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Abstract—Segmentation of the spine directly from three-dimensional (3-D) image data is desirable to accurately capture its morphological properties. We describe a method that allows true 3-D spinal image segmentation using a deformable integral spine model. The method learns the appearance of vertebrae from multiple continuous features recorded along vertebra boundaries in a given training set of images. Important summarizing statistics are encoded into a necklace model on which landmarks are differentiated on their free dimensions. The landmarks are used within a priority segmentation scheme to reduce the complexity of the segmentation problem. Necklace models are coupled by string models. The string models describe in detail the biological variability in the appearance of spinal curvatures from multiple continuous features recorded in the training set. In the segmentation phase, the necklace and string models are used to interactively detect vertebral structures in new image data via elastic deformation reminiscent of a marionette with strings allowing for movement between interrelated structures. Strings constrain the deformation of the spine model within feasible solutions. The driving application in this work is analysis of computed tomography scans of the human lumbar spine. An illustration of the segmentation process shows that the method is promising for interactive image segmentation, landmark-based object analysis, and anatomical saliency in the visual appearance of the spine. Third, geometrical and spatial models often offer no room for human-computer interaction, which is still crucial for segmentation. In order to construct an apt spine segmentation model it is natural i) to model shape as well as gray-level features, ii) to address the natural variability of these features and iii) to use human-computer interaction for exploiting inhomogeneities in these features.

Commonly, spinal image segmentation is done by fitting a priori geometrical models of vertebrae and a priori spatial models of inter-relationships between vertebrae to edges in the image. There are three important shortcomings to this. First, the models only capture a priori shape and spatial information, while the appearance of the spine in the image is also defined by gray-level features. There is also a need to model gray-level appearance [1]. Second, geometrical and spatial models often lack expressive power to catch the full range of feasible image appearances of the spine. Third, geometrical and spatial models often offer no room for human-computer interaction, which is still crucial for segmentation. In order to construct an apt spine segmentation model it is natural i) to model shape as well as gray-level features, ii) to address the natural variability of these features and iii) to use human-computer interaction for exploiting inhomogeneities in these features.

This paper presents a segmentation method that combines strings [2] and necklaces [3] into a deformable integral spine model. Strings focus on learning the most relevant biological variation in the visual appearance of the spine as a whole under the premise that this variation can be well captured in a statistical sense. Learning in this context is reduced to statistical analysis of multiple continuous shape and gray level features in a given training set of segmented spinal images. Necklaces aim to exploit inhomogeneities in multiple continuous shape and gray-level features of vertebrae that are also deduced from a given training set of segmented spinal images. The premise is that feature inhomogeneities can be reliably detected in the training phase and then interactively used as salient features in the image segmentation phase. Hence, we enhance the segmentation model with a priori knowledge about natural variation and anatomical saliency in the visual appearance of the spine rather than focusing on more a priori geometrical or spatial knowledge.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section II related work on segmentation of spinal images is discussed. Section III briefly describes the image material used in this work and introduces the proposed method. The following issues are addressed: the necklace model for capturing vertebral structures,
the string model for expressing spinal curvatures and the spine model for segmenting the entire spine by elastic deformation in the image reminiscent of a marionette with interrelated structures moved by strings. In Section IV an illustration of the entire segmentation process is given. Discussion and conclusion follow in Section V.

II. RELATED WORK

Image-based analysis of spinal morphology predominantly involves multiplanar images on which two-dimensional (2-D) segmentation models, e.g., [4] and [5] or 3-D segmentation models, e.g., [6] and [7], are applied. Here, we discuss a number of 3-D models for segmentation of 3-D spinal or vertebral images in terms of boundary model, objective function, model deformation and interaction.

In [8], an image segmentation model is proposed that uses prior knowledge of an object’s structure to guide the search for its boundaries. The boundary model is a 3-D radial surface, which is a direct extension of the radial contour model [9] that has also been applied for interactive segmentation of vertebral structures. The surface is represented as a series of parallel slices, where the center points for the slices are collinear, forming an axis that runs perpendicular to all the slices. A realistic radial surface model of vertebral structures is constructed on the basis of a training set. The user instantiates a shape model for a given volume dataset by indicating a set of landmarks in the volume data. These landmarks define the model’s local coordinate system within the image volume, and may also provide initial values for one or two radials. A constraint propagation algorithm is invoked to find the values for the remaining radials that are consistent with these starting points. The radial surface is deformed in the image to optimize an objective function such that in the result radials correspond with highlighted edges in the volume image. During segmentation, an uncertainty interval is maintained for each radial so as to keep track of which values still satisfy the constraints to maintain the trained shape of the model.

