A FAST AND RIGOROUS ANISOTROPIC SMOOTHING METHOD FOR DT-MRI
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ABSTRACT

Tensors are nowadays an increasing research domain in different areas, especially in image processing, motivated for example by DT-MRI (Diffusion Tensor Magnetic Resonance Imaging). In this paper, we exploit the theoretically well-founded differential geometrical properties of the space of multivariate normal distributions, where it is possible to define a Riemannian metric and express statistics on the manifold of symmetric positive definite matrices. We focus on the contributions of these tools to the anisotropic filtering and regularization of tensor fields. We present promising results on synthetic and real DT-MRI data.

1. INTRODUCTION

DT-MRI (Diffusion Tensor Magnetic Resonance Imaging) is a relatively new medical imaging modality with many possible applications [2] and from which a great deal of research on tensors has stemmed. It can be estimated from a set of diffusion weighted images and provides a discrete three-dimensional dataset where each voxel contains a $3 \times 3$ symmetric positive definite matrix. These covariance matrices can be used to model the local anisotropic diffusion of water molecules by a Gaussian process. Working with these tensor fields may require some regularization to reduce the amount of noise arising, for instance, from the acquisition process.

Regularization and filtering schemes of tensor fields are widely studied in the literature, especially for DT-MRI. As an example, [11] proposed a PDE-based scheme based on a spectral decomposition. A complementary work is that presented in [5] and relying on constrained flows for matrix-valued functions. Another approach presented in [12] provides a generalization of anisotropic and nonlinear diffusion process to matrix-valued data. More recently, [6] proposes a scheme to recover the main direction of the tensors and use the resulting direction to regularize the eigenvalues by an anisotropic diffusion process. However, tensor eigenvalues tend to regularize faster than the associated eigenvectors. This phenomenon is known as the eigenvalue swelling effect for long regularization time, as shown in [11], while noise removal is not quite significant for short time regularization. Other works, such as [13], couple the regularization with the tensors estimation process from diffusion-weighted images.

In this paper, we use the mathematical framework presented in [8] and summarized in section 2 to take into account the particular geometry of the set of symmetric, positive definite matrices in the DT-MRI smoothing process. It is interesting to note that other recent works like [7] and [10] also addressed, from a Lie groups perspective, the definition of statistical quantities and filtering tools for tensor fields. We introduce an anisotropic filtering algorithm controlled by the magnitude of the spatial gradient of the tensor field in section 3. In section 4, qualitative and quantitative results obtained on noisy and synthetic datasets show that our method is favorably compared to a state-of-the-art approach [12]. We also present results obtained on different real datasets.

2. DIFFUSION TENSOR PROCESSING TOOLS

2.1. Riemannian geometry of tensor space

We consider the family of three-dimensional normal distributions with 0-mean as the 6-dimensional parameter space of variances and covariances. We identify it with $S^+(3)$, the set of $3 \times 3$ real symmetric positive-definite matrices. A Riemannian metric can be introduced for $S^+(3)$ in terms of the Fisher information matrix [3]:

\textbf{Theorem 2.1} The Riemannian metric for the space $S^+(3)$ of multivariate normal distributions with zero mean is given, $\forall \Sigma \in S^+(3)$ by:

\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
g_{ij} &= g(E_i, E_j) = \langle E_i, E_j \rangle_\Sigma = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\Sigma^{-1} E_i \Sigma^{-1} E_j) \\
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}

where $\{E_i\}_{i,j = 1,...,6}$ denotes the basis of the tangent space $T_\Sigma S^+(3) = S_\Sigma^2(3)$ at $\Sigma \in S^+(3)$.

In other words, for any tangent vectors $A, B \in S(3)$, their inner product at $\Sigma$ is $\langle A, B \rangle_\Sigma = \frac{1}{4} \text{tr}(\Sigma^{-1} A \Sigma^{-1} B)$. 

\[ \]
We can then define the length of a curve segment in $S^+(3)$ between two normal distributions parameterized by $\Sigma_1$ and $\Sigma_2$ and, hence, the geodesic distance [1].

**Theorem 2.2 (S.T. Jensen, 1976)** Consider the family of multivariate normal distributions with common mean vector but different covariance matrices. The geodesic distance between two members of the family with covariance matrices $\Sigma_1$ and $\Sigma_2$ is given by

$$D(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\log^2(\Sigma_1^{-1/2}\Sigma_2\Sigma_1^{-1/2}))}$$

Now, we can recall how the local average and spatial gradient of a diffusion image can be computed.

