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Abstract—The cancer prognosis on gigapixel Whole-Slide Images (WSIs) has always been a challenging task. Most existing approaches focus solely on single-resolution images. The multi-resolution schemes, utilizing image pyramids to enhance WSI visual representations, have not yet been paid enough attention to. In order to explore a multi-resolution solution for improving cancer prognosis accuracy, this paper proposes a dual-stream architecture to model WSIs by an image pyramid strategy. This architecture consists of two sub-streams: one is for low-resolution WSIs, and the other is especially for high-resolution ones. Compared to other approaches, our scheme has three highlights: (i) there exists a one-to-one relation between stream and resolution; (ii) a square pooling layer is added to align the patches from two resolution streams, largely reducing computation cost and enabling a natural stream feature fusion; (iii) a cross-attention-based method is proposed to pool high-resolution patches spatially under the guidance of low-resolution ones. We validate our scheme on three publicly-available datasets, a total number of 3,101 WSIs from 1,911 patients. Experimental results verify that (1) hierarchical dual-stream representation is more effective than single-stream ones for cancer prognosis, gaining an average C-Index rise of 5.0% and 1.8% on a single low-resolution and high-resolution stream, respectively; (2) our dual-stream scheme could outperform current state-of-the-art ones, by a 5.1% average improvement of C-Index; (3) the cancer diseases with observable survival differences could have different preferences for model complexity. Our scheme could serve as an alternative tool for further facilitating WSI prognosis research.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Cancer prognosis typically answers the question of how the disease will go for patients. It can be affected by various factors such as age, primary site, tumor grade, tumor stage, and treatment response [1]. Among these factors, some tumor-related ones can be uncovered by the histopathology Whole-Slide Image (WSI) from a high-end microscope. WSIs are extremely high-resolution, usually of gigapixels, allowing pathologists to view regions of interest or examine individual cells by changing image magnification [2], [3].

With the development of computational pathology, the analysis of WSIs nowadays has become a critical way to estimate cancer prognosis [4], [5]. This way can automatically recognize the prognostic patterns of WSIs, by using deep-learning techniques [6]–[12]. Due to the gigapixel of images, WSI analysis approaches usually slice images into a myriad of small patches and then organize these patches into a determined structure to train deep neural networks. For example, Li et al. [7] initially adopted a graph to describe patches. They trained a graph convolution network (GCN) to aggregate patch features and derive WSI representations. Afterwards, researchers further tried clusters or sequences, and utilized fully-connected networks (FCNs) or attention-based multiple instance learning (AMIL) networks to aggregate patch information, as shown in Figure 1(a). From a unified perspective, there approaches are intended to make patch aggregation flow within a specified structure, outputting new patch embeddings to obtain WSI representations.

However, most existing approaches are limited to single-resolution images. A multi-resolution scheme currently has not been paid enough attention to. And yet, more and more facts show that multi-resolution schemes could be a potential technique for cancer prognosis. (1) On the one hand, the multi-resolution form, showing image pyramids [13], is inherent in WSIs. It can express rich multi-scale semantics, ranging from extremely small cells to tumor micro-environments to large tissues. These pyramidal semantics can cover tumor-related information thoroughly [2], thus enabling us to estimate prognosis more accurately. (2) On the other hand, image pyramids have shown promising results in pathology classification tasks [14]–[16]. Pati et al. [14] tried to construct entity pyramids to characterize the whole tissue for breast cancer subtyping. They segmented cells and tissue regions from images and took them to build a cell-to-tissue graph. But the cellular computation costs in entity pyramids were infeasible for histopathology WSIs, so Li et al. [15] proposed a patch pyramid strategy, named DSMIL. DSMIL simply embedded the features of patch pyramids in vectors to employ multi-scale information, as illustrated by Figure 1(b). After that, H²MIL [16] built a heterogeneous graph with extremely-dense connections (between patches from same-resolution or cross-resolution), based on patch pyramids similarly, as shown in Figure 1(b). As expected, these image pyramid schemes achieved better results than single-resolution ones in classification tasks.