In [10] and [11], a more sophisticated model is introduced for segmentation of the cervical spine. The cervical spine model is a finite-element model augmented with additional structures to locate landmarks, contours, surfaces, and regions. The spine model is constructed on the basis of a training set of spinal images. This training set is fed to a tessellation algorithm and a smoothing and triangle decimation step to produce a typical set of triangular surface patches comprising each individual vertebra. The surfaces and volumes are used in statistical estimation modules to interactively localize a number of a priori selected landmarks in a new image, using the finite-element model as a road map. Once the landmarks are found they are successively employed to refine the vertebra models using a nonlinear optimization method that aims to minimize the distance of the model surface to the vertebra surface in the image. The objective function that drives the model deformation is based on gray-value intensity, image gradient and curvature properties. Other works that apply a finite element model for segmentation of spinal or vertebral structures include [12].

In [13] and [14], a method is presented which allows the development of a statistical shape model of an object’s surface, in the reference these are vertebral surfaces. A statistical shape model is obtained from a training set by principal component analysis. For image segmentation, the average shape model is interactively placed in the image in the proximity of the vertebral structure of interest. To this end, mesh cut-lines of the average shape model are roughly positioned onto orthogonal cuts of a 3-D computed tomography (CT) image. The average model is then deformed in statistically feasible ways to find the vertebral boundary in the gray-level image. Model deformation reduces to optimization of the weights of the first principal eigenmodes and of the translational and rotational parameters. The statistical shape model is easily extended to capture multiple vertebrae, however, without the capacity to explicitly quantify properties of the entire spine. Other works that use a statistical shape model for segmentation of spinal or vertebral structures include [6]. Vrtovec et al. [15] propose a similar shape model incorporating gray-level information.

The reported methods have in common that an intrinsically 3-D boundary model is constructed from a priori information and then realistically deformed in a 3-D image using interactively defined and localized landmarks as a guide. However, with the exception of [15], the methods do not rely on a priori information about the gray-level appearance of vertebral structures. The gray-level informahas specific characteristics and is highly suited to enhance the segmentation model. Apart from this, most of the 3-D methods rely on manual definition and localization of anatomical landmarks, which is subjective and laborious. To overcome these shortcomings we propose an interactive statistical segmentation model of continuous image and shape features with automatically defined and interactively applied landmarks.

III. MATERIALS AND METHOD

We use image data consisting of CT scans of the abdomen of a group of 18 elderly people, originally taken to investigate the aorta (see Fig. 1). All subjects were scanned with a Philips SR 700 CT at 140 KV (Philips Medical Systems, Best, The Netherlands) using a maximum field of view (48 cm). Each CT image contains about 300 slices of 512 x 512 pixels. Slice thickness is 0.5 mm, slice interval is 0.5 mm and density resolution is 12 bits. CT source images have been transferred to an offline computer workstation (EasyScil, Philips Medical Systems) for viewing and post processing. We concentrate on the lower four lumbar vertebrae (L2, L3, L4, L5) and demonstrate our method on 6 CT images of subjects with minimal spinal and vertebral deformities.

For segmentation of the spine images we use deformable models (see, e.g., [16]–[18] for detailed information). First introduced by Kass et al. [19] and Staib et al. [20], the idea behind deformable models is to treat segmentation as an optimization
problem, typically by minimizing a model fitting function that 
rewards locally smooth boundaries passing through high-gra-
dient image regions. A model is deformed in the image trying 
to compromise between features derived from the image and 
features obtained from a shape model. The deformation stops 
when an equilibrium is reached. The deformable model is then 
assumed to lie on the target boundary in the image.

We adopt the deformable model approach with the difference 
that we aim to learn vertebral features rather than to define them 
on the basis of a priori geometrical knowledge. In addition, to 
exploit salient and variation-based image as observed in a given 
training set of segmented spinal images we construct 1) models 
of the lumbar vertebrae using necklaces, 2) models of the spinal 
curvature using strings, and 3) an integral spine model using 
coupled necklace and string models. In the following section 
we describe the models one by one.

A. Necklace Models of Vertebral Surfaces

The vertebra surface has many concave and convex surface 
parts differing from weakly to strongly curved. Analogous to 
diversity in shape surface, the gray-level structure along the ver-
tebra boundary varies from one part to the other. At some parts 
the vertebra boundary has well-defined intensity discontinuities, 
while at other parts there is vague pictorial evidence and/or none 
at all due to insufficient image quality or interfering structures 
in the neighborhood.

To appropriately capture and exploit the locally sophisticated 
shape and gray-level appearance of the vertebra surface we need 
to observe multiple features. For this reason, we employ neck-
laces [3]. A necklace model allows for the analysis of inho-
mogeneous boundaries by recording a repertoire of shape 
and gray-level features along a continuous surface. Specifically it al-

dows for exploitation of salient features as landmarks for image segmentation.

