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Computational Anatomy aims to model and analyze the variability of the human anatomy. Given a set of medical images of the same organ, the first step is the estimation of the mean organ’s shape. This mean anatomical shape is called the template in Computer vision or Medical imaging. The estimation of a template/atlas is central because it represents the starting point for all further processing or analyses. In view of the medical applications, evaluating the quality of this statistical estimate is crucial. How does the estimated template behave for varying amount of data, for small and large level of noise? We present a geometric Bayesian framework which unifies two estimation problems that are usually considered distinct: the template estimation problem and manifold learning problem - here associated to estimating the template’s orbit. We leverage this to evaluate the quality of the template estimator.

Template estimation in Computational Anatomy

Computational Medicine relying on medical images
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Computational Anatomy

Template estimation as a non-linear model of Errors-in-Variables

Generative model of organs’ shapes

\[ X_i = \rho(T, g_i) + \varepsilon_i \]

where \( g_i \sim \mathcal{N}(g_0, \eta) \) i.i.d. and \( \varepsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma) \) i.i.d.
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Goal: Estimate the template \( T \)

Non-linear model of Errors-in-Variables

\[ X_i = \rho(T, g_i) + \varepsilon_i \]

where \( g_i \sim \mathcal{N}(g_0, \eta) \) i.i.d. and \( \varepsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma) \) i.i.d.
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Regression curve parameterized by \( T \)

Goal: Estimate the curve parameterized by \( T \)

Different estimators of the template’s shape

Functional model: \( g_i \)'s are parameters

Structural model: \( g_i \)'s are random variables

Likelihood: \( L = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \exp \left( -\frac{d_{2}(\rho(T, g_i), X_i)}{2\sigma^2} \right) \)

- Modal approximation in (1): \( \exp \left( -\frac{d_{2}(\rho(T, g_i), X_i)}{2\sigma^2} \right) \approx \delta_{g_0} \) i.e. \( \eta \approx 0 \)
- Adding regularization in (1): \( \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_{2}(\rho(T, g_i), X_i) \)

Frechet mean in the shape space

Maximum-Likelihood (MLE-F)

(1) \( \hat{g}_i = \text{argmin}_{g} \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_{2}(\rho(T, g_i), X_i) \)

(2) \( \hat{T} = \text{argmin}_{T} \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_{2}(\rho(T, g_i), X_i) \)

Maximum-Likelihood (MLE-S)

(1) Expectation

(2) Maximization

No closed form solution

Adding priors: \( p(T) = \text{cte.} \exp \left( -\frac{d_{2}(\rho(T, g_i), X_i)}{2\sigma^2} \right) \) reweights metric in shape space; \( p(g_i) = \text{cte.} \exp \left( -\frac{d_{2}(g_i, g_0)}{2\sigma^2} \right) \) reweights metric in the orbit; \( p(\varepsilon_i) = \text{cte.} \exp \left( -\frac{\varepsilon_i^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) \) ; \( p(\varepsilon_i) = \text{cte.} \exp \left( -\frac{\varepsilon_i^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) \)

Maximum-a-Posteriori (MAP-F)

MLE-S: Consistent but slow
MLE-F: Fast but inconsistent

Comparison of the estimators

Efficiency of the estimators

MLE-F is more efficient than MLE-S, MLE-F is consistent, while MLE-S is not.
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