

ON ENHANCING BRAIN TUMOR SEGMENTATION ACROSS DIVERSE POPULATIONS WITH CONVOLUTIONAL NEURAL NETWORKS

Fadillah Adamsyah Maani, Anees Ur Rehman Hashmi, Numan Saeed, and Mohammad Yaqub

Mohamed bin Zayed University of Artificial Intelligence, Abu Dhabi, UAE

ABSTRACT

Brain tumor segmentation is a fundamental step in assessing a patient’s cancer progression. However, manual segmentation demands significant expert time to identify tumors in 3D multimodal brain MRI scans accurately. This reliance on manual segmentation makes the process prone to intra- and inter-observer variability. This work proposes a brain tumor segmentation method as part of the *BraTS-GoAT* challenge. The task is to segment tumors in brain MRI scans automatically from various populations, such as adults, pediatrics, and underserved sub-Saharan Africa. We employ a recent CNN architecture for medical image segmentation, namely MedNeXt, as our baseline, and we implement extensive model ensembling and postprocessing for inference. Our experiments show that our method performs well on the unseen validation set with an average DSC of 85.54% and HD95 of 27.88. The code is available on https://github.com/BioMedIA-MBZUAI/BraTS2024_BioMedIAMBZ.

Index Terms— BraTS-GoAT, Brain MRI, Tumor Segmentation, MedNeXt, Model Ensembling

1. INTRODUCTION

Cancer is a leading cause of death worldwide, specifically brain tumors. Many initiatives have been presented to enhance automatic brain tumor segmentation, aiming to increase the quality of diagnosis. The Brain Tumor Segmentation (BraTS) challenge is one of the most notable initiatives in this area. However, previous BraTS challenges have been tailored to address specific types of tumors within a single patient demographic, e.g., Adult Glioma [1, 2, 3, 4, 5], Pediatrics [6], sub-Saharan African brain glioma patient population [7], Brain Meningioma [8], and Brain Metastasis [9]. To fill this gap, the organizer introduces a new challenge segment, namely BraTS Generalizability Across Tumors (BraTS-GoAT). This manuscript is our contribution to the BraTS-GoAT challenge. In summary, we implement the MedNeXt [10] architecture to segment tumors, an ensembling mechanism to enhance prediction, and a set of postprocessing to remove prediction noises. We submitted our models for the testing phase using MedPerf [11].

2. METHODS

2.1. Dataset

The dataset for this challenge was compiled from diverse populations, including adults, pediatrics, and underrepresented groups from sub-Saharan Africa. It comprises 2,251 brain MRI scans in the training set and 360 scans in the validation set. The provided MRI modalities are T1, T1Gd, T2, and T2-FLAIR. Each scan includes expert annotations that identify three tumor subtypes: enhancing tumor (ET), tumor core (TC), and whole tumor (WT). It is interesting to note that each MRI scan contains one or more tumors. The size of each MRI scan is consistently 240x240x155.

2.2. Network Architecture

We implemented MedNeXt, the successor to the renowned nnU-Net framework, as our baseline architecture. MedNeXt draws inspiration from the ConvNeXt [12] architecture, which is prominent in 2D natural image classification. Major components of MedNeXt include residual connections, depth-wise convolution with a variety of large kernel sizes ($k \in \{3, 5, 7, 9\}$), and point-wise convolution with wide channels. MedNeXt offers a range of model sizes: small (S), base (B), medium (M), and large (L). Further details on this architecture can be found in [10]. For this competition, the model input channel is 4, and the output channel is 3, corresponding to TC, WT, and ET.

2.3. Inference

Given that the typical size of a brain MRI scan exceeds the model’s input sizes, we employed a sliding window inference approach to segment tumor(s). Additionally, to enhance the reliability of predictions, we implemented test-time augmentation (TTA) by flipping the scans across all possible dimensions ($2^3 = 8$) and averaging the predicted tumor probabilities. Further improvement in segmentation accuracy was achieved through model ensembling, leveraging models trained using 5-fold cross-validation (CV), and aggregating their probability outputs. We devised a set of post-processing steps to refine our predictions and reduce the false positives (FPs) in tumor detection. For each output channel (i.e. TC,




Fig. 1. The MedNeXt [10] architecture. It combines the benefits of CNNs and transformers by designing transformer-inspired ConvNeXt [12] blocks for image segmentation tasks.

WT, and ET), we first conducted a connected component analysis to cluster predicted voxels into groups (i.e. tumors), estimated the size of these groups, and computed the average probability of tumor voxels within each group. Subsequently, we eliminated groups characterized by small sizes and low mean tumor voxel probabilities.

3. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

3.1. Model Training

We conducted our experiments on an NVIDIA GPU with 24 GB of memory. The models' input size is $128 \times 128 \times 128$ voxels. Employing 5-fold cross-validation on the training set, we developed MedNeXt-B and MedNeXt-M models. Both models were initially trained with a kernel size of 3 for 55 epochs, after which kernel upsampling to 5 was applied, and the models were further trained for an additional 90 epochs. The optimization was carried out using the AdamW optimizer, set with a learning rate of $3e-4$ and a weight decay of $1e-6$. We employed a cosine annealing scheduler, initiating with a warm-up period of 3 epochs, a start learning rate of $1e-7$ during the warm-up, and concluding with a final learning rate of $1e-6$. We used a batch size of 2 for training. In terms of the objective function (loss), deep supervision, brain MRI preprocessing, and data augmentation, we followed [13].

We tuned postprocessing hyperparameters using Wandb [14] sweep on the 5-fold CV and then manually tuned them to adapt to the unseen validation set.

3.2. Model Inference

We begin by preprocessing the input MRI scans: first, by cropping them to isolate the brain region and eliminate back-

ground, and then by normalizing the intensity of each MRI channel using mean and standard deviation, excluding background pixels in this process. Tumor probability maps are generated through sliding window inference, employing a 50% overlap between windows to enhance the precision of our predictions. Subsequently, we improve the robustness of these predictions by averaging the tumor probability masks from all models in an ensemble approach, resulting in a refined final tumor probability map. We then postprocess the tumor probability map to detect and segment tumors.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

We summarize our results on the validation leaderboard in Table 1. We provide a qualitative result for the median case of our submission in Figure 2. We began by utilizing MedNeXt-B with a kernel size 5, trained using 5-fold cross-validation (CV), and averaged the tumor probability maps from these models' predictions. Our post-processing step enhances the average Dice Similarity Coefficient (DSC) by 3.18%. Employing a larger model, MedNeXt-M, further boosts the average DSC by 0.52%. Based on our experiments, automatic hyperparameter tuning with Weights and Biases (Wandb) sweeps did not significantly improve performance on the validation leaderboard. We hypothesize that the sweeps are less effective because they tune the hyperparameters based solely on the 5-fold CV results without ensembling, whereas ensembling is implemented when submitting to the validation leaderboard.

Training with the full dataset enhanced model performance, particularly for the WT class. In this study, we trained our models using five different seeds. We applied a 0.5 threshold to each channel (ET, TC, and WT). For post-

Table 1. Summary of our results on the validation leaderboard. Each row represents a submission with potentially different sets of post-processing hyperparameters. *Full training* refers to models trained using all training samples (with 5 different seeds) instead of 5-fold CV.

	BraTS 2024 Score								Legacy Score							
	Dice				HD95				Dice				HD95			
	ET	TC	WT	Avg	ET	TC	WT	Avg	ET	TC	WT	Avg	ET	TC	WT	Avg
MedNeXt-B5	0.7755	0.8380	0.8335	0.8157	53.24	30.91	40.63	41.59	0.8306	0.8699	0.9026	0.8677	24.83	14.98	12.36	17.39
+ postprocessing	0.8292	0.8450	0.8682	0.8475	33.77	31.29	26.39	30.48	0.8450	0.8671	0.9004	0.8708	24.75	21.04	13.44	19.74
MedNeXt-M5	0.8381	0.8485	0.8716	0.8527	30.94	29.53	25.35	28.61	0.8509	0.8697	0.9041	0.8749	23.88	19.21	11.81	18.30
+ Sweep for ET	0.8390	0.8485	0.8716	0.8530	30.45	29.53	25.35	28.44	0.8511	0.8697	0.9041	0.8750	23.79	19.21	11.81	18.27
+ Full training	0.8397	0.8501	0.8746	0.8548	30.69	29.31	24.30	28.10	0.8524	0.8713	0.9063	0.8767	25.62	20.97	13.58	20.06
+ Post. hyp. tuning	0.8405	0.8510	0.8746	0.8554	30.36	28.97	24.30	27.88	0.8524	0.8713	0.9063	0.8767	24.89	20.24	12.85	19.33




Fig. 2. Qualitative result showing median performance on the validation leaderboard.

processing, we removed detected tumors with sizes smaller than 100 voxels for ET, 150 voxels for TC, and 500 voxels for WT.

