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# Abstract

Recent advancements in deep learning (DL) offer significant advantages in PET imaging, particularly in enhancing attenuation scatter correction (ASC) and artifact removal. However, practical implementation remains challenging due to variability in scanner types and radiotracer distributions. We aim to develop an Integrated Multi-Center DL Model (IMCM) to address the direct ASC of PET images and evaluate its performance in removing image artifacts.

A total of 270 clean and artifact-free images were selected from a collection of over 2000 patient images undergoing 68Ga and 18F-FDG PET/CT scans across seven centers. Three centers were designated for external testing: one for 68Ga data (Cross-Center) and two for 18F-FDG data (Cross-Tracer). A dedicated 3D-UNet model employing a deep supervision strategy was trained on artifact-free images from four centers. The model's performance was then evaluated quantitatively and qualitatively for artifact correction on three external test sets.

For the internal centers, the IMCM model achieved a Mean Error (ME) of -0.56±0.74, a Mean Absolute Error (MAE) of 1.28±0.37, and a Structural Similarity Index (SSIM) of 0.93±0.03. For the external test sets, IMCM yielded an ME of -1.92±0.58 and -0.54±0.13, an MAE of 2.38±0.76 and 0.69±0.12, and an SSIM of 0.89±0.03 and 0.78±0.10 for the Cross-Center and Cross-Tracer, respectively. IMCM successfully corrected motion and halo artifacts in both 68Ga data and 18F-FDG images.

The developed model effectively addressed variations in scanner types and radiotracers, demonstrating its adaptability, generalizability, and effectiveness in different clinical scenarios for direct ASC and artifact correction. This study highlighted the potential of DL to provide accurate, artifact-free PET images, offering a promising alternative to CT-based ASC.

**Keywords:** Deep learning, attenuation scatter correction, CT-less PET.

# Abbreviation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Positron Emission Tomography | PET |
| Attenuation correction | AC |
| Attenuation and scatter correction | ASC |
| Computed Tomography | CT |
| Gallium-68 | 68Ga |
| Fluorodeoxyglucose | FDG |
| Non attenuation scatter correction | NAC |
| CT based attenuation-scatter correction | MAC |
| Time of flight | TOF |
| Maximum likelihood estimation of activity and attenuation | MLAA |
| Long axial field of view | LAFOV |
| Artificial Intelligent | AI |
| Federated learning | FL |
| prostate-specific membrane antigen | PSMA |
| Anatomy-dependent correction model | ADCM |
| Deep learning model-based attenuation correction | DL |
| Standard uptake value | SUV |
| Integrated multi-Centre model | IMCM |
| Tuned Transfer Learning for IMCM model | TL-MC |
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# Introduction

Positron Emission Tomography (PET) is the gold standard of molecular imaging modalities for the non-invasive study of various diseases (1–3). Numerous patients undergo PET scans worldwide for staging and restaging cancer, evaluating treatment diagnostic, radiation therapy planning, diagnosing neurological disorders, Assessing myocardial perfusion, and surgical planning (4–6).

During a whole-body PET image creation, more than 50% of all recorded photons result in a Compton scatter fraction before capturing by detectors (7–9). Photon scattering occurs due to dense materials in the patient's body and surrounding area and causes energy loss. The misplaced line of response (LOR) is allocated to the scattered, attenuated photon, which is not rejected after energy window discrimination and random coincidence correction technique (10). So, scatter and attenuation phenomena lead to miscalculation of radiopharmaceutical distribution inside the body (7,10).Attenuation and Scatter correction (ASC) has a critical role in achieving a high-quality image interpretation and acceptable quantitative analysis of PET scans (Figure 1) (11,12). ASC was performed using a CT scanner to model attenuation coefficient maps (μ-maps). Typically, an unenhanced, low-dose CT scan is conducted alongside PET scans for ASC, and occasionally, a diagnostic CT scan with a contrast agent may serve the same function (13,14).

While various research has been done to create μ-maps from proton density information, ASC has remained a challenge in MRI-based AC. Despite the implementation of CT or MRI for ASC, artifacts, which are anomalies in the final images and do not correspond to the authentic radiotracer distribution within the body, can still occur (15–18). Patient motion during or between two scans complicates the alignment of PET with CT or MR images, causes mismatch, misregistration, or motion artifacts (15,16,19,20). Moreover, in reconstruction with ASC, neighboring areas to high-activity organs, such as the kidney bladder, might assign negative or zero values, leading to halo artifacts in clinical observations (21,22).

Halo artifacts are very common in 68Ga-PET imaging, which is widely used for prostate and pelvic cancer diagnosis, staging, and treatment planning. This artifact might change the quantitative interpretation of clinical diagnosis. To remove these artifacts, like giving diuretics, often makes the patient more uncomfortable and increases the chance of motion artifacts, which makes the image quality and readability even worse (29–31).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Non-ASC CT-ASC | Non-ASC CT-ASC |
| A close-up of x-ray images  Description automatically generated | A comparison of a person's body  Description automatically generated |

Figure 1: showcases examples of PET images before and after attenuation and scatter correction.

Most PET acquisition settings are performed with arms up (to decrease photon scatter). As arm raising is uncomfortable for patients, this will cause arm motion during sequential PET and CT/MRI scans (32–34). The presence of artifacts can significantly decrease the image quality and accuracy of interpretation and result in misdiagnoses. Consequently, even repeating scans fails to resolve the issue and can lead to an increased cumulative total body dose, higher utilization rates, and longer waiting times (35–37).

Historically, the field has seen progress through different strategies and algorithmic advances such as the maximum likelihood estimation of activity and attenuation (MLAA), further refined with time of flight (TOF) enhancements (49–51). Despite these developments, the interplay between activity distribution and attenuation remains a challenging frontier, compounded by scanner-specific noise and resolution discrepancies (28). The integration of CT in PET/CT imaging, while invaluable for AC and precise anatomical localization, significantly contributes to patients' total ionizing radiation dose. Innovations such as long axial field of view (LAFOV) total-body PET scanners have markedly improved image resolution and quantification while integrating CT/MRI with PET, reducing the need for high radiopharmaceutical doses (23,26,27) and acquisition.

Recent advancements in Artificial intelligence (AI) have significantly impacted the field of medicine, with notable progress in segmentation, classification, detection, noise reduction, and reconstruction questions. These successes have driven researchers to explore the feasibility and application of CT-free methods for ASC in PET imaging (52–57). Eliminating the CT could be particularly beneficial for patients requiring repeated PET/CT scans, notably pediatric patients, as even marginal reductions in cumulative radiation exposure are significant (47,48).

Some Deep Learning-based methods have been developed to generate the synthesis of pseudo-CT images from MRI or uncorrected PET data, prediction of scatter maps from emission data (39,42,58–61), while other research focuses on the direct generation of ASC PET images from non-attenuation-scatter-correction (NAC) as inputs to predict ASC PET images directly (53,57,62). The direct image-to-image translation technique not only highlights the capabilities of deep learning models in ASC without CT but also possesses the ability to detect and correct artifacts in PET images accurately (40,63).

A critical question facing researchers today is the practical applicability of these models in clinical environments. Due to differences in spatial resolution, sensitivity, and technical information among scanners and variations of radiotracer biodistribution in the body, a model optimized for data from one specific scanner may not perform effectively under different conditions or other equipment. Moreover, not all medical centers are equipped with a dedicated AI team or even restricted in data sharing by ethical and regulatory considerations. Federated learning (FL) addresses some challenges, such as data privacy and limited dataset sizes in medical imaging (17,18,45,65). Yet, the quest for novel correction techniques in CT-free PET imaging avenues is needed to achieve widespread clinical acceptance and enhance the diagnostic capabilities of PET imaging (52).

