Hierarchical Riemannian Models for Pointset Shape Representations: Applications in Hypothesis Testing, Object Segmentation and Shape Clustering

> PhD Defense Presentation August 2020 by Saurabh J. Shigwan

Under guidance of **Prof. Suyash P. Awate** 

## Outline of the Talk

Driving applications

- Hypothesis testing, segmentation, clustering

- Statistical modeling on shapes
   Formulation
- Multigroup hypothesis testing
   Formulation, empirical evaluation
- Shape priors for object segmentation
  - Formulation, empirical evaluation
- Clustering a set of shapes
  - Formulation, empirical evaluation
- Conclusion

# Application 1 – Hypothesis Testing

• Data: Object segmentations in multiple cohorts



- Task: Test null hypothesis that two cohorts have no difference in shapes
  - Need to learn a generative model of shape for each cohort / group
  - Visualizing group mean, modes of variation is key to clinical applications

# Application 2 – Object Segmentation

 Data: Object segmentations in a group of subjects; test image to be segmented



Need to learn a generative model of shape

Generate segmentation using shape prior

Brain subcortical thalamus segmentation examples

Task:

Brain subcortical image under observation Estimated Shape fitting



Output

## Application 3 – Clustering

• Data: Set of object segmentations



Some examples

- Task: Cluster object shapes
  - Needs a generative model of shapes for each group
    - Estimate mean, modes of variation, for each cluster
  - Visualizing cluster mean, modes of variation is key to clinical applications

Estimated means for each cluster







### **Representation of Shapes**

- What is shape ?
  - Object shape is all the geometrical information that remains when location, scale, and rotational effects are filtered out from an object
  - We leverage the notion of Kendall Shape space that has a non-Euclidean structure
- Our representation of shape
  - Finite number of points
    on object boundary with
    triangular mesh



• Group

– Data 
$$x := \{x_i\}_{i=1}^N$$

- Individual shapes  $Y := \{Y_i \in \mathbb{R}^{3J}\}_{i=1}^N$ (latent / hidden random variable)
- Mean  $\mu$  (unknown)
- Modes of variation C (unknown)
- Smoothness prior  $\beta$  (free parameter)

[ A Gaikwad, SJ Shigwan, SP Awate, 2015 MICCAI]

• Group

- Data 
$$x := \{x_i\}_{i=1}^N$$

- Individual shapes  $Y := \{Y_i \in \mathbb{R}^{3J}\}_{i=1}^N$ (latent / hidden random variable)
- Mean  $\mu$  (unknown)
- Modes of variation C (unknown)
- Smoothness prior  $\beta$  (free parameter)

[ A Gaikwad, SJ Shigwan, SP Awate, 2015 MICCAI]

• Group

- Data 
$$x := \{x_i\}_{i=1}^N$$

- Individual shapes  $Y := \{Y_i \in \mathbb{R}^{3J}\}_{i=1}^N$ (latent / hidden random variable)
- Mean  $\mu$  (unknown)
- Modes of variation C (unknown)
- Smoothness prior  $\beta$  (free parameter)

[ A Gaikwad, SJ Shigwan, SP Awate, 2015 MICCAI]

• Group

– Data 
$$x := \{x_i\}_{i=1}^N$$

- Individual shapes  $Y := \{Y_i \in \mathbb{R}^{3J}\}_{i=1}^N$ (latent / hidden random variable)
- Mean  $\mu$  (unknown)
- Modes of variation C (unknown)
- Smoothness prior  $\beta$  (free parameter)

[ A Gaikwad, SJ Shigwan, SP Awate, 2015 MICCAI]

 $\{\mu, {\color{black} C}, eta\}$ 

• Group

– Data 
$$x := \{x_i\}_{i=1}^N$$

- Individual shapes  $Y := \{Y_i \in \mathbb{R}^{3J}\}_{i=1}^N$ (latent / hidden random variable)
- Mean  $\mu$  (unknown)
- Modes of variation C (unknown)
- Smoothness prior  $\beta$  (free parameter)

[ A Gaikwad, SJ Shigwan, SP Awate, 2015 MICCAI]

 $\{\mu, C, \beta\}$ 

• Group

– Data 
$$x := \{x_i\}_{i=1}^N$$

- Individual shapes  $Y := \{Y_i \in \mathbb{R}^{3J}\}_{i=1}^N$ (latent / hidden random variable)
- Mean  $\mu$  (unknown)
- Modes of variation C (unknown)
- Smoothness prior  $\beta$  (free parameter)