All these facts drive us to introduce image pyramids to enhance WSI visual representation for a more accurate cancer prognosis. Although existing image pyramid schemes have
been validated effective in classification tasks, we argue that these schemes do not necessarily perform well in cancer prognosis, in view of the intrinsic difference in task complexity and the generalization bottleneck of classification networks. (1) First, most classification-oriented models [17]–[21] only need to identify a specific tumor stage or subtype. However, in addition to stage and subtype, cancer prognosis models [22], [23] are often required to gather more evidence, such as certain traits of cancer cells [24] and tumor surrounding micro-environmental cues [25]. Furthermore, literature has found some well-defined prognostic factors in WSIs, such as mitosis in breast cancer [26] and Gleason score in prostate cancer [27]. But these well-known factors couldn’t adequately reveal cancer prognosis because of tumor heterogeneity and individual diversity [28]–[31]. This means that the actual prognostic factors underneath WSIs may be more complex, varying across cancer types and individuals, leaving a challenging task. (2) Second, the network architectures for classification are well-designed and fine-tuned according to their performance in downstream tasks. They consequently may not be able to directly generalize well for other tasks [32].

In light of these considerations, this paper resolves to revisit the image pyramids in WSIs for cancer prognosis. Specifically, we focus on investigating (1) whether image pyramids can enhance WSI representation to improve cancer prognosis accuracy; and (2) the model architecture that can exploit patch pyramids and be more suitable for cancer prognosis. To this end, we propose a dual-stream architecture, a sketch of which can be found in Figure 1(c). We especially design one stream for low-resolution WSIs and the other stream for high-resolution ones in this architecture. The two sub-streams finally join together to predict survival outcomes. Compared to current image pyramid schemes shown in Figure 1(b), our scheme takes patch pyramids as input similarly. But the differences between them are evident: (1) either stream serves its respective resolution; (2) a square pooling layer is specially placed at high-resolution stream; and (3) a cross-attention-based guidance method is proposed to implement square pooling. As a result, high-resolution patches could be pooled into the informative vectors aligned to low-resolution patches, reducing computation cost and enabling a natural dual-stream feature fusion. Thereby, hierarchical and discriminative features could be distilled from patch pyramids via our dual-stream network. Under feasible computation cost, our scheme can be easily extended to multi-stream to model multi-scale WSIs.

Our main contributions are summarized as follows:

1. A dual-stream architecture is proposed to distill hierarchical dual-stream features from patch pyramids for cancer prognosis. Our scheme has three highlights:
   - Two specialized sub-networks are utilized to distill discriminative features from low-resolution and high-resolution patches individually.
   - A square pooling layer is specially devised to align dual-stream patches, which can significantly reduce computation cost and enable the stream feature fusion to follow naturally.
   - A cross-attention-based pooling method is proposed to aggregate high-resolution patches spatially under the guidance of low-resolution ones.

2. A total number of 3,101 WSIs from 1,911 patients with lung cancer, breast cancer, or low-grade glioma, is used to validate our scheme and other state-of-the-art (SOTA) approaches. Experimental results and empirical analysis show:
by the nature of models have achieved great success [39]–[41]. However, these works cannot be directly adapted to gigapixel WSIs. Thus, the research on WSI modeling turns to an initial way: assembling image pyramids first and producing feature pyramids using pre-trained models afterward. As a sacrifice, the feature pyramids from WSIs are often fixed and untrainable.

B. Multiple Instance Learning

Multiple Instance Learning is a weakly-supervised learning method [42]. In MIL setting, the dataset, $T$, can be written by

$$T = \{ (X_i, y_i) \}_{i=1}^{N}, \quad X_i = \{ f^{(j)}_i \}_{j=1}^{n_i} ,$$

(1)

where $X_i$ denotes a sample, $y_i$ is the label of $X_i$, and $f^{(j)}_i$ is the $j$-th instance of $X_i$. A bag sample is composed of multiple instances and only bag labels are available. MIL aims to learn the bag-level representation that can adequately characterize bag.