5. CONCLUSION

This work represents our contribution to the BraTS-GoAT competition. We utilized a CNN-based model to detect tumors from brain MRI scans. The model processes four MRI input channels and produces three output channels for TC, WT, and ET, respectively. We implemented model ensembling and postprocessing techniques to enhance predictions and reduce noise. Our experiments demonstrated that larger models perform better in this competition, suggesting that the BraTS-GoAT competition is more challenging than previous BraTS competitions.

6. COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL STANDARDS

This work adhered to the BraTS2024-GoAT data policies to prevent any potential ethical misconduct.

7. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank Ikboljon Sobirov and Mariam Aljuboory for contributing to our group in the BraTS 2023 competition.

8. REFERENCES

- [1] Bjoern H Menze, Andras Jakab, Stefan Bauer, Jayashree Kalpathy-Cramer, Farahani, et al., “The multimodal brain tumor image segmentation benchmark (brats),”

- IEEE transactions on medical imaging*, vol. 34, no. 10, pp. 1993–2024, 2014.
- [2] Spyridon Bakas, Hamed Akbari, Aristeidis Sotiras, Michel Bilello, Rozycki, et al., “Advancing the cancer genome atlas glioma mri collections with expert segmentation labels and radiomic features,” *Scientific data*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 1–13, 2017.
- [3] Ujjwal Baid, Satyam Ghodasara, Suyash Mohan, Michel Bilello, Evan Calabrese, Colak, et al., “The rsna-asnr-miccai brats 2021 benchmark on brain tumor segmentation and radiogenomic classification,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.02314*, 2021.
- [4] Spyridon Bakas, Hamed Akbari, Aristeidis Sotiras, Michel Bilello, Rozycki, et al., “Segmentation labels and radiomic features for the pre-operative scans of the tcga-igg collection,” *The cancer imaging archive*, vol. 286, 2017.
- [5] Spyridon Bakas, Hamed Akbari, Aristeidis Sotiras, Michel Bilello, Rozycki, et al., “Segmentation labels and radiomic features for the pre-operative scans of the tcga-gbm collection. the cancer imaging archive,” *Nat. Sci. Data*, vol. 4, no. 170117, pp. 10–1038, 2017.
- [6] Anahita Fathi Kazerooni, Nastaran Khalili, Xinyang Liu, Haldar, et al., “The brain tumor segmentation (brats) challenge 2023: Focus on pediatrics (cbtnc-connect-dipgr-asnr-miccai brats-peds),” *ArXiv*, 2023.
- [7] Maruf Adewole, Jeffrey D Rudie, Anu Gbdamosi, Oluyemisi Toyobo, Raymond, et al., “The brain tumor segmentation (brats) challenge 2023: Glioma segmentation in sub-saharan africa patient population (brats-africa),” *ArXiv*, 2023.
- [8] Dominic LaBella, Maruf Adewole, Michelle Alonso-Basanta, Talissa Altes, Syed Muhammad Anwar, Ujjwal Baid, Bergquist, et al., “The asnr-miccai brain tumor segmentation (brats) challenge 2023: Intracranial meningioma,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.07642*, 2023.
- [9] Ahmed W Moawad, Anastasia Janas, Ujjwal Baid, Divya Ramakrishnan, Jekel, et al., “The brain tumor segmentation (brats-mets) challenge 2023: Brain metastasis segmentation on pre-treatment mri,” *ArXiv*, 2023.
- [10] Saikat Roy, Gregor Koehler, Constantin Ulrich, Michael Baumgartner, Petersen, et al., “Mednext: transformer-driven scaling of convnets for medical image segmentation,” in *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*. Springer, 2023, pp. 405–415.
- [11] Alexandros Karargyris, Renato Umeton, Micah J Sheller, Alejandro Aristizabal, George, et al., “Federated benchmarking of medical artificial intelligence with medperf,” *Nature Machine Intelligence*, vol. 5, no. 7, pp. 799–810, 2023.
- [12] Zhuang Liu, Hanzi Mao, Chao-Yuan Wu, Christoph Feichtenhofer, Trevor Darrell, and Saining Xie, “A convnet for the 2020s,” in *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2022, pp. 11966–11976.
- [13] Fadillah Maani, Anees Ur Rehman Hashmi, Mariam Aljuboory, Numan Saeed, Ikboljon Sobirov, and Mohammad Yaqub, “Advanced tumor segmentation in medical imaging: An ensemble approach for brats 2023 adult glioma and pediatric tumor tasks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.09262*, 2024.
- [14] Lukas Biewald et al., “Experiment tracking with weights and biases,” *Software available from wandb.com*, vol. 2, no. 5, 2020.