DeepSLM: Image Registration Aware of Sliding Interfaces for Motion-Compensated Reconstruction

Markus Susenburger¹, Pascal Paysan², Ricky Savjani², Joscha Maier¹, Igor Peterlik² and Marc Kachelrieß¹

¹ German Cancer Research Center (DKFZ), Heidelberg, Germany ² Varian Medical Systems, Baden-Dättwil, Switzerland





Motivation

- Sliding interface motion appears in patients at the border of different organs, for example at the ventral cavity. We will concentrate at the thoracic cavity and refer to it as sliding lung motion (SLM).
- Motion-compensated (MoCo) reconstruction can introduce nonphysiological motion at these anatomical regions.
- This is especially important, when it is used with high regularization, for example in MoCo reconstruction for 4D CBCT.







Motivation II

- Previous work by us has been dealt with MoCo reconstruction on short 4D CBCT scans.
- However, the respiration phase images are sparse and require strong regularization in the Demons image registration algorithm.
- To transfer the knowledge from the conventional image registration, to a deep learning framework, we apply as an intermediate step MoCo on 4D CT.







Aim

- Include sliding lung motion in a deep learning framework for deformable image registration.
- Prevent or suppress non-physiological motion in motion-compensated reconstruction.
- Show the benefit of motion-compensated reconstruction for 4D CT.





Deformable Image Registration

• In deformable image registration, we look for a motion vector field (MVF) *d*, which warps the source image *f* into the destination *g*:

$$g(\boldsymbol{r}) = f(\boldsymbol{r} + \boldsymbol{d}(\boldsymbol{r}))$$

• This search is usually conducted by optimizing a loss function, which features an image similarity metric and an MVF regularization:

 $\operatorname{argmin}_{\boldsymbol{d}} \mathcal{L}(f, g, \boldsymbol{d}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{SIM}}(f(\boldsymbol{d}), g) + \lambda \, \mathcal{L}_{\text{REG}}(\boldsymbol{d})$

 Common choices for the similarity loss is the I2 norm of the image differences and for the MVF regularization the I2 norm of the gradient of the MVF:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SIM}}(f(\boldsymbol{d}), g) = \|f(\boldsymbol{d}) - g\|_2^2$$
$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{REG}}(\boldsymbol{d}) = \|\nabla \boldsymbol{d}\|_2^2$$





Previous Work

 Alexander Schmidt-Richberg, Jan Erhardt et al., "Estimation of Slipping Organ Motion by Registration with Direction-Dependent Regularization," Medical Image Analysis 16(1), 150–159 (2012).

$$\mathcal{L}_{ ext{REG}} = \sum_{oldsymbol{r}} \|
abla oldsymbol{d}(oldsymbol{r}) \|_2^2 pprox \sum_{oldsymbol{r}} \|
abla oldsymbol{d}_\perp(oldsymbol{r}) \|_2^2 + \sum_{oldsymbol{r}} \|
abla oldsymbol{d}_\parallel(oldsymbol{r}) \|_2^2$$

- Sebastian Sauppe, Marc Kachelrieß et al., "Demons-Based Sliding Lung Motion Registration with Guided-Bilateral Filter at the Lung Border.", ECR 2018
- Markus Susenburger, Marc Kachelrieß et al., "4D Segmentation-Based Anatomy-Constrained Motion-Compensated Reconstruction of On-Board 4D CBCT Scans", CT Meeting 2020



Gaussian filter

guided-bilateral filter



SLM allowed





MVF Regularization

• For motion estimation with sliding lung motion constraint, we split the MVF *d* regularization into a part perpendicular d_{\perp} and tangential d_{\parallel} to the border of the ventral cavity segmentation *m*.

$$egin{split} \mathcal{L}_{ ext{REG}} &= \sum_{m{r}} \|
abla m{d}(m{r}) \|_2^2 pprox \sum_{m{r}} \|
abla m{d}_\perp(m{r}) \|_2^2 + \sum_{m{r}} \|
abla m{d}_\parallel(m{r}) \|_2^2 \ ext{with} \ m{d}_\perp &= rac{(m{n} \cdot m{d})m{n}}{m{n}^2} ext{ and } m{d}_\parallel = m{d} - m{d}_\perp \end{split}$$

• This approximation becomes an equality, if the normal vector field map *n* is smooth.





