

**Assessing Fracture Healing
with Artificial Intelligence:**

Using Transfer Learning to Predict the
Radiographic Union Score for Tibial Fractures,
in the Radiography of High-Energy Trauma

Shen Zhou Hong Goldsmiths, UoL

April 4th, 2023

Contents

1	Implementation and Analysis	2
1.1	One-Hot Encoding for Labels	3
1.2	K-Fold Evaluation	4
1.3	Establishing Baseline Performance Targets	6
1.3.1	Shallow Convolutional Neural Network	6
1.3.2	End-to-End Training with InceptionV3	9
1.3.3	Baseline Metrics	11
1.4	InceptionV3 with Transfer Learning	11
1.4.1	Base Model Trained on RadImageNet Dataset	11
1.4.2	Base Model Trained on InceptionV3 Dataset	12
1.4.3	Comparison between RadImageNet and ImageNet	13
1.5	Hyperparameter Search	13
1.5.1	Hyperparameter Search Regime I	13
1.5.2	Hyperparameter Search Regime II	17
1.5.3	Final Hyperparameters	18
1.6	Final Model Performance	18
A	Additional Materials	20
A.1	Project Code and Github Repository	20
A.1.1	Initial Evaluation Models	20
A.1.2	Hyperparameter Search Code	20
A.1.3	Analysis Notebooks	20

Chapter 1

Implementation and Analysis

In this chapter, we will present the implementation of the study methodology. Recall that the methodology has three components. We will begin with the establishment of an initial baseline, by creating and training a classical ‘shallow’ convolutional neural network based upon LeCun et al.’s 1998 LeNet model. [1] This classical CNN baseline will serve as the minimal performance standard that our model will aim to surpass. Next, utilising the InceptionV3 architecture which will serve as our transfer-learning base model, we will train an end-to-end (i.e. without transfer learning) model on our radiography dataset. This will serve as an additional baseline that will allow us to validate the transfer-learning *technique* against regular end-to-end training.

Following the establishment of these two baselines, we will proceed to begin an initial evaluation of two different transfer-learning base models. We will compare the performance of InceptionV3 trained with ImageNet weights [2], against InceptionV3 trained with RadImageNet [3] weights. This initial evaluation will help us explore whether a base model trained on the smaller, but domain-specific RadImageNet dataset will have any advantages over the larger, but general ImageNet dataset. We will select the better performing base model out of the two options, and proceed to optimize the model’s hyperparameters.

Our model’s hyperparameter search procedure consists of two steps, which we term hyperparameter search Regime I and hyperparameter search Regime II. As per our methodology, in Regime I we find the optimal batch size and dropout rate for our model. This is done using a stochastic search process where the hyperparameter space of the model is randomly sampled for t trials, where each trial consists of a k -fold cross-validation of the model with the selected hyperparameters. Once the optimal combination of batch size and dropout rate are found, we will set these hyperparameters

as constant and proceed to the second hyperparameter search regime. In Regime II we find the optimal learning rate and epsilon value ϵ for the Adam optimizer, by conducting a grid search over a selection of possible values.

1.1 One-Hot Encoding for Labels

Recall that our model must predict a RUST score from a pair of input radiographs. RUST scores are measures of orthopaedic union (i.e. healing), and ordinarily consist of two subscores for each view (the anterior-posterior and medial-lateral views), quantifying the development of bone calluses and bridging over the fracture line. The score components are as follows:

Radiographic Feature	Score
Fracture Line, No Callus	1
Fracture Line, Visible Callus	2
No Fracture Line, Bridging Callus	3
No Fracture Line, Remodeled.	4

Table 1.1: Radiographic Union Score for Tibial Fractures (RUST) Rubric

These score components¹ are then used to assess the features of a fracture from the anterior, posterior, medial, and lateral cortices:

Subscore
Anterior Cortex
Posterior Cortex
Medial Cortex
Lateral Cortex

Table 1.2: RUST Scoring Instrument

Finally the resulting subscore components are summed in order to yield a RUST score for the fracture as a whole.

For this study, our model is designed to predict every component subscore. Hence, the label will consist of a 18-value `tf.Tensor` with the shape (18,), consisting of 16 one-hot encoded values for the RUST subscores (four for each cortex), as well as two additional one-hot values to represent the view (anterioposterior or medial-lateral).

