Multi-pathology MRI lesion segmentation in a multi-centre cohort of patients with focal epilepsy: a MELD study

 Mathilde Ripart¹
 M.RIPART@UCL.AC.UK

 ¹ UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, London, UK
 MELD-consortium

 Sophie Adler^{*1}
 SEE APPENDIX

 Sophie Adler^{*1}
 SOPHIE.ADLER.13@UCL.AC.UK

 Konrad Wagstyl^{*2,1}
 KONRAD.WAGSTYL@GMAIL.COM

 ² School of Biomedical Engineering & Imaging Sciences, KCL, London, UK

Editors: Accepted for publication at MIDL 2024

Abstract

Drug-resistant focal epilepsy can be caused by structural lesions for which surgery can be curative if the lesion is found and fully resected. We built a large multi-centre MRI dataset of 1181 patients with focal epilepsy and 1009 healthy controls to train a state-of-the-art nnU-Net model to segment a range of aetiologies on T1w MRI scans. The model was able to detect different aetiological causes of focal epilepsy with a sensitivity of 73% in patients and a specificity of 90% in controls.

Keywords: lesion detection, nnU-Net, MRI, epilepsy, multi-centre

1. Introduction

Drug-resistant focal epilepsy (DRFE) can be caused by a range of structural brain abnormalities, from large tumours to small, difficult-to-detect cortical malformations. Resective brain surgery is a potentially curative treatment. The likelihood of being offered surgery and the rate of post-surgical seizure freedom is higher if the abnormality is detected on MRI. Diagnosing these lesions is a widely-recognised challenge in epilepsy, with 10-50% of lesions described as "MRI negative", i.e. not found on MRI review (Eriksson et al., 2023; Téllez-Zenteno et al., 2010). AI models have been developed to aid in the detection of specific epilepsy pathologies, such as focal cortical dysplasia (FCD) or hippocampal sclerosis (HS) (Spitzer and Ripart et al., 2022; Ripart et al., 2023). However, at the point of MRI review, the underlying pathology is not known and there is an urgent clinical need to develop models capable of detecting a broad range of those pathologies. In this study, we leverage the MELD Focal Epilepsy dataset, the largest collection of 3D MRI scans in patients with drug-resistant focal epilepsy, to investigate whether a single classifier can segment a variety of structural causes of focal epilepsy.

2. Material and Methods

2.1. Cohort and dataset preparation

Following national and local Institutional Review Board approval, data were retrospectively collected and anonymised from 18 epilepsy centres worldwide. The study included 1181

^{*} Contributed equally

^{© 2024} CC-BY 4.0, M. Ripart, M. MELD-consortium, S. Adler & K. Wagstyl.

patients with DRFE and a radiological or histopathological lesion. Pathologies included focal cortical dysplasia (FCD), hippocampal sclerosis (HS), low-grade epilepsy-associated tumours (LEAT) (including dysembryoplastic neuroepithelial tumours (DNET) and gangliogliomas), hypothalamic hamartoma (HH), cavernoma (CAV), polymicrogyria (PMG), periventricular nodular heterotopia (PNH) and other pathologies. A cohort of 1009 controls was included. All participants had a 3D T1w scan acquired on a 1.5T or 3T MRI scanner. The cohort was split into 80% train-val and 20% test datasets using stratified random sampling by pathology, site, and histological status to ensure a good representation of each of the groups in the training and test datasets (Figure 1). T1w scans underwent neuroanatomical brain segmentation using Synthseg (Billot et al., 2023). For patients with hippocampal lesions, the SynthSeg hippocampal segmentation was used as the ground truth lesion mask. For all other lesions, experts manually drew the ground truth lesion mask on the preoperative T1w scan. Lesion mask preprocessing included a dilation-erosion algorithm to fill in small defects/holes derived from masking in 2D and removal of any CSF voxels, using the Synthesis CSF segmentation. For patients with dual pathologies (e.g. HS & FCD in FCD Type 3a), hippocampal labels were merged with the manual cortical lesion mask.