Previous research has shown that direct ASC frameworks can correct artifacts in 18F-FDG PET/CT images. Additionally, the GAN model's performance in combination with 68Ga and 18F radiotracers across various centers has been evaluated (39,65). Additionally, the detection and correction of 18Ga image artifacts using a tuned direct ASC model for multiple centers have been assessed. Despite these advances, further investigation into a multi-center model for quantitative analysis of gallium studies is still needed.

The main aim of this study is to address the direct ASC of PET images and evaluate its performance in removing image artifacts using the multicenter dataset. We will use our approach to estimate and compare the performance of models under both strategies within different radiotracers and scanners. In particular, we will integrate domain expertise into our deep learning framework to detect and correct artifacts more efficiently in multi-center studies.

# Material and methods

## Data Preparation

68 Ga PET/CT scans from five different hospitals from the previous study were used for training and initial model validation in the primary stage of this study. A secondary dataset was incorporated to test the model's adaptability, distinct in both the imaging centers and the type of radiotracer used (18F-FDG PET scans from two different hospitals). Additionally, a specialized set of images presenting artifacts was included to assess the model's capability to detect and correct image quality issues.

### Gallium PET/CT dataset

A cohort of 1000 patients underwent 68Ga-prostate-specific membrane antigen (PSMA). PET/CT imaging across five centers located in different countries. To ensure the integrity of the data for model training, an expert in nuclear medicine evaluated all the scans, identifying 184 images of optimal quality without artifacts from the total pool. Detailed information on the datasets collected is outlined in Table 1. The CT-based ASC was applied to amend PET images for accurate correction of attenuation and scatter effects on the images. For this study, non-attenuation-corrected images will be referred to as NAC, and CT-based attenuation scatter-corrected images will be denoted as MAC.

Table 1: Data information in 5 different imaging centers.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Center | No | Train | Validation | Test | Scanner | Reconstruction | Matrix size × Z\* |
| Center 1 | 56 | 43 | 11 | 2 | Siemens Biograph 6 | 3D-OSEM | 168 × 168 |
| Center 2 | 31 | 25 | 4 | 2 | GE Discovery IQ | 3D-OSEM | 192 × 192 |
| Center 3 | 45 | 35 | 8 | 2 | Siemens mCT | 3D-OSEM | 200 × 200 |
| Center 4 | 40 | 28 | 10 | 2 | Siemens Biograph 6 | 3D-OSEM | 168 × 168 |
| External Center | 12 | - | - | 12 | Siemens Horizon | PSF+TOF+3D-OSEM | 180 × 180 |
| Total | 184 | 131 | 33 | 20 | - | - | - |
| \*  Z' representing the number of slices in the axial view, depends on body length, scanner resolution, scan protocol, and patient positioning. So, it is different patiently. | | | | | | | |

#### Normalization of PET Image

The standard uptake value (SUV) in PET imaging is an important standardization procedure that allows quantitative measurement. This means that the detected radiotracer concentration reflects the metabolism of the patient's body. It corrects based on the radiotracer injected dose and the patient's body weight. This conversion is essential as it factors in variations due to patient size and the amount of radiotracer administered. The SUV is calculated using the Equation 1:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | ( 1) |

To turn the voxel values into SUV metrics, this conversion was done the same way on all MAC and NAC images. To preserve quantitative values across all images and since deep learning models operate more efficiently with smaller numbers, the images were normalized by dividing them by a constant factor. MAC images underwent a factor of 5 scaling, while 2 was picked for NAC images.

This method of normalization ensures that the data remains quantitatively comparable while being computationally straightforward. By scaling the intensity values in this manner, we were able to preserve the quantitative nature of PET imaging and easily rescale the images back to the original, which is vital for accurate diagnosis and assessment of metabolic activity. The histogram of the images post-normalization illustrates the effect of this scaling on the distribution of voxel intensities, confirming the consistency of intensity levels across the processed images (Figure 2A).

#### Data Transformation and Augmentations:

For training data preparation, each PET image was initially trimmed to fit the body's outline, followed by the addition of zero-padding to standardize the dimensions to a uniform bounding box size of 168×168×Z (with 'Z' representing the count of slices), as illustrated in Figure 2a. This ensured the retention of the original image resolution and anatomical structure. To ensure uniformity and enhance the training process's efficiency, all PET images were re-scaled to a voxel size of 4.07 × 4.07 × 3.0 mm3, the most common resolution across the collected data and crucial for consistent image analysis. This standardization was crucial for achieving consistent image quality throughout the dataset. Details regarding the initial voxel spacing are provided in Figure 2b.

|  |
| --- |
| A graph of a graph  Description automatically generated |
| A graph with green bars  Description automatically generated |
| A colorful circle with text  Description automatically generated |
| Figure 2: **A)** Distribution of maximum intensity values for NAC and MAC images, displaying variations pre- and post-normalization to highlight data scaling effects. NAC images were scaled down by a factor of 2 and MAC images by a factor of 5. **B)** initial PET image dimensions are distributed across sagittal, coronal, and axial planes. Each bar represents the frequency of occurrence for specific dimension sizes within the dataset. **C)** Proportion of different voxel spacings utilized in PET image preprocessing. The donut charts depict the percentage of images corresponding to each voxel spacing dimension in millimeters across sagittal, coronal, and axial views. |

### Generation of Anatomy-Dependent Correction Maps (ADCM)

In exploring advanced techniques for PET image correction, we examine a decomposition-based deep learning approach previously proposed (52)From NAC to MAC, the complex MAC was divided into two parts: anatomy-independent textures (related to tracers and diseases) and anatomy-dependent correction. In other words, this method involves dividing the MAC image into these two key component maps. Anatomy-independent information, which correlates with tracer type and disease pathology, and another component, anatomy-dependent factors necessary for image correction.

The anatomy-dependent correction map (ADCM) at each voxel is defined by conditional Equation 2, which captures the ratio of the MAC intensity to the NACs:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | ( 2) |

The threshold ε ensures that division by zero is avoided, defaulting to the MAC intensity where necessary.

In the evaluation phase, our trained model predicts the DL-ADCM for a given NAC. We then employ the following transformation (Equation 3) to achieve the DL model-based attenuation correction (DL):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | ( 3) |

Sample cases are visualized in Figure 3.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | NAC-PET MAC-PET ADCM | | | NAC-PET MAC-PET ADCM | |
| a) | A comparison of a body scan  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | | | A comparison of a body scan  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | |
| b) | A several images of a person's body  Description automatically generated | | | A comparison of a body scan  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | |
| c) | A close-up of several images of a person's body  Description automatically generated | | | A comparison of x-ray images of a human body  Description automatically generated | |
|  | | |  | | | |

Figure 3: The middle slice of the coronal view for NAC, MAC, and ADCM images. Color bar unit: SUV

#### Normalization of ADCM

As we already mentioned, famous normalization methods were not used to calibrate ADCM to preserve the quantitative accuracy of SUV, which is necessary for accurate clinical interpretations. We came up with an empirical normalization factor just for ADCM values. This factor was carefully chosen to make the dataset's wide range of values more manageable. This factor ensures the broad spectrum of data, ranging from minimal to several thousand units, is normalized to permit later recalibration into their original SUV metrics. Notably, extreme values that could bias the model (such as outliers with values of 28180 and 7300) were carefully excluded to align the focus with the representative range critical for analysis. Then, voxel intensities were normalized using a factor of 50 to maintain relative, comparable, and manageable values for training. The resultant histograms, illustrating the distribution of maximum values both pre- and post-normalization, are depicted in Figure 5.

A group of graphs showing different colors

Description automatically generated

Figure 4: shows the range of highest intensity values for NAC and MAC images as well as ADCM metrics, showing changes before and after normalization to show how data scaling affects the images. NAC images are scaled down by a factor of 2, MAC images by a factor of 5, and ADCM by a factor of 50.

