Self-Adaptive Vision Agents Using Evolutionary Strategies

Thomas Bäck¹, Rui Li¹, Jeroen Eggermont², Michael Emmerich¹, Ernst Bovenkamp², Jouke Dijkstra², Johan Reiber² (<u>baeck@liacs.n</u>l)

¹Natural Computing Group, Leiden Advanced Institute of Computer Science (LIACS), ²Leiden University Medical Center, LKEB Group, Leiden University, The Netherlands



Universiteit Leiden

The Netherlands



CITATIONS

- Mixed-Integer Evolution Strategies for Parameter Optimization and Their Applications to Medical Image Analysis. R. Li, PhD Thesis, Leiden University, ISBN: 978-90-9024665-9, October 2009
- User-Agent Cooperation in Multiagent IVUS Image Segmentation,
 E.G.P. Bovenkamp, J. Dijkstra, J.G. Bosch, J.H.C. Reiber, IEEE
 Transaction on Medical Imaging, 94-105, 28(1), 2009.
- Optimizing a Medical Image Analysis Using Mixed-Integer Evolution Strategies. R. Li, M.T.M. Emmerich, J. Eggermont, E.G.P. Bovenkamp, T. Bäck, J. Dijkstra, and H. Reiber. Book chapter in Evolutionary Image Analysis and Signal Processing, 91-112, Springer, ISBN: 978-3-642-01635-6, July 2009

RATIONALE

- One of the highest targets in medical image analysis is the realization of intelligent fully automatic image interpretation
 - Cardiovascular disease is recognized as the leading cause of the death (30%) in the world; important to have reliable systems to detect the calcified plaques that cause this disease
 - Intravascular Ultrasound (IVUS), Computed Tomography Angiography (CTA), and Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI)
 - Often complex and variable structures, such as calcified plaques in arteries, are to be detected and modeled in image or sequences of images
 - Proven to be very hard due to the complexities of the scenes, poor image quality, variability of objects, artifacts, and occlusion.

RATIONAL (CONT.)

- The performance of most systems still depends on a large number of control parameters
 - The setting of these control-parameters is done by means of an educated guess or manual tuning following a tedious trial and error approach
 - Often leads to suboptimal settings
 - Given the frequent changes in image processing technologies (e.g., IVUS, CTA, and MRI) this manual tuning has to be carried out again and again

EXAMPLE











Leiden University. The university to discover.

GECCO HUMIES - 2010

IVUS IMAGE ANALYSIS (CONT.)



GECCO HUMIES - 2010

CTA IMAGE ANALYSIS





GECCO HUMIES - 2010

Leiden University. The university to discover.

CTA IMAGE ANALYSIS (CONT.)



CTA IMAGE ANALYSIS (CONT.)



Combination of transversal and longitudinal contour detection for 3D contour detection

Create longitudinal cross-sectional images

Detect longitudinal lumen contours

Detect transversal lumen contours



MR IMAGE ANALSYS

- Vessel wall segmentation





Based on 2D image information and the detected lumen model fit the outer wall using a NURBS Tubular model



GECCO HUMIES - 2010

OPTIMIZING MEDICAL IMAGE SEGMENTATION



GECCO HUMIES - 2010

MIXED-INTEGER PARAMETERS

name	type	range	dependencies	default
maxgray	integer	[2, 150]	> mingray	35
mingray	integer	[1, 149]	< maxgray	1
connectivity	discrete	{4,6,8}		6
relativeopenings	discrete	{false,true}		true
nrofcloses	integer	[0, 100]	used if not relativeopenings	5
nrofopenings	integer	[0, 100]	used if not relativeopenings	45
scanlinedir	discrete	{0,1,2}		1
scanindexleft	integer	[-100, 100]	< scanindexright	-55
scanindexright	integer	[-100, 100]	> scanindexleft	7
centermethod	discrete	{0,1}		1
fitmodel	discrete	{ellipse, circel}		ellipse
sigma	continuous	[0.5 10.0]		0.8
scantype	discrete	{0,1,2}		0
sidestep	integer	[0, 20]		3
sidecost	continuous	[0.0, 100]		5
nroflines	integer	[32, 256]		128

