

Atlas-Based Under-Segmentation

Christian Wachinger^{1,2}, Polina Golland¹ ¹Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence Lab (CSAIL), MIT ²Massachusetts General Hospital, Harvard Medical School



Introduction

- Atlas-based segmentation is commonly used in medical image analysis
- Tendency of atlas-based segmentation to under-segment structures
- Dice overlap and Hausdorff distance do not measure under-segmentation
- Wang, Yushkevich (2012) proposed deconvolution of label maps
- Contributions:
 - Volume overlap measures to quantify under-segmentation
 - Hypothesis: asymmetry in single organ segmentation as cause
 - Generative model of background to correct under-segmentation

0

Segmentation of parotid glands in CT images



Red: manual, Yellow: automatic

Merging several structures to one background label







- Quantitative segmentation results for three applications
- Under-segmentation errors significantly higher than over-segmentation errors





White matter (WM), Gray matter (GM), Hippocampus (HC), Caudate (CA), Putamen (PU), Pallidum (PA), Amygdala (AM), Accumbens (AC), Ventricles (VE)

Hypothesis for under-segmentation

- Under-segmentation is caused by asymmetry in foreground-background segmentation
- Merging all surrounding labels into background creates a new meta-label that dominates the voting process
- Multi-organ segmentation of brain supports hypothesis

Illustration of multi-organ and foreground-background segmentation

Second column: under-segmentation



Red: manual, Yellow: automatic, White: voxel of interest

Multi-organ brain segmentation



Latent multi-label model of the background

- Generative model for the unsupervised separation of the background in K components and simultaneous estimation of K
- Dirichlet process Gaussian mixture model (DP-GMM) on patches:

 $\mathcal{P} = \{ P_{ix} : x \in \Gamma, S_i(x) = b \}$









Replace background label with mixture component:

$$S_i(x) = b$$
 \longrightarrow $S_i(x) = z_{ix}$ $z_{ix} \in \{1, \dots, K\}$

 $(\mu_k, \Sigma_k) \sim \mathcal{NW}(\lambda)$



Label maps specify likelihood of each label: $L^{l}(x) = \sum p(S(x) = l|S_{i}) \cdot p(I(x)|I_{i}) \quad l \in \{1, \dots, \eta\}$

Label likelihood term:

$$p(S(x) = l|S_i) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } S_i(\phi_i(x)) = l, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Intensity likelihood term:

$$p(I(x)|I_i) \propto \exp\left(-(I(x) - I_i(\phi_i(x)))^2/2\sigma^2\right)$$

Most likely label yields segmentation:

$$\hat{S}(x) = \arg\max_{l} L^{l}(x)$$

Foreground-Background segmentation: $L^f(x) > L^b(x)$

Results

- Datasets:
 - 16 heart MRA images (0.6x0.6x1.5mm)
 - 18 head and neck CT scans (0.9x0.9x2.5mm)
 - 39 brain MRI with 1mm isotropic resolution
- Comparison to deconvolution (Wang, 2012)
- Details:
- DP-GMM, GMM, DP-means, k-means



Brain



- Global and local approach
- Patch size: 3 x 3 x 3

§ 50

40

b 30

. हु 20

and ur

Conclusions

- Significant bias in atlas-based segmentation to under-segmentation
- Asymmetry in foreground-background segmentation as new hypothesis
- Generative model to partition background reduces under-segmentation

Acknowledgement:

We thank Jason Chang and Greg Sharp. This work was supported in part by the National Alliance for Medical Image Computing (U54-EB005149) and the NeuroImaging Analysis Center (P41-EB015902).