2.2. Training and evaluating the model

T1w MRI scans were used to train a nnU-Net model (Isensee et al., 2021) to segment focal lesions using the ground truth lesion masks. The nnU-Net was trained for 1000 epochs with the '3d_fullres' configuration. The model's predictions were connected to regroup any fragmented clusters, discarding those containing fewer than 100 voxels. The model was evaluated on the test dataset for its sensitivity in detecting lesions (i.e. minimum 1 voxel overlap between the prediction and the mask) and specificity in controls (i.e. no prediction). We report the performance of the model on the test dataset and test dataset subgroups: pathology, age group, histology confirmation and MRI status.

3. Results

Model performance is detailed in Figure 1. The model detected 170 out of the 232 focal epilepsy abnormalities in patients (73% sensitivity). It accurately detected 63% of FCD, 91% of HS, 80% of LEAT, 60% of CAV, 67% of PMG and 50% of HH, PNH and other pathologies. Notably, the model accurately detected 13 out of the 29 abnormalities (45%) previously reported MRI-negative. Patients had a median of 0 false-positive clusters predicted, and the model accurately predicted no putative lesions in 182 out of 202 healthy controls (90% specificity). Figure 2 depicts examples of seven accurate predictions in patients with different underlying pathologies. The radiological characteristics visibly differ between the pathologies. Nonetheless, the model was able to segment these pathologies with a good overlap with the manual lesion masks.

4. Discussion

We demonstrate that a single deep-learning model can segment a variety of pathologies associated with focal epilepsy on T1w MRI, on an heterogenous cohort, representing a range of ages, countries and MRI scanners. The algorithm successfully detected 45% of MRInegative lesions, evidence of its potential utility as a radiological adjunct. Furthermore, radiological delineation of subtle lesions in epilepsy typically relies on inspection of a 3D FLAIR, and we anticipate future work incorporating additional sequences will further boost model performance. This work represents a significant step forward in the development of a robust automated lesion segmentation tool that could help in the presurgical planning for patients with focal epilepsy, potentially aiding early identification and referral of candidates for epilepsy surgery, and reducing the need for invasive investigations.

			Demographic and clinical information		Model performances on the test dataset	
			Training dataset	Test dataset	Detection rate % (n)	Number of FP cluster IQR [0.25, 0.5, 0.75]
Healthy controls (n)			807	202	90.1% (182/202)	[0, 0, 0]
Sex (m:f)			319:488	70:132	-	-
Age at scan, years (median [min-max])			34.0 [0.4-78.0]	36.5 [1.9-68.0]	-	-
Patients (n)			949	232	73.3% (170/232)	[0, 0, 1]
Sex (m:f)			486:463	118:114	-	-
Age of epilepsy onset, years (median [IQR])		7.5 [2.5-15.0]	7.5 [3.0-15.0]	-	-	
Age at scan	years (median [min-max])		22.5 [0.1-69.0]	22.0 [1.0-60.4]	-	-
	Children (< 18 years old)		402	96	64.6% (62/96)	[0, 0.5, 2]
	Adults (≥ 18 years old)		547	136	79.4% (108/136)	[0, 0, 1]
		FCD	389	101	63.4% (64/101)	[0, 1, 2]
		HS	298	74	90.5% (67/74)	[0, 0, 0]
		LEAT	124	30	80.0% (24/30)	[0, 0, 1]
Histopathology (n)		CAV	45	10	60.0% (6/10)	[0, 0, 1]
		PMG	16	3	66.7% (2/3)	[0, 0, 0]
		нн	16	2	50.0% (1/2)	[2, 2, 2]
		PNH	16	4	50.0% (2/4)	[0.75, 1, 1]
		Other	45	8	50.0% (4/8)	[0, 0, 1]
Carelanada	- 61-4	yes	765 (81%)	189 (81%)	74.1% (140/189)	[0, 0, 1]
commed on histopathology		no	184 (19%)	43 (19%)	69.8% (30/43)	[0, 1, 1]
Ever reported MRI-negative (n) yes		yes	93/722 (13%)	29/176 (16%)	44.8% (13/29)	[0, 0, 1]
		no	629/722 (87%)	147/176 (83%)	72.1% (106/147)	[0, 0, 1]

