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ABSTRACT

In this paper, we present a novel and efficient method for brain tumor (and sub-regions) segmentation in multimodal MR images based on a fully convolutional network (FCN) that enables end-to-end training and fast inference. Our structure consists of a downsampling path and three upsampling paths, which extract multi-level contextual information by concatenating hierarchical feature representation from each upsampling path. Meanwhile, we introduce a symmetry-driven FCN by the proposal of using symmetry difference images. The model was evaluated on Brain Tumor Image Segmentation Benchmark (BRATS) 2013 challenge dataset and achieved the state-of-the-art results while the computational cost is less than competitors.

Index Terms— FCN, brain tumor segmentation

1. INTRODUCTION

Gliomas are the most frequent primary brain tumors in adults [1] and can be classified as high-grade (HG) or low-grade (LG) based on the aggressive form of the disease. Multimodal MRI is usually utilized to enhance the contrast of tumor and its structures. Fig. 1 shows a typical HG gliomas tumor with experts’ delineation of tumor structure: edema (green), necrosis (red), non-enhancing (blue) and enhancing tumor (yellow). The last three also make up a super-structure called tumor core.

Clinically, precise segmentations of tumors are crucial for making treatment plans, guiding surgery and follow-up of individual patients. Unreliable segmentation may mislead surgery, which could cause irreversible impact, e.g., the loss of brain functions such as speaking or reading. However, it is tedious and time-consuming to segment brain tumor manually, especially in 3D MR images. Automatic and reliable segmentation of gliomas brain tumor is an active topic for decades with challenges on the diversity and variation of tumor size, shape, and location and appearance.

A common approach is to pose this problem as classifying voxels into different tissues using hand-crafted features, followed by conditional random fields (CRF) models, incorporating smoothness terms of the classification results and maximizing label agreement between pixels in the neighborhood [1, 2, 3]. Nowadays, deep convolutional neural network (CNN) achieved several substantial breakthrough in several image recognition benchmarks, such as image classification [4, 5], semantic segmentation [6, 7] and object detection [8] and is getting popular in applications of medical imaging. Basically, CNN automatically learns high-level discriminative feature representations through a supervised manner. When CNN were applied to MRI brain tumor segmentation they achieved the state-of-the-art results [9, 10, 11]. Specifically, [10] trained a traditional 2D CNN on 2D image patches. During testing, 2D patches were extracted from the new images by a sliding window and assigned labels for the central pixel. [9] used 2D CNN on larger 2D patches in a cascade way to capture both local and global contextual information. [11] learned 3D CNN on 3D patches and considered global contextual feature via downsampling the original 3D patches. All these methods are patch-level based. Fully convolutional networks (FCN) are recently studied by [6, 7] and achieved promising results for natural image segmentation. It replaces the fully connected layers in the traditional CNN with all convolutional kernels and includes upsampling or deconvolutional layers to transform back to original spatial size. Thus, it can take input of arbitrary size and enables image end-to-end training as well as fast inference. Although FCN has been recently applied to medical image segmentation tasks [12, 13, 14], but not for brain tumor.

In this paper, we propose an automatic method for brain tumor segmentation based on FCN. The main contributions of our paper are: 1) to our best knowledge, we are the first to apply FCN for multimodal brain tumor (and sub-structure)
segmentation; 2) our proposed FCN structure is simple and efficient, with only one loss layer coupling features at different levels; 3) we introduce brain symmetry inputs to FCN to further improve the segmentation performance; 4) our model is ranked top on BRATS 2013 testing set, and more efficient than the other competitors.

2. METHODOLOGY

In this section, we present an efficient fully convolutional network (FCN) for brain tumor segmentation. The proposed network is a variant which combines multiscale information from different stages and also takes full advantage of convolutional kernels for efficient and effective image segmentation.

2.1. Our FCN structure

The architecture of the proposed method is illustrated in Fig. 2. It contains two modules, i.e., one downsampling path with convolutional and maxpooling layers and three upsampling paths with upsampling and convolutional layers. The downsampling path aims at enlarging receptive fields to encode high level abstract and contextual information to detect tumors, while the upsampling paths reconstruct the fine details such as tumor boundaries. We designed the upsampling paths in a hierarchical manner to take full advantage of including multiple scale feature maps from downsampling path.