MIXED-INTEGER EVOLUTION STRATEGIES

- A special variant of an Evolution Strategies (ES)
- Designed for the *simultaneous* optimization of continuous, integer, and nominal discrete parameters
 - Combines mutation operators of ES in the different search domain, e.g., geometrical distribution
- Focus on *black-box* optimization problem
 - Assisted by some advanced constraints handling techniques, MIES can also be applied to some classical MINLP problems
- Enriched by introducing some advanced technologies
 - Niching
 - Metamodeling, e.g., Radial basis function network (RBFN)
 - Dynamic fitness partitioning

$$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{MIXED-INTEGER ES: MUTATION}\\ \textbf{for } i = 1, \dots, n_r \textbf{ do}\\ \hline \textbf{Learning rates}\\ \textbf{(global)} \end{array} \xrightarrow{s'_i \leftarrow s_i \exp(\tau_g N_g + \tau_l N(0, 1))} \\ \overrightarrow{r'_i = r_i + N(0, s'_i)} \\ \textbf{end for}\\ \textbf{for } i = 1, \dots, n_z \textbf{ do}\\ q'_i \leftarrow q_i \exp(\tau_g N_g + \tau_l N(0, 1))\\ z'_i \leftarrow z_i + G(0, q'_i) \\ \textbf{end for}\\ \textbf{end for}\\ \overrightarrow{r'_i = 1/[1 + \frac{1 - p_i}{p_i} * \exp(-\tau_l * N(0, 1))]} \\ \textbf{for } i \in \{1, \dots, n_d\} \textbf{ do } \\ \textbf{if } U(0, 1) < p'_i \textbf{ then} \\ d'_i \leftarrow \textbf{ uniformly randomly value from } D_i \\ \textbf{end for} \\ \textbf{end if} \\ \textbf{end for} \end{array}$$

RESULTS ON IVUS IMAGES

- IVUS Images

- Fitness: Dissimilarity measure \rightarrow min

	Dataset 1		Dataset 2		Dataset 3		Dataset 4		Dataset 5	
	Fitness	S.D.	Fitness	S.D.	Fitness	S.D.	Fitness	S.D.	Fitness	S.D.
Expert	395.2	86.2	400.2	109.2	344.8	66.4	483.1	110.6	444.2	90.6
MI-ES 1	151.3	39.2	183.6	59.0	201.0	67.1	280.9	91.9	365.5	105.9
MI-ES 2	160.3	45.9	181.4	58.7	206.7	70.3	273.6	74.5	372.5	99.2
MI-ES 3	173.8	42.1	202.9	69.1	165.6	47.2	250.7	80.2	446.4	372.8
MI-ES 4	154.0	51.7	243.7	67.7	198.8	80.1	186.4	59.0	171.3	57.8
MI-ES 5	275.7	75.6	358.4	76.9	327.7	56.7	329.1	82.0	171.8	54.5

Table 2. Performance of the best found MI-ES parameter solutions when trained on one of the five datasets (MI-ES solution *i* was trained on dataset *i*). All parameter solutions and the (default) expert parameters are applied to all datasets. Average difference (fitness) and standard deviation w.r.t. expert drawn contours are given with $\tau = 2.24$ and nrofpoints = 128.

RESULTS ON IVUS IMAGES (CONT.)



Figure: Expert-drawn lumen contours (green) compared with expert-set parameter solution (yellow, bottom row) and MI-ES parameter solution (top row, yellow). The contours which are detected by using the MIES parameter are more smooth than those by using the default parameter settings.

MIES:

Experts:

GECCO HUMIES - 2010

RESULTS ON CTA IMAGES

СТ	Default	MI-ES					
data set	parameters	avg	s.d.	min	max		
1	0.295	0.242	0.004	0.236	0.248		
2	0.255	0.152	0.003	0.148	0.159		
3	0.189	0.176	0.004	0.169	0.182		
4	0.211	0.186	0.006	0.175	0.193		
5	0.675	0.327	0.016	0.297	0.364		
6	0.360	0.320	0.026	0.275	0.343		
7	0.324	0.307	0.011	0.276	0.313		
8	0.181	0.169	0.001	0.167	0.170		
9	0.244	0.199	0.011	0.185	0.219		

Table: Performance of the best found MI-ES parameter solutions when trained on one of the nine datasets. All parameter solutions and the (default) expert parameters are applied to all datasets

There is no one solution for all images

IVUS IMAGE ANALYSIS: COMMERCIAL SOFTWARE



GECCO HUMIES - 2010

SATISFIED CRITERION

- (E) The result is equal to or better than the most recent human-created solution to a longstanding problem for which there has been a succession of increasingly better human-created solutions.
- (F) The result is equal to or better than a result that was considered an achievement in its field at the time it was first discovered
- (G) The results solves a problem of indisputable difficulty in its field

WHY SHOULD WE WIN THE PRIZE ?

- Average improvement of classification measure: 30-50% (compared to humans)
- Speed-up of image processing time: from several minutes (humans) to seconds
- Automatic software configuration approach for IVUS, CTA, MRI image analysis systems
- Provides better and more reliable results than manual tuning
- Improves quality and speed of medical image diagnosis significantly
- Frees up time of cardiovascular disease experts for other tasks, e.g., patient care
- The number of these experts is also quite limited!