[ A Gaikwad, SJ Shigwan, SP Awate, 2015 MICCAI]

- Group
  - Data x
  - Individual shape y
  - Mean  $\mu$
  - Modes of variation  ${\cal C}$
  - Smoothness prior  $\beta$  (free parameter)



 $\theta := \{\mu, C\}$  $\max_{\theta} P(x|\theta) := \max_{\theta} \int P(x, Y|\theta) dY$  $:= \max_{\mu, C} \int P(x|Y) P(Y|\mu, C, \beta) dY$ 

- Shape distribution in Riemannian Space
  - Mean  $\mu$
  - Covariance  ${\cal C}\,$  in tangent space at mean

$$P(y_i|\mu, C, \beta) := \frac{1}{\eta(C,\beta)} \exp\left(-\frac{d_{\text{Mah}}^2(y_i;\mu, C)}{2} - \frac{\beta}{2} \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_j} \|y_{ij} - y_{ik}\|_2^2\right)$$

where Mahalanobis distance

$$d_{\mathrm{Mah}}^2(y_i;\mu,C) := \mathrm{Log}_{\mu}^{\mathbb{S}}(y_i)^{\top} C^{-1} \mathrm{Log}_{\mu}^{\mathbb{S}}(y_i)$$

 $\max_{\mu,C} \int P(x|Y) \frac{P(Y|\mu,C,\beta)}{P(Y|\mu,C,\beta)} dY$ 

• Shape distribution in Riemannian Space

– Mean  $\mu$ 

— Covariance  ${\cal C}\,$  in tangent space at mean

 $P(y_i|\mu, C, \beta) := \frac{1}{\eta(C,\beta)} \exp\left(-\frac{d_{\text{Mah}}^2(y_i;\mu,C)}{2} - \frac{\beta}{2} \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_j} \|y_{ij} - y_{ik}\|_2^2\right)$ where Mahalanobis distance

$$d_{\mathrm{Mah}}^2(y_i;\mu,C) := \mathrm{Log}_{\mu}^{\mathbb{S}}(y_i)^{\top} C^{-1} \mathrm{Log}_{\mu}^{\mathbb{S}}(y_i)$$

 $\max_{\mu,C} \int P(x|Y) \frac{P(Y|\mu,C,\beta)}{P(Y|\mu,C,\beta)} dY$ 

- Shape distribution in Riemannian Space
  - Mean  $\mu$
  - Covariance in tangent space at mean  ${\cal C}$
  - Log map in shape space
    - For pointsets a<sub>1</sub>,a<sub>2</sub> on unit hypersphere, Log<sub>a1</sub>(a<sub>2</sub>) is the log map of a<sub>2</sub> with respect to a<sub>1</sub>

• 
$$\operatorname{Log}_{\mathbf{a}_1}^{\mathbb{S}}(\mathbf{a}_2) := \operatorname{Log}_{\mathbf{a}_1}(\mathcal{R}^*\mathbf{a}_2)$$

where,  $\mathcal{R}^* := \arg \min_{\mathcal{R}} d_g(\mathcal{R}\mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{a}_1)$  with  $\mathcal{R}^*$  applying rotation to each point within pointset  $\mathbf{a}_2$ ;  $d_g(.,.)$  is geodesic distance over unit hypersphere

- Approximate Normal law on hyperspheres
  - Mean
  - Covariance in tangent space at mean



Shape distribution in Riemannian Space

– Mean  $\mu$ 

— Covariance in tangent space at mean  ${\cal C}$ 

$$P(y_i|\mu, C, \beta) :=$$

$$\frac{1}{\eta(C,\beta)} \exp\left(-\frac{d_{\mathrm{Mah}}^2(y_i;\mu,C)}{2} - \frac{\beta}{2} \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_j} \|y_{ij} - y_{ik}\|_2^2\right)$$