SLM Training Input Generation Weight and Normal Vector Field Map

• From an initial ventral cavity segmentation m, we can generate all necessary input for the training. n





EDT = Euclidean Distance Transform



DeepSLM Loss Function

• The loss function can be constructed as $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{SIM} + \lambda \mathcal{L}_{REG} = MSE + \lambda \mathcal{L}_{REG}$

• The choices for the motion vector field regularization loss are given by:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{VoxelMorph} \ \mathcal{L}_{\text{REG}} = \frac{1}{3N} \sum_{r} ||\nabla d||_{2}^{2} & \lambda_{\parallel} & \lambda_{\parallel} & 0 \\ \\ \text{global DeepSLM} \ \mathcal{L}_{\text{REG}} = \frac{1}{3N} \sum_{r} (||\nabla d_{\perp}||_{2}^{2} + \lambda_{\parallel}||\nabla d_{\parallel}||_{2}^{2}) & \square_{\lambda_{\parallel}} \\ \\ \text{local DeepSLM} \ \mathcal{L}_{\text{REG}} = \frac{1}{3N} \sum_{r} \begin{cases} ||\nabla d||_{2}^{2} & \text{if } \lambda_{\parallel} = 1 \\ ||\nabla d_{\perp}||_{2}^{2} + \lambda_{\parallel}||\nabla d_{\parallel}||_{2}^{2} & \text{else.} \end{cases} \\ \\ \text{strict DeepSLM} \ \mathcal{L}_{\text{REG}} = \frac{1}{3N} \sum_{r} \lambda_{\parallel} ||\nabla d||_{2}^{2} \end{cases}$$

Guha Balakrishnan, Adrian V. Dalca et al., "VoxelMorph: A Learning Framework for Deformable Medical Image Registration," IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging 38(8), 1788–1800 (2019).

A Siemens Healthineers Compan



Unsupervised Deep Learning of Deformable Image Registration

 Deformable image registration with unsupervised deep learning can be closely related to conventional registration algorithms. One such architecture is VoxelMorph, the basis for our networks.

	Demons-based with Guided Bilateral Filter	VoxelMorph	
type	conventional	unsupervised deep learning	
input	image pair, ventral cavity segmentation	image pair, ventral cavity segmentation only during training	
output	MVF and deformed source	MVF and deformed source	
multiresolution	yes	yes	
diffeomorphic	yes	yes	
cost function	MSE and L2 norm of MVF gradient	MSE and L2 norm of MVF gradient	

A Siemens Healthineers Compan



Network Architecture



A Siemens Healthineers Company



Data, Preparation and Training

- Clinical 4D CT, 10 respiration phases, all phases include a ventral cavity segmentation (70 training patients, 15 test patients)
- The data preprocessing:
 - Resample to cubic voxels (3×3×3 mm³).
 - Move center of mass of ventral cavity segmentation to center of volume.
 - Crop (x and y) or pad (z) volume to 224×224×128.
 - Offset and scale images individually into range [0,1].
- 150,000 registrations per training, each registration is a random selection of two phases from one random patient.
- Training parameters are similar to the ones used in VoxelMorph.





Results – Registration Register All Phases to One Phase



end of inhale

all phases average

All phases deformed to the target phase and average of the results. With a perfect registration, there would be no difference to the target phase.



mean volumes: C = -250 HU, W = 1500 HU difference volumes: C = 0 HU, W = 50 HU



Evaluation Metrics

• The methods are evaluated against local normalized cross correlation, root mean square error and DICE:

$$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{r} ||f(d) - g||_{2}^{2}}$$
$$NCC = \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{q} \frac{(\sigma_{f(d),q} - \mu_{f(d),q})(\sigma_{g,q} - \mu_{g,q})}{\sigma_{f(d),q}\sigma_{g,q}}$$
$$Dice = \frac{2|S_{f(d)} \cap S_{g}|}{|S_{f(d)}| + |S_{g}|}$$





Evaluation Losses

Test loss	unregistered image pairs	VM	global DeepSLM	local DeepSLM	strict DeepSLM
RMSE	0.013 ± 0.009	0.005 ± 0.002	0.005 ± 0.002	0.005 ± 0.002	0.005 ± 0.002
NCC	0.428 ± 0.081	0.464 ± 0.042	0.465 ± 0.036	0.464 ± 0.035	0.428 ± 0.081
Dice	0.989 ± 0.005	0.988 ± 0.003	0.987 ± 0.003	0.987 ± 0.003	0.989 ± 0.005





Motion-Compensated Reconstruction of 4D CT Images

 In motion-compensated reconstruction, we can use the full dose information and warp it into other phases. This results in 100% dose usage for each phase. Therefore, we just need to register each phase to all other phases:

$$f_{\rm MoCo}(i) = \sum_{j} f(\boldsymbol{d}_{j}^{i})$$





Results Motion-Compensated Reconstruction (4D CT)



difference to the 4D CT



C = -250 HU, W = 1500 HU 15 respirations per minute



Motion Vector Field Representation







Conclusions

- The vector field representation indicates that the network can apply the segmentations learned in the training during inference.
- The loss function from VoxelMorph can be adapted to match the loss function of the Demons-based SLM registration approaches.
- The regularization needed for registration in 4D CT is too small to show a significant improvement. A next step is to transfer the learned knowledge into the more complicated case of sparse 4D CBCT.





Thank You!

This study was supported by Varian Medical Systems. Job opportunities through DKFZ's international Fellowship programs (marc.kachelriess@dkfz.de). Parts of the reconstruction software were provided by RayConStruct[®] GmbH, Nürnberg, Germany



