# Atlas-free Brain Tissue Segmentation Using a Single T1-weighted MRI Acquisition

Tobias Kober<sup>1</sup>, Alexis Roche<sup>1,2</sup>, Oscar Esteban<sup>3,4</sup>, Subrahmanyam Gorthi<sup>4</sup>, Delphine Ribes<sup>5</sup>, Meritxell Bach-Cuadra<sup>2,4</sup>, Reto Meuli<sup>2</sup>, and Gunnar Krueger<sup>1,2</sup> <sup>1</sup>Advanced Clinical Imaging Technology, Siemens Healthcare Sector IM&WS S, Lausanne, Switzerland, <sup>2</sup>Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Vaudois and University of Lausanne, Switzerland, <sup>3</sup>Biomedical Image Technology (BIT), Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Madrid, Spain, <sup>4</sup>Signal Processing Laboratory (LTS5), École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland, <sup>5</sup>ARTORG Center for Computer Aided Surgery, University of Bern, Switzerland

### Introduction

Many studies investigating the aging brain or disease-induced brain alterations rely on accurate and reproducible brain tissue segmentation. Being a preliminary processing step prior to the segmentation, reliable skull-stripping – the removal of non-brain tissue – is also crucial for all later image assessment. Typically, segmentation algorithms rely on an atlas i.e. pre-segmented template data. Brain morphology, however, differs considerably depending on age, sex and race. In addition, diseased brains may deviate significantly from the atlas information typically gained from healthy volunteers. The imposed prior atlas information can thus lead to degradation of segmentation results. The recently introduced MP2RAGE sequence

provides a bias-free T1 contrast with heavily reduced T2\*- and PD-weighting compared to the standard MP-RAGE [1]. To this end, it acquires two image volumes at different inversion times in one acquisition, combining them to a "uniform", i.e. homogenous image. In this work, we exploit the advantageous contrast properties of the MP2RAGE and combine it with a Dixon (i.e. fat-water separation) approach. The information gained by the additional fat image of the head considerably improves the skull-stripping outcome [2]. In conjunction with the pure T1 contrast of the MP2RAGE uniform image, we achieve robust skull-stripping and brain tissue segmentation without the use of an atlas.

### **Material and Methods**

Four healthy volunteers (25±4yo) were scanned at 3T (MAGNETOM Trio and Skyra, Siemens Healthcare, Germany) using a double-echo MP2RAGE sequence with the following parameters: TI1/TI2/TR= 700/2500/5000 ms, TE1/TE2=2.44/6.06 ms, GRAPPA R=3, TA=8:52 min. Per echo time, three image volumes were thus obtained (at the 1st and 2nd inversion time 'INV1' and 'INV2', and the homogeneous pure-T1w image 'UNI'). In each session, a scan and a rescan were conducted in addition to a standard MP-RAGE (TI/TR=900/2200 ms, GRAPPA R=2, TA=5:12 min). To fit the two echo readouts without changing the



#### **Results and Discussion**

The presented results indicate that an MP2RAGE-Dixon acquisition contains enough information to perform reliable brain tissue segmentation without the use of an atlas. The additional fat image supports the segmentation by providing robust information about non-brain tissue. Notably, no image registration is necessary, since all image volumes are acquired simultaneously, preventing the introduction of further partial volume effects. Quantitative comparison of atlas-free MP2RAGE and atlas-based MP-RAGE segmentations showed similar outcomes. Confirming this, the segmentations resulted in very reproducible grey matter volumes (Fig. 3, differences <1%) and only little differences to the MP-RAGE values except for one subject (Fig. 3, green). It should be noted that the atlas-based segmentation is shown here to illustrate the range of the expected values; it also suffers from limitations in



brain/non-brain tissue interface regions of similar intensities; it thus cannot be considered as a hard reference. In conclusion, the presented work shows a high potential to ameliorate automatic brain segmentation results by drawing a maximum of image information from a single acquisition.

# References

[1] Marques et al., Neuroimage 49(2):1271-1281 (2010); [2] Ribes et al., ISMRM 2011 abstract #5409; [3] Dixon et al., Radiology 153:189-194 (1984); [4] v. d. Kouwe et al., NeuroImage 40:559–569 (2008); [5] Boykov et al., IEEE T Pattern Anal 23(1):1222-1239 (2001);

This work was supported by CIBM of the UNIL, UNIGE, HUG, CHUV, EPFL and the Leenaards and Jeantet Foundations



Fig. 1 – Exemplary image slices of the input to the segmentation algorithm. From left to right: cFAT, cINV2, cUNI