1) Surface Representation: The appearance of the spine 
is learned from a set of \( M = 5 \) training objects, consisting of 
3-D spinal images \( I_m: x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, m = 1, \ldots, M \) 
and ground-truth vertebral surface \( s_m^0: u \in \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3, \theta = 1, \ldots, V, \) one for each vertebra. In order to optimally represent 
the continuous vertebral surface we use continuous B-spline sur-
faces. The advantage of a B-spline representation is that quan-
titative information can be analytically computed, allowing for 
more complete and accurate measurements. The B-spline sur-
face is a collection of B-Spline curves [21], i.e., the vertebral 
surface is defined as the set of all points given by the following 
expression for all parameter values of \( u = [u_1, u_2]^T: \)

\[
\mathbf{s}(u|\mathbf{b}^{ij}) = \sum_{i=0}^{I} \sum_{j=0}^{J} B_{ij}^p(u_1) B_{ij}^q(u_2) \mathbf{b}^{ij},
\]

where \( \mathbf{b}^{ij} \) is the array of \( I \times J \) control points. The \( B_{ij}^p(\mathbf{u}_1) \) are 
B-spline basis functions of degree \( p - 1 \) in \( u_1 \) direction, which are \( p \rightarrow 2 \) times continuously differentiable. The \( B_{ij}^q(\mathbf{u}_2) \) are 
the basis functions of degree \( q \rightarrow 1 \) in \( u_2 \), which are \( q \rightarrow 2 \) times continuously differentiable. A set of knots in a path parameter 
interval relating to the control points is used to define the basis 
functions. For an analytic expression of B-splines basis func-
tions see [21].

We control the B-spline surface by interpolation points \( \mathbf{p}^{ij} \) 
rather than by control points \( \mathbf{b}^{ij} \). This is beneficial because 
a restricted number of points are required to define the spine 
and to control the spine model when defining ground-truth sur-
faces and when segmenting images. Here, the ground-truth ver-
tebra surface is obtained by interpolating a B-Spline surface 
through \( 12 \times 12 \) interpolation points using centripetal surface 
parametrization to handle very sharp turns [21]. The interpola-
tion points are defined as

\[
\mathbf{p}^{ij} = \mathbf{s}(u_1^{ij}, u_2^{ij}) = \sum_{i=0}^{I} \sum_{j=0}^{J} B_{ij}^p(u_1) B_{ij}^q(u_2) \mathbf{b}^{ij}.
\]

The interpolation points are indicated by a medical expert 
in three 2-D orthogonal slices of the volume data once and 
within one day. Generally, the interpolated B-spline surface 
corresponds to the true vertebral surface. At places where the 
B-spline surface locally deviates from the true vertebra surface, 
better correspondence can be obtained either by indicating 
boundary points more precisely or more densely.

2) Feature Definition: After construction of the ground-
truth B-spline vertebra surfaces, they are manually aligned to 
prepare them for statistical analysis. Manual alignment reduces 
to indicating corresponding landmark points on the different 
vertebra surfaces in our training set. Once the B-spline surfaces 
are aligned and validated by visual inspection, shape and image 
features are sampled at 400 points and conveniently captured by 
feature function \( \mathbf{f}^{ij}(\mathbf{u}) \) in the \( N \)-dimensional functional 
space. The functional \( \mathbf{f}^{ij}(\mathbf{u}) \) is a manifold defined as the 
B-spline surface that interpolates through the sampled features. 
Considering the \( \theta \)th vertebrae, the set of multivariate continu-
ous features deduced from the training data by the mapping 
\( \mathbf{f}^{ij}: \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N \) is then represented by

\[
\mathbf{F}^j(\mathbf{u}) = \left[ \mathbf{f}_1^j(\mathbf{u}), \ldots, \mathbf{f}_V^j(\mathbf{u}) \right].
\]

Here, we have chosen to compute the location, rotation and scale 
invariant mean curvature as the first local shape feature to be 
recorded along the surface outlines. This feature is captured by 
\( \mathbf{f}_1^{ij}(\mathbf{u}) \). We also compute the principal curvatures to simplify 
landmark definition in subsequent steps. They are captured in 
\( \mathbf{f}_2^{ij}(\mathbf{u}) \) and \( \mathbf{f}_3^{ij}(\mathbf{u}) \), respectively. The feature values are analy-

tically computed from the B-spline surfaces \( \mathbf{s}_m^0(\mathbf{u}) \) and are 
then used to construct feature functions \( \mathbf{f}_m^0(\mathbf{u}) \) by interpolating 
smooth B-spline surface through them. Table I lists the shape 
feature definitions.