### 18F-FDG Datasets

To assess the model's performance with different radiotracers, our study incorporated a dataset of 98 whole-body 18F-FDG PET scans originating from two distinct centers, representing our external radiotracer dataset (Figure 6). During the preprocessing phase, the intensities of voxels in both MAC and NAC images were standardized for SUVs by scaling factors, 9 for MAC and 3 for NAC images.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| A comparison of ct-a-zoster  Description automatically generated | A comparison of a person's body  Description automatically generated |
| A close-up of x-ray images  Description automatically generated |

Figure 5: Sample of coronal slices from an FDG dataset, illustrating the range in axial slice counts, which vary from 180 to 600 based on the organ of interest.

Table 2: "Overview of External Radiotracer Dataset Specifications.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Center | No | Train | Validation | Test | Matrix size × Z |
| Center 6 | 55 | 39 | 6 | 11 | 272 × 200 |
| Center 7 | 43 | 23 | 9 | 10 | 272 × 200 |
| Total | 98 | 62 | 15 | 21 | - |
| \*  Z' representing the number of slices in the axial view, depends on body length, scanner resolution, scan protocol, and patient positioning. So, it is different patiently. | | | | | |

### Artifact dataset

A third test set was utilized to evaluate the performance of the developed model under more challenging conditions. This set consisted of imaging data from 198 patients, each displaying various types of artifacts. The artifacts in this dataset were chosen to test how well the model can handle and correctly interpret images that are distorted by common problems seen in clinical 18Ga imaging, like motion and Halo artifacts.

## Deep neural network

For final implementation, we used the Dyn-UNet architecture, renowned for its adaptability and efficiency in processing biomedical images (66). This model is particularly chosen for its dynamic configuration and deep supervision, enabling precise results tailored to the specific requirements of our dataset. The Dyn-UNet model's initialization is specially made to find the best kernel sizes and strides based on the size and spacing of the input patches in our dataset. These parameters were determined by evaluating the spatial dimensions and resolution of the input data, ensuring the network architecture is directly aligned with the inherent characteristics of our medical images.

The Dyn-UNet model is specified with supervision heads, which ensure that intermediate layers are optimized for accurate prediction, enhancing learning efficiency and model robustness. Deep supervision ensures that intermediate layers are also optimized for accurate prediction, not just the final output layer. This strategy boosts the learning efficiency and enhances the robustness of the model, making it adept at segmenting complex anatomical structures with high fidelity.

For the Ga-based dataset, the computed kernel sizes and strides are set to four layers of [3, 3, 3] kernels, with strides transitioning from [1, 1, 1] in the initial layer to [2, 2, 1] in the deeper layers. Additionally, the implementation of deep supervision, with two supervision heads, enhanced the learning process by optimizing the network's final and intermediate layers. By adjusting the ReLU activation function in the last layer, we can get the non-zero value for the concept of the PET image. Our deep learning network was designed to process NAC images as inputs to generate MAC or ADCM images for different approaches and will be elaborated upon later.

Network training involved using 3D patches sized at 168×168×16 and 20 sample patches per patient. The key training parameters were as follows: Learning rate of 0.001, Loss function of the mean squared error (MSE)—also referred to as the squared L2 norm. The MSE loss function was employed to measure the deviation of the network's output from the MAC ground truth.

The network was optimized using the Adam algorithm. The beta coefficients, set at 0.5 and 0.999, governed the moment estimates' exponential decay rates. Supplemental Material 1 details the architecture and more information about this network. To maintain the model's integrity, only artifact-free datasets were used during the network's training and validation stages. We trained the network near 500 epochs to ensure adequate convergence and comprehensive learning from the dataset. To prevent data leakage and ensure data integrity, patients were not overlapped across the training, testing, and validation datasets, maintaining the independence of each dataset. Details on alternative models tested, including those that did not meet our criteria for inclusion in the final report, are documented in Supplementary Material 1 for transparency and completeness.

## Training approaches for deep learning models:

#### Integrated multi-Centre model (IMCM):

A Dyn-Unet deep learning model was developed using a combined dataset from four different centers, all utilizing 68Ga-based radiotracers. This model was initially trained on a collective dataset and subsequently tested on an external center’s data to evaluate its generalization capabilities. It was also tested within the originating dataset from each center. This approach aims to overcome the limitations of models trained on data from single centers, which may struggle with generalizability to new, unseen cases. The training and validation losses for the IMCM are illustrated in Figure 7.

A graph with red and blue lines

Description automatically generated

Figure 6: Training and validation loss for the Integrated Multi-Center Model showing the best metric of 0.0527 at epoch 434.

#### Anatomy-Dependent Correction Model (ADCM):

This methodology adopts a new approach by decomposing the transformation from non-attenuation-corrected PET (NAC-PET) to model-based attenuation-corrected PET (MAC-PET) into two distinct components. Specifically, the model targets anatomy-independent features associated with tracers and diseases and anatomy-dependent corrections that are crucial for accurate image interpretation. This decomposition enables a more targeted and efficient data handling during the deep learning process.

The previous network focused exclusively on estimating the anatomy-dependent correction maps (ADCM). This model's effectiveness is evaluated through its ability to generalize across different centers and tracers, testing its robustness in a variety of clinical settings. The training progress and validation stability for the ADCM are detailed in Figure 8.

A graph of a graph

Description automatically generated

Figure 7: Training and validation loss for the ADCM model, where the best metric of 0.1237 was reached at epoch 466.

#### Tuned Transfer Learning for IMCM model (TL-MC):

The IMCM model underwent tuning through transfer learning (TL) to address the challenges encountered with different radiotracers. This method involves modifying the deep learning model by integrating learning with the new dataset. This refinement enhanced the model’s performance and adaptability across different tracer types, providing a more robust solution that could potentially handle variability more effectively. The effectiveness of the TL approach is depicted in Figure 9, demonstrating rapid convergence and effective transfer learning.

A graph with blue and red lines

Description automatically generated

Figure 8: Training and validation loss for the Tune TL Model with a best metric of 0.0014 achieved at epoch 10, demonstrating rapid convergence and effective transfer learning.

## Quantitative evaluation:

The model's efficacy was rigorously quantified using a range of statistical metrics, calculated by comparing the DL-predicted PET images against the ground truth CT-based attenuation/scatter-corrected images. These voxel-wise metrics are computed as follows:

* **Mean Error (ME):** This reflects the average deviation across all voxels.

( 4)

* **Mean Absolute Error (MAE):** Measures the average magnitude of errors without considering their direction.

( 5)

* **Relative Error (RE%):** Provides a percentage error relative to the true values, indicating the proportion of the deviation.

( 6)

* **Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE):** Measures the average of the squared differences between the predicted and reference values. It is useful for quantifying the deviation in predictions from the observed values across the dataset.**​**

( 7)

Where tot refers to the total number of voxels, and and indicate the predicted image via DL model and the ground truth image, respectively.

* **Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio (PSNR):** Evaluates the ratio of the maximum possible signal to the corrupting noise.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | ( 8) |

In Eq. 8, Peak represents the maximum intensity value in the image.

* **Structural Similarity Index (SSIM):** Assesses the perceptual quality of the predicted images relative to the reference images.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | ( 9) |

where: and are the averages of the pixel intensities in the predicted PET images () and the CT-attenuation corrected PET images (), respectively. and are the variances of the pixel intensities in the predicted and CT-attenuation corrected PET images, respectively. is the covariance of the predicted and CT-attenuation corrected PET images. and are constants to stabilize the division with a weak denominator; L is the dynamic range of the pixel values (typically ). = 0.01 and =0.03 is the default value for the stabilization constants.