¹Note that the original Whelan et al. paper [4] does not include a value for remodelled fractures, however as the METRC dataset includes this category, we will be using the modified RUST variant specific to Johns Hopkins for this study.

1.2 K-Fold Evaluation

Before we begin, we must first implement our k-fold cross-validation routine. Since model performance is sensitive to the network's random weight initialisation² [5], our methodology requires k-fold cross-validation to be conducted on every experiment (i.e. model run). My implementation of the k-fold cross-validation process consists of two parts: a function which will divide the dataset into k folds, as well as a function that runs the k-fold cross-validation on the given model. The `k_fold_dataset()` function is given as follows:³

```
def k_fold_dataset(ds: tf.data.Dataset, k: int = 10) -> list[tuple[tf.data.Dataset,
    ↪ tf.data.Dataset]]:
    # First shard the given dataset into k individual folds.
    list_of_folds: list[tf.data.Dataset] = []
    for i in range(k):
        fold: tf.data.Dataset = ds.shard(num_shards=k, index=i)
        list_of_folds.append(fold)

    # Next, generate a list of train and validation dataset tuples
    list_of_ds_pairs: list[tuple[tf.data.Dataset, tf.data.Dataset]] = []
    for i, holdout_fold in enumerate(list_of_folds):
        ds_valid: tf.data.Dataset = holdout_fold

        # Select every fold except holdout_fold as the training folds
        training_folds: list[tf.data.Dataset] = list_of_folds[:i] +
            ↪ list_of_folds[i+1:]

        # ds_train size is  $\frac{k-1}{k}$  of the original dataset
        ds_train: tf.data.Dataset = training_folds[0]
        for fold in training_folds[1:]:
            ds_train = ds_train.concatenate(fold)

        ds_pair: tuple[tf.data.Dataset, tf.data.Dataset] = (ds_train, ds_valid)
        list_of_ds_pairs.append(ds_pair)

    return list_of_ds_pairs
```

Listing 1: Sharding dataset for K-Fold Cross Validation ([Github](#))

One thing of note, is that our `k_fold_dataset()` function conducts all dataset-related operations using the Tensorflow's high-performance `tf.data.Dataset` API. This allows support for pre-fetch, caching, and other low-level optimisations. This function serves as a dependency which is called by `cross_validate()`, which runs the actual K-fold cross validation experiments on the given model:

²This is particularly true on small datasets with unbalanced classes like ours.

³The code listings provided in this document *are for illustration only*. The actual implementation is generally longer, and contains docstrings, debugging instrumentation, file I/O logic, as well as additional function arguments. Every listing will have a link to it's corresponding implementation in the git repository.

```

def cross_validate(ModelClass: tf.keras.Model, ds: tf.data.Dataset, epochs: int = 50,
    ↪ batch_size: int = 128, k: int = 10) -> list[tf.keras.callbacks.History]:
    history_list: list[tf.keras.callbacks.History] = []
    train_valid_pairs: list[tf.data.Dataset] = k_fold_dataset(ds, k)

    for i, (ds_train, ds_valid) in enumerate(train_valid_pairs):
        # Reset tensorflow gradient tape
        tf.keras.backend.clear_session()
        model = ModelClass()
        model.compile(
            optimizer=tf.keras.optimizers.Adam(),
            loss=tf.keras.losses.BinaryCrossentropy(),
            metrics=metrics
        )
        history = model.fit(
            ds_train,
            validation_data=ds_valid,
            epochs=epochs,
            batch_size=batch_size,
        )
        history_list.append(history.history)

    return history_list

```

Listing 2: K-Fold Cross Validation ([Github](#))

The output of every k-fold cross-validation experiment will be a ‘history list’ containing k `tf.keras.callbacks.History` objects. This History object will contain training and validation metrics which will be used to calculate the average metric over k folds:

```

def calculate_mean_metrics(kfold_metrics: list[dict[str, float]]) -> dict[str,
    ↪ list[float]]:
    # Initialise aggregate metrics with appropriate keys
    aggregate_metrics: dict[str, list[float]] = {}
    for fold in kfold_metrics:
        for metric in fold.keys():
            if metric not in aggregate_metrics:
                aggregate_metrics[metric] = []

    # Calculate the average metric per epoch for every fold
    number_of_folds: int = len(kfold_metrics)
    for metric in aggregate_metrics.keys():
        number_of_epochs: int = len(kfold_metrics[0][metric])
        for epoch in range(number_of_epochs):
            # A list of every value for that given metric in this epoch across folds
            values_per_epoch: list[float] = [x[metric][epoch] for x in kfold_metrics]
            mean_per_epoch : float = sum(values_per_epoch) / number_of_folds
            aggregate_metrics[metric].append(mean_per_epoch)

    return aggregate_metrics

```

Listing 3: Calculating Mean Metrics from K-Fold Data ([Github](#))

The above code now completes the prerequisites necessary for data gathering.