Following [3], we also compute the three image features 
listed in Table II. They are obtained from the structure tensor 
matrix \( \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{x}; \sigma) [22] \). This matrix gives for each image point 
\( \mathbf{x} \) the local 3-D structure of the image at scale \( \sigma \). When all 
it's eigenvalues are sufficiently large this indicates a point-like 
structure. Feature function \( \mathbf{f}_m^0(\mathbf{u}) \mathbf{I}_m \mathbf{S}_m^0 \) expresses such 
point-like structures. Two eigenvalue, \( \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \) a multiplier larger 
than the smallest eigenvalue \( \lambda_3 \) indicates a point on a curve-like

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st princ. curvat.</td>
<td>( k_1(\mathbf{u}</td>
<td>\mathbf{S}_m) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd princ. curvat.</td>
<td>( k_2(\mathbf{u}</td>
<td>\mathbf{S}_m) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean curvature</td>
<td>( k_3(\mathbf{u}</td>
<td>\mathbf{S}_m) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
structure. This is expressed by \( f^0_{\text{mg}}(\mathbf{u} | I_m, s^0_m) \). Finally, feature function \( f^0_{\text{mg}}(\mathbf{u} | I_m, s^0_m) \) highlights sheet-like structures. The distinction between the three types of surface points is made on the basis of the normalization constant \( c_t \), reflecting the minimum required image variation for an image point to be classified as point or curve landmark. This way we can focus on strong point landmarks and curve landmarks while disregarding image variations caused by minor bumps or noise.

The extraction of \( N = 6 \) features for each vertebra yields \( M = 5 \) sets of \( V = 4 \) surfaces in a 6-dimensional functional space. These surfaces are statistically analyzed for model construction.

3) Landmark Selection: We aim at exploiting landmarks that are defined by the multiple features recorded along the continuous vertebra surface. Thanks to the B-spline surface representation, no manual or other additional heuristic techniques are required to compute the positions of landmarks, in contrast with other approaches such as [4]. Vertebral landmark definition reduces to localizing peaks in feature function values \( f^0_{\text{mg}}(\mathbf{u}) \). However, rather than separately investigating each training instance \( n \) for landmarks, we first compute the elementary statistics of the training sets. Then we try to identify robust landmarks from the average feature functions. The population average for vertebra \( \hat{g} \) is computed as

\[
\hat{f}^0(\mathbf{u} | I_m, s^0_m) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{n=1}^{M} f^0_{mg}(\mathbf{u} | I_m, s^0_m). \tag{4}
\]

The functional \( \hat{f}^0(\mathbf{u}) \) is a surface in the \( N \)-dimensional functional space, obtained by averaging each training surface \( f^0_{mg}(\mathbf{u} | I_m, s^0_m) \) in each dimension. The corresponding standard deviation is

\[
 \sigma_{\hat{f}^0}(\mathbf{u} | I_m, s^0_m) = \left( \frac{1}{M-1} \sum_{n=1}^{M} ||f^0_{mg}(\mathbf{u} | I_m, s^0_m) - \hat{f}^0(\mathbf{u})||^2 \right)^{1/2}. \tag{5}
\]

The average feature function \( \hat{f}^0(\mathbf{u}) \) is investigated for high curvature points on the basis of its local second order properties [23]. These properties are obtained from the infinite set of planes passing through and containing the normal in geometric space at a specific point on the population average surface \( \hat{f}^0(\mathbf{u}) \). For example, when the only features considered are the \( x, y, \) and \( z \) coordinates of the vertebra surfaces \( s^0_m(\mathbf{u}) \), each of the normal planes intersects the surface by a planar curve. The curvature at the point of interest is an identifying curvature measure for the surface. The pair of directions \( \mathbf{v} \) and \( \mathbf{w} \) are defined such that these curvatures reach their maximum and minimum curvatures \( k_1 \) and \( k_2 \) as illustrated in Fig. 2. We use these principal curvatures and locally associated directions to define landmarks.

We make a distinction between point landmarks, curve landmarks and sheet points by evaluating the principal curvature values at each point of \( \hat{f}^0(\mathbf{u}) \). Point landmarks are surface points \( U_A \) where both principle curvatures have an extreme absolute value. They are precisely localized in three dimensions. Surface points where the absolute value of one of the principal curvatures is extreme, are curve landmarks, denoted by \( U_B \). They are precisely localized in two dimensions. At sheet points \( U_C \) both values of the absolute principle curvature is low. Typically they are well-defined in only one dimension. The sets \( U_A, U_B, U_C \) together contain all relevant path positions. A threshold for the principal curvature values may be chosen such that the definition of these sets, i.e., the distribution of geometrical surface landmarks, largely coincides with anatomical landmarks.

