



## **A reference free approach for the comparative evaluation of eight segmentation methods for the estimation of the left ventricular ejection fraction in cardiac MRI.**

Alain Lalande, Jessica Lebenberg, Irène Buvat, Patrick Clarysse, Christopher Casta, Alexandre Cochet, Constantin Constantinidès, Jean Cousty, Alain De Cesare, Stéphanie Jehan-Besson, et al.

### **► To cite this version:**

Alain Lalande, Jessica Lebenberg, Irène Buvat, Patrick Clarysse, Christopher Casta, et al.. A reference free approach for the comparative evaluation of eight segmentation methods for the estimation of the left ventricular ejection fraction in cardiac MRI.. European Society for Magnetic Resonance in Medicine and Biology (ESMRMB), Oct 2012, Lisbonne, Portugal. pp.658, 2012.

**HAL Id: hal-00787512**

**<https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00787512>**

Submitted on 12 Feb 2013

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Abstract 45322

A reference free approach for the comparative evaluation of eight segmentation methods for the estimation of the left ventricular ejection fraction in cardiac MRI.

Category: Scientific Session Communications

Topic: Preclinical Studies and Basic Science / Processing and quantification: imaging

Authors: A. Lalande<sup>1</sup>, J. Leberberg<sup>2,3</sup>, I. Buvat<sup>4</sup>, P. Clarysse<sup>5</sup>, C. Casta<sup>5</sup>, A. Cochet<sup>1</sup>, C. Constantinidès<sup>2,3</sup>, J. Cousty<sup>6</sup>, A. de Cesare<sup>2</sup>, S. Jehan-Besson<sup>7</sup>, M. Lefort<sup>2</sup>, L. Najman<sup>6</sup>, E. Rouillot<sup>3</sup>, L. Sarry<sup>8</sup>, C. Tilmant<sup>9</sup>, M. Garreau<sup>10</sup>, F. Frouin<sup>2</sup>; <sup>1</sup>Dijon,FR,University of Burgundy,LE2I (UMR CNRS 6306), <sup>2</sup>Paris,FR,Inserm/UPMC,Laboratoire d'Imagerie Fonctionnelle, <sup>3</sup>Ivry Sur Seine,FR,ESME-Sudria,PRIAM, <sup>4</sup>Orsay,FR,Université de Paris Sud,IMNC (CNRS UMR 8165), <sup>5</sup>Lyon,FR,Université de Lyon,CREATIS (CNRS UMR 5220), <sup>6</sup>Marne La Vallée,FR,Université de Paris Est,LIGM-A3SI (UMR 8049), <sup>7</sup>Aubière,FR,LIMOS,LIMOS (CNRS UMR 6158), <sup>8</sup>Clermont-Ferrand,FR,Université d'Auvergne,ISIT (CNRS UMR 6284), <sup>9</sup>Clermont-Ferrand,FR,Université Blaise Pascal,Institut Pasteur (CNRS UMR 6602), <sup>10</sup>Rennes,FR,Université Rennes 1,LTISI (INSERM UMR 1099)

### Purpose / Introduction

Objective evaluation and comparison of segmentation algorithms for medical imaging is still a challenging issue. The most frequently used evaluation method consists in comparing the segmentation with a manual delineation. Since obtaining such manual segmentation can be tedious, we proposed a method based on the "extended Regression Without Truth" approach (eRWT)(1). This approach is applied to the comparative evaluation of 8 segmentation algorithms with different degrees of automation from the estimated left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF).

### Subjects and Methods

Series of short-axis cine MR images covering the left ventricle were obtained in 36 patients and 9 healthy volunteers (20 frames per cycle). For each series, five automated segmentation methods(2-6) with different degrees of automation were used, and manual contouring was also performed by three operators, providing 8 independent estimates of the LVEF (eLVEF). The principle of our non-supervised method consists in estimating the parameters of a linear model linking the measurements (eLVEF) and the true value (tLVEF). The distribution of the tLVEF is assumed to follow a Beta distribution ( $\mu=4$  and  $\nu=5$ ) :

$$Pr(tLVEF) = \frac{tLVEF^{\mu-1} \times (1-tLVEF)^{\nu-1}}{B(\mu, \nu)} \text{ with } B(\mu, \nu) = \int_0^1 x^{\mu-1} (1-x)^{\nu-1} dx$$

The relationship between the tLVEF and the eLVEF is given by :

$$eLVEF = a \times tLVEF + b + error$$

The determination of a, b and the standard deviation of the error makes it possible to compare the accuracy of the methods. Methods are ranked as a function of their accuracy, based on a figure of merit (Fm) :

$$Fm = (a-1)^2 \times \frac{\mu(\mu+1)}{(\mu+\nu)(\mu+\nu+1)} + 2(a-1) \times b \frac{\mu}{\mu+\nu} + b^2 + \sigma_{error}^2$$

### Results

The obtained ranking suggests that the LVEF estimations provided by manual methods were the most accurate and the least variable.

Methods	Fm
Manual	0.002
Manual	0.004
Manual	0.004
Semi-automatic(2)	0.006
Semi-automatic(3)	0.009
Automatic(4)	0.010
Semi-automatic(5)	0.011
Semi-automatic(6)	0.012

### Discussion/Conclusion

All automated methods considered in our study were less accurate than manual delineations. The main limitations are due to segmentation failures in some particular slices. Their combination to provide one optimized mutual contour is currently under study.

The eRWT approach proved to be relevant to compare different segmentation methods without the use of gold standard and without any prior concerning the automation degree of the method. Moreover, it can be used to evaluate the improvement of a method in progress.

### References

- (1) Lebenberg J. et al, 2012, IEEE Trans Med Imaging, in press
- (2) Constantinides C. et al, 2009, The Midas Journal
- (3) Lalande A. et al, 2004, JCMR, 817-827
- (4) Constantinides C. et al, 2012, IEEE EMBC, in press
- (5) Schaerer J. et al, 2010, Med Image Anal, 738-749
- (6) Cousty J. et al, 2010, Image Vision Comput, 1229-1243

Print