Visualization and Virtual Reality in Medicine

Prof. Dr.-Ing. Bernhard Preim, Dr.-Ing. Steffen Oeltze-Jafra Lehrstuhl für Visualisierung Universität Magdeburg



Tutorial Syllabus

Surface Visualization - Marching Cubes and its improvements - Smoothing of surface visualizations	(40 min.)
3D Vessel Visualization	(30 min.)
Labeling Medical Visualizations	(20 min.)
Break	(15 min.)
Direct Volume Visualization - Ray casting and texture-based approaches - Projection methods	(40 min.)
Multifield Medical Visualization	(30 min.)
Virtual Endoscopy	(20 min.)



Introduction



Visual Computing for Medicine

Theory, Algorithms, and Applications



See medvisbook.com, includes tutorial notes and five free online chapters

Medical Data Sets

- Regular data in an orthogonal grid
- Resolution:
 - Anisotropic data sets (layer distance > distance of pixels in the layer)
 - **Characteristic**: CT or MRI data: 512x512 per layer,
 - » 80-850 layers, resolution: 12 Bit per layer ,~20-50 Mvoxel
 - High-End: Multi-slice CT: 1024x1024 per layer,
 - » up to 500 layers, ~ 160-400 MVoxel
- Less common:
 - PET, SPECT, 3D ultra sound with lower resolution





Surface Visualization

Visualization of isosurfaces and segmentation results





Surface Visualization: Introduction

- Assumption:
 - Relevant structures are segmented.
 - Segmentation is model-based (Snakes, ...), with "classical" procedures (Region Growing, Watershed, ...), or manually
 - Segmentation result is binary represented at the voxel plane (1 for the foreground, 0 for the background).
- Visualization: 1st idea: presentation of the voxels ("Cuberille" approach, Herman & Liu 1979)



J. Andreas Bærentzen http://www2.imm.dtu.dk/~jab/



Surface Visualization: Introduction

- Visualization, better idea:
 - linear interpolation, depiction on a polygonal surface (isosurface for the value 0.5)
 - definition of intersection between voxel edges and isoline, triangulation, definition of normals for shading
 - rendering by using the graphics hardware



J. Andreas Bærentzen http://www2.imm.dtu.dk/~jab/



Surface Visualization: Introduction

- How can this be realized?
 - Follow the outlines: very difficult in 3D, many case distinctions
 - Locally independent inspection of the cells. Determine how the cell is cut from the surface.
 - > basic idea of Marching Cubes (patented in 1985, published in 1987)





From Contours in slices to Surfaces

- Which problems need to be solved?
 - Correspondence: Which contour of one slice belongs to a contour at the next slice
 - Triangulation (Tiling): C₁ and C₂ be corresponding contours. How shall these contours be connected through triangle nets?
 - Branching problem: If the number of contours in one slice S_n is different to the number of contours in the neighbor slice S_{n+1} .



From Contours in slices to Surfaces

• *Correspondence problem:* Comes up, if the following applies:

- > The contours in slice S_n and S_{n+1} belonging to the same object do not overlap, and the number of contours belonging to one object is > 1 in S_n and/or S_{n+1} .
- What does Marching Cubes?
 - An overlapping of contours in neighbored slices is assumed.
 - Limit of this assumption? In case of a large slice distance or thin objects which proceed diagonal to the slices.
 - If the requirements are not fulfilled, separate surfaces are generated.
- In such cases, correct solutions are complex.
 - Interpolation of intermediate slices often helps.





Consideration of the 2D case (Marching Squares). Isoline for iso=0.5.



• Ambiguities:



© Dirk Bartz

- Extension to 3D:
 - there are 15 topologically different cases of how a cell can proceed through a surface.
- Procedure (rough):
 - determine the case for each cell.
 - determine the triangles if the cell is cut.





• Marching Cubes

- Purpose: transfer of the voxels of a volume with a given value into a triangulation net (Lorensen et al. [1987])
- Procedure:
 - 1. Consider cells from 4 voxels of the slice S_n and 4 voxels of the slice S_{n+1}
 - 2. Check which vertices have values above the threshold value, create an index
 - 3. Determine the involved edges
 - 4. Determination of points at these edges through linear interpolation
 - 5. Connection of these points to create triangles



Marching Cubes

- Step 2:
 - ▶ v1, v5, v6, v8 above,
 - ▶ v2, v3, v4, v7 below
 - Index: 1000 1101
- Step 4: Linear interpolation
 - Example: determination of e1 to the edge (v1; v2)
 - e1 = v1 + (isoval f(v1)) / (f(v2) f(v1)) * (v2 -v1)
- Step 5: Triangles

≻ (e4, e7, e11)	(e1 <i>,</i> e7, e4)		
≻ (e1, e6, e7)	(e1, e10, e6)		



© Alexandre Telea



Marching Cubes and its Improvements

Marching Cubes may also be applied to original data. Challenge: threshold detection



Histogram depiction of CT thorax data sets for selection of threshold values. In the left image: an interval is specified.