At this point we have \( V = 4 \) necklace models; one for each vertebra. In the segmentation step, the information contained in \( \hat{f}^0(\mathbf{u}) \) and \( \sigma_{\hat{f}^0}(\mathbf{u}) \) is used as a reference model for feature selection and qualification. The sets \( U_A, U_B, U_C \) are used for landmark-based segmentation.

B. String Models of the Spinal Curves

We stack each of the necklace models to obtain a model at the level of the spine. The stack of necklace models allows us to model the cervical and lumbar curvatures, characterized by a convex shape, and the thoracic and sacral curvatures, characterized a convex forward shape. These spinal curvatures are almost always present with some variation across and among subjects. A model of these curvatures, therefore, is likely to assist segmentation of the spine in an image.

We aim at capturing the spinal curvatures using string models. As introduced in [2], in contrast to other similar approaches (e.g., [24]–[26]), the string model has the capacity to build a detailed underlying statistical model of open and closed boundaries from multiple continuous shape and image features. Here, we use strings to catch the common appearance of the spinal curvatures observed in our training data and the main modes of variation therein, in ways similar to [27].

1) Curve Representation: The shape of the spinal curvatures is learned from the same training set of \( M = 5 \) example images and \( V = 4 \) surface outlines described in Section III-A. Assuming the landmarks on the lumbar vertebrae occur at approximately the same position, we select point landmarks \( \mathbf{u}_\ell \in U_A \) for \( \ell = 1, \ldots , L \) and learn the appearance of the \( L \) curves that pass through the surface landmark points.
s_{m}^{1}(u), \ldots, s_{m}^{V}(u)$. We represent the $\ell$th feature in the $m$th training image by a $q$th-order tensor product B-spline curve that handles the mapping $c : u \in \Re \rightarrow \Re^{3}$. The B-spline curve is defined by

$$c_{m}^{\ell}(u,v) = \sum_{i=1}^{V} B_{m}^{V}(u,v).$$  

Basis functions $B_{m}^{V}(u)$ correspond to the $V = 4$ interpolation points $v$. This way, each curve captures the spatial relation between corresponding point landmarks on adjacent vertebrae, derived automatically from the vertebral surfaces $s_{m}^{V}(u)$.  

2) Feature Definition: Image and shape features are extracted along the curves $c_{m}^{\ell}(u)$ in the training set and captured by space curves in functional space. This yields the set of feature functions

$$F(u) = \{f_{1}^{\ell}(u), \ldots, f_{M}^{\ell}(u)\}.$$  

We observe two features along the curve $c_{m}^{\ell}(u)$. The first feature is the 3-D curvature, which is analytically computed at each point of $c_{m}^{\ell}(u)$. We have chosen this feature because of its invariance properties and because it might reveal new and interesting anatomical knowledge. For example, the value and location of the maximum curvature along the spinal curves has already been reported to be a relevant clinical measure for spinal deformities [27]. Curvature values are computed entirely in 3D. The second feature measures the image gradient magnitude, supporting the definition of spinal curvature by means of image evidence, which is mainly confined at tips of the vertebral structures. Table III lists the two features and their definition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>curvature</td>
<td>$f_{m}^{\ell}(u</td>
<td>m, c_{m}^{\ell})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gradient</td>
<td>$f_{m}^{\ell}(u</td>
<td>m, c_{m}^{\ell})$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table III Curve Features in Our Implementation. The functional $f_{m}^{\ell}(u|m, c_{m}^{\ell})$ expresses the contour curvature, computed on the basis of the first derivative $c$ and second derivative $c$. The functional $f_{m}^{\ell}(u|m, c_{m}^{\ell})$ captures the image gradient.

The one-dimensional (1-D) curve $\tilde{F}(u)$ in the multidimensional functional space is obtained by averaging each training curve $f_{m}^{\ell}(u)$ in each dimension separately. The standard deviation is

$$\alpha_{F}(u) = \left(\frac{1}{M-1} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \|f_{m}^{\ell}(u|m, c_{m}^{\ell}) - \tilde{F}(u)\|^{2}\right)^{1/2}$$  

The average feature function $\tilde{F}(u)$ and variation $\alpha_{F}(u)$ only contain elementary statistics of the training data. Variational information is captured in more detail by functional data analysis [29], producing string models of the spinal curvatures. The string models capture the most important modes of variation by functional principal components analysis. In addition, they incorporate a functional principal regression model that allows to weight features according to these modes of variation and to explain unknown instances by a statistically determined feature weighting procedure. We refer to [2] for more detail.

At this point we have a detailed statistical description of the spinal curvatures. For simplicity, we assume all the relevant information is contained in $\tilde{F}(u)$, and $\alpha_{F}(u)$. We proceed with only these two quantities. The tubes in Fig. 3 illustrates the population average spinal curvatures of the spinal lumbar parts in our training data.