Most approaches used for WSIs are categorized as MIL because these approaches essentially do the similar things as MIL. WSIs and patches are viewed as bags and instances, respectively.

C. Structure-specific Model

1) Cluster-based Model: It organizes patches as clusters according to patch similarities. WSISA [6] is the first deep learning model for WSI prognosis. It trains a model for each cluster while DeepAttnMISL [9] develops an end-to-end model to process all clusters simultaneously. After that, BDOCOX [10] is proposed to improve DeepAttnMISL. It first introduces the concept of pseudo-bag and adds survival ranking term into loss function.

2) Graph-based Model: It typically connects each patch with its neighbors and constructs a patch graph. DeepGraphSurv [7] uses an adaptive graph for graph convolution, but RankSurv [8] and PatchGCN [11] adopt feature vectors and spatial coordinates to compute the distances between patches, respectively. Besides these, the $H^2$MIL [16], as a model using...
WSI image pyramids, adds the connections between low-resolution and high-resolution patches. After graph construction, GCNs are used to aggregate patch features.

D. Structure-free Model

1) Vision Transformer: Vision Transformer (ViT) [43] is a Transformer-based [44] vision model. It takes an image as \(16 \times 16\) words (or tokens), and uses Transformer to learn patch dependencies. ViT and its variants [45]–[47] have achieved remarkable success. The key reason is that the self-attention mechanism of Transformer can learn dependencies using large-sized and data-specific kernels.

2) Attention-MIL Method: SeTranSurv [12], DT-MIL [33], and TransMIL [34] are Transformer-based models. But DSMIL [15] and DTFD-MIL [35] use simplified models, i.e., AMIL [48], for classification tasks. In DSMIL, only those selected key patches can aggregate the other patches. However in DTFD-MIL, a pseudo-bag feature is aggregated according to the class activation map (CAM) of patches in this pseudo-bag. It worth noting that DSMIL and DTFD-MIL can only be used for classification, because DSMIL selects patches using class scores while DTFD-MIL relies on class-specific CAMs [49]. In addition, the HIP [?] based on ViT adopts a hierarchical self-supervised learning strategy to obtain pre-trained high-resolution features for WSI downstream tasks, which also aggregates patches by a way of AMIL.

Patch-based models don’t restrict the structure of patches, but just takes patches as sequences and uses Attention-based networks to aggregate patch information. Compared to those structure-specific models, structure-free ones have weaker inductive bias and allow an aggregation flow involving all patches, but only limiting to the patches in clusters or connected in graphs, as depicted in Figure 1. Moreover, with attention mechanisms, long-term and data-specific dependencies can be learned for patches effectively [44].

III. METHODOLOGY

Our dual-stream architecture consists of four components: patch embedding layer, Transformer layer, stream feature fusion, and output layer. The fashion of two single-stream networks roughly follows the philosophy of ViT.

A. Dual-stream Patch Token

We denote our dataset as:

\[
T = \{(P_i, t_i, c_i)\}_{i=1}^{N}, \quad P_i = \{p_i^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^{k}, \tag{2}
\]

where \(P_i, t_i, \) and \(c_i\) is the data, follow-up time, and censorship status of \(i\)-th patient, respectively. \(p_i^{(j)}\) denotes the \(j\)-th patch data of \(P_i\). Note that \(k\) may be different across patients.

We use the two layers from WSI image pyramids to prepare dual-stream patch tokens. Namely, we select \(20 \times 20\) and \(5 \times 5\) magnification (or resolution), because \(20 \times 20\) resolution has always been adopted by most approaches and \(5 \times 5\) resolution could achieve a suitable computation cost. As shown in Figure 2(a), we slice a WSI at \(5 \times 5\) resolution, obtaining patches with \(256 \times 256\) pixels, followed by the WSI patching at \(20 \times 20\). The region of one \(5 \times 5\) patch is exactly the same as that of one \(4 \times 4\) square (filled with the 16 patches at \(20 \times 20\)). Finally, we use a pre-trained ResNet50 model [37] to extract patch features with a dimension of 1,024, as used in [18].

