Robust Image Segmentation Quality Assessment

Leixin Zhou LEIXIN-ZHOU@UIOWA.EDU Wenxiang Deng WENXIANG-DENG@UIOWA.EDU Xiaodong Wu XIAODONG-WU@UIOWA.EDU Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Iowa, USA

Abstract

Deep learning based image segmentation methods have achieved great success, even having human-level accuracy in some applications. However, due to the black box nature of deep learning, the best method may fail in some situations. Thus predicting segmentation quality without ground truth would be very crucial especially in clinical practice. Recently, people proposed to train neural networks to estimate the quality score by regression. Although it can achieve promising prediction accuracy, the network suffers robustness problem, e.g. it is vulnerable to adversarial attacks. In this paper, we propose to alleviate this problem by utilizing the difference between the input image and the reconstructed image, which is conditioned on the segmentation to be assessed, to lower the chance to overfit to the undesired image features from the original input image, and thus to increase the robustness. Results on ACDC17 dataset demonstrated our method is promising.

Keywords: Robust, Segmentation Quality, Deep Learning

1. Introduction

Segmentation quality assessment with the absence of ground truth, which estimates segmentation accuracy without human or expert intervention, is of high interest in medical imaging research and clinical fields. In many applications, the deep learning based segmentation methods can even achieve expert-level accuracy. However, in practice, deep learning methods may fail due to many factors: such as domain shift (Patel et al., 2015), adversarial noise, and low image quality. Therefore predicting segmentation quality without ground truth would be very crucial and of high interest for the downstream analysis.

One straightforward idea is to predict segmentation quality using a CNN regression network, where the image and its segmentation are concatenated as different channels to feed into the network (Robinson et al., 2018b,a). However, that state-of-the-art method suffers the robustness problem if the input images have a different distribution from that of those training datasets for the regress network. This can be demonstrated with adversarial attacks, in which it involves adding hand-crafted perturbations to the images drew from the distribution of training data and leading to misbehave for deep neural networks.

Inspired by the work of representation learning and factorization (Mirza and Osindero, 2014; Chartsias et al., 2018), we propose to improve the prediction robustness by extracting features directly related to the segmentation. More precisely, we propose to utilize the difference of the original input image and the reconstructed image conditioned on the input image and the input segmentation. Our work is most related to Kohlberger *et al.*'s work (Kohlberger et al., 2012), in which the quality assessment score is estimated by re-



Figure 1: The work flow of proposed segmentation quality assessment method.

gression based on numerous statistical and energy measures from segmentation algorithms. Our method also shares merits of unsupervised lesion or outlier detection (Schlegl et al., 2017; Baur et al., 2018; Chen and Konukoglu, 2018; Pawlowski et al., 2018; Seeböck et al., 2016; Alaverdyan et al., 2018), where only normal data (ground truth segmentation in our scenario) is utilized in the training of the reconstruction network.

Contributions: In this paper, we propose to make use of features directly related to segmentation to improve the robustness of the quality regression network for segmentation quality assessment. To achieve this goal, we have developed two CNNs: one is a reconstruction network (REC-Net), which aims to reconstruct the original image from the image masked by the provided segmentation; the other is a quality regression network (REG-Net), which predicts the segmentation quality based on the reconstruction difference image and the provided segmentation. Our experiments on ACDC17 dataset ¹ have demonstrated highly promising performance of the proposed method.

2. Method

Assume the input image, its ground truth segmentation and the candidate segmentation (to be assessed) are $\mathcal{I}_{in} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $\mathcal{S}_{gt} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{seg} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$, respectively. It is trivial to apply any metric functions (e.g. Dice, Jaccard scores) to the pair \mathcal{S}_{gt} and \mathcal{S}_{seg} to get the ground truth segmentation quality score, e.g. \mathcal{GT}_{dice} . However, the absence of \mathcal{S}_{gt} makes generating Dice prediction \mathcal{P}_{dice} non-trivial.

The flow of the proposed method is demonstrated as in Fig. 1. We use $\mathcal{I}_{in|S}$ to represent the image with the segmented target S being masked by zero, in which $S_{ij} = 1$ if the corresponding pixel belongs to the target; otherwise $S_{ij} = 0$. More specifically, $\mathcal{I}_{in|S} = \mathcal{I}_{in} \cdot (1 - S)$. In other words, all pixels that are labeled by S as the target object in \mathcal{I}_{in} are set to zero intensity. The reconstructed image using the proposed reconstruction network (REC-Net) from $\mathcal{I}_{in|S}$, is denoted as \mathcal{I}_{rec} . The difference image \mathcal{I}_{dif} , which serves as one input channel to the quality regression network (REG-Net), is defined as: $\mathcal{I}_{dif} = \mathcal{I}_{in} - \mathcal{I}_{rec}$. The output of REG-Net \mathcal{P}_{dice} is the predicted score for the segmentation quality.

During the training of REC-Net, only pairs of \mathcal{I}_{in} and its \mathcal{S}_{gt} are utilized. The rationale behind is that the REC-Net is trained to well recover the original input image only when \mathcal{S} is a good segmentation. However, during the training of REG-Net, segmentations of different quality have to be used to teach the REG-Net the quality measure. The REC-Net and the REG-Net have a U-net and Alex-net architectures, respectively.

^{1.} https://www.creatis.insa-lyon.fr/Challenge/acdc/databases.html

Method	$\epsilon = 0$	$\epsilon = 0.05$	$\epsilon = 0.1$	$\epsilon = 0.2$	$\epsilon = 0.3$
Robinson <i>et al</i> .	$0.04{\pm}0.05$	$0.08 {\pm} 0.06$	$0.11 {\pm} 0.07$	$0.14{\pm}0.08$	$0.16 {\pm} 0.09$
proposed	$0.04{\pm}0.05$	$0.07 {\pm} 0.06$	$0.09{\pm}0.06$	$0.09 {\pm} 0.07$	$0.12 {\pm} 0.09$

Table 1: Mean absolute errors of dice prediction under different levels of adversarial attack.