Smoothness prior on shapes

• Neighborhood system  $\mathcal{N} := \{\mathcal{N}_j\}_{j=1}^N$ , where  $\mathcal{N}_j$  gives set of neighbors of  $j^{\text{th}}$  point in all  $y := \{y_i\}_{i=1}^N$ 

$$\max_{\mu,C} \int P(x|Y) \frac{P(Y|\mu,C,\beta)}{P(Y|\mu,C,\beta)} dY$$

- Joint model on individual shapes and individual data
  - Mean
  - Covariance in tangent space at mean
  - Prior Model  $\frac{1}{\eta(C,\beta)} \exp\left(-\frac{d_{\operatorname{Mah}}^2(y_i;\mu,C)}{2} \frac{\beta}{2}\sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{k\in\mathcal{N}_j} \|y_{ij} y_{ik}\|_2^2\right)$
  - -Likelihood  $P(x_i|y_i) := \exp(-\Delta(x_i, y_i))/\tau$ 
    - Dissimilarity measure

$$\Delta(x_i, y_i) := \min_{\mathcal{S}_i} \left( \sum_{j=1}^J (\mathcal{D}_{x_i}(\mathcal{S}_i y_{ij}))^2 + \sum_{l=1}^L \min_j \|\mathcal{Z}_{x_i}^l - \mathcal{S}_i y_{ij}\|_2^2 \right)$$

 $\max_{\mu,C} \int \frac{P(x|Y)}{P(Y|\mu,C,\beta)} dY$ 



- Joint model on individual shapes and individual data
  - Mean
  - Covariance in tangent space at mean
  - Prior Model  $P(y_i|\mu, C, \beta) :=$

$$\frac{1}{\eta(C,\beta)} \exp\left(-\frac{d_{\operatorname{Mah}}^2(y_i;\mu,C)}{2} - \frac{\beta}{2} \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_j} \|y_{ij} - y_{ik}\|_2^2\right)$$
  
- Likelihood  $P(x_i|y_i) := \exp(-\Delta(x_i,y_i))/\tau$ 

$$\max_{\theta} \int P(x, Y|\theta) dY \qquad \qquad \theta := \{\mu, C\}$$
$$:= \max_{\mu, C} \int P(x|Y) P(Y|\mu, C, \beta) dY$$

- We solve  $\theta^* := \arg \max_{\theta} \int P(x, Y|\theta) dY$  using Expectation Maximization (EM)
- At  $t^{\text{th}}$  iteration  $\theta^t := \{\mu^t, C^t\}$
- Estep:  $\mathcal{Q}(\theta; \theta^t) := E_{P(Y|x, \theta^t)}[\log P(x, Y|\theta)]$
- Expectation is analytically intractable
- We use Monte-Carlo approximation  $\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}(\theta; \theta^t) \approx \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^{S} \log P(x, y^s | \theta),$ where  $(y^s) \sim P(Y | x, \theta^t)$
- M step:

$$\theta^{t+1} := \arg \max_{\theta} \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}(\theta; \theta^t)$$

$$(y^s) \sim P(Y|x, \theta^t)$$

23

- Leapfrog sampling
  - It maintains a set of state vectors  $\, ar w^{\! u}$
  - This set represents independent samples in same distribution  $P(\bar{w})$
  - Proposal state is accepted according to Metropolis rule with probability ratio  $P(\bar{w}^{u'})/P(\bar{w}^{u})$



 $\bar{w}^{u'} := \operatorname{Exp}_{\bar{w}^t}^{\mathbb{F}}(-\operatorname{Log}_{\bar{w}^t}^{\mathbb{F}}(\bar{w}^u))$ 

- Data
- Individual shapes
- Group variables
  - Group mean
  - Covariance
  - Smoothness prior (free parameter)
- Population variables
- Used for hypothesis testing [SJ Shigwan, SP Awate, 2016 MICCAI]



- Data
- Individual shapes
- Group variables
  - Group mean
  - Covariance
  - Smoothness prior (free parameter)
- Population variables
- Used for hypothesis testing [SJ Shigwan, SP Awate, 2016 MICCAI]



- Data
- **Individual shapes**
- Group variables
  - Group mean
  - Covariance
  - Smoothness prior (free parameter)
- Population variables
- Used for hypothesis testing [SJ Shigwan, SP Awate, 2016 MICCAI]



- Data
- Individual shapes

- $(x_{11})$  $(x_{12})$  $(x_{1N_1})$  $(x_{21})$  $(x_{22})$  $(x_{2N_2})$  Used for hypothesis testing [SJ Shigwan, SP Awate, 2016 MICCAI]
- $\{\mu, C, \beta\}$  Group variables – Group mean - Covariance  $\{Z_1, C_1, \beta_1\}$  $\{Z_2, C_2, \beta_2\}$  $\{Z_M, C_M, \beta_M\}$ - Smoothness prior (free parameter) Population  $(Y_{1N_1})$  $(\tilde{Y}_{12})$  $(Y_{2N_2})$  $(Y_{22})$  $(Y_{11})$  $(\hat{Y}_{21}),$  $(Y_{M1})$  $(Y_{M2})$ variables  $(x_{M1})$  $(x_{M2})$