C. A Deformable Integral Spine Model

To form an integral model of the spine we couple the necklace models of vertebrae and the string models of the spinal curvature as illustrated in Fig. 3. The spine model is deformed onto new image data such that it fits best the spine visualized by that image.

1) Qualification: The deformable integral spine model consists of deformable surfaces $s_{\ell}(u)$ and deformable curves $c_{\ell}(u)$, which account for variability among vertebral structures and their interrelationships, respectively. For all $V = 4$ necklace models, the initial surfaces are $s_{\ell}(0)$ and curve $c_{\ell}(0)$ and for all $L = 6$ string models the initial curves are the population average. That is, assuming models $s_{\ell}(u)$ and $c_{\ell}(u)$ are properly aligned and uniformly parameterized to establish point correspondence the initial models are defined as

$$s_{\ell}(0)(u) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M} s_{m}^{\ell}(u)$$  

$$c_{\ell}(0)(u) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M} c_{m}^{\ell}(u).$$  

The fit quality is determined on the basis of features $f_{\ell}(u)$ and $\tilde{f}(u)$ emanating from $s_{\ell}(0)(u)$ and $c_{\ell}(0)(u)$ respectively.
The model fitting function is a compromise between the fit quality of the necklace models and the string models. When the set $S^i_t(u), \ldots, S^i_{v}(u)$ is represented by $S^i_t(u)$ and $C^i_f(u), \ldots, C^i_{v}(u)$ by $C^i_t(u)$ we have

$$\Theta_{\text{spine}}(S^i_t(u), C^i_t(u)) = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{i=1}^{V} \omega^i \cdot \theta^i \left( \hat{F}^i, \sigma_{F^i}, \tilde{F}^i \right) + \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^{L} \omega^l \cdot \theta^l \left( \hat{F}^l, \sigma_{F^l}, \tilde{F}^l \right).$$ (12)

The first term measures the distance between the expected and the sampled values for each vertebra $\theta^i$. To ensure a controllable distance measure, the Mahalanobis distance [30] is computed using mean and variation information obtained from the training data. For the $j$th vertebra this means

$$\theta^j \left( S^j_i(u), \tilde{F}^j, \sigma_{F^j}, \hat{F}^j \right) = \int u \left( \frac{\| \tilde{F}^j(u) - F^j(u) \|^{2}}{\sigma_{F^j}(u)} \right) du.$$ (13)

The fit is controlled by means of the function $v(u)$ which weights the fit at each point of the deformable surface $S^j_i(u)$. Weighting is done according to the type of surface point under consideration: for point landmarks there is a predefined weight $v_A$, for curve landmarks $v_B$ and for sheet points $v_C$. For example, interactive landmark-based image segmentation is performed using settings $v_A = 1$, $v_B = 0$, $v_C = 0$. The weights may also be set such that features along the entire surface contribute by setting all values larger than 0, but are constrained to add up to one.

The second component in (12) measures the distance between the expected and the sampled values for each of the $L = 6$ modeled spinal curvatures. This way the deformable integral spine model seeks resemblance between the reference spinal curvature $\hat{F}^f$ and the deformed curve $\tilde{F}^f$ normalized by the common modes of variation. For the $f$th string model the fit quality is formulated as

$$\theta^f \left( C^f_i(u), \tilde{F}^f, \sigma_{F^f}, \hat{F}^f \right) = \int u \left( \frac{\| \tilde{F}^f(u) - F^f(u) \|^{2}}{\sigma_{F^f}(u)} \right) du.$$ (14)

The model fitting function is regulated by means of weights $\omega^i$ and $\omega^j$, which are positive and add up to one. Their value is defined by the user and generally tuned such that they emphasis either the fit of the necklace models or the fit of the strings models. The fit quality forms the basis for optimization.

2) Optimization: Having specified the model fitting function, we must choose how to optimize the degrees of freedom of the deformable integral spine model. The degrees of freedom are specified by the number and types of points that control the spine model. Each of the $V = 4$ necklace models is controlled by $12 \times 12$ interpolation points (see Fig. 4). We, thus, have a total of 448 control points which we need to reposition in order to optimize the spine model. Optimization of the spine model is done progressively: a single necklace model is optimized and fixed, results are propagated to the remaining necklace models via the string models, the next adjacent necklace model is refined and fixed and results are propagated to the remaining necklace models, etc. Optimization only affects the surface geometry of the necklace models: in our implementation the curves constituting the string models are automatically derived from them.