Given one patient with multiple WSIs, we denote its processed patch tokens at \(5 \times 20\) resolution as

\[
X_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d} \quad \text{and} \quad X_h \in \mathbb{R}^{16m \times d},
\]

respectively, where \(m\) is the number of \(5 \times 5\) patches and \(d = 1024\) is the dimension of tokens. Compared with \(X_h, X_i\) is coarser but its receptive field is larger. However, \(X_h\) can provide more fine-grained information, which exactly lacks in low-resolution tokens.

B. Patch Embedding Layer

1) Low Resolution Stream: In low resolution stream (Figure 2), i.e., \(5 \times 5\) stream, we adopt a 1D convolution layer as its patch embedding layer for simplicity. \(X_i\) is firstly padded with zeros to keep the resolution. The output of patch embedding is

\[
E_l = \text{Conv1D}(X_i; k = 5, s = 1, p = 2), \tag{3}
\]

where \(E_l \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d_e}\) and \(d_e\) is the dimension of feature embedding. \(k, s,\) and \(p\) denote the kernel size, stride length, and padding length of convolutions, respectively. This function also can be taken as a dimension reduction layer. The 1D convolution integrates the individual patches within overlapping convolution windows, thus outputting overlapping patch embeddings. This way of patch overlapping embedding also has been used in [45], which could obtain more local continuity in tokens.

2) High Resolution Stream: Feature Embedding. In high resolution stream, i.e., \(20 \times 20\) stream, we employ a patch embedding layer for \(4 \times 4\) square regions. Firstly \(X_h\) is reshaped into the square sequence region-aligned with \(5 \times 5\) patch by one by one, which implements the function: \(\text{resize} : \mathbb{R}^{16m \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times 4 \times 4 \times d}.\) Then the reshaped input goes through a patch embedding layer and an activation layer in turn, written by

\[
O_h = \sigma(\rho(\text{resize}(X_h))), \tag{4}
\]

where \(O_h \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times 4 \times 4 \times d_e}\) and \(\sigma(\cdot)\) is an activation function. We consider two implementations of \(\rho(\cdot)\):

- 2D convolution (called \(\text{Conv}\)), which computes overlapping patch embeddings using the patch tokens within overlapping convolution windows;
- and linear projection (called \(\text{FC}\)), which projects individual patch tokens, thus generating the compact patch embeddings without local continuity.

Compared to FC, Conv has more learnable parameters and a stronger inductive bias. As verified in [45], Conv can ensure tokens’ local continuity and thereby it has a better performance than non-overlapping operations. We argue that it may not hold on WSIs, because the information density of gigapixel WSIs is significantly lower than that of common images. Namely, the way of overlapping embedding applied to large low-density images could incur more redundancy. Note that
we just consider the two most representative implementations for patch embedding although there are more alternative ones.

3) **High Resolution Stream: Square Pooling.** It is utilized to pool the tokens in squares. It is defined by \( F : \mathbb{R}^{m \times 4 \times 4 \times d_e} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times 1 \times d_e} \). We consider one of square pooling methods that pools high-resolution patch tokens under the guidance of low-resolution tokens.\( F_{\text{cap}} \), actually does a spatial attention pooling for big regions (1,024 \( \times \) 1,024 pixels in our setting) and keeps the alignment of dual-scale patches. As a result, we can desirably alleviate the computation load of the Transformer layer at high-resolution stream. And most importantly, it naturally enables the feature fusion of two sub-streams to follow.

**C. Transformer Layer**

1) **Sparse Positional Embedding:** The positional embedding (PE) we adopt for Transformer is the same as [44], instead of ViT, because the size of tokens varies across WSIs, which is different from general cases. Moreover, we filter the patches without any tissue region during WSI patching, leading to the problem of sparse spatial distribution in tokens.