# Results

## Quantitative assessment

### Cross-Centre Results:

The two proposed DL algorithms were evaluated on the 68Ga-PET dataset (IMCM and ADCM) in this section. We tested the trained DL model with two internal and external test sets to evaluate its robustness. The internal test sets included 8 subjects from 4 different centers as an external test set and 12 subjects from an external, non-seen center. Figure 6 displays the quantitative accuracy of the deep learning-based images compared to the ground-truth MAC images for both internal and external centers. The results demonstrate that both DL methods effectively performed some degree of attenuation and scattering correction across these centers. Refer to the Supplementary Material in Figure 1 for a detailed center-wise analysis.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| A diagram of a mean error  Description automatically generated | A chart with different colored boxes  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |
| A diagram of a number of colored boxes  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | A diagram of a root mean squared error  Description automatically generated |
| A chart with different colored boxes  Description automatically generated | A diagram of a number of different colored boxes  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |

Figure 9: Quantitative metrics for the IMCM and ADCM methods across internal and external centers, including mean error (SUV), mean absolute error (SUV), relative error (SUV%), root mean squared error, peak signal-to-noise ratio, and structural similarity index.

For the external center, ADCM yielded a ME of -0.631±0.965 (CI 95%: -1.23 to -0.03), an MAE of 3.072±1.012 (CI 95%: 2.815 to 3.329), and a RE of -8.139±27.36% (CI 95%: -21.76 to 5.48). In contrast, the IMCM demonstrated improved consistency with an ME of -1.835±1.387 (CI 95%: -2.80 to -0.87) and an MAE of 2.588±0.931 (CI 95%: 2.386 to 2.790). Internal centers showed ADCM produced an ME of 0.373±1.455 (CI 95%: -0.55 to 1.30) and an MAE of 2.343±0.768 (CI 95%: 2.191 to 2.495). IMCM showed a lower ME of -0.364±0.841 (CI 95%: -0.76 to 0.03) and an MAE of 1.415±0.327 (CI 95%: 1.360 to 1.470). PSNR also favored the IMCM method, registering at 35.526±2.117 (CI 95%: 34.9 to 36.2) compared to 38.251±1.923 (CI 95%: 37.6 to 38.9) for the ADCM method. Notably, SSIM for IMCM in the external center was superior, recorded at 0.879±0.020 (CI 95%: 0.871 to 0.887). Details are available in the Supplementary Material, table 1.

In addition to voxel-wise assessments, model performance was further validated through various statistical tests, which compared image-derived metrics between different training models. The Wilcoxon test was used due to the data's non-normal distribution, as evidenced by the Shapiro-Wilk tests. The Wilcoxon test showed that the ADCM and IMCM datasets were significantly different for all metrics except RE (SUV%), where the p-value does not indicate a statistically significant difference threshold of 0.05. IMCM consistently shows lower errors, a higher PSNR, and higher SSIM values, indicating superior image quality and more reliable estimations. These findings are further detailed in Supplementary Material 2, Statistical test.

In the analysis of the joint histograms, such as Pearson correlation, the voxel-wise correlation across the different centers for both methods was visualized in Figure 11. A clear difference in predictive accuracy and linearity in SUV estimation was demonstrated. In the external center, the IMCM regression slope of 0.65 ± 0.02 with an R-value of 0.949 clearly showed a systematic underestimation over the range of predicted SUV values, compared to ADCM, which showed a slope of 1.18 ± 0.10 and an R-value of 0.850, suggesting a trend towards overestimation potentially linked to very high SUV values that might not be clinically advantageous.

In internal centers, the behavior of the methods differed, with the IMCM method closer to ideal prediction, especially evident at center C3 with a regression slope of 0.87 ± 0.01 and an R-value of 0.988. On the other hand, the ADCM method had slopes greater than one, specifically 1.13 ± 0.03 at C2 and 1.19 ± 0.03 at C4. This could mean that the method wasn't calibrated correctly, leading to an overall overestimation of the SUV.

The voxel-wise analysis further confirmed these findings, showing larger discrepancies in centers where ADCM predicted significantly higher values. Overall, these results demonstrate that ADCM appears to be closer to the truth in some centers because the R-values are higher. However, the reliability and clinical usefulness of ADCM can be called into question. IMCM demonstrated image quality comparable to MAC and preserved more detailed information with lower noise compared to ADCM.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Predicted (SUV) | A graph of a function  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |
| Predicted (SUV) | A diagram of a graph  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |
| Predicted (SUV) | A graph of different colored lines  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |
| Predicted (SUV) | A graph of different colored lines  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |
| Predicted (SUV) | A graph of a graph of a person  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |
|  | Reference (SUV) Reference (SUV) |

Figure 10: Joint histogram analysis displaying the correlation between activity concentration in DL-IMCM and DL-ADCM images versus reference MAC images serving as the ground truth. Note that a logarithmic scale was used to display the SUV levels. C1-4 are internal centres, while C5 is an external centre.

### Cross-Tracer Results:

As part of our assessment of generalization capabilities across different tracer types, IMCM was initially tested without specific tuning for cross-tracer variations. As proved before, the results revealed that the IMCM, without prior tuning, struggled to maintain its efficacy when applied to different radiopharmaceutical tracers (39). However, this outcome contrasts sharply with the claims from the ADCM approach, which posits that the ADCM model architecture inherently accommodates variations across tracers and anatomical structures without the need for additional adjustments.

So, the 18F-FDG-PET dataset was used as a cross-tracer in this study to test the two proposed DL algorithms: TL-MC (the tuned version of IMCM) and ADCM. We tested the trained DL model to evaluate its robustness, which included 20 subjects from 2 different centers as external non-seen centers. Figure 12 showcases a sample coronal slice of IMCM, TL-MC, and ADCM on cross-tracer subjects. The significant drop in accuracy and increased error rates highlight the challenges in achieving robust cross-tracer generalization with a single, unified model approach. These results show how important it is to tune the model specifically to each tracer's specific properties. This will make the model more useful and accurate in various clinical settings.

The two approaches, TL-MC and ADCM, indicate significant differences in error metrics. Both ME and MAE indicated much smaller error margins for the TL-MC, with the overall mean values reflecting better accuracy than the ADCM. The TL-MC ME deviated narrowly by -0.10±0.76, while the ADCM deviated by 0.82±0.70, signifying a much wider spread of the SUV estimates (Figure 13). These are shown as RE%. This also confirms that TL-MC had a better performance. The RE spread was relatively lower for TL-MC, averaging at 30±50%, in contrast with ADCM, where the spread was much broader at 50±100%.

TL-MC gave a lower RMSE of 2.0 ± 0.6, which pointed out consistency and reliability compared to ADCM's 3.2 ± 1.1. It was also better than ADCM in image quality metrics, having higher PSNR and SSIM values, which showed tighter control over noise and structural fidelity. Altogether, these findings point towards superiority in the use of TL-MC over ADCM in terms of accuracy and consistency in all major key PET imaging metrics, and the use of this approach is recommended in clinical practice where precision is critical. The data make a compelling case that TL-MC should be preferred with respect to its strong performance in consistently keeping lower errors in the images. For a comprehensive view and deeper analysis, refer to the box plots in Figure 9. Detailed statistical comparisons of these metrics are illustrated in Supplementary Material 2, Tables 3 and 4, provided.

|  |
| --- |
| NAC MAC IMCM TL-MC ADCM |
| A collage of images of a person  Description automatically generated |
| Figure 11: From left to right, a coronal slice of NAC, MAC, IMCM, TL-MC, and ADCM on cross-tracer subjects, respectively. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| A graph with a number of green and red boxes  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | A graph with green and red boxes  Description automatically generated |
| A graph with a number of boxes  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | A graph with numbers and lines  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |
| A chart of a graph  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | A chart with green and red squares  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |

Figure 12: Comparative Analysis of Imaging Metrics Between ADCM and IMCM Methods. The box plots depict the distribution of mean error (SUV), mean absolute error (SUV), relative error (SUV%), root mean squared error, peak signal-to-noise ratio, and structural similarity index across centers C6 and C7.