### 2.2. Weighted average of diffusion tensors

An important practical application of theorem 2.2 is the ability to define statistics on $S^+(3)$, taking into account its special geometry. In this sense, the normal distribution parameterized by $\Sigma^w \in S^+(3)$ and defined as the weighted intrinsic mean of $N$ distributions $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \ldots, \Sigma_N$, achieves a minimum of the weighted sum of squared distances:

$$\mu^w(\Sigma^w, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \ldots, \Sigma_N) = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \omega_k D^2(\Sigma^w, \Sigma_k) \sum_{k=1}^{N} \omega_k$$

A closed form expression cannot be obtained, but it is possible to derive a gradient descent algorithm for the computation of the intrinsic mean as shown in [8]. The associated numerical scheme is:

$$\Sigma_{l+1}^w = \exp\left(-dt \frac{\omega_1}{\omega_k} \frac{\Sigma_{l+1}^w}{\sum_{k=1}^{N} \omega_k} \frac{\Sigma_{l+1}^w - \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{N} \omega_k \log(\Sigma_{l+1}^w)\right)}{\sum_{k=1}^{N} \omega_k} \right) \Sigma_{l+1}^w$$

The algorithm simply starts from an initial guess $\Sigma_0^w$ and follows the opposite of the gradient of the objective function (Eq. 2) along the geodesics of $S^+(3)$ to reach the minimum $\Sigma_{l+1}^w$ in no more than $l = 4$ or 5 iterations.

### 2.3. Spatial gradient of diffusion tensor fields

The magnitude of the spatial gradient of a tensor field can be estimated through the sum of squared geodesic distances between neighbors as follows:

$$|\nabla \Sigma(x)|^2 \simeq \sum_{k=1}^{3} D^2(\Sigma(x), \Sigma(x \pm e_k))$$

where $\Sigma(x) : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \mapsto S^+(3), \forall x \in \Omega$ is a tensor field defined in the spatial domain $\Omega$ and $\pm e_k$ are forward and backward elements of the canonical basis in $\mathbb{R}^3$ (see [4] for more details).

### 3. DT-MRI ANISOTROPIC FILTERING

The mathematical tools presented in the previous section allow us to develop an anisotropic smoothing algorithm for tensor fields regularization. In practice, we simply use the operator $3$ to estimate local weighted averages. The anisotropic behavior is introduced by weighting each sample, within a local neighborhood, by a function that depends on the Riemannian gradient magnitude. This function is chosen so that, in homogeneous regions, the weights are constant and the tensors are isotropically averaged. On the contrary, when lying on an edge of the image, we would like that only samples on that boundary, and not those across, contribute to the local averaging. To achieve this goal and avoid mixing structures of the image, a possible choice for the weighting function is $w_k = e + |\nabla \Sigma(x)|^2$. A major advantage of this approach is that a straightforward C++ implementation yields a quite computationally efficient algorithm since, to regularize a $50 \times 50 \times 50$ volume of $3 \times 3$ tensors, using a $3 \times 3 \times 3$ averaging neighborhood, we obtain an average processing time of 8 minutes on a 1.7GHz Pentium M CPU with 1 Gb of RAM. Moreover, it is easy to automatically detect the convergence of the gradient descent detailed in equation 3 by checking the evolution speed $\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{N} \omega_k \log(\Sigma_{l+1}^w)}{\sum_{k=1}^{N} \omega_k}$ and stopping whenever a given norm (Frobenius for instance) of this symmetric matrix has reached a certain threshold (1e-6 in practice). Hence not only do we ensure the convergence of the weighted mean but we also discard the need for a parameter such as the number of iterations.

### 4. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

#### 4.1. Synthetic data

In order to check the performance of our approach we generate a $32 \times 32 \times 32$ volume with the pattern shown on Fig. 1.a. Then, we generate the noisy version on Fig. 1.b. The noise follows a generalization of the Gaussian distribution for samples belonging to $S^+(3)$ using the algorithm proposed in [8] to generate a set of random positive definite tensors with the desired mean and covariance matrix. The noise model is consistent with the parametric model for noise in DT-MRI proposed in [9] where the authors proved that noise in DT-MRI data within a voxel follows a 6-dimensional Normal distribution, assuming that the magnitude diffusion weighted images are Rician distributed. Fig. 1.c corresponds to the output of the anisotropic Riemannian filtering approach proposed in this paper, while Fig. 1.d is the output of a nonlinear matrix-averaging neighborhood, we obtain an average processing time of 8 minutes on a 1.7GHz Pentium M CPU with 1 Gb of RAM. Moreover, it is easy to automatically detect the convergence of the gradient descent detailed in equation 3 by checking the evolution speed $\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{N} \omega_k \log(\Sigma_{l+1}^w)}{\sum_{k=1}^{N} \omega_k}$ and stopping whenever a given norm (Frobenius for instance) of this symmetric matrix has reached a certain threshold (1e-6 in practice). Hence not only do we ensure the convergence of the weighted mean but we also discard the need for a parameter such as the number of iterations.