To solve this, we put all WSIs from one patient in a row and then map the coordinates of all available patches to a discrete domain without breaking their relative locations. In this way, we can encode the position information of patches from multiple WSIs while preserving patches’ spatially-sparse property. We simply write sparse PE as

\[ \text{PE} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d_e}. \]

2) **Patch Dependency Learning:** We employ a Transformer encoder layer at the end of either stream to learn the potential dependencies between tokens, as shown in Figure 2(c). This layer is a vanilla Transformer encoder that consists of a multi-head self-attention sublayer and a feed-forward network sublayer. We denote this two sublayers as MSA(\( \cdot \)) : \( \mathbb{R}^{m \times d_e} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times d_e} \) and FFN(\( \cdot \)) : \( \mathbb{R}^{m \times d_e} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times d_e} \), respectively. The
implementation of Transformer encoder, $T(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^{m \times d_s} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times d_o}$, can be expressed by

$$T = \zeta \circ \varphi,$$

$$\zeta(x) = \text{LN}(\text{MSA}(x) + x),$$

$$\varphi(x) = \text{LN}(\text{FFN}(x) + x),$$

where LN(·) is a layer normalization function. Based on Equation 7, we can get the outputs as follows:

$$V_l = T_l(E_l + PE) \text{ and } V_h = T_h(E_h + PE).$$

Compared to FCNs or GCNs, Transformer can learn patch dependencies using large-sized and data-specific kernels, owing to its self-attention mechanism and long-range receptive field.

**D. WSI representation**

1) Dual-stream Feature Fusion: The stream feature fusion (FF) implements the following function:

$$F = \text{FF}([V_l, V_h]).$$

We consider two simple implementations: feature addition and feature concatenation. They are defined by

$$\text{add} : \mathbb{R}^{2m \times d_s} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times d_o} \text{ and } \text{cat} : \mathbb{R}^{2m \times d_s} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times 2d_o}.$$

Compared to add(·), cat(·) outputs a matrix with higher dimension, thus linking to a more complex model.

2) Output Layer: We utilize global attention pooling (GAP) [48] to derive WSI-level representation, in which all tokens are aggregated into a global vector. Finally, this global vector is used to infer prediction via a multiple layer perceptron (MLP). The output layer we adopt implements

$$H = \text{GAP}(F),$$

$$O = \text{sigmoid}(\text{MLP}(H)),$$

where GAP : $\mathbb{R}^{m \times d_o} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_o}$, MLP : $\mathbb{R}^{d_o} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_t}$, and $O \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t \times d_o}$. $d_o$ is the output dimension, which equals to $d_e$ or $2d_e$. $n_t$ denotes the number of time points we set.

**E. Loss Function**

The loss function we adopt is a negative log-likelihood function [50] for training discrete deep survival models:

$$L = L_{\text{uncensored}} + (1 - \alpha) L_{\text{censored}},$$

$$L_{\text{uncensored}} = \sum_{(p, t, i,c) \in T} \left\{ (1 - c_i) \cdot \log(S(t_i) \cdot h(t_i)) \right\},$$

$$L_{\text{censored}} = \sum_{(p, t, i,c) \in T} \left\{ c_i \cdot \log(S(t_i)) \right\},$$

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+_0$, $h(t_i)$ is the $t_i$-th element of $O$, and $S(t_i) = \prod_{s=1}^{t_i} (1 - h(s))$. In survival analysis, $h(t)$ is a hazard function and $S(t)$ is a survival function indicating the probability of surviving $t$.

This survival function doesn’t make any assumption about the form of hazard function, but a Cox loss function [51], [52] has a strong constraint, i.e., proportional hazard assumption. Thus, we use Equation 10 to optimize our whole dual-stream network, as suggested in [50].