Upon further investigation through joint histogram analysis of the TL-MC and ADCM models across different centers, a nuanced understanding of each model’s predictive capabilities for SUVs emerges. The TL-MC model aligns closely with reference values, as evidenced by regression slopes of 0.98 ± 0.38 and 0.69 ± 0.08 at two respective centers. Notably, this model also shows high correlation coefficients of 0.915 and 0.918, underscoring its precision in SUV prediction despite a tendency to slightly underestimate values, particularly at Centre C7 as depicted in the analysis.

On the other hand, the ADCM model has lower correlation coefficients of 0.660 and 0.678, even though its regression slopes are higher at 1.10 ± 0.46 and 1.35 ± 0.66, which means it overestimates the data. This discrepancy highlights the lesser consistency and reliability of its predictions when compared to TL-MC. Contrary to intuitive expectations of better correlation, the higher slopes observed in ADCM indicate a greater deviation from the reference line, pointing to a systematic error in overestimating SUVs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Predicted (SUV) | A diagram of a graph  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |
| Predicted (SUV) | A chart with numbers and a diagram  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |
|  | Reference (SUV) Reference (SUV) |

Figure 13: Joint histogram analysis displaying the correlation between activity concentration in TL-MC and ADCM images versus reference MAC images serving as the ground truth for cross-tracer. Note that a logarithmic scale was used to display the SUV levels.

## Case Study on Artifact Images

This section examined a series of case studies involving repeated scans. These repeated scans have been requested by nuclear medicine physicians shortly after initial assessments. Figures 15, 16, and 17 display the imaging results for patients with halo artifacts in the pelvic, kidney, diaphragm, lung, liver, and spleen regions. These artifacts were removed in the repeated scan. The ICMC method produced artifact-free images of high quality, diagnostic confidence, and nearly identical to the initial scan. Figure 18 features patients with a halo artifact in the kidneys. A repeated scan was conducted in this region due to the initial scan's low image quality and diagnostic confidence. Unfortunately, in some cases, the repeated scan could not remove these artifacts. Nonetheless, the ICMC model successfully eliminated the artifact in both the original and subsequent scans.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| A close-up of x-ray images  Description automatically generated | A close-up of a person's body  Description automatically generated |  |
| A close up of eyes  Description automatically generated | A close up of eyes  Description automatically generated |  | |
| A close-up of a person's body  Description automatically generated | A close-up of a person's body  Description automatically generated |
| A close-up of a pair of eyes  Description automatically generated | A close-up of a pair of eyes  Description automatically generated |

Figure 14: Coronal and axial views of 12 clinical studies showing from left to right NAC, MAC, IMCM-DL and the difference images of MAC and DL image. The images generated using the IMCM approach successfully corrected the halo artefact in pelvic area.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| A close-up of a person's body  Description automatically generated | A comparison of a person's body  Description automatically generated | A black and white image of a long rectangular object  Description automatically generated |
|  | A close-up of x-rays  Description automatically generated |
| A close-up of x-ray images  Description automatically generated | A close-up of a scan of a person  Description automatically generated |
| A close-up of a person's body  Description automatically generated | A close-up of x-ray images  Description automatically generated |

Figure 15: Coronal views of 8 clinical studies, representing from left to right: NAC, MAC, IMCM-DL and the difference images of MAC and DL image. Our method effectively disentangles halo artefacts in the kidney area.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | A black and white image of a long rectangular object  Description automatically generated |
| A close-up of a person's body  Description automatically generated | A close-up of a person's body  Description automatically generated |
| A comparison of a person's body  Description automatically generated | A close-up of a person's body  Description automatically generated |
| A close-up of a person's body  Description automatically generated | A close-up of x-ray images  Description automatically generated |
| A comparison of a person's body  Description automatically generated | A close-up of a person's body  Description automatically generated |
| A close-up of a person's body  Description automatically generated | A close-up of a person's body  Description automatically generated |

Figure 16: Coronal views of 12 clinical studies showing from left to right NAC, MAC, IMCM-DL, and the difference images of MAC and DL image. The images generated using the IMCM approach successfully corrected the mismatch artifact in the diaphragm, lung, liver, and spleen regions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | A black and white image of a long rectangular object  Description automatically generated |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

Figure 17: Coronal and axial views showing from left to right NAC, MAC, IMCM-DL and the difference images of MAC and DL image. The repeated scan which was requested right after the initial scan. The IMCM image recovered high quality and high diagnostic confidence for both scans.

# Discussion

Various deep learning-based attenuation scatter correction (DL-ASC) methods have been developed for PET imaging. These include indirect approaches that generate attenuation maps from MRI and NAC images or maximum likelihood estimation of activity and attenuation (MLAA). For instance, studies have employed generative adversarial networks (GANs) to derive pseudo-CT images from PET non-attenuation-corrected (non-AC) scans in both brain and whole-body PET imaging. Furthermore, MLAA methodologies have been enhanced by incorporating deep learning to mitigate common issues such as crosstalk artifacts, slow convergence, and the generation of noisy attenuation maps. Direct DL-ASC methods get around traditional methods by making ASC PET images directly from NAC images. This was first used in brain PET imaging and then tested in 18F-FDG PET studies of the whole body.

A significant challenge arises with the low tracer activity and the extensive positron range of 68Ga-labelled pharmaceuticals, which generally produce lower-quality images compared to 18F-labelled compounds. Initially, employing DL for direct ASC in PET might seem overly reliant on advanced technology. However, our findings indicate that it enhances both quantitative and qualitative aspects of PET images and effectively identifies and corrects mismatches and halo artifacts without needing anatomical images. While indirect techniques require reconstructions to produce ASC PET images, they often fail to address halo artifacts that arise during the reconstruction phase and are predominantly influenced by the PET images themselves.

This study has demonstrated that a single universal model may not be effective due to variations in tracer-injected activity across different hospitals. There is a need to tune radiotracer-wise models using heterogeneous datasets to address these discrepancies. However, using large and heterogeneous datasets from different hospitals in the same tracer can compensate for the differences in equipment, image acquisition, and reconstruction strategies. In our research, we utilized different data from various hospitals, which enhanced the accuracy of ASC in PET images when implementing a shared model across different hospitals for identical radiotracer imaging.

Furthermore, we employed the IMCM for additional qualitative analysis. Through quantitative assessments, we observed the substantial impact that radiotracers and scanners have on model performance. Notably, IMCM greatly increased the quantitative accuracy across various scanners, indicating the need for model tuning using transfer learning that is tailored to specific tracer situations and thus performs better than ADCM. IMCM showed enhanced efficiency when different scanners utilized the same radiotracer, compared to when various radiotracers were employed on the same scanner. We also found that the source of the data, including the type of scanner and radiotracer used, significantly affected ADCM's effectiveness, contrary to initial assumptions.

While the ADCM method focuses on decomposing the PET image correction process into separating anatomical and radiotracer-dependent information, our investigation couldn’t prove that it may not be able to handle the differences between variant scanners and radiotracers well. This underscores the need for more robust, adaptable models like IMCM, which not only accommodate but thrive on the heterogeneity inherent in multi-center clinical data.

The joint histogram analysis raised pertinent questions regarding the calibration and reliability of the ADCM method in clinical settings. Notably, the overestimations seen by ADCM, especially in cross-center, could lead to incorrect diagnoses in situations where accuracy in SUV estimation is critical. The systematic bias towards higher SUV values, although providing a superficial appearance of accuracy due to closer R-values to unity, suggests underlying issues in the algorithm or its application across different PET systems.

In contrast, the IMCM method’s adherence to lower regression slopes and higher correlation coefficients, particularly in internal centers, underscores its suitability for clinical applications by providing reliable SUV estimations. The variance in predictive performance between IMCM and ADCM highlights the necessity for rigorous validation of imaging algorithms to ensure uniform performance across different settings.