 $(Y_{MN_M})$ 

 $(x_{MN_M})$ 

- Data
- Individual shapes
- Group variables
  - Group mean
  - Covariance
  - Smoothness prior (free parameter)
- Population variables
- Used for hypothesis testing [SJ Shigwan, SP Awate, 2016 MICCAI]



- Data
- Individual shapes
- Group variables

- Population variables
- Used for hypothesis testing [SJ Shigwan, SP Awate, 2016 MICCAI]



- Data
- Individual shapes
- Group variables
  - Group mean
  - Covariance
  - Smoothness prior (free parameter)
- Population variables
- Used for hypothesis testing [SJ Shigwan, SP Awate, 2016 MICCAI]



- Data
- Individual shapes
- Group variables

- Population variables
- Used for hypothesis testing [SJ Shigwan, SP Awate, 2016 MICCAI]





• With  $\theta := \{\mu, C, \{C_m\}_{m=1}^M\}$  as parameter and Y and Z as random variables

 $P(x, Y, Z|\theta) := \prod_{m=1}^{M} \prod_{i=1}^{N_M} P(x_{mi}|Y_{mi}) P(Y_{mi}|Z_m, C_m, \beta_m) P(Z_m|\mu, C, \beta)$ 



• With  $\theta := \{\mu, C, \{C_m\}_{m=1}^M\}$  as parameter and Y and Z as random variables

 $P(x, Y, Z|\theta) := \prod_{m=1}^{M} \prod_{i=1}^{N_M} \frac{P(x_{mi}|Y_{mi})}{P(Y_{mi}|Z_m, C_m, \beta_m)} P(Z_m|\mu, C, \beta)$ 



• With  $\theta := \{\mu, C, \{C_m\}_{m=1}^M\}$  as parameter and Y and Z as random variables

 $P(x, Y, Z|\theta) := \prod_{m=1}^{M} \prod_{i=1}^{N_M} P(x_{mi}|Y_{mi}) \frac{P(Y_{mi}|Z_m, C_m, \beta_m)}{P(Z_m|\mu, C, \beta)} P(Z_m|\mu, C, \beta)$ 



• With  $\theta := \{\mu, C, \{C_m\}_{m=1}^M\}$  as parameter and Y and Z as random variables

 $P(x, Y, Z|\theta) := \prod_{m=1}^{M} \prod_{i=1}^{N_M} P(x_{mi}|Y_{mi}) P(Y_{mi}|Z_m, C_m, \beta_m) \frac{P(Z_m|\mu, C, \beta)}{P(Z_m|\mu, C, \beta)}$ 

- We solve  $\theta^* := \arg \max_{\theta} \iint P(x, Y, Z|\theta) dY dZ$ using Expectation Maximization (EM)
- At  $t^{\text{th}}$  iteration  $\theta^t := \{\mu^t, C^t, \{C_m^t\}_{m=1}^M\}$
- Estep:  $\mathcal{Q}(\theta; \theta^t) := E_{P(Y,Z|x,\theta^t)}[\log P(x,Y,Z|\theta)]$
- Expectation is analytically intractable
- We use Monte-Carlo approximation  $\widehat{Q}(\theta; \theta^t) \approx \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^{S} \log P(x, y^s, z^s | \theta),$ where  $(y^s, z^s) \sim P(Y, Z | x, \theta^t)$
- M step:

$$\theta^{t+1} := \arg \max_{\theta} \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}(\theta; \theta^t)$$
- Null hypothesis: Given 2 groups of data A and B are from the same distribution
- We do permutation testing to test null hypothesis of equality of two group distribution in shape space
  - Permutation test is non-parametric, robust to type-1 errors
- Proposed test statistic *T* to measure differences between two shape distributions

$$T := \frac{1}{N_A} \sum_{i=1}^{N_A} d_{\text{Mah}}^2(y_{Ai}; z^B, C^B) + \frac{1}{N_B} \sum_{i=1}^{N_B} d_{\text{Mah}}^2(y_{Bi}; z^A, C^A)$$