1.3 Establishing Baseline Performance Targets

In this section, we will establish the baseline performance targets for our transfer-learning model by training and developing two models which will represent alternative approaches to the problem of multilabel classification on a small dataset. The baseline models will be: a ‘shallow’ CNN following LeCun et al.’s classical 1998 LeNet architecture [1], and an InceptionV3 model that is directly end-to-end trained on our radiography dataset. We explicitly choose the above two models as our baseline for comparison, because they each help validate a different aspect of this project: whether a deep neural network is appropriate for the task in the first place, and whether the *technique* of transfer learning is appropriate for our dataset. The second question of whether or not our technique is necessary is why we train a version of our model’s architecture directly on the radiography data, in order to obtain a performance measure of using the same model architecture *without* transfer learning. At minimum, our transfer-learning model must achieve a better performance (as measured by its AUROC score) over the two baseline models.

The performance of the baseline models will be measured as the highest observed *average* AUROC, found using k -fold cross-validation with $k = 10$. The value of $k = 10$ is chosen because the resulting per-fold training and validation splits are no larger than a conventional train, test, and validation split of 70%, 15%, 15%, where:

- Training and Validation Set (ds_train + ds_valid): 2490 (85%):
 - K-Fold Cross-Validation, $K = 10$:
 - * Training Set: 2241 (~76%)
 - * Validation Set: 249 (~8.5% per fold)
- Hold-out Test Set (ds_test): 441 (15%)

Larger k values yield a more thorough measurement of a model’s performance at the cost of additional computational costs, while lower k values risk lowering the training-validation split ratio until the training set is too small for adequate training. For this initial evaluation, as we wish to yield a benchmark for baseline performance, we will be using a k value of 10. For the hyperparameter search regime, we will be using $k = 6$ in order to lower computational costs.

1.3.1 Shallow Convolutional Neural Network

For the first benchmark, we begin by implementing the shallow convolutional neural network described by LeCun et al in [1] in Tensorflow. Our implementation follows the original paper, with a slight modification in the final classifier, in order to output the 18-vector one-hot encoded label predictions. Note the presence of only two convolutional layers — this is typical for early CNNs of that period.

```
class LeNet1998(tf.keras.Model):
    def __init__(self, **kwargs):
        super().__init__(**kwargs)

        self.input_layer: tf.Tensor = layers.InputLayer(input_shape=(299, 299, 3))
        self.data_augmentation: tf.keras.Sequential = tf.keras.Sequential([
            layers.RandomFlip(seed=RNG_SEED),
        ])

        self.lenet1998: tf.keras.Model = tf.keras.Sequential([
            layers.Conv2D(6, kernel_size=5, strides=1, activation='tanh',
                ⇨ padding='same'),
            layers.AveragePooling2D(),
            layers.Conv2D(16, kernel_size=5, strides=1, activation='tanh',
                ⇨ padding='valid'),
            layers.AveragePooling2D(),
        ])

        self.classifier: tf.keras.Sequential = tf.keras.Sequential([
            layers.Flatten(),
            layers.Dense(1024, activation='relu'),
            layers.Dense(18, activation='sigmoid')
        ])

        self.model: tf.keras.Sequential = tf.keras.Sequential([
            self.input_layer,
            self.data_augmentation,
            self.lenet1998,
            self.classifier
        ])

    def call(self, inputs):
        return self.model(inputs)
```

Listing 4: The LeNet 1998 Shallow CNN Model ([Github](#))

We implement our version of the LeNet architecture by subclassing `tf.keras.Model` class, which is then passed on to our `cross_validate()` function to be evaluated. This entire experiment is conducted within a Jupyter notebook which is made available as a self-contained, reproducible unit within the project repository ([Github](#)). Running the experiment yields our first AUROC to performance graph:




Figure 1.1: Baseline shallow CNN based on the LeNet 1998 architecture

The bold lines in the chart represent the *average* training (red) and validation (blue) AUROC, as measured after performing k -fold cross-validation on 10 folds ($k = 10$). The transparent lines indicate the observed training and validation AUROC per each individual fold: this per-fold performance has been charted in order for us to better observe the consistency of model performance per epoch. Variations in performance per fold is due to a combination of different random starting conditions (due to random weight initialisation at the start of a model's training), as well as variances in floating-point calculations.

