

# Supplementary Material of HAMIL-QA: Hierarchical Approach to Multiple Instance Learning for LGE MRI Quality Assessment

K M Arefeen Sultan, Md Hasibul Husain Hisham, Benjamin Orkild, Alan Morris, Eugene Kholmovski, Erik Bieging, Eugene Kwan, Ravi Ranjan, Ed DiBella, and Shireen Elhabian

<b>Method</b>	<b>#Patches</b>	<b>#Sub-bags</b>	<b>Acc</b>	<b>AUROC</b>	<b>F1 Score</b>
ABMIL	60	X	$0.643 \pm 0.028$	$0.647 \pm 0.013$	$0.433 \pm 0.093$
DTFD-MIL	60	5	$0.588 \pm 0.049$	$0.568 \pm 0.062$	$0.448 \pm 0.110$
DTFD-MIL	60	6	$0.604 \pm 0.075$	$0.637 \pm 0.065$	$0.242 \pm 0.242$
DTFD-MIL	60	7	$0.592 \pm 0.037$	$0.582 \pm 0.043$	$0.398 \pm 0.202$
HAMIL-QA	60	5	$0.647 \pm 0.034$	$0.647 \pm 0.034$	<b><math>0.623 \pm 0.028</math></b>
HAMIL-QA	60	6	<b><math>0.682 \pm 0.030</math></b>	<b><math>0.700 \pm 0.009</math></b>	$0.596 \pm 0.084$
HAMIL-QA	60	7	$0.663 \pm 0.044$	<b><math>0.705 \pm 0.010</math></b>	$0.524 \pm 0.138$
ABMIL	80	X	$0.639 \pm 0.037$	$0.637 \pm 0.050$	$0.497 \pm 0.130$
DTFD-MIL	80	5	$0.553 \pm 0.035$	$0.563 \pm 0.047$	$0.149 \pm 0.149$
DTFD-MIL	80	6	$0.577 \pm 0.058$	$0.598 \pm 0.076$	$0.356 \pm 0.156$
DTFD-MIL	80	7	<b><math>0.659 \pm 0.007</math></b>	<b><math>0.673 \pm 0.016</math></b>	<b><math>0.669 \pm 0.005</math></b>
HAMIL-QA	80	5	$0.608 \pm 0.016$	$0.598 \pm 0.015$	$0.504 \pm 0.019$
HAMIL-QA	80	6	$0.616 \pm 0.041$	$0.636 \pm 0.045$	$0.567 \pm 0.056$
HAMIL-QA	80	7	$0.651 \pm 0.045$	$0.642 \pm 0.045$	$0.567 \pm 0.056$
ABMIL	100	X	$0.647 \pm 0.020$	$0.661 \pm 0.022$	$0.577 \pm 0.042$
DTFD-MIL	100	5	$0.667 \pm 0.014$	$0.663 \pm 0.015$	$0.601 \pm 0.056$
DTFD-MIL	100	6	$0.631 \pm 0.046$	$0.616 \pm 0.053$	$0.423 \pm 0.187$
DTFD-MIL	100	7	$0.647 \pm 0.020$	$0.660 \pm 0.021$	<b><math>0.626 \pm 0.036</math></b>
HAMIL-QA	100	5	$0.620 \pm 0.045$	<b><math>0.669 \pm 0.020</math></b>	$0.458 \pm 0.205$
HAMIL-QA	100	6	$0.647 \pm 0.045$	$0.645 \pm 0.053$	$0.547 \pm 0.098$
HAMIL-QA	100	7	<b><math>0.675 \pm 0.034</math></b>	$0.664 \pm 0.043$	$0.513 \pm 0.114$

Table 1: Comparative analysis of Attention based MIL (ABMIL) [1], DTFD-MIL [2], and our method. We used patch size (60, 60) throughout the experiments. The results are presented as mean  $\pm$  standard deviation of 3 runs, reflecting the performance of each method under the specified conditions (number of patches, number of sub-bags).

We have used different number of patches and number of sub-bags as hyperparameters for each method and have chosen the best model based on the validation set.

<b>Method</b>	<b>MACs/FLOPS</b>	<b>Number of Parameters</b>
<b>Fully Supervised</b>	180.8B	14.59M
<b>ABMIL</b>	2.0B	14.57M
<b>DTFD-MIL</b>	1.99B	14.57M
<b>HAMIL-QA</b>	0.24B	5.12M

Table 2: Computational Complexity and Number of Parameters for Different Methods

## References

1. Ilse, M., Tomczak, J., Welling, M.: Attention-based deep multiple instance learning. In: International conference on machine learning. pp. 2127–2136. PMLR (2018)
2. Zhang, H., Meng, Y., Zhao, Y., Qiao, Y., Yang, X., Coupland, S.E., Zheng, Y.: Dtfd-mil: Double-tier feature distillation multiple instance learning for histopathology whole slide image classification. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 18802–18812 (2022)