- Null hypothesis: Given 2 groups of data A and B are from the same distribution
- We do **permutation testing** to test null hypothesis of equality of two group distribution in shape space
  - Permutation test is non-parametric, robust to type-1 errors
- Proposed test statistic *T* to measure differences between two shape distributions

$$T := \frac{1}{N_A} \sum_{i=1}^{N_A} d_{\text{Mah}}^2(y_{Ai}; z^B, C^B) + \frac{1}{N_B} \sum_{i=1}^{N_B} d_{\text{Mah}}^2(y_{Bi}; z^A, C^A)$$

- Null hypothesis: Given 2 groups of data A and B are from the same distribution
- We do **permutation testing** to test null hypothesis of equality of two group distribution in shape space
  - Permutation test is non-parametric, robust to type-1 errors
- Proposed test statistic *T* to measure differences between two shape distributions

$$T := \frac{1}{N_A} \sum_{i=1}^{N_A} d_{\text{Mah}}^2(y_{Ai}; z^B, C^B) +$$

$$\frac{1}{N_B} \sum_{i=1}^{N_B} d^2_{\text{Mah}}(y_{Bi}; z^A, C^A)$$

- Null hypothesis: Given 2 groups of data A and B are from the same distribution
- We do **permutation testing** to test null hypothesis of equality of two group distribution in shape space
  - Permutation test is non-parametric, robust to type-1 errors
- Proposed test statistic *T* to measure differences between two shape distributions

$$T := \frac{1}{N_A} \sum_{i=1}^{N_A} d_{\text{Mah}}^2(y_{Ai}; z^B, C^B) +$$

$$\frac{1}{N_B} \sum_{i=1}^{N_B} d^2_{\text{Mah}}(y_{Bi}; z^A, C^A)$$

#### **Results on Anatomical Data**

- Data from 2 groups of bones in humans
  - Group 1(Males) and Group 2(Females)
    - Each group has 15 individuals
    - Manually segmented images, imperfect segmentations





Capitate

Hamate

41

# **Evaluation - Baseline**

- ShapeWorks [Cates 2017]
  - 3D pointset-based framework for shape modeling
  - Does not employ hierarchical model
  - Forces point locations (within shape) to object boundary
  - Does not enforce shape smoothness and shape alignment during model fitting

[Cates 2017] Joshua Cates, Shireen Elhabian, Ross Whitaker. "Shapeworks: particlebased shape correspondence and visualization software." Statistical Shape and Deformation Analysis. Academic Press, 2017. 257-298

Group means  $z_1, z_2$ 



# Variation around mean of group-1

Ours



#### Mean shape $z_1$

#### ShapeWorks









46

#### Population mean $\mu$ with Cohen's d effect size



Ours

47

- Permutation test
  - Test statistic does not follow standard probability distribution
  - Infer distribution using permutation test
- Hypothesis testing results
  - Our method give p-value 0.13 and Shapeworks give p-value 0.3
  - Our method more confident about rejecting null hypothesis that given two groups are from same distribution, than Shapeworkss

- Shape model provides shape mean and covariance matrix
- Eigenvectors of covariance matrix could act as basis for shape distribution in shape space
- We have designed a novel objective function for finding optimized segmentation

- Data
  - Object segmentations in a training set. Test image.



- Task
  - Learning a generative model of shape
  - Estimating segmentation using shape prior

- Similarity measure between a feature F of image I and shape surface y
  - Shape surface *y*
  - $S \circ y$  = similarity transform of shape surface y
  - $\mathcal{B}(\cdot)$  = binarized volume for shape y
  - $L_x \in \{0,1\}$  be label at voxel x
    - 1 = object's interior
    - 0 = object's exterior
  - $-P_{\text{DNN}}(L|I,\theta)$  = distribution trained using DNN with weight parameters  $\theta$  $\log P_{\rm DNN}(l_x =$

-15

-20

-25

- PCA based shape representation with prior
  - $\Lambda := \{\lambda_k\}_{k=1}^K = \text{Top } K \text{ eigenvalues of covariance matrix } C$
  - $V := \{v_k\}_{k=1}^K = \text{Top } K \text{ eigenvectors of covariance matrix } C$
  - Any point y in shape space,  $y := \operatorname{Exp}_{\mu}(\sum_{k=1}^{K} w_k v_k)$
  - $-\{w_k \in \mathbb{R}\}_{k=1}^K$  are top K basis coefficients
  - $\tau$  is weighting parameter to sparsity prior and  $\zeta$  is normalizing constant

