting.

4 Discussion

We introduced a novel zero-shot transferability estimator for segmentation models which does not require access to source training data or target domain labels. The rankings by our estimators are strongly correlated with the direct model performance ranking, achieving a new state-of-the-art for semantic and instance segmentation transferability estimation in microscopy. Our estimators require only two inference runs on the test data and are applicable to blackbox and greybox models, facilitating efficient model selection in a model bank context.

References

- Aithal, S.K., Kashyap, D., Subramanyam, N.: Robustness to Augmentations as a Generalization metric (2021), arXiv:2101.06459
- Arganda-Carreras, I., Turaga, S.C., Berger, D.R., Cireşan, D., et al.: Crowdsourcing the creation of image segmentation algorithms for connectomics. Frontiers in Neuroanatomy 9, 142 (2015)
- Arvidsson, M., Rashed, S.K., Aits, S.: An annotated high-content fluorescence microscopy dataset with Hoechst 33342-stained nuclei and manually labelled outlines. Data in Brief 46, 108769 (2023)
- Caicedo, J.C., Goodman, A., Karhohs, K.W., et al.: Nucleus segmentation across imaging experiments: the 2018 Data Science Bowl. Nature Methods 16(12), 1247– 1253 (2019)
- von Chamier, L., Laine, R.F., Jukkala, J., et al.: Democratising deep learning for microscopy with ZeroCostDL4Mic. Nature Communications 12(1), 2276 (2021)
- De, T., Urbanski, A., Thangamani, S., Wyrzykowska, M., Yakimovich, A.: HeLa-CytoNuc: fluorescence microscopy dataset with segmentation masks for cell nuclei and cytoplasm (2024)
- Deng, W., Gould, S., Zheng, L.: On the Strong Correlation Between Model Invariance and Generalization (2022), arXiv:2207.07065
- Franco-Barranco, D., Lin, Z., Jang, W.D., et al.: Current Progress and Challenges in Large-Scale 3D Mitochondria Instance Segmentation. IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging 42(12), 3956–3971 (2023)
- Funke, J., Mais, L., Champion, A., Dye, N., Kainmueller, D.: A Benchmark for Epithelial Cell Tracking. In: Computer Vision – ECCV 2018 Workshops, vol. 11134, pp. 437–445. Cham (2019)
- Gal, Y., Ghahramani, Z.: Dropout as a Bayesian Approximation: Representing Model Uncertainty in Deep Learning. In: PMLR. pp. 1050–1059 (2016), iSSN: 1938-7228
- Garg, S., Balakrishnan, S., Lipton, Z.C., Neyshabur, B., Sedghi, H.: Leveraging Unlabeled Data to Predict Out-of-Distribution Performance (2022), arXiv:2201.04234
- Hawkins, R., Balaghi, N., Rothenberg, K.E., Ly, M., Fernandez-Gonzalez, R.: ReSCU-Nets: recurrent U-Nets for segmentation of multidimensional microscopy data (2024)
- Huang, L.K., Wei, Y., Rong, Y., Yang, Q., Huang, J.: Frustratingly Easy Transferability Estimation. International Conference on Machine Learning (2021)
- 14. Kromp, F., Bozsaky, E., Rifatbegovic, F., et al.: An annotated fluorescence image dataset for training nuclear segmentation methods. Scientific Data 7(1), 262 (2020)