The downsampling path is similar to VGG-16 network [5], but instead of using total 5 convolutional blocks (one convolutional blocks contains two or three convolutional layers with $3 \times 3$ kernels and 1 maxpooling layer with $2 \times 2$ strides), we only use the first 3 convolutional blocks. There are three main reasons for only adopting the first 3 convolutional blocks: 1) unlike natural images which mostly contains rich high-level semantic features, medical images are mostly based on low-level texture features. Thus going deeper may not be helpful for medical images as limited high-level feature information could be learned from medical images; 2) in medical images, the sizes of lesions (e.g., brain tumors) are normally small compared to the entire image. Going too deeper may cause some tiny lesions vanished in the later convolutional blocks as each block shrinks image size by maxpooling operation using a factor of stride (usually stride is set to 2). Therefore, the filters learned in the later blocks has less capability of detecting lesions; 3) adding more convolutional blocks will introduce more parameters (e.g., adding the forth block will introduce 6 millions more parameters), which could lead to overfit the medical datasets of small scale. Our experiments confirmed that adding more convolutional blocks is not helpful in terms of brain tumor segmentation accuracy (described in Section 3.2).

For upsampling paths, we simply upsample the feature maps from the last convolutional layer of each convolutional block (before maxpooling layer) to the original spatial size. Then another three convolutional layers are applied to encode multi-scale feature representations. The resulting feature maps from three upsampling paths are concatenated before the final classification layer. Note that we did not use backwards strided convolutional (a.k.a deconvolutional) layer to perform upsampling as it will also introduce more parameters in the network, which may potentially lead to over-fitting.

Our structure shares some similarity with the one used in [14], but instead of injecting 3 auxiliary classifiers for each upsampling path for regularization, we extract multi-level contextual information by concatenating hierarchical feature representation from each upsampling path before the classification layer. We formulate the training of whole network as a per-pixel classification problem with respect to the ground-truth segmentation masks and choose categorical cross entropy as the loss function.

After each convolutional layer, we use ReLU [4] as activation function to ensure non-linear mapping and batch normalization [15] to reduce the internal-covariate-shift. We observe batch normalization is crucial to optimize our network in experiments: it can accelerate training process by allowing a larger learning rate and avoid optimization ending with poor local minimals. In our architecture, we use 2D slices split from 3D MR volumes from axial view as the input of the proposed network. This is for two reasons: 1) it can significantly increase the number of training samples as each 3D volumes contains about 100~150 slices; 2) 2D axial slices might have enough discriminative information to differentiate tumor tissues as the experts’ annotations in BRATS dataset were drawn in 2D axial slices rather than in a 3D version [1].

2.2. Symmetry-Driven FCN

It was noted that symmetry in axial view is an important cue for brain tumor segmentation as tumors usually break symmetric appearance of a health brain (see Fig. 1). Although,
brain symmetry or asymmetry information has been used in shallow methods [2, 16, 17], however, they are not explored in deep method such as CNN.

In this paper, we encode brain symmetry information to the CNN framework by adding extra symmetry maps. Our symmetry maps are computed as follows: 1) we first locate the symmetric axis in T1 modality axial slices through the approach presented in [18]; 2) given the symmetric axis (the red dash line in Fig. 3), we found the corresponding matching pixel pairs and calculated their intensity differences. In order to reduce the effects of the errors of symmetric axis and image noises, each image was smoothed beforehand using a Gaussian filter with $5 \times 5$ kernel. The most matched pixel was searched in a $11 \times 11$ local window (the blue square in Fig. 3) centered on the mirrored the location w.r.t the symmetry axis. The resulting intensity differences are then converted into range $[0, 1]$ by a sigmoid function.

The results of each step when computing the symmetry maps are visualized in the top row of Fig. 3, while the final symmetry maps for each MR modality are shown in the bottom row. We combine them with the four original images as the inputs of our CNN framework as show in Fig. 2.

3. EVALUATION

We evaluated our model on BRATS 2013 clinical dataset. The dataset contains 20 HG patients with pixel-level annotations for the training (10 LG patients were not used for the HG segmentation task) and 10 HGs for the testing. For each patient, there exists 4 modalities, namely T1, T1-contrast (T1c), T2 and Flair, which are skull-stripped and co-registered.

Quantitative evaluation on the testing set is through the online VSD evaluation system [1] for three sub-tasks: 1) the complete tumor region (including all four tumor structures); 2) the core tumor region (including all tumor structure except "edema"); 3) the enhancing tumor region (including only the "enhancing tumor" structure). For each tumor region, Dice, Sensitivity and Positive Predictive Value are computed.