3. Experiments

3.1. Data

To validate the proposed segmentation quality assessment method, we utilize a public dataset: Automated Cardiac Diagnosis Challenge (ACDC) MICCAI challenge 2017. For our experiments, only segmentation of left-ventricular myocardium (LVM), which is very challenging, was considered. To train the REG-Net, segmentations of different quality have to be generated first. In our experiments, in contrast to random forests used in (Robinson et al., 2018a), U-nets with different depths, different number of starting filters and different training epochs, were applied to generate the simulated segmentations with different quality.

3.2. Adversarial attacks generation

We compared the robustness of our proposed method with respect to adversarial attacks against the state-of-the-art methods (Robinson et al., 2018a, 2017, 2018b). We applied a simple fast gradient sign method (Kurakin et al., 2016) to generate the adversarial images for REG-Net to conduct our experiments. Only adversarial attacks on the original images \mathcal{I}_{in} and the difference image \mathcal{I}_{dif} were considered and no changes were made to \mathcal{S}_{seg} .

3.3. Performance comparison

The mean absolution error (MAE) of the Dice scores, $MAE = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{SN} |\mathcal{P}_{dice}^i - \mathcal{GT}_{dice}^i|}{SN}$, was utilized as the metric, where SN is total number of slices in the test set. The results without adversarial attacks are shown in column $\epsilon = 0$ in Table. 1. As can be seen, when there is no attack, the proposed method works as well as Robinson *et al.*'s (Robinson *et al.*, 2018a, 2017, 2018b). The performance when having attacks is demonstrated in the right most four columns in Table. 1. It can be noticed that for both methods, the MAEs are monotonically non-decreasing as the attack level increases. However, the proposed method has a smaller increasing rate and works better than Robinson *et al.*'s.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, a robust method for segmentation quality assessment has been proposed. We make use of the image difference between the input image and the reconstructed image using our proposed image reconstruction network (REC-Net), as the feature image for the quality score regression network (REG-Net). Results on ACDC17 dataset verified our method is more robust.

References

- Zara Alaverdyan, Julien Jung, Romain Bouet, and Carole Lartizien. Regularized siamese neural network for unsupervised outlier detection on brain multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging: application to epilepsy lesion screening. 2018.
- Christoph Baur, Benedikt Wiestler, Shadi Albarqouni, and Nassir Navab. Deep autoencoding models for unsupervised anomaly segmentation in brain mr images. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.04488*, 2018.
- Agisilaos Chartsias, Thomas Joyce, Giorgos Papanastasiou, Scott Semple, Michelle Williams, David Newby, Rohan Dharmakumar, and Sotirios A Tsaftaris. Factorised spatial representation learning: application in semi-supervised myocardial segmentation. arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.07031, 2018.
- Xiaoran Chen and Ender Konukoglu. Unsupervised detection of lesions in brain mri using constrained adversarial auto-encoders. arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.04972, 2018.
- Timo Kohlberger, Vivek Singh, Chris Alvino, Claus Bahlmann, and Leo Grady. Evaluating segmentation error without ground truth. In *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*, pages 528–536. Springer, 2012.
- Alexey Kurakin, Ian Goodfellow, and Samy Bengio. Adversarial examples in the physical world. arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.02533, 2016.
- Mehdi Mirza and Simon Osindero. Conditional generative adversarial nets. arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.1784, 2014.
- Vishal M Patel, Raghuraman Gopalan, Ruonan Li, and Rama Chellappa. Visual domain adaptation: A survey of recent advances. *IEEE signal processing magazine*, 32(3):53–69, 2015.
- Nick Pawlowski, Matthew CH Lee, Martin Rajchl, Steven McDonagh, Enzo Ferrante, Konstantinos Kamnitsas, Sam Cooke, Susan Stevenson, Aneesh Khetani, Tom Newman, et al. Unsupervised lesion detection in brain ct using bayesian convolutional autoencoders. 2018.
- Robert Robinson, Vanya V Valindria, Wenjia Bai, Hideaki Suzuki, Paul M Matthews, Chris Page, Daniel Rueckert, and Ben Glocker. Automatic quality control of cardiac mri segmentation in large-scale population imaging. In *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*, pages 720–727. Springer, 2017.
- Robert Robinson, Ozan Oktay, Wenjia Bai, Vanya Valindria, Mihir Sanghvi, Nay Aung, José Paiva, Filip Zemrak, Kenneth Fung, Elena Lukaschuk, et al. Real-time prediction of segmentation quality. arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.06244, 2018a.
- Robert Robinson, Ozan Oktay, Wenjia Bai, Vanya V Valindria, Mihir M Sanghvi, Nay Aung, José Miguel Paiva, Filip Zemrak, Kenneth Fung, Elena Lukaschuk, et al. Subject-level prediction of segmentation failure using real-time convolutional neural nets. 2018b.

- Thomas Schlegl, Philipp Seeböck, Sebastian M Waldstein, Ursula Schmidt-Erfurth, and Georg Langs. Unsupervised anomaly detection with generative adversarial networks to guide marker discovery. In *International Conference on Information Processing in Medical Imaging*, pages 146–157. Springer, 2017.
- Philipp Seeböck, Sebastian Waldstein, Sophie Klimscha, Bianca S Gerendas, René Donner, Thomas Schlegl, Ursula Schmidt-Erfurth, and Georg Langs. Identifying and categorizing anomalies in retinal imaging data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.00686*, 2016.