### 4. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

#### 4.1. Synthetic data

In order to check the performance of our approach we generate a $32 \times 32 \times 32$ volume with the pattern shown on Fig. 1.a. Then, we generate the noisy version on Fig. 1.b. The noise follows a generalization of the Gaussian distribution for samples belonging to $S^+(3)$ using the algorithm proposed in [8] to generate a set of random positive definite tensors with the desired mean and covariance matrix. The noise model is consistent with the parametric model for noise in DT-MRI proposed in [9] where the authors proved that noise in DT-MRI data within a voxel follows a 6-dimensional Normal distribution, assuming that the magnitude diffusion weighted images are Rician distributed. Fig. 1.c corresponds to the output of the anisotropic Riemannian filtering approach proposed in this paper, while Fig. 1.d is the output of a nonlinear matrix-averaging scheme, as proposed in [12]. Differences arise when comparing these two images. First of all, noise is better removed with the Riemannian approach than with the nonlinear diffusion, where some misoriented tensors remain even after 536 iterations with a time step of 0.01, which are the parameters that provide the optimal response. Furthermore, the well-known swelling effect, due to a faster reg-
ularization of the eigenvalues, is observed for the nonlinear diffusion, whereas it is not noticeable for our Riemannian approach. This can be observed by looking at the colors (blue: low FA and red: high FA) of the tensors. First, we point out that the original tensors are blue because they are all identical, thus have the same FA (0.77), and our visualization software assigns the color associated to the lowest value in that case. But most importantly, we can see that the regularized tensor field obtained with our approach is more anisotropic (tensors are yellow and FA is around 0.75) than that obtained with the nonlinear diffusion (tensors are green and FA is around 0.60). From a quantitative point of view, we measure the error between the original and regularized images by the geodesic distance between corresponding tensors. As shown in Table 1, the mean geodesic distance is much lower for the Riemannian anisotropic approach.

4.2. Real DT-MRI data

For experiments with real data, diffusion weighted images were acquired on a 3 Tesla scanner at the Centre IRMf de Marseille, France. We used 12 gradient directions and a b-value of 1000\(s/mm^2\). Acquisitions were repeated 8 times for each direction to ensure a good signal-to-noise ratio. Voxel size was 2 × 2 × 2 mm\(^3\). Diffusion tensors shown on Figs. 2.a and 4.a were estimated by a robust gradient descent algorithm ensuring their symmetry and positive-definiteness, as presented in [8]. The idea of this method is to minimize a functional of the linearized Stejskal-Tanner equation by evolving an initial guess of the tensor on the manifold \(S^+(3)\) with a numerical scheme similar to the one used for the estimation of the average.

Fig. 2.b displays the regularized image using the anisotropic Riemannian smoothing, while bottom images are regularized using the nonlinear diffusion, both with 10 iterations, but different time steps. If we analyze the different structures on this axial slice, we can see that tensors orientation within the splenium and the genu of the corpus callosum CC(S) and CC(G) is more coherent with our Riemannian filtering scheme. Anisotropy in these areas is also better preserved than in the nonlinear diffusion case, which yields blurred areas most likely because of the properties of the Euclidean gradient. In addition, the ventricles VE, which are mainly homogeneous structures, are better regularized with our approach, as inhomogeneities do not disappear with the nonlinear diffusion. Finally, the corona radiata CR is well preserved with our approach while it is completely smoothed away from the image with a long diffusion time.

On Fig. 3 we show another DT-MRI volume where fiber orientation is color coded as follows: Red: Right-Left / Green: Anterior-Posterior / Blue: Inferior-Superior. Original data is shown on top of the image, while the filtered version is shown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aniso. Riem.</td>
<td>0.2572</td>
<td>0.1313</td>
<td>1.3065</td>
<td>0.0300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonlin. Diff.</td>
<td>0.8284</td>
<td>0.1209</td>
<td>3.2551</td>
<td>0.2630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Statistics on the error (geodesic distance)
5. CONCLUSION

We have presented a novel differential geometrical approach for the anisotropic regularization of tensor fields, seen as fields of multivariate normal distributions. We focused on the properties of the space of multivariate normal distributions to introduce a Riemannian metric and notions such as the mean and spatial gradient which provide a well-founded framework to develop an anisotropic filtering algorithm for tensor data. The anisotropic behavior is introduced through the gradient magnitude, simply computed by using the geodesic distance between distributions. Our filtering scheme was compared to nonlinear diffusion of matrix-valued data to point out its added value and to show that it yields better results on synthetic and real DT-MRI data.
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