Figure 1: Demographic and clinical information of the training and test datasets and model performances on the test dataset. (FP: False Positives, IQR: interquartile range)



Figure 2: Examples of segmentation of multiple focal epilepsy pathologies. Coronal views of the T1w scan with and without the ground truth lesion mask, model prediction, and their overlap overlayed.

Acknowledgments

MR and SA are supported by the Rosetrees Trust (A2665) and Epilepsy Research Institute (P2208). SG and HP are supported by Seed grant from Amrita Institute of Medical Science. PS and KH are supported by Health and Care Research Wales. NTC is supported by AAN Career Development Award. IW is supported by NIH R01 NS109439. GMR and AI are supported by FONDECYT (1210195, FONDECYT 1210176, 1220995). AR is supported by Supported by Research Program "MNESYS (PNRR-MUR-M4C2 PE0000006). MHE is supported by The Sigrid Jusélius Foundation. JD is supported by BRC. GPW is supported by MRC (G0802012, MR/M00841X/1). JSD is supported by NIHR. JEI is supported by NIH (1RF1MH123195, 1R01AG070988, 1R01EB031114, 1UM1MH130981, 1RF1AG080371). KW is supported by the Wellcome Trust.

References

- Benjamin Billot et al. Synthseg: Segmentation of brain mri scans of any contrast and resolution without retraining. *Medical Image Analysis*, 86:102789, 2023.
- Maria H. Eriksson et al. Pediatric epilepsy surgery from 2000 to 2018: Changes in referral and surgical volumes, patient characteristics, genetic testing, and postsurgical outcomes. *Epilepsia*, June, 2023.
- Fabian Isensee et al. nnu-net: A self-configuring method for deep learning-based biomedical image segmentation. *Nature Methods*, 18(2):203–11, 2021.
- Mathilde Ripart et al. Automated and interpretable detection of hippocampal sclerosis in temporal lobe epilepsy: Aid-hs. *medRxiv*, 2023.
- Hannah Spitzer and Mathilde Ripart et al. Interpretable surface-based detection of focal cortical dysplasias: A multi-centre epilepsy lesion detection study. Brain: A Journal of Neurology, August, 2022.
- José Téllez-Zenteno et al. Isurgical outcomes in lesional and non-lesional epilepsy: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Epilepsy Research*, 89:310–18, 2010.

Appendix A. MELD consortium

Siby Gopinath ³	SIBYGOPI@GMAIL.COM
3 Amrita Advanced Centre for Epilepsy (AACE)	, Amrita Institute of Medical Sciences,
Amrita Vishwa Vidyapeetham, Kochi, Kerala, Ind	ia
Harilal Parasuram 3	HARILAL.NAVAMI@GMAIL.COM
Jiajie Mo^4	JIAJIEMO@FOXMAIL.COM
⁴ Beijing Tiantan Hospital, Beijing, China	
Kai Zhang ⁴	ZHANGKAI62035@SINA.COM
$Marcus Likeman^5$	MARCUS.LIKEMAN@UHBW.NHS.UK
⁵ Bristol Royal Hospital for Children, Bristol, UK	
Georgian Ciobotaru ⁶	NEUROCHIRURGIE@DOCTORCIOBOTARU.RO