The analysis across cross-tracer highlights brings to light the critical aspect that a higher slope does not necessarily equate to better correlation or prediction accuracy. Instead, the consistency with which predictions align with actual values, as measured by correlation coefficients, provides a more substantial indication of a model's effectiveness. With its tighter adherence to the regression line despite lower slopes, the TL-MC model demonstrates a more reliable and consistent performance in capturing the true behavior of SUVs across the studied centers. CT-ASCs are a primary adjustment for quantitative 68Ga PET imaging. However, this process can introduce mismatches and halo artifacts in 68Ga PET images, potentially altering patient diagnosis and prognosis. These artifacts are challenging to detect and correct in real clinical settings.

Our developed model does not require iterative image reconstruction with ASC. Qualitative analysis underscored the effectiveness of our proposed model in detecting and correcting mismatches and halo artefacts in the chest, abdomen, and pelvic regions without needing ground truth in 68Ga PET images. We also observed scenarios in which repeated scans, typically conducted to eliminate artifacts, failed and even exacerbated them. Here, our DL algorithms were able to distinguish and correct these issues independently of the ground truth.

Previous studies' predominant limitation lies in their single-centre datasets, which restrict the generalizability of DL models. Our current study employs a multi-centre approach to address this issue. Moving forward, future research should explore clinical imaging parameters such as SUVmean, SUVmax, and total lesion metabolism, providing a more comprehensive analysis of the IMCM model's performance. These metrics, along with an assessment of the most relevant radiomic features within the sphere of influence, will provide crucial insights into the model's effectiveness under various clinical conditions.

Additionally, future investigations should focus on the performance of the IMCM model, specifically concerning artifact images, with a particular emphasis on organ-specific evaluations. This targeted approach would afford a nuanced understanding of the model's performance in diverse clinical scenarios, potentially leading to significant improvements in model precision and utility. Furthermore, rigorous statistical tests on categorised outcomes will be paramount. These tests will offer deeper insights into the consistency and reliability of the model across different diagnostic categories, helping to refine the model's application and enhance its diagnostic accuracy in practical healthcare settings.

# Conclusion

In this thesis, we have demonstrated the efficacy of an Integrated multi-centre Dynamic Unet deep learning framework for artifact detection and correction in PET imaging of 68Ga-labelled compounds. The approach leverages large datasets from multiple centers. Through the incorporation of transfer learning concepts, we have developed site-specific models that significantly outperform centralized models and those based on single-center data, thereby addressing a major limitation in the field of medical imaging. Our model effectively detected and corrected artifacts. This enhancement is vital for making therapeutic decisions in the field of oncology, where PET imaging plays a central role in diagnosing, planning treatments, and evaluating responses. By using Dyn-Unet architecture and other advanced deep learning techniques, our method has not only improved image quality but also greatly decreased the appearance of common artifacts like halo and mismatch artifacts, especially in 68Ga-PET imaging. The effective implementation of our models in different centers highlights their resilience and flexibility, which are essential for general acceptance in clinical settings.
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# Supplementary Material 1

## Initial Step from Segmentation task to translation

The foundational idea is that if a deep learning model is capable of accurately identifying and positioning organs for segmentation, then it could ostensibly learn to correct an image in desire style by effectively utilizing the right activation functions, loss functions, and an appropriate architectural design. So, for the first step: Could a model, trained on any images, learn to produce an acceptable output by using the same image as both input and target, focusing initially on visual acceptability rather than quantitative metrics?

We utilized CT images as samples before accessing the original data. The experimental setup involved using these images as both the training inputs and targets inputs, aiming to fine-tune the model’s hyperparameters to achieve visually satisfactory outputs. This stage was primarily about understanding the influence of various parameters on the initial results and was not concerned with the precision of error metrics.

Figure 1 and Table 1 in this supplementary section illustrates some of the outputs. This stage served an educational purpose, helping us to understand the foundational dynamics of deep learning applications in corrected images.

Table 3: Some specification of training approach

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| crop\_size | (512, 512, 32) |
| transforms | ScaleIntensityRanged(keys**=**["image", "target"],a\_min**=-**1024, a\_max**=**2048, b\_min**=**0.0, b\_max**=**1.0, clip**=True**),  Orientationd(keys**=**["image", "target"], axcodes**=**"RAS"),  Spacingd(keys**=**["image", "target"], pixdim**=**(1.5, 1.5, 2.0)),  Resized(keys**=**["image", "target"], spatial\_size**=**crop\_size, mode**=**'bilinear'),  CenterSpatialCropd(keys**=**["image", "target"], roi\_size**=**crop\_size), |
| batch\_size | 4 |
| model | UNet(spatial\_dims**=**3,in\_channels**=**1,out\_channels**=**1,channels**=**(16, 32, 64),act**=**(nn**.**ReLU, {"inplace": **True**}), strides**=**(2, 2), num\_res\_units**=**2, norm**=**Norm**.**BATCH) |
| loss\_function | torch**.**nn**.**MSELoss() |
| optimizer | torch**.**optim**.**Adam(model**.**parameters(), 1e-6) |
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Figure 18s: One slice of output and raining loss, from the left to right: input, target and output of the model.

## Different Models

### 3D-Unet-Model

Following the initial phase, we progressed to applying the developed model to the 68Ga dataset.

To adapt the model for our dataset, several transformations and optimization of hyperparameters tuned to better process the specific profiles of Ga images. First, we checked the model just for one patient data.

Figure 2 and Table 2 in this section detail the variables and outputs from this phase of the project.
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Figure 19: top: Training and validation loss for 3D-Unet model, bottom: One slice of output.

And then we tried it for a portion of data (20 patient):
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Figure 20: One slice of output.

Table 4: Some specification of training approach

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| crop\_size | (180, 180, 312) |
| train\_transforms | Spacingd(keys**=**["image", "target"], pixdim**=**(1.5, 1.5, 2.0)), Resized(keys**=**["image", "target"], spatial\_size**=**crop\_size, ode**=**'bilinear') |
| val\_transforms | Spacingd(keys**=**["image", "target"], pixdim**=**(1.5, 1.5, 2.0)),  Resized(keys**=**["image", "target"], spatial\_size**=**crop\_size, mode**=**('bilinear')) |
| batch\_size | 2 |
| model | UNet(spatial\_dims**=**3, in\_channels**=**1, out\_channels**=**1, channels**=**(16, 32, 64), act**=**(nn**.**ReLU6, {"inplace": **True**}), strides**=**(2, 2), num\_res\_units**=**2,  norm**=**Norm**.**BATCH, |
| loss\_function | torch**.**nn**.**MSELoss() |
| optimizer | torch**.**optim**.**Adam(model**.**parameters(), 1e-4) |
| max\_epochs | 50 |

As it is obvious there was still some patch pattern on the image, and it means there are parameters need to be changed.

As it is mentioned in table 3 after adapting the spacing, dimensions and other parameters for loading the data appropriate for our dataset, and using all dataset, the Figure 4 concluded.

Table 5: Some specification of training approach

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| roi\_size | [168, 168, 320] |
| train\_transforms | Spacingd(keys=["image", "target"], pixdim=(4.07, 4.07, 3.00)),  SpatialPadd(keys=["image", "target"], spatial\_size=(200, 200, 350), mode='constant'),  CenterSpatialCropd(keys=["image", "target"], roi\_size=roi\_size), |
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Figure 21: top: Training and validation loss for 3D-Unet model, bottom: One slice of output.

### Patched-3D Unet:

In the initial phase of our research, we attempted to use full-body 3D PET data as single inputs for training our deep learning model. This approach, however, presented significant challenges. The limit number of available data and the limit computational resources required to process full-body 3D data.

Most researchers in this field typically use a 2D slice-wise approach using data-frame images, which significantly reduces the computational demand. Others utilize a smaller section of the data-frame, training their models patch-wise to manage resource constraints effectively. Considering these factors, we opted to focus on using image patches exclusively in the axial direction, and fixed boundaries in the coronal and sagittal dimensions 168 and 168 with each patch containing 32 axial slices. This approach effectively increased our data tenfold, facilitating more extensive training under limited resource conditions.