Fig. 3: top row: each step of computing the symmetry maps (from left to right: Flair, symmetry axis, local search, and symmetry map); bottom row: the final symmetry maps for each MR modality.

3.1. Implementation

Each brain MR image is standardized with zero mean and unit standard deviation. We augmented the data set by scaling, rotating, flipping each image; thus resulting a new dataset that is 3 times larger than the original one.

Our model was implemented with Keras library and Theano backend. All images were cropped to have the same size $144 \times 192 \times 128$ as the input into the network, which was trained with standard back-propagation using Adam optimizer. We set the learning rate as 0.001 and never changed it during the training. The downsampling path was initialized by VGG-16 weights [5] while the upsampling paths were initialized randomly using the method proposed by [19]. The training time on the augmented dataset is about five hours using a standard PC with a NVIDIA Titan Pascal GPU.

3.2. Cross Validation

We perform a 5-fold cross validation for 20 HG training images, and conducted two experiments to test the effects of 1) going 'deeper' and 2) symmetry maps. The augmented dataset was not used in 5-fold CV to save computational cost.

Firstly, we compare the performance with 3 or 4 convolutional blocks to see whether going 'deeper' of the model is helpful for our tasks. We plot the Dice scores for three sub-tasks at different training epoch (up to 50). The curves are shown Fig 4. It can be observed that there is no obvious improvement using 4 convolutional blocks over 3 for all subtasks in terms of Dice score. On the other hand, going 'deeper' added more parameters and thus resulted in more training time and slower convergence.

We then evaluate the effect of symmetry maps. Fig.5 shows the validation Dice scores w.r.t epochs of FCN and symmetry-driven FCN. It could be observed that FCN ben-
### Table 1: Comparison with the state-of-the-arts on the testing set (ranked by VSD evaluation system [1])

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Dice Complete</th>
<th>Dice Core</th>
<th>Dice Enhancing</th>
<th>PPV Complete</th>
<th>PPV Core</th>
<th>PPV Enhancing</th>
<th>Sensitivity Complete</th>
<th>Sensitivity Core</th>
<th>Sensitivity Enhancing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pereira [10]</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwon [20]</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havaei [9]</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tustison [2]</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meier [1]</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reza [1]</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 6: Examples of segmentation results. From left to right: T1c, T2, Flair(+GT) w/o sym with sym

### 3.3. Comparison with Best Performers on Testing Set

We compare the proposed method with state-of-the-arts on BRATS13 testing set. As it only contains HG images, we only use the 20 HG images for training. The proposed method is among the top-ranking in the state-of-the-arts (see Table 1).

Specifically, Tustison, Meier and Reza were the best performers of BRATS13 challenge [1]. Our method outperforms them all (by a big margin over Meier and Reza, e.g., 0.82 vs 0.72 in terms of Dice for Core tumor segmentation). Particularly, Tustison[2], the winner of BRATS13 challenge, is less efficient than ours as it needs an auxiliary health brain dataset for registration to calculate the features, while we only use the data provided by the challenge. Our model is fully automatic and overall ranked higher than a semi-automatic method [20].

For CNN methods, our results are competitive with [10] and better than [9]. Compared to the cascade structure [9], our network structure is simpler, showing the effectiveness of FCN framework and combining multi-scale features. Note that although [10] performs best on this dataset, they evaluated different experimental settings on the testing set, which might lead to overfit and produce optimistically-biased results. A fair comparison with 3D CNN [11] is not available as they did not evaluate on this dataset.

One advantage of our model over the others is the computational efficiency for a new test image. [20] reported an average running time of 85 minutes for each 3D volume on CPU, which is a bottleneck for daily clinical use. The two CNN approaches, [10] reported an average running time of 8 minutes while 3 minutes was reported by [9], both using a modern GPU. For an indicative comparison, our method took about 2 minutes for each 3D volume in its current implementation. Note that 95% of the time was used to compute the symmetry inputs on CPU. Thus it expects the time could be much less if the computation of symmetry maps is parallelized on GPU.

### 4. CONCLUSION

We propose an automatic brain tumor segmentation method based on fully convolutional neural network. Our method contains three convolutional blocks and encodes multi-scale features from different layers in one loss function. Going deeper did not make a big difference. We also present a symmetry-driven FCN, which further improves segmentation performance, especially for the Complete tumor region. Our method achieved state-of-the-art results, and is more efficient than others. In the future, we will evaluate our model on a larger dataset.
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