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Contrastive pre-training may help!
Self-supervised Contrastive Learning

\[ L_{NCE} = - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log \frac{e^{\theta(t_i^1, t_i^2)}}{\frac{1}{b} \sum_{j=1}^{b} e^{\theta(t_i^1, t_j^2)}} \]
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Negative sampling assumption is not suitable for AD detection

> Equidistant assumption risks false negatives

\[ L_{NCE} = - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log \frac{1}{b} \sum_{j=1}^{b} e^{\theta(t_i, t'_j)} \]

[1] Khosla, Prannay, et al. "Supervised contrastive learning." Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33 (2020): 18661-18673.
One way to fix the negative sampling issue is to use supervised-contrastive learning [1] during pre-training.

[1] Khosla, Prannay, et al. "Supervised contrastive learning." Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33 (2020): 18661-18673.
One way to fix the negative sampling issue is to use supervised-contrastive learning [1] during pre-training.

However, this may exhaust the entropic capacity of the labels.
Summing Up

- Self-supervised Contrastive Learning’s negative sampling assumption doesn’t hold for AD data.
- Supervised Contrastive Learning exhausts all label information.

What to do?
Mixture Prediction with Synthetic Samples

We can reformulate the contrastive objective as a mixture detection problem!
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To that end, we need two main components:

1. A way to generate mixtures (synthetic samples)
2. A soft-label capable contrastive loss
A Way to Generate Mixtures: CutMix

> CutMix [2] creates mixtures between the images and labels.

\[
X_i^p = (1 - M) \odot X_i + M \odot X_j \\
y_i^p = \lambda y_i + (1 - \lambda) * y_j
\]

[2] Yun, Sangdoo, et al. "Cutmix: Regularization strategy to train strong classifiers with localizable features." Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision. 2019.
Brain-Aware Replacements by Using a Brain Atlas

- Brain-Aware Replacements (BAR)
  - Utilizes anatomically relevant regions from the Automated Anatomical Labeling Atlas (AAL)

[3] Tzourio-Mazoyer, Nathalie, et al. "Automated anatomical labeling of activations in SPM using a macroscopic anatomical parcellation of the MNI MRI single-subject brain." Neuroimage 15.1 (2002): 273-289.
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To that end, we need two main components:

1. A way to generate mixtures (synthetic samples)
2. A soft-label capable contrastive loss
2) Soft-Label Capable Contrastive Loss

> Soft labels generated by BAR can be exploited with a slight modification on the supervised contrastive loss to learn the relative similarity between pairs.

\[
L^c_{NCE} = - \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{\varphi(y^p_k, y^p_i)}{\sum_{j=1}^{b} \varphi(y^p_j, y^p_i)} \log \frac{e^{\theta(t^i_1, t^k_2)}}{\frac{1}{b} \sum_{j=1}^{b} e^{\theta(t^i_1, t^j_2)}}
\]

[3] Dufumier, Benoit, et al. "Contrastive learning with continuous proxy meta-data for 3d mri classification." International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention. Springer, Cham, 2021.
Mixture Learning Framework with BAR
Proposed Pre-Training Framework
## Results

> We used ADNI on all our experiments

| Framework                          | Method                  | Precision  | Recall    | Accuracy  |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|
| No Pre Training                   | ViT from scratch        | 74.38 ± 7  | 85.6 ± 3.1| 80.83 ± 3 |
| Self Supervised Pre-Training      | Contrastive             | 78.42 ± 4.5| 81.18 ± 1.6| 80.1 ± 1.9|
| + Fine Tuning                     | Recon                   | 78.6 ± 5   | 85.57 ± 1.1| 82.69 ± 2.5|
|                                  | Contrastive + Recon     | 80.2 ± 4.1 | 85.77 ± 2 | 83.4 ± 1.7 |
| Supervised Pre-Training           | CutMIX                  | 83.06 ± 4.8| 87.08 ± 3.5| 85.29 ± 2.8|
| + Fine Tuning                     | CutMIX + Recon          | 84.6 ± 3.8 | 87.9 ± 2.2 | 86.4 ± 1   |
|                                  | BAR                     | 84.7 ± 3.3 | 87.6 ± 2.1 | 86.3 ± 1.1 |
|                                  | BAR + Recon             | 86.24 ± 3  | 88.08 ± 2.3| 87.22 ± 0.8|
Attention Visualization for the AD case
A Bonus Talk on Diffusion Models

- Text-to-image diffusion models have shown unprecedented success in recent research!
- Stable Diffusion
- Dall-E
- PARTI

"a photograph of an astronaut riding a horse"
Diffusion Models
Augmented reality allows Virtual Try-on but it’s very expensive as it requires some manual labor.

Can we do Virtual-Try On without 3D modeling directly on 2d images using the diffusion models?
DREAMbooth-inPAINT(DreamPaint)

> We propose DreamPaint, a framework to intelligently inpaint any e-commerce product on any user-provided context image!
DreamPaint
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Inpainting is either done by text guided models, or image guided models.

Text Guided column shows results generated by the asin title (which does not have the capacity to fully describe the item) or a SOTA model, Paint By Example (PBE), which uses a single exemplar image, but mostly omits the fidelity that is required in the e-commerce setting.
## Compared to SOTA

| User Image | Reference Images | Text Guided | PBE | DreamPaint |
|------------|------------------|-------------|-----|------------|
| ![User Image](image1.png) | ![Reference Images](image2.png) | ![Text Guided](image3.png) | ![PBE](image4.png) | ![DreamPaint](image5.png) |
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Quantitative and Human Survey Results

Table 1: Quantitative comparison of CLIP score between our approach and the baselines.

| Method                        | CLIP Score(↑) |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| SD Inpaint with Text Guidance | 0.62          |
| Paint by Example              | 0.68          |
| Ours                          | 0.70          |

Table 2: Average user ratings for each method measuring similarity to the reference image and how harmoniously the generated image.

| Method                        | Similarity(↓) | Harmony(↓) |
|-------------------------------|---------------|------------|
| SD Inpaint with Text Guidance | 4.41          | 2.75       |
| Paint by Example              | 3.82          | 2.57       |
| Ours                          | 2.68          | 2.33       |