This MICCAI paper is the Open Access version, provided by the MICCAI Society. It is identical to the accepted version, except for the format and this watermark; the final published version is available on SpringerLink.



# A Visual Results on BraTS





Fig. 1: Visual results for our method, AnomalyDINO and Dinomaly.

# B Results on VisA

In addition to the medical datasets, we evaluated the DINO-based methods on the industrial VisA dataset. Since there is no validation set available, no model selection was performed and we evaluated the model after the last epoch. Otherwise, the evaluation setting is the same as for the BMAD datasets. AUROC and AUPR scores averaged over three seeds and all 12 subsets are provided in Tab. 1.

Table 1: AUROC and AUPR results on VisA for DINO-based methods, averaged across all object categories. For each method, scores are computed over three random seeds and reported as mean ± standard deviation.

| Method | AUROC | AUPR |
|---|---|---|
| AnomalyDINO (v2-S) | 98.88 ± 0.00 | 41.62 ± 0.00 |
| AnomalyDINO (v3-S) | 99.01 ± 0.00 | 44.23 ± 0.00 |
| DINO-DPMM (v2-S) | 30.73 ± 2.76 | 0.48 ± 0.09 |
| DINO-DPMM (v3-S) | 27.34 ± 0.66 | 0.39 ± 0.00 |
| Dinomaly (v2-S) | 96.70 ± 0.06 | 29.04 ± 0.52 |
| Dinomaly (v3-S) | 99.15 ± 0.02 | 44.49 ± 0.39 |
| Ours (standard conv) | 98.76 ± 0.01 | 43.82 ± 0.49 |