⁶ Central Emergency Military Hospital, Bucarest, Romania Philip Sequeiros-Peggs⁷ P.SEQUEIROSPEGGS@BTINTERNET.COM ⁷ University Hospital of Wales, Cardiff, UK James Galea⁷ GALEAJ2@CARDIFF.AC.UK Khalid Hamandi⁷ HAMANDIK@CARDIFF.AC.UK Venkata Sita Priyanka Illapani⁸ VILLAPANI@CHILDRENSNATIONAL.ORG ⁸ Center for Neuroscience, Children's National Hospital, US Hua Xie⁸ HXIE@CHILDRENSNATIONAL.ORG Nathan T. Cohen⁸ NCOHEN@CHILDRENSNATIONAL.ORG William D. Gaillard^{8,9} WGAILLAR@CHILDRENSNATIONAL.ORG ⁹ Geo Washington University, US Ting-Yu Su^{10,11} SUT@CCF.ORG ¹⁰ Epilepsy Center, Neurological Institute, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, OH, US ¹¹ Biomedical Engineering, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, US Rvuzaburo Kochi¹⁰ RYUZABURO0618@HOTMAIL.CO.JP Irene $Wang^{10}$ WANGI2@CCF.ORG Gonzalo M. Rojas-Costa^{12,13} GONZALO.ROJAS.COSTA@GMAIL.COM ¹² Advanced Epilepsy Center, Clínica las Condes, Santiago, Chile ¹³ School of Medicine, Finis Terrae University, Santiago, Chile Agustín Ibáñez^{14,15} AGUSTIN.IBANEZ@GBHI.ORG ¹⁴ Latin America Brain Health Institute (BrainLat), Universidad Adolfo Ibanez, Chile ¹⁵ Global Brain Health Institute (GBHI), Trinity College Dublin, Ireland Costanza Parodi¹⁶ COSTANZA.BIANCA.PARODI@GMAIL.COM ¹⁶ Department of Neuroradiology, IRCCS Istituto Giannina Gaslini, Genova, Italy Mariasavina Severino¹⁶ MARIASAVINASEVERINO@GASLINI.ORG **Domenico Tortora**¹⁶ DOMENICOTORTORA@GASLINI.ORG Giulia Nobile¹⁷ GIULIA.NOBILE@GASLINI.ORG ¹⁷ Unit of Child Neuropsychiatry, Department of Medical and Surgical Neuroscience and Rehabilitation, IRCCS Istituto Giannina Gaslini, Genova, Italy Alessandro Consales¹⁸ ALESSANDROCONSALES@GASLINI.ORG ¹⁸ Division of Neurosurgery, IRCCS Istituto Giannina Gaslini, Genova, Italy. Antonella Riva^{19,20} RIVA.ANTO94@GMAIL.COM ¹⁹ IRCCS Istituto Giannina Gaslini, Genova, Italy ²⁰ Department of Neurosciences, Rehabilitation, Ophthalmology, Genetics, Maternal and Child Health, University of Genova, Genova, Italy Felice D'Arco²¹ FELICE.D'ARCO@GOSH.NHS.UK ²¹ Radiology department, Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children, London, UK Kshitij Mankad²¹ KSHITIJ.MANKAD@GOSH.NHS.UK Aswin Chari²² ASWIN.CHARI.18@UCL.AC.UK ²² Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children, London, UK Martin Tisdall²² MARTIN.TISDALL@GOSH.NHS.UK Maria H. Eriksson^{1,23} M.ERIKSSON.16@UCL.AC.UK ²³ The Hospital for Sick Children (SickKids), Toronto, Canada Rory J. Piper^{1,24} RORY.PIPER.20@UCL.AC.UK ²⁴ Department of Neurosurgery, Great Ormond Street Hospital, London, UK