Regularizing  
prior on  
coefficients  
$$\{w_k \in \mathbb{R}\}_{k=1}^{K}$$
  
 $P(y = \operatorname{Exp}_{\mu}(\sum_{k=1}^{K} w_k v_k))$   
 $:= \zeta \exp(-\tau \sum_{k=1}^{K} |w_k| / \sqrt{\lambda_k})$ 

- Log-posterior PDF of object shape y $\log P(y = \operatorname{Exp}_{\mu}(\sum_{k=1}^{K} w_k v_k) | S, w, \mu, \Lambda, V, \theta, I)$ 
  - $:= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S} \circ y)_x \log P_{\text{DNN}}(l_x = 1|\theta, I) +$ 
    - $(1 \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S} \circ y)_x) \log P_{\text{DNN}}(l_x = 0|\theta, I) \tau \sum_{k=1}^K |w_k| / \sqrt{\lambda_k}$

Log-posterior PDF of object shape y

 $\log P(y = \operatorname{Exp}_{\mu}(\sum_{k=1}^{K} w_k v_k) | \mathcal{S}, w, \mu, \Lambda, V, \theta, I)$ 

- $:= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S} \circ y)_x \log P_{\text{DNN}}(l_x = 1|\theta, I) +$ 
  - $(1 \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S} \circ y)_x) \log P_{\text{DNN}}(l_x = 0|\theta, I) \tau \sum_{k=1}^K |w_k| / \sqrt{\lambda_k}$



Log-posterior PDF of object shape y

$$\log P(y = \operatorname{Exp}_{\mu}(\sum_{k=1}^{K} w_k v_k) | \mathcal{S}, w, \mu, \Lambda, V, \theta, I)$$

 $:= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S} \circ y)_x \log P_{\text{DNN}}(l_x = 1|\theta, I) + (1 - \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S} \circ y)_x) \log P_{\text{DNN}}(l_x = 0|\theta, I) - \tau \sum_{k=1}^K |w_k| / \sqrt{\lambda_k}$ 



• Log-posterior PDF of object shape y

$$\log P(y = \operatorname{Exp}_{\mu}(\sum_{k=1}^{K} w_k v_k) | \mathcal{S}, w, \mu, \Lambda, V, \theta, I)$$

- $:= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S} \circ y)_x \log P_{\text{DNN}}(l_x = 1|\theta, I) +$ 
  - $(1 \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S} \circ y)_x) \log P_{\text{DNN}}(l_x = 0|\theta, I) \tau \sum_{k=1}^K |w_k| / \sqrt{\lambda_k}$



• This sum of multiplications is nothing but sum of log-probabilities of overlapping voxels.

Log-posterior PDF of object shape y

$$\log P(y = \operatorname{Exp}_{\mu}(\sum_{k=1}^{K} w_k v_k) | \mathcal{S}, w, \mu, \Lambda, V, \theta, I)$$

- $:= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S} \circ y)_x \log P_{\text{DNN}}(l_x = 1|\theta, I) +$ 
  - $(1 \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S} \circ y)_x) \log P_{\text{DNN}}(l_x = 0|\theta, I) \tau \sum_{k=1}^K |w_k| / \sqrt{\lambda_k}$

• This is equivalent term for background voxels.

58

- Log-posterior PDF of object shape y $\log P(y = \operatorname{Exp}_{\mu}(\sum_{k=1}^{K} w_k v_k) | S, w, \mu, \Lambda, V, \theta, I)$ 
  - $:= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S} \circ y)_x \log P_{\text{DNN}}(l_x = 1|\theta, I) +$ 
    - $(1 \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S} \circ y)_x) \log P_{\text{DNN}}(l_x = 0|\theta, I) \tau \sum_{k=1}^K |w_k| / \sqrt{\lambda_k}$

• This last term is log of regularizing prior on basis coefficients.