We discuss optimization of a necklace model and propagation of its results via string models to obtain the optimal spine model

$$\Theta_{\text{spine, opt}} = \arg \min_{\Theta_{\text{spine}}(S_t, C_t)} \Theta_{\text{spine}}(S_t, C_t).$$ (15)

Optimization of a single necklace model involves two main steps. In the first step, a new position is suggested for an interpolation point on the necklace model and the model fitting function value is recomputed for the spine model. This is followed by deformation of the necklace model to move the point to the newly suggested position if the model fits better this way. Interpolation points are optimized either in a 3-D, 2-D, or 1-D space, depending on the type of surface points: point landmarks are optimized in three dimensions, curve landmarks in two dimensions, and sheet points in one dimension. The 3-D search space is defined by a linear combination of the vectors $\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{v}$, and $\mathbf{w}$ as defined in Fig. 5. The 2-D search space is defined by a linear combination the vectors $\mathbf{n}$ and $\mathbf{v}$. The 1-D search space is defined by $\mathbf{n}$. Optimizing a point landmark, for example, reduces to finding optimal values for scalars $\alpha, \beta$, and $\gamma$ that define the point movement

$$\mathbf{d} \left( \mathbf{u} \right| \mathbf{s}^f) = \alpha \mathbf{n} \left( \mathbf{u} \right| \mathbf{s}^f) + \beta \mathbf{v} \left( \mathbf{u} \right| \mathbf{s}^f) + \gamma \mathbf{w} \left( \mathbf{u} \right| \mathbf{s}^f).$$ (16)

Apart from the differences in degrees of freedom per surface point, we also differentiate between priority per surface point. The following scheme is employed: 1) optimize point landmarks on the necklace model in a 3-D area, resulting in a rough estimate of the position of the vertebra boundary by its point landmarks; 2) optimize curve landmarks in a 2-D area departing from 1), resulting in the location of surface curve points determining the outline of the vertebrae; 3) optimize sheet points in a 1-D area departing from 2), resulting in the location of all boundary points; and 4) optimize all points one more time in their respective dimensions departing from 3) to fine tune the result and to obtain a global optimum. This scheme allows us to interactively search for a limited set of well-defined points in...
the image and then to exploit solutions thereof to constrain the deformation of the entire necklace model.

We also distribute the force working on a point landmark to the entire necklace model. That is, we preserve the shape of the deformable surface as much as possible when fitting a specific surface point by simultaneously estimating the correct position for deformable surface points that have not yet been optimized. This means that, given drive $d(\mathbf{u}_i | \mathbf{s}_j^\delta)$ working on surface point $\mathbf{s}_j^\delta(\mathbf{u}_i)$, the following movement of points $\mathbf{s}_j^\delta(\mathbf{u}_j)$, $\forall \mathbf{u}_j \in U$ is performed to compute

$$
\mathbf{s}_{j+1}^\delta(\mathbf{u}_j) = \mathbf{s}_j^\delta(\mathbf{u}_j) + d(\mathbf{u}_j | \mathbf{s}_j^\delta) e^{-\epsilon_\delta/s/c_d}
$$

where $\epsilon_\delta = D(s_j^\delta(\mathbf{u}_i), s_j^\delta(\mathbf{u}_j))$ denotes the Euclidean distance between surface points $s_j^\delta(\mathbf{u}_j)$ and $s_j^\delta(\mathbf{u}_j)$. The constant $c_d > 0$ is a predefined value controlling the magnitude of the distribution.

Optimization of a single necklace model effects adjacent necklace models by propagating the deformation of one necklace model to the others via the string models. That is, in searching for a specific vertebra we also estimate the position of other vertebrae. We do the estimation only when optimizing point landmarks so that only movement of one point landmark affects the entire spine model. We accomplish this by distributing the force that works on a single point on one necklace model to all other points on all necklace models, in this case, weighted according to distance. For example, if there is a drive $d(\mathbf{u}_i)$ working on surface point $\mathbf{s}_j^\delta(\mathbf{u}_i), \mathbf{u}_i \in \mathcal{U}_i$, which is also the connection point $c_i(t_{ij})$ for a string model, this yields the following estimation for $s_j^\delta(\mathbf{u}_j)$ for all other necklace models $\theta = 1, \ldots, V$

$$
\mathbf{s}_{j+1}^\delta(\mathbf{u}_j) = \mathbf{s}_j^\delta(\mathbf{u}_j) + d(\mathbf{u}_i | \mathbf{s}_j^\delta) e^{-\epsilon_\delta/\epsilon_d}.
$$

The distance $\epsilon_d = D(c_i(t_{ij}), c_j(t_{ij}))$ between points $c_i(t_{ij})$ and $c_j(t_{ij})$ is used to determine the extent of the distribution. Here too, a small value for the distribution constant $c_d$ influences the shape of the deformable necklace model above or beneath the one being optimized, while a large value also affects the shape of the surfaces at large distances. This way segmentation of a single vertebra influences the entire spine model.