The outcomes of this method, presented in Figure 5 and Table 4. These results underline the adaptability of our approach in optimizing data usage and computational resources while still enabling robust model training.

Table 6: Some specification of training approach

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| roi\_size | [168, 168, 320] |
| train\_transforms | Spacingd(keys**=**["image", "target"], pixdim**=**(4.07, 4.07, 3.00), mode**=** 'trilinear'),  SpatialPadd(keys**=**["image", "target"], spatial\_size**=**(168, 168, 320), mode**=**'constant'), *# Pad to ensure minimum size*  RandCropByPosNegLabeld(keys**=**["image", "target"],label\_key**=**"target", spatial\_size**=**(168, 168, 32), pos**=**1,neg**=**1,num\_samples**=**4,image\_key**=**"image",image\_threshold**=**0, |
| val\_transforms | Spacingd(keys**=**["image", "target"], pixdim**=**(4.07, 4.07, 3.00), mode**=** 'trilinear'),  SpatialPadd(keys**=**["image", "target"], spatial\_size**=**(168, 168, 320), mode**=**'constant'), *# Pad to ensure minimum size* |
| batch\_size | 16 |
| model | UNet(spatial\_dims**=**3,in\_channels**=**1,out\_channels**=**1,  channels**=**(32, 64, 128, 256),act**=**(nn**.**ReLU6, {"inplace": **True**}),strides**=**(2, 2, 2, 2), num\_res\_units**=**2, |
| optimizer | torch**.**optim**.**Adam(model**.**parameters(), lr**=**1e-4, weight\_decay**=**0.0) |
| scheduler | torch**.**optim**.**lr\_scheduler**.**StepLR(optimizer, 40, 0.1) |
| max\_epochs | 150 |

A graph with blue and orange lines

Description automatically generated

A group of images of a person's body

Description automatically generatedA group of images of a person's body

Description automatically generated

Figure 22: top: Training and validation loss for 3D-Unet model, bottom: Two sample slices of outputs, Best Metric: 0.2328, Epoch: 148

### 2D-Unet

In addition to search for the best match model to get lower loss and better quality of images, we evaluated a 2D-Unet model training approach.

This 2D U-Net architecture was mostly similar to the previous model. The model training was optimized using an Adam optimizer with a specifically tailored learning rate schedule, which adjusted the learning rate based on the epoch count to enhance training stability and performance.

Some key variables and results detailed in Figure 4 and Table 4.

Table 7: Some specification of training approach

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| train\_transforms | Spacingd(keys=["image", "target"], pixdim=(4.07, 4.07), mode= 'bilinear'),  spatial\_size=[168, 168], mode='constant' |
| model | monai.networks.nets.UNet(spatial\_dims=2,in\_channels=1,out\_channels=1,channels=(16, 32, 64, 128),strides=(2, 2, 2, 2),num\_res\_units=2, |
| loss\_function | = torch.nn.MSELoss() |
| optimizer | torch.optim.Adam(model.parameters(), lr=learning\_rate, betas=(0.5, 0.999)) |
| max\_epoch | 300 |
| lr\_lambda | DecayLR(epochs=max\_epochs, offset=0, decay\_epochs=decay\_epoch).step |
| scheduler | torch.optim.lr\_scheduler.LambdaLR(optimizer, lr\_lambda=lr\_lambda) |
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Figure 23: top: Training and validation loss for 2D-Unet model, bottom: Sample slice of output, Best Metric: 0.206, Epoch: 48

### DyUnet:

In parallel with 2D evaluation, we implemented the DynUNet architecture, an advanced and dynamic variant of the traditional U-Net designed specifically for biomedical image segmentation.

DynUNet introduces several key enhancements over the standard U-Net, including the option for deep supervision. This feature allows the network to output additional intermediate layers' predictions and facilitate the learning process by ensuring that gradients are effectively propagated back through the network, enhancing the training dynamics and enabling the model to learn detailed representations without significant overfitting.

With compatible configurations of kernel sizes and strides and depth of artitecture, model enables to effectively capture relevant features at different scales.

Key configuration parameters of DynUNet are listed in table 6 and there is one sample output from out initial implementation in the Figure 5.

Table 8: Some specification of training approach

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| patch\_size | [168, 168, 16] |
| spacing | [4.07, 4.07, 3.00] |
| spatial\_size | (168, 168, 320) |
| train\_transforms | Spacingd(keys=["image", "target"], pixdim= spacing, mode= 'trilinear'),SpatialPadd(keys=["image","target"], spatial\_size=spatial\_size, mode='constant'),RandSpatialCropSamplesd(keys=["image","target"], roi\_size=self.patch\_size, num\_samples=4), |
| val\_transforms | CenterSpatialCropd(keys=["image", "target"], roi\_size=self.spatial\_size) |
| Model | DynUNet( spatial\_dims=3, in\_channels=1, out\_channels=1, kernel\_size=kernels, strides=strides, upsample\_kernel\_size=strides[1:], norm\_name="INSTANCE", deep\_supervision=True, deep\_supr\_num=2,) |

After these improvements, finally we could decrease the validation loss from around 0.2 at the initially trials to the 0.0664.

To enhance the robustness of our model, we implemented specific data augmentations. These included adding rotations of ±15 degrees and increasing the number of samples per patient from 4 to 20.
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Figure 24: top: Training and validation loss for 2D-Unet model, bottom: Sample slice of output, Best Metric: 0.206, Epoch: 48

Here are some other metric errors from the beginning of this research:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| At early stage | ME: 0.64  MAE: 0.95  RE: 193.7%  ARE: 199.0% |
| Using Unet | Mean Error (SUV): -0.32 ± 0.1032  Mean Absolure Error (SUV): 0.33 ± 0.0868  Relative Error (SUV%): -55.49 ± 15.6193  Absolure Relative Error (SUV%): 56.98 ± 13.3306  Root Mean Squared Error: 0.48 ± 0.1741  Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio: 23.92 ± 6.4356  Structual Similarity Index: 0.63 ± 0.1537 |
| Using DynUnet | mean\_error: -0.43 ± 0.3433  mean\_absolute\_error: 0.54 ± 0.2896  relative\_error: -23.92 ± 14.8091  absolute\_relative\_error: 35.36 ± 7.7831  rmse: 1.13 ± 0.8008  psnr: 32.57 ± 4.2616  ssim: 0.87 ± 0.0568 |
| DynUnet, ADCM method | Mean Error (SUV): -0.42 ± 0.0783  Mean Absolure Error (SUV): 0.42 ± 0.0767  Relative Error (SUV%): -72.41 ± 10.2247  Absolure Relative Error (SUV%): 72.65 ± 9.9125  Root Mean Squared Error: 0.57 ± 0.1856  Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio: 22.53 ± 6.7792  Structual Similarity Index: 0.44 ± 0.1617 |
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Figure 7: The architecture of DynUnet.
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Figure 25: Performance Metrics of IMCM and ADCM Across Centres C1 to C5

Table 9: Summary statistics of quantitative parameters for different approaches on cross center (Ga dataset)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Method** | **ME** | **MAE** | **RE** | **ARE** | **RMSE** | **PSNR** | **SSI** |
| **Mean ± SD** | **ADCM** | 0.67 ± 1.10 | 2.87 ± 0.75 | -2.17 ± 20.85 | 57.23 ± 7.41 | 11.79 ± 7.03 | 36.83 ± 3.17 | 0.85 ± 0.03 |
| **IMCM** | -1.38 ± 0.93 | 1.94 ± 0.83 | -12.38 ± 20.98 | 43.62 ± 11.56 | 4.40 ± 2.66 | 34.42 ± 3.92 | 0.91 ± 0.04 |
| **CI95%** | **ADCM** | [0.15, 1.18] | [2.52, 3.22] | [-11.93, 7.59] | [53.77, 60.70] | [8.50, 15.08] | [35.35, 38.31] | [0.84, 0.86] |
| **IMCM** | [-1.81, -0.94] | [1.55, 2.33] | [-22.20, -2.56] | [38.21, 49.04] | [3.16, 5.65] | [32.58, 36.25] | [0.89, 0.92] |

## Statistical tests

### Normality Testing

Before selecting an appropriate statistical test for our analysis, we first assessed the normality of the distribution of each metric within both datasets using the Shapiro-Wilk test. This step was crucial to determine whether parametric or non-parametric statistical methods were suitable. Our findings indicated that several metrics did not follow a normal distribution, particularly in the IMCM dataset where metrics such as Relative Error (SUV%) and Absolute Relative Error (SUV%) showed significant deviations from normality with p-values below 0.05. Similarly, Root Mean Squared Error and Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio in the ADCM dataset also deviated significantly from a normal distribution.