- 10 J. Talks et al.
- 15. Ledda, E., Fumera, G., Roli, F.: Dropout injection at test time for post hoc uncertainty quantification in neural networks. Information Sciences **645**, 119356 (2023)
- Ljosa, V., Sokolnicki, K.L., Carpenter, A.E.: Annotated high-throughput microscopy image sets for validation. Nature Methods 9(7), 637–637 (2012)
- Loquercio, A., Segù, M., Scaramuzza, D.: A General Framework for Uncertainty Estimation in Deep Learning. IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters 5(2), 3153– 3160 (2020), arXiv:1907.06890
- Lucchi, A., Li, Y., Fua, P.: Learning for Structured Prediction Using Approximate Subgradient Descent with Working Sets. In: 2013 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 1987–1994 (2013), iSSN: 1063-6919
- Mensink, T., Uijlings, J., Kuznetsova, A., Gygli, M., Ferrari, V.: Factors of Influence for Transfer Learning across Diverse Appearance Domains and Task Types. (2021)
- 20. Mi, L., Wang, H., Tian, Y., He, H., Shavit, N.: Training-Free Uncertainty Estimation for Dense Regression: Sensitivity as a Surrogate (2022), arXiv:1910.04858
- Mustafa, B., Loh, A., Freyberg, J., et al.: Supervised Transfer Learning at Scale for Medical Imaging. arXiv.org (2021)
- Nguyen, C.V., Nguyen, C.V., Hassner, T., Archambeau, C., Seeger, M.: LEEP: A New Measure to Evaluate Transferability of Learned Representations. arXiv: Learning (2020)
- Ouali, Y., Hudelot, C., Tami, M.: Semi-Supervised Semantic Segmentation with Cross-Consistency Training (2020), arXiv:2003.09005
- Ouyang, W., Beuttenmueller, F., Gómez-de Mariscal, E., Pape, C., et al.: BioImage Model Zoo: A Community-Driven Resource for Accessible Deep Learning in BioImage Analysis. bioRxiv (2022)
- Ovadia, Y., Fertig, E., Ren, J., et al.: Can you trust your model' s uncertainty? Evaluating predictive uncertainty under dataset shift. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems. vol. 32 (2019)
- P'andy, M., Agostinelli, A., Uijlings, J., Ferrari, V., Mensink, T.: Transferability Estimation using Bhattacharyya Class Separability. Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (2021)
- Phelps, J.S., Colburn Hildebrand, D.G., Graham, B.J., et al.: Reconstruction of motor control circuits in adult Drosophila using automated transmission electron microscopy. Cell 184(3), 759–774.e18 (2021)
- 28. Ronneberger, O., Fischer, P., Brox, T.: U-Net: Convolutional Networks for Biomedical Image Segmentation. arXiv: Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (2015)
- Russakovsky, O., Deng, J., Su, H., Krause, J., Satheesh, S., Ma, S., Huang, Z., Karpathy, A., Khosla, A., Bernstein, M., Berg, A.C., Fei-Fei, L.: ImageNet Large Scale Visual Recognition Challenge (2015), arXiv:1409.0575
- Schiff, Y., Quanz, B., Das, P., Chen, P.Y.: Predicting Deep Neural Network Generalization with Perturbation Response Curves (2021), arXiv:2106.04765
- Shimodaira, H.: Improving predictive inference under covariate shift by weighting the log-likelihood function. Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference 90, 227– 244 (2000)
- Tompson, J., Goroshin, R., Jain, A., LeCun, Y., Bregler, C.: Efficient Object Localization Using Convolutional Networks (2015), arXiv:1411.4280
- Vijayan, A., Mody, T.A., Yu, Q., et al.: A deep learning-based toolkit for 3D nuclei segmentation and quantitative analysis in cellular and tissue context. Development (Cambridge, England) 151(14), dev202800 (2024)
- Wang, H., Ji, Q.: Epistemic Uncertainty Quantification For Pre-Trained Neural Networks. pp. 11052–11061 (2024)

- Weiss, K.R., Khoshgoftaar, T.M., Khoshgoftaar, T.M., Khoshgoftaar, T.M., Khoshgoftaar, T.M., Wang, D.: A survey of transfer learning. Journal of Big Data (2016)
- 36. Willis, L., Refahi, Y., Wightman, R., et al.: Cell size and growth regulation in the Arabidopsis thaliana apical stem cell niche. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America **113**(51), E8238–E8246 (2016)
- 37. Wolny, A., Cerrone, L., Vijayan, A., et al.: Accurate and versatile 3D segmentation of plant tissues at cellular resolution. eLife **9**, e57613 (2020)
- Yang, Y., Wei, M., He, J., Yang, J., Ye, J., Gu, Y.: Pick the Best Pretrained Model: Towards Transferability Estimation for Medical Image Segmentation (2023), arXiv:2307.11958