IV. APPLICATION

We illustrate interactive segmentation of part of the Lumbar spine from a CT image that was excluded from the training data. First the fourth lumbar vertebra is segmented using a necklace model, then part of the lumbar spine is segmented with help of the spine model.

For initialization of the necklace model in the image data in the vicinity of the L4, a fixed point is selected to enable a quick correspondence between the model and the target boundary. The necklace model is interactively bootstrapped by pointing and clicking at the corresponding point in the image. In this segmentation session no translation, rotation or scaling is required as the initialization by point correspondence results in an acceptable starting point for the necklace model. The first row in Fig. 6 shows the condition after initialization from three different perspectives, with the image data rendered with opacity 0.5 and the model in it with opacity 1. The local fit quality at a number of control points is indicated with colored spheres. The color varies from green, indicating a good fit to red, expressing a bad fit. The local fit quality, in this case, is evaluated by measuring the distance of the features measured at that point of the necklace model to the corresponding features observed in the training set [see (12)].

Following the priority scheme described in the previous section, in the first step point landmarks are automatically fit to the image data after interactive marking of their approximate position. The following point landmarks are used for human-computer interaction: two points corresponding to the two tips on the spinal process, and the two tips at the two transverse processes. This produces a preliminary solution which is closer to the target boundary than was the starting condition. In the second step, curve landmarks, in particular at the lower part of the vertebral body, move toward the target boundary. In the third step, the lower and the upper planes of the vertebral body are reasonably found by deformation of the surface in one dimension. The result after optimizing all surface points once again in their respective dimension is illustrated in the second row of Fig. 6. In this case, the necklace model has found an optimal solution. The majority of the surface points is fitted well to the target vertebra. At some parts the necklace model moves away due to attraction by neighboring structures or due to locally too much deviation of the target boundary from the population average. A validation of the necklace model on CT images of vertebrae is given in [3].

To illustrate how the spine is segmented using the spine model, segmentation of part of the lumbar spine is performed. First the L3 is segmented by deformation of the corresponding deformable surface as before. Simultaneously, the position of the L4 is estimated by changing the geometry of the corresponding deformable surface according to the solution for the L3. On the basis of the preliminary solution for the L4, point landmarks on the L4 are sought under the constraints that the expected spatial relation is maintained as much as possible, i.e., spinal curvatures comply to the statistics. No interaction is required as the spine model is accurate enough to find the desired solution from that position. Then curve landmarks and sheet points are sought in the image data. The position of the initial deformable surfaces and curves and their position after optimizing are illustrated in Fig. 7. The step-by-step automatic segmentation of the L3 and L4 succeeds reasonably despite the articulated vertebral structures and their complex interrelationship.
We accentuate some important issues of our method. First, our method works completely in three dimensions, allowing to measure truly 3-D properties of vertebral structures and spinal curvatures, rather than relying on 2-D features. Second, we capture not only shape properties but also image properties as they also define the appearance of the spine. Multiple continuous features are extracted, then statistically analyzed by multivariate functional techniques [29] to obtain subtle but important population statistics. This is done 1) to exploit natural patient-to-patient variation of the spine appearance for constraining the deformation of the spine model and 2) to exploit salient information, defined as differential geometrical multifeature surface landmarks, for reducing the complexity of the image segmentation problem. Furthermore, we do a step-by-step interactive image segmentation departing from geometrically well-defined landmarks on a particular vertebra rather than a one shot integral solution for the spine using manually marked anatomical landmarks. We incrementally and elastically deform the spine model in the image reminiscent to a marionette with interrelated structures moved by strings.

We have illustrated how interactive CT image segmentation of the spine is facilitated using the integral deformable spine model. The segmentation was of exemplary nature, showing landmarks on a particular vertebra rather than a one shot integral image by means of six point landmarks per vertebra. The use of point landmarks alleviates the problem of interaction in 3-D image to make one-to-one correspondence between model and image by means of six point landmarks per vertebra. The use of point landmarks alleviates the problem of interaction in 3-D space [33] due to their zero-dimensional property. During segmentation the user controls the entire spine model as a marionette by interaction with a few point landmarks and propagation of landmark solutions to other parts of the spine.

We conclude that the deformable integral spine model is a viable solution for interactive segmentation of 3-D spinal images. Future work will concentrate on improving and validating the constituents of the spine model, i.e., the necklace and strings models, on a statistically large number of segmented training images.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors thank F. Gerritsen from the Easy Vision Advanced Development, Philips Medical Systems, Best (The Netherlands), for providing the spinal CT images and the Easy Vision workstation. They are also thankful to J. Neuerburg from the Academic Hospital of the Heinrich-Heine University (Germany) and D. Bosch from the Academic Hospital of the Free University of Amsterdam (The Netherlands) for ground-truth segmentation.

REFERENCES