• Log-posterior PDF of object shape  $\mathcal{Y}$ 

 $\log P(y = \operatorname{Exp}_{\mu}(\sum_{k=1}^{K} w_k v_k) | \mathcal{S}, w, \mu, \Lambda, V, \theta, I)$ 

 $:= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S} \circ y)_x \log P_{\text{DNN}}(l_x = 1 | \theta, I) + (1 - \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S} \circ y)_x) \log P_{\text{DNN}}(l_x = 0 | \theta, I) - \tau \sum_{k=1}^K |w_k| / \sqrt{\lambda_k}$ 

- Optimization of objective function (log-posterior PDF)
  - Calculating gradient is complex
  - Represent all parameters as set of independent scalars
  - Do parameter update by local unidirectional interval search for next update iteratively till convergence

#### Segmentation Results: Subcortical Brain <sup>60</sup> Structures

- Data from 30 human individuals (small number)
  - 30 human subjects
  - Low-quality expert segmentations
  - Actual MRI images for segmentation is available



### Segmentation Results: Subcortical Brain <sup>61</sup> Structures

- Experiment
  - Data: Brain MRI image with object segmentations
  - Baselines
    - U-Net: 3D U-Net [Brox 2015 MICCAI]
    - SR-Unet: Shape regularized Unet [Ravishankar 2017 MICCAI]
    - **Unet+SW**: U-Net coupled with shape prior learned from ShapeWorks [Cates 2017 Stat. Shape Deformation Analysis]
    - MA: Multiatlas segmentation using nonlinear nonparametric diffeomorphic registration
  - Comparison between estimated and true segmentations
- Evaluation metrics
  - Dice Similarity Coefficient (DSC)
  - Inter-surface distance
    - Histogram of nearest neighbor distances between surface pointsets of both images

#### Segmentation Results: Caudate



#### **Segmentation Results: Thalamus**





Clustering using hierarchical Riemannian Shape model

- Data
- Individual shapes
- Cluster variables
  - Cluster mean
  - Covariance
  - Smoothness prior  $\gamma_{11}$
  - Mixture weights
  - Membership
  - Cluster labels
- Population variables



- Data
- Individual shapes
- Cluster variables
  - Cluster mean
  - Covariance
  - Smoothness prior  $\gamma_{11}$
  - Mixture weights
  - Membership
  - Cluster labels
- Population variables



- Data
- Individual shapes
- Cluster variables
  - Cluster mean
  - Covariance
  - Smoothness prior  $\gamma_{11}$
  - Mixture weights
  - Membership
  - Cluster labels
- Population variables



 $\{z_1, C_1, \beta_1, w_1\}$ 

 $\gamma_{21}$ 

 $x_1$ 

 $\{\mu, C, \beta\}$ 

 $\gamma_2 M$ 

 $[x_2]$ 

 $(\{z_2, C_2, \beta_2, w_2\})...(\{z_M, C_M, \beta_M, w_M\})$ 

(3M)

 $x_N$ 

 $x_3$ 

 $N2 \gamma_1$ 

- Data
- Individual shapes
- Cluster variables
  - Cluster mean
  - Covariance
  - Smoothness prior  $\gamma_{11}$
  - Mixture weights
  - Membership
  - Cluster labels
- Population variables

NM

- Data
- Individual shapes
- Cluster variables
  - Cluster mean
  - Covariance
  - Smoothness prior  $\gamma_{11}$
  - Mixture weights
  - Membership
  - Cluster labels
- Population variables



- Data
- Individual shapes
- Cluster variables
  - Cluster mean
  - Covariance
  - Smoothness prior  $\gamma_{11}$
  - Mixture weights
  - Membership
  - Cluster labels
- Population variables



- Data
- Individual shapes
- Cluster variables
  - Cluster mean
  - Covariance
  - Smoothness prior
  - Mixture weights
  - Membership
  - Cluster labels
- Population variables



- Data
- Individual shapes
- Cluster variables
  - Cluster mean
  - Covariance
  - Smoothness prior  $\gamma_{11}$
  - Mixture weights
  - Membership
  - Cluster labels
- Population variables


$\gamma_{N1}$ 

 $\{z_1, C_1, \beta_1, w_1\}$ 

 $\gamma_{21}$ 

 $x_1$ 

 $\{\mu, C, \beta\}$ 

 $\gamma_{2M}$ 

 $[x_2]$ 

 $\{z_2, C_2, \beta_2, w_2\}$ )... $\{z_M, C_M, \beta_M, w_M\}$ 

(3M

 $x_N$ 

 $x_3$ 

 $N2 \gamma_1$ 

- Data
- Individual shapes
- Cluster variables
  - Cluster mean
  - Covariance
  - Smoothness prior m
  - Mixture weights
  - Membership
  - Cluster labels
- Population variables