**IV. EXPERIMENTS**

**A. Datasets**

We validate our architecture on the three publicly-available datasets: National Lung Screening Trial (NLST), The Cancer Genome Atlas BRaCancer (TCGA-BRCA), and The Cancer Genome Atlas Low-Grade Glioma (TCGA-LGG). As exhibited by Table II, we obtain a total number of 1,911 patients and 3,101 WSIIs from three cancer datasets, after excluding the patients with unknown follow-up status or unavailable WSIIs. Note that there isn’t any other form of data curation except what we mentioned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>NLST</th>
<th>TCGA-BRCA</th>
<th>TCGA-LGG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>primary site</td>
<td>lung</td>
<td>breast</td>
<td>brain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>storage size</td>
<td>0.76 TB</td>
<td>0.98 TB</td>
<td>0.88 TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>death ratio</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># patients</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># WSIs</td>
<td>1,222</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># patches</td>
<td>247,209</td>
<td>201,780</td>
<td>164,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># patches / # WSIs</td>
<td>202.3</td>
<td>193.5</td>
<td>197.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 × # patches</td>
<td>3,955,344</td>
<td>3,228,480</td>
<td>2,637,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 × # patches / # WSIs</td>
<td>3,236.8</td>
<td>3,095.4</td>
<td>3,154.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table II, we can see that the overall prognosis of breast cancer is better than the other two cancer diseases statistically. And there are usually more than 3,000 patches from one 20× WSI on average. At 5× resolution, the average number of patches is around 200, which equals the value of $m$ in our setting.

**B. Experiment Setup**

1) Evaluation Metrics: We adopt Concordance Index (C-Index) [54] to measure model performance. C-Index is a commonly-used evaluation metrics in survival analysis, which mainly evaluates the model ability in survival risk discrimination. It’s written by

$$\text{C-Index} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i \in C} \sum_{j : t_i < t_j} I(y_i > y_j) \in [0, 1],$$

where $I(\cdot)$ is an indicator function and $M$ is the number of all comparable pairs. We compute $\hat{y}$ as a negative average on the survival probabilities at all time points, i.e., $\hat{y} = \frac{1}{t^*} \sum_{k=1}^{t^*} S(k)$. The C-Index would be larger if a survival model could predict higher risks for the patients who die earlier.

2) Model Evaluation: To evaluate models presented in our experiments, we use 5-fold cross-validation. In each fold training, we retain the 20% training set as a validation set. All data splittings are ensured to conduct at patient level.

3) Implementation Details: For each dataset we use the same settings: 150 epochs, a learning rate of $8 \times 10^{-5}$, a gradient accumulation step of 16, an optimizer of Adam with a weight decay rate of $5 \times 10^{-4}$, and a loss function given by Equation 10. Learning rate decays by a factor of 0.5 if validation loss
doesn’t decrease in past 10 epochs. Model training stops with patience of 30 epochs. For model architecture, we empirically set $d_e$ as 384 and $n_h$ as 4. All experiments run on a machine with 2 NVIDIA Tesla V100 GPUs.

4) Baselines: The Deep Sets [53] and original Attention-MIL [48], as classical MIL approaches, are among our baselines. We also select baselines from Table I, including classification and prognosis approaches. Not all approaches are selected because: (1) source codes are unavailable: BDOCOX [10] and RankSurv [8]; (2) approaches are inapplicable to prognosis tasks: DSMIL [33] and DTFD-MIL [35] (Explanations refer to Section II-D.2). WSISA [6] and DT-MIL [33] are not among our baselines because the former is not a MIL model and the latter cannot be used for spatially-sparse patches. Despite the unavailable source code, SeTranSurv [12] is also taken as one of our baselines, because it’s the first Transformer-based prognosis model. We use an inhouse-implementation for it.

C. Model Performance

1) Overall Performance: The results of overall performance are shown in Table III. From this table, we can summarize that: (1) The SOTA approaches, originally proposed for classification, i.e., TransMIL and H^2MIL, cannot always achieve a leading C-Index among existing ones on three cancer datasets. (2) The C-Index performance of dual-stream input is always better than that of single-stream ones under our architecture. (3) Our dual-stream scheme achieves the best C-Index on three datasets, and it has clear advantages in lung and breast cancer.