What information does our data for the LeNet model tell us? First, we can observe severe overfitting: by epoch 10, performance on the training set asymptotically approaches 1.0 (as quantified by AUROC). However, the validation performance remains minimal: generally averaging around 0.60, with certain instances of the model performing little better than chance (0.50). This information indicates that a classical 'shallow' CNN lacks the representational power to extract the features necessary to perform classification on our dataset. Indeed, it appears that the LeNet model fails to converge at all. This is to be expected: and our experiment yields a minimal baseline AUROC value of 0.608 that our subsequent models must beat. Likewise, by demonstrating that classical 'shallow' CNNs are unable to solve our problem, we make the

case for using a ‘deep’ neural network: in the form of the InceptionV3 architecture, which we will explore in the following section.

1.3.2 End-to-End Training with InceptionV3

```
class TransferLearningModel(tf.keras.Model):
    def __init__(self, dropout_rate: float, **kwargs):
        super().__init__(**kwargs)

        self.input_layer: tf.Tensor = layers.InputLayer(input_shape=(299, 299, 3))
        self.data_augmentation: tf.keras.Sequential = tf.keras.Sequential([
            layers.RandomFlip(seed=RNG_SEED),
        ])

        self.inceptionv3: tf.keras.Model = tf.keras.applications.InceptionV3(
            include_top=False,
            weights='imagenet'
        )
        self.inceptionv3.trainable = False

        self.classifier: tf.keras.Sequential = tf.keras.Sequential([
            layers.GlobalMaxPooling2D(),
            layers.Dense(1024, activation='relu'),
            layers.Dropout(dropout_rate),
            layers.Dense( 512, activation='relu'),
            layers.Dropout(dropout_rate),
            layers.Dense( 256, activation='relu'),
            layers.Dropout(dropout_rate),
            layers.Dense( 18, activation='sigmoid')
        ])

        self.model: tf.keras.Sequential = tf.keras.Sequential([
            self.input_layer,
            self.data_augmentation,
            self.inceptionv3,
            self.classifier
        ])

    def call(self, inputs):
        return self.model(inputs)
```

Listing 5: Model Class for InceptionV3 ([Github](#))




Figure 1.2: InceptionV3 Model Trained on Study Data.

1.3.3 Baseline Metrics

1.4 InceptionV3 with Transfer Learning

1.4.1 Base Model Trained on RadImageNet Dataset




Figure 1.3: InceptionV3 with RadImageNet Weights

1.4.2 Base Model Trained on InceptionV3 Dataset




Figure 1.4: InceptionV3 with RadImageNet Weights

1.4.3 Comparison between RadImageNet and ImageNet

1.5 Hyperparameter Search

1.5.1 Hyperparameter Search Regime I

```
def hyperparameter_search(trials: int, kfold: int = 6, epochs: int = 20) ->
    list[dict[str, Union[int, float, list[tuple[keras.callbacks.Callback]]]]]:
    search_results: list[dict[str, any]] = []

    for trial in range(trials):
        # Randomly pick hyperparameter options
        rng = np.random.default_rng()
        batch_size : int = rng.integers(16, 2048, endpoint=True)
        dropout_rate: float = rng.uniform(0.0, 0.5)

        # Conduct K-Fold cross-validation with given hyperparameters
        results: list[tuple[keras.callbacks.Callback]] = cross_validate(
            TransferLearningModel,
            ds_train_and_valid,
            k=kfold,
            epochs=epochs,
            batch_size=batch_size,
            model_kwargs={"dropout_rate": dropout_rate},
        )

        search_results.append({
            "batch_size" : batch_size,
            "dropout_rate": dropout_rate,
            "history_list": k_fold_results
        })

    return search_results
```

Listing 6: Hyperparameter Search Regime I ([Github](#))




Figure 1.5: Results for the Hyperparameter Search Regime I




Figure 1.6: Examples of model performance from hyperparameter regime I search.