Chris A. Clark¹ CHRISTOPHER.CLARK@UCL.AC.UK J. Helen Cross¹ H.CROSS@UCL.AC.UK Torsten Baldeweg¹ T.BALDEWEG@UCL.AC.UK Adrián Valls Carbó²⁵ ADRIANVALLSC@GMAIL.COM ²⁵ Department of Neurology, Epilepsy Program, Ruber International Hospital, Madrid, Spain Rafael Toledano²⁵ RTOLEDANO@RUBERINTERNACIONAL.ES Callum M. Simpson²⁶ C.SIMPSON5@NEWCASTLE.AC.UK ²⁶ School of Computing, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK Yujiang Wang²⁶ YUJIANG.WANG@NEWCASTLE.AC.UK Peter Taylor²⁶ PETER.TAYLOR@NEWCASTLE.AC.UK Antonio Napolitano²⁷ ANTONIO.NAPOLITANO@OPBG.NET ²⁷ Medical Physics Unit, Bambino Gesù children's hospital, IRCCS, Rome, Italy Luca De Palma²⁸ LUCA.DEPALMA@OPBG.NET ²⁸ Neurology, Epilepsy and Movement Disorders, Bambino Gesù Children's Hospital, IR-CCS, Rome, Italy Alessandro De Benedictis²⁹ ALESSANDRO.DEBENEDICTIS@OPBG.NET ²⁹ Neurosurgery Unit, Bambino Gesù Children's Hospital, IRCCS, Rome, Italy Maria Camilla Rossi-Espagnet³⁰ MCAMILLA.ROSSI@OPBG.NET ³⁰ Functional and Interventional Neuroradiology Unit, Bambino Gesù children's hospital, IRCCS, Rome, Italy Anna Willard³¹ ANNA.WILLARD@MONASH.EDU ³¹ Department of Neuroscience, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia Ben Sinclair^{31,32} BEN.SINCLAIR@MONASH.EDU ³² Department of Neurology, Alfred Health, Melbourne, Australia Lucy Vivash^{31,32} LUCY.VIVASH@MONASH.EDU Joshua Pepper³³ JOSHUA.PEPPER1@NHS.NET ³³ Birmingham Women's and Children's NHS Foundation Trust, Birmingham, UK Stefano Seri³³ S.SERI@NHS.NET David N. Vaughan^{34,35} DAVID.VAUGHAN@FLOREY.EDU.AU ³⁴ Florey Institute of Neuroscience and Mental Health, Melbourne, Australia ³⁵ Department of Neurology, Austin Health, Melbourne, Australia Donna Parker³⁴ DONNA.PARKER@FLOREY.EDU.AU Graeme Jackson³⁴ GJACKSON@BRAIN.ORG.AU Heath R. Pardoe³⁴ HEATH.PARDOE@FLOREY.EDU.AU Jane de Tisi^{36,37} J.DETISI@UCL.AC.UK ³⁶ UCL Queen Square Institute of Neurology, London, UK ³⁷ National Hospital for Neurology and Neurosurgery, London, UK Gavin P. Winston^{36,38} GAVIN.WINSTON@QUEENSU.CA ³⁸ Department of Medicine, Queen's University, Kingston, Canada John S. Duncan^{36,37} J.DUNCAN@UCL.AC.UK Clarissa L. Yasuda^{39,40} CYASUDA@UNICAMP.BR ³⁹ UNICAMP University of Campinas, Campinas, Brasil ⁴⁰ Brazilian Institute of Neuroscience and Neurotechnology, Brazil Lucas Scárdua-Silva³⁹ SCARDUA@UNICAMP.BR Marina K. M. Alvim³⁹MARINAKM@UNICAMP.BRFernando Cendes³⁹FCENDES@GMAIL.COMLennart Walger^{41,42}LENNART.WALGER@UKBONN.DE⁴¹ Department of Neuroradiology, University Hospital Bonn, Bonn, Germany⁴² Department of Epileptology, University Hospital Bonn, Bonn, GermanyTheodor Rüber^{41,42}THEODOR.RUEBER@UKBONN.DEJuan Eugenio Iglesias^{43,44}E.IGLESIAS@UCL.AC.UK⁴³ Massachusetts General Hospital & Harvard Medical School, USA⁴⁴ Centre for Medical Image Computing, UCL, UK