First, the performances of TransMIL and H^2MIL are not salient among existing methods. For example, H^2MIL is the worst one with a C-Index of 0.56867 on TCGA-LGG. Also, TransMIL and H^2MIL perform worse than 4 out of 6 existing methods on TCGA-BRCA. These experimental facts exactly back up one of our arguments: classification-oriented methods may not generalize well for cancer prognosis. The possible reason of these facts is two-fold: classification-oriented methods have less learnable parameters (see model size and FLOPs in Table III) and they don’t utilize specialized networks to process different resolution images. Second, compared to single-stream features, hierarchical dual-stream features can always perform better on three cancer datasets, with an average C-Index improvement of 5.0% and 1.8% than a single low-resolution and high-resolution stream, respectively. It indicates that the WSI image pyramids, enhancing WSI representation, indeed play a positive role in predicting cancer prognosis. This is exactly one of what this paper wants to focus on investigating. Third, our dual-stream method gains a C-Index of 8%, 6%, and 1% on NLST, TCGA-BRCA, and TCGA-LGG, respectively, in comparison with SOTA baselines. This verifies that our architecture could often be superior to others for WSI prognosis. Lastly, in Table III, our models are often shown with more parameters and computation costs than baselines, which will be discussed at Section IV-D.

2) Risk Stratification: We also assess the model’s ability in risk stratification, which is also a widely-used evaluation for survival analysis models. In the setting of risk stratification, patients are stratified into a high-risk group if their risk predictions are higher than the median; otherwise, patients are in a low-risk one.

![Fig. 3. Risk stratification. Our method and the other best ones (in C-Index) are shown. The survival curves are plotted using ground-truth labels, i.e., censorship and follow-up time. P-Value is computed by log-rank test to measure the significance of survival differences between two risk groups.](image-url)
From Figure 3, we can see that our models, trained on three cancer types individually, all can classify patients into a high- or low-risk group with a significant difference (P-Value<0.01). It means that our models could accurately identify a bad or good prognosis from the WSIs of cancer patients. In addition, the stratification differences given by our method are more obvious than that given by others on NLST and TCGA-BRCA, as seen from P-Value. Moreover, the confidence region of two risk groups overlap obviously on TCGA-BRCA, but it is not on NLST and TCGA-LGG. Thereby, we can infer that it may be more difficult to predict survival from WSIs for breast cancer, compared to lung cancer and low-grade glioma.

D. Model Complexity

We particularly explore the effect of model complexity on overall performance under our architecture, considering: (1) one of our motivations that investigates the models more suitable for WSI prognosis; and (2) the opinion that the tumor-related survival patterns in the cancer with unique invasion may need to be mined by a WSI model with certain properties. But these are often ignored by the existing studies on WSI prognosis modeling.

We get a total number of 24 model implementations (from 6 types of feature embedding and 4 types of PE and FF) as a result, 360 models (5-fold cross-validation on three datasets) are trained and evaluated. The overall performance and complexity of these models are shown in Figure 4. From these results, we can see that (1) the closer a cell is to the lower-left corner of heatmaps, the lower the model complexity it represents; (2) on NLST and TCGA-LGG, the cells with darker colors generally appear in the lower half of heatmaps; (3) but on TCGA-BRCA, darker cells tend to appear in a region closer to the upper right corner.

These observations suggest that some simple models could be sufficient to achieve a desirable prognosis performance for lung cancer and low-grade glioma. Yet for breast cancer, a high accuracy may require a more complex model with bigger size and higher computation cost. Thereby, we can infer that different cancer diseases may have different preferences for model complexity. We believe that this inference meets our knowledge and experiences: the cancers with different primary sites naturally show different disease invasions, and they exhibit distinct survival prognoses statistically (see Table II) [1]. We hope that these empirical findings could provide insights to build WSI models for cancer prognosis in real cases, although the scale of our experiments is limited in a way.