Table 10: Evaluation of normality of all metric variables across both ADCM and IMCM datasets, by performing a Shapiro-Wilk test for each metric.

|  | **Metric** | **ADCM Statistic** | **ADCM P-value** | **IMCM Statistic** | **IMCM P-value** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | Mean Error (SUV) | 0.962684 | 0.598745 | 0.964505 | 0.637189 |
| 1 | Mean Absolure Error (SUV) | 0.973161 | 0.819726 | 0.902938 | 0.046832 |
| 2 | Relative Error (SUV%) | 0.926644 | 0.133062 | 0.903215 | 0.047397 |
| 3 | Absolure Relative Error (SUV%) | 0.934748 | 0.190480 | 0.813324 | 0.001375 |
| 4 | Root Mean Squared Error | 0.875041 | 0.014425 | 0.670732 | 0.000018 |
| 5 | Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio | 0.826691 | 0.002222 | 0.944862 | 0.295736 |
| 6 | Structual Similarity Index | 0.963606 | 0.618108 | 0.973200 | 0.820480 |

### Choice of Statistical Test

Given the non-normality observed in several key metrics across the datasets, we opted to use the Wilcoxon signed-rank test, a non-parametric method, for our analysis. This test is particularly advantageous as it does not assume normality of the data and is ideal for comparing two related samples or repeated measurements on a single sample. This choice was reinforced by the need to handle the paired nature of our data, where each centre was analysed under both ADCM and IMCM conditions.

Our analysis revealed significant differences between the ADCM and IMCM methodologies in several metrics. Notably, the Mean Error (SUV) and Absolute Relative Error (SUV%) showed considerable variations, suggesting distinct impacts of the two methodologies on these particular metrics. The Wilcoxon test results indicated statistically significant differences with low p-values, underscoring the effectiveness of one method over the other in specific conditions.

Table 11: Summarized results of the Wilcoxon test with the False Discovery Rate (FDR) corrections applied to the p-values.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **U-statistic** | **P-value** |
| Mean Error (SUV) | 371.0 | 0.000039 |
| Mean Absolute Error (SUV) | 330.0 | 0.000460 |
| Relative Error (SUV%) | 267.0 | 0.072045 |
| Absolute Relative Error (SUV%) | 357.0 | 0.000023 |
| Root Mean Squared Error | 364.0 | 0.000097 |
| Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio | 286.0 | 0.020734 |
| Structural Similarity Index | 42.0 | 0.000020 |

The results from the Wilcoxon test show that there are statistically significant differences between the ADCM and IMCM datasets for most of the image-derived metrics, except for the "Relative Error (SUV%)" where the corrected p-value does not indicate a statistically significant difference.

Table 12: Summary statistics of quantitative parameters for different approaches on cross tracer (FDG dataset)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Method** | **ME** | **MAE** | **RE** | **ARE** | **RMSE** | **PSNR** | **SSI** |
| **Mean ± SD** | **ADCM** | 0.29 ± 0.58 | 1.08 ± 0.35 | 34.08 ± 48.96 | 80.22 ± 34.25 | 3.71 ± 4.14 | 37.38 ± 3.89 | 0.77 ± 0.09 |
| **TL-MC** | -0.54 ± 0.15 | 0.69 ± 0.13 | -39.70 ± 9.13 | 52.11 ± 7.61 | 1.18 ± 0.61 | 35.27 ± 6.18 | 0.78 ± 0.11 |
| **CI95%** | **ADCM** | [0.02, 0.55] | [0.92, 1.24] | [11.80, 56.37] | [64.63, 95.81] | [1.82, 5.59] | [35.61, 39.15] | [0.72, 0.81] |
| **TL-MC** | [-0.60, -0.47] | [0.63, 0.75] | [-43.86, -35.55] | [48.64, 55.57] | [0.91, 1.46] | [32.46, 38.09] | [0.73, 0.83] |

Table 13: Summary statistics of quantitative parameters for different centers tuned for each radiotracer separately (TL-MC) and tested on all test sets (centers 1-7).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Quantitative metric** | **Centre 1-4** | **Centre 5** | **Centre 6** | **Centre 7** | **All Test Set** | |
| **ME** | -0.56 ± 0.74 | -1.92 ± 0.58 | -0.46 ± 0.16 | -0.61 ± 0.09 | -0.95 ± 0.78 | |
| **MAE** | 1.28 ± 0.37 | 2.38 ± 0.76 | 0.64 ± 0.13 | 0.73 ± 0.12 | 1.30 ± 0.86 | |
| **RE** | -1.15 ± 18.77 | -19.87 ± 19.58 | -35.66 ± 11.69 | -43.38 ± 3.55 | -26.38 ± 21.03 | |
| **ARE** | 36.38 ± 7.12 | 48.45 ± 11.62 | 49.56 ± 8.11 | 54.42 ± 6.64 | 47.97 ± 10.53 | |
| **RMSE** | 2.90 ± 0.58 | 5.41 ± 3.05 | 1.00 ± 0.25 | 1.35 ± 0.78 | 2.75 ± 2.49 | |
| **PSNR** | 37.66 ± 2.67 | 32.25 ± 3.04 | 37.74 ± 6.59 | 33.03 ± 5.07 | 34.86 ± 5.16 | |
| **SSIM** | 0.93 ± 0.03 | 0.89 ± 0.03 | 0.80 ± 0.13 | 0.76 ± 0.092 | 0.84 ± 0.11 | |
| **CI 95%** | | | | |  |
| **ME** | [-1.18, 0.06] | [-2.29, -1.56] | [-0.57, -0.34] | [-0.67, -0.55] | [-1.19, -0.70] | |
| **MAE** | [0.97, 1.59] | [1.90, 2.87] | [0.55, 0.73] | [0.65, 0.81] | [1.03, 1.57] | |
| **RE** | [-16.84, 14.55] | [-32.31, -7.43] | [-44.02, -27.29] | [-45.77, -41.00] | [-33.01, -19.74] | |
| **ARE** | [30.42, 42.34] | [41.07, 55.84] | [43.75, 55.37] | [49.96, 58.89] | [44.65, 51.29] | |
| **RMSE** | [2.42, 3.38] | [3.47, 7.35] | [0.82, 1.18] | [0.83, 1.88] | [1.97, 3.54] | |
| **PSNR** | [35.43, 39.90] | [30.32, 34.18] | [37.62, 37.85] | 32.97 to 33.09 | [33.23, 36.48] | |
| **SSIM** | [0.90, 0.96] | [0.87, 0.91] | 0.68 to 0.91 | 0.70 to 0.82 | [0.81, 0.87] | |
| Column “Centre 1-4” represents the results of testing on the whole test set when training is performed on centre 1 to 4 data set. “Centre 5” represents as external centre with same radiotracer and Centre 6 & 7 test sets represent the results of tuned models, in which training and testing are performed for different radiotracer (whole 20% of the clean dataset). | | | | | | |