NM

- Data
- Individual shapes
- Cluster variables
  - Cluster mean
  - Covariance
  - Smoothness prior  $\gamma$
  - Mixture weights
  - Membership
  - Cluster labels
- Population variables

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{S} \\ (\mu, C, \beta) \\ (\mu,$$

$$\bar{\nu} := \{\nu_n \in \{1, 2, \cdots, M\}\}_{n=1}^N$$

 $\gamma_{N1}$ 

 $\{z_1, C_1, \beta_1, w_1\}$ 

 $\gamma_{21}$ 

 $x_1$ 

 $\{\mu, C, \beta\}$ 

Y32

 $\gamma_{2M}$ 

 $(x_2)$ 

 $\{z_2, C_2, \beta_2, w_2\}$ )... $\{z_M, C_M, \beta_M, w_M\}$ 

(3M)

 $x_N$ 

 $x_3$ 

 $N2 \gamma_1$ 

75

NM

- Data
- Individual shapes
- Cluster variables
  - Cluster mean
  - Covariance
  - Smoothness prior  $\gamma_{11}$
  - Mixture weights
  - Membership
  - Cluster labels
- Population variables

- Data
- Individual shapes
- Cluster variables
  - Cluster mean
  - Covariance
  - Smoothness prior  $\gamma$
  - Mixture weights
  - Membership
  - Cluster labels
- Population variables

$$\begin{array}{c} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \mu, C, \beta \right\} \\ = S \\ \left\{ z_1, C_1, \beta_1, w_1 \right\}_{\gamma_{N1}} \left\{ z_2, C_2, \beta_2, w_2 \right\} \\ (z_1, C_1, \beta_1, w_1) \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N2} \\ \gamma_{N2} \\ \gamma_{N2} \\ \gamma_{N2} \\ \gamma_{N2} \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N2} \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N2} \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N2} \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N2} \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N2} \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N2} \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N2} \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N2} \\ \gamma_{N1} \\ \gamma_{N$$

 $\bar{\nu} := \{\nu_n \in \{1, 2, \cdots, M\}\}_{n=1}^N$ 

77



• With **Z** and  $\theta := \{\mu, C, \overline{C}, \overline{w}\}$  as parameters,

 $\max_{\mathbf{z},\theta} P(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z},\theta) P(\mathbf{z}|\theta) = \max_{\mathbf{z},\theta} \int P(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{Y},\bar{\nu}|\mathbf{z},\theta) P(\mathbf{z}|\theta) d\mathbf{Y} d\bar{\nu}$ 





• Optimize using MC-EM

 $\theta := \{\mu, C, \bar{C}, \bar{w}\}$ 

 $\prod_{n=1}^{N} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \int P(x_n | Y_n) P(Y_n | \nu_n = m, z_m, C_m)$  $P(\nu_n = m | \theta) P(\mathbf{z} | \mu, C, \beta) dY_n$ 



Sampling using Leapfrog in Shape Space

 $\prod_{n=1}^{N} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \int P(x_n | Y_n) P(Y_n | \nu_n = m, z_m, C_m)$  $P(\nu_n = m | \theta) P(\mathbf{z} | \mu, C, \beta) dY_n$ 

- Simulating data from 3 groups of 3D ellipsoids
  - Groups
    - 32 ellipsoids each
    - 2 axes lengths fixed to 30
    - 3<sup>rd</sup> axis length varies from
      10 to 17 in group 1
      16 to 24 in group 2
      23 to 30 in group 3



- Introduce random perturbations / bumps on surface
- Evaluated clusters based on ground truth
- Compared our results with VBMixPCA [Gooya et.al., TPAMI 2018]

82

 Accuracy of clustering is calculated between true labels and estimated labels





83

Cluster means

## Clustering Evaluation Simulated Data Principle mode of Variation around z<sub>1</sub>



Our method 84

#### Cluster-1 mean z<sub>1</sub>









## Clustering Evaluation Simulated Data Principle mode of Variation around z<sub>2</sub>



Our method 85







#### VBMix PCA

#### Principle mode of Variation around $z_3$



86

Our

**PCA** 

## Conclusion

- Proposed a novel hierarchical generative model for statistical shape analysis using point distribution model, in which pointsets lie in Kendall shape space
- Handles noisy segmentations
- Evaluated this framework for hypothesis testing
- Proposed Bayesian object segmentation using statistical shape prior, which extends deep neural nets and give improved segmentation
- Proposed hierarchical shape clustering framework based on Riemannian mixture component

## Thank You