E. Ablation Study

Except for the factor of dual-stream input showed before, we will examine the other factors that may have great effects on our models by ablation study.

1) Square Pooling Combined with Different Feature Embedding Layer: The results are shown in Figure 5. From this figure, we can see that a feature embedding layer of FC + $F_{cap}$ is the best one among 6 layer types on NLST, and FC + $F_{gap}$ is the best one on TCGA-LGG. But on TCGA-BRCA, Conv + $F_{gap}$ achieves the best. In general, both the way of feature embedding and square pooling have effects on model performance. But there isn’t clear evidence to show which way is always the best for all the three cancer diseases with distinct survival statistics (refer to Table II).

Specifically, the proposed spatial guidance pooling, $F_{cap}$, is competitive among three square pooling methods, because it achieves the best C-Index of 0.70181 on TCGA-LGG and the second best C-Index of 0.61224 on TCGA-BRCA. But at the same time, $F_{cap}$ performs worst on NLST, which implies that low-resolution patches sometimes could mislead the pooling of high-resolution patches. In addition, comparing Conv with FC in a head-to-head manner, the C-Index performance of Conv doesn’t always surpass that of FC, so we cannot directly make...
a conclusion that the scheme of overlapping patch embedding provided by Conv could often perform as well on gigapixel WSIs as on common images.

2) Sparse Positional Embedding and Stream Feature Fusion:

From the results shown in Table IV, we can see that only on TCGA-BRCA PE can perform better, with an improvement of 1.2% in C-Index, but on NLST and TCGA-LGG PE represents a deteriorating C-Index performance. One possible reason is that there could be potential prognostic factors related to spatial characteristics on breast cancer. From the results of stream FF, we find that the way of feature concatenation is always superior to that of feature addition.

![Table IV](https://example.com/table4.png)

**Ablation Study of Sparse Positional Embedding (PE) and Stream Feature Fusion (FF).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PE</th>
<th>NLST</th>
<th>TCGA-BRCA</th>
<th>TCGA-LGG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>×</td>
<td>0.68177 ± 0.03932 0.60273 ± 0.05917</td>
<td>0.70181 ± 0.04321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0.6887 ± 0.04981 0.61510 ± 0.04359</td>
<td>0.68740 ± 0.03521</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>NLST</td>
<td>TCGA-BRCA</td>
<td>TCGA-LGG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cat</td>
<td>0.68177 ± 0.03932 0.61510 ± 0.04359</td>
<td>0.70181 ± 0.04321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add</td>
<td>0.6831 ± 0.04395 0.58652 ± 0.07757</td>
<td>0.68121 ± 0.05386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. CONCLUSION

This paper proposed a dual-stream architecture to explore hierarchical features on WSIs for cancer prognosis. This architecture utilized two specialized sub-streams to process low-resolution and high-resolution patches. To validate this architecture, we used the three publicly-available datasets from different cancer diseases. The result of comparative experiments showed that our dual-stream scheme could often outperform other SOTA methods. And our empirical analysis suggested that those classification-oriented SOTA methods couldn’t often generalize well for cancer prognosis. In addition, we conducted extensive experiments to examine our architecture, obtaining notable experimental findings. First, hierarchical dual-stream features were better than single-stream ones, as demonstrated on all datasets. Second, the result of model complexity exploration suggested that different cancer types might have different preferences for model complexity. Third, our proposed guidance pooling based on cross-attention was competitive with average pooling and global attention pooling. Fourth, feature concatenation was always better than feature addition in dual-stream feature fusion. And the sparse positional embedding of patch tokens sometimes could bring gains in prognosis accuracy.

We hope that our dual-stream scheme could encourage more works to visit WSI image pyramids, and that our dual-stream architecture could serve as an effective tool for WSI cancer prognosis. Moreover, we also expect that our empirical findings could provide insights for WSI prognosis modeling and further facilitate the future studies on cancer prognosis.
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