Figure 1.7: Best performing model in Regime I

1.5.2 Hyperparameter Search Regime II

```
def learning_rate_gridsearch(kfolds: int = 6) -> list[dict[str, Union[int, float,
↳ list[tf.keras.callbacks.History]]]]:
    # Grid i:  $1.0 \times 10^{-1} \leq \text{learning\_rate} \leq 1.0 \times 10^{-4}$ 
    learning_rates: list = [1 * np.float_power(10, -exp) for exp in range(1, 5)]
    # Grid j:  $1.0 \times 10^{-1} \leq \text{epsilon\_rate} \leq 1.0 \times 10^{-8}$ 
    epsilon_rates : list = [1 * np.float_power(10, -exp) for exp in range(1, 9)]

    search_results: list[dict[str, Union[int, float,
    ↳ list[tf.keras.callbacks.History]]]] = []
    for i, learning_rate in enumerate(learning_rates):
        for j, epsilon_rate in enumerate(epsilon_rates):
            # Conduct K-Fold Experiment
            k_fold_results: list[tf.keras.callbacks.History] = cross_validate(
                TransferLearningModel,
                ds_train_and_valid,
                k=kfolds,
                epochs=EPOCHS,
                batch_size=BATCH_SIZE,
                model_kwargs={"dropout_rate": DROPOUT_RATE}
                optimizer_kwargs={"learning_rate": learning_rate, "epsilon":
                    ↳ epsilon_rate},
            )
            search_results.append({
                "learning_rate": learning_rate,
                "epsilon_rate": epsilon_rate,
                "history_list": k_fold_results
            })

    return search_results
```

Listing 7: Hyperparameter Search Regime II ([Github](#))




Figure 1.8: Results for the Hyperparameter Search Regime II

1.5.3 Final Hyperparameters

1.6 Final Model Performance

Bibliography

- [1] Y. Lecun, L. Bottou, Y. Bengio, and P. Haffner, "Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 86, no. 11, pp. 2278–2324, Nov. 1998. DOI: [10.1109/5.726791](https://doi.org/10.1109/5.726791).
- [2] J. Deng, W. Dong, R. Socher, L.-J. Li, K. Li, and L. Fei-Fei, "Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database," pp. 248–255, 2009.
- [3] X. Mei, Z. Liu, P. M. Robson, *et al.*, "Radimagenet: An open radiologic deep learning research dataset for effective transfer learning," *Radiology: Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 0, no. ja, e210315, 0. DOI: [10.1148/ryai.210315](https://doi.org/10.1148/ryai.210315). eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1148/ryai.210315>. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1148/ryai.210315>.
- [4] D. B. Whelan, M. Bhandari, D. Stephen, *et al.*, "Development of the radiographic union score for tibial fractures for the assessment of tibial fracture healing after intramedullary fixation," *Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery*, vol. 68, no. 3, 2010, ISSN: 2163-0755. [Online]. Available: https://journals.lww.com/jtrauma/Fulltext/2010/03000/Development_of_the_Radiographic_Union_Score_for.24.aspx.
- [5] M. V. Narkhede, P. P. Bartakke, and M. S. Sutaone, "A review on weight initialization strategies for neural networks," *Artificial Intelligence Review*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 291–322, Jan. 1, 2022, ISSN: 1573-7462. DOI: [10.1007/s10462-021-10033-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-021-10033-z). [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-021-10033-z>.

Appendix A

Additional Materials

A.1 Project Code and Github Repository

All of the Python code used in this project (including experiment and analysis code) are available within the project Git repository, hosted on [Github](#). The code is located within the `python/` directory of the repository root:

<https://github.com/ShenZhouHong/radiography-ai-project/>

A.1.1 Initial Evaluation Models

Jupyter notebooks used to run the initial evaluations of LeNet 1998, InceptionV3 with end-to-end training, and initial transfer learning models:

<https://github.com/ShenZhouHong/radiography-ai-project/tree/master/python/initial-evaluation>

A.1.2 Hyperparameter Search Code

Jupyter notebooks used to perform the hyperparameter search regime.

<https://github.com/ShenZhouHong/radiography-ai-project/tree/master/python/hyperparam-search>

A.1.3 Analysis Notebooks

Jupyter notebooks used to analyse the raw data, process for insights and visualisations, and output CSV files:

<https://github.com/ShenZhouHong/radiography-ai-project/tree/master/python/analysis>