Marching Cubes and its Improvements



Sensitivity: Small changes of the threshold (isovalue) may severely affect the resulting surface and the diagnostic consequences

(Courtesy of Hoen-Oh Shin, Medical School Hannover)

Marching Cubes and its Improvements



• Simultaneous display of several surfaces. Right: outer surface is semi-transparent (gradient-weighted opacity).



- What is important about Marching Cubes?
 - Very simple
 - Compared to Cuberille: Better depiction through linear interpolation
 - But: Viewers are also sensitive for discontinuities of the first and second derivative
 - Ambiguities and inconsistencies, no treatment of the correspondence problem, no optimal solution for the tiling problem
 - Relatively precise, but improvable (only interpolation along the edges)
 - Relatively fast procedure
 - **But:** A lot of time is spent on cells which do not contribute to the surface
 - Fast rendering



Quality problems through linear interpolation and Gouraud shading



Virtual bronchoscopy © Dirk Bartz



- Holes in the surface arise, if, for the neighboring cells,...
 - the decision is made to divide the intersections and ...
 - the decision is made to connect them in the second cell.





- How can this inconsistency be corrected?
 - Interpolation of points at the shared face. The state of this point (above/below) is decisive (Nielsen, Hamann [1991])
 - Decomposition of the cells into tetrahedrons (Shirley, Tuchman [1990])
- How can Marching Cubes be accelerated?
 - Fast recognition of areas that are not affected by the surface.
 - Representation of the scene through hierarchic data structures, e.g., min-max-octrees (Wilhelms, van Gelder [1992])



Source: http://de.wikipedia.org /wiki/Octree

- Problem:
 - Generation of surface models from segmentation results leads to artifacts, especially in case of strongly anisotropic data





Liver from almost isotropic CT data



- **Problem**: Development of many small surfaces which represent artifacts
- **Purpose**: Restriction of the extraction to the largest surface (or a given amount of surfaces)
- Method: Connected Component Analysis (according to Schroeder et al.[1998])
- VTK: vtkConnectivityFilter





- Algorithm Connected Component Analysis:
 While there are cells which are not "visited",
 - Start with any cell z and mark it as "visited".
 - Initialise the component k

While there is a cell z_n adjacent to z which

contributes to the surface and has not been "visited" yet:

- add z_n to the component k and mark it as "visited".

Repeat recursively as long as there are still neighboring cells which have not been visited

- Result: all connected components
- Selection of the largest (n) component(s) according to the surface area or length of the object contour



Connected Component Analysis. Display of the largest component.







Connected Component Analysis. Display of the largest component.



Digitalized photograph of a pine root

(Source: Schroeder et al. [1998])

- General practice:
 - Interpolation of intermediate slices
 - "Manual" smoothing
 - e.g., in vtk (vtkSmoothPolyDataFilter), itk, 3D Studio, Amira
- Disadvantages
 - complex trial-and-error process
 - not reproduceable, not standardized
 - only visual control



- Long-term goal:
 - Pipeline of algorithms for the post-processing of segmentation results (e.g., closure of holes), surface generation and subsequent smoothing
- Adaptation of the respective procedures to
 - the class of anatomic structure (e.g., tumor, organ, ...)
 - imaging or segmentation parameters (e.g., slice distance, model-based segmentation)

Extraction of surfaces



• Smoothing of the segmentation result through smoothing filters (e.g., Gauss) or morphologic methods



Source: Neubauer et al., IEEE Visualization 2004



Smoothing of the segmentation result through morphological methods



Source: Neubauer et al., IEEE Visualization 2004



Smoothing of Polygonal Surfaces

• Examples and problems:



Smoothing of Polygonal Surfaces

- Iterate over all vertices and replace each vertex through a weighted average from its former value and the vertices from the neighborhood
- Which neighborhood?
 - vertices in a specific distance (Euclidean distance)
 - vertices which are connected to the current vertex (directly or through a path of length n) (topological distance)
 - Typical: vertices in the topological distance of 1 or 2



Direct, 1st order neighbors

Smoothing of Polygonal Surfaces: Laplace Smoothing

- Considers the points q_i in the topological distance of 1
- Parameter: smoothing factor α and number of iterations



- Simple, fast realization (e.g., in vtkSmoothPolyDataFilter)
- Causes strong (uncontrolled) shrinkage and the favored smoothness is often only achieved through total smoothing of minor features



smoothing with α = 0.5 and 20 iterations

Smoothing: Laplace Smoothing with Correction

- Correction to maintain the volume
- In each step, modified nodes are shifted back about a certain value (the average of all shiftings in the considered surrounding)
- Additional parameters:
 - How strong is the shifting in direction to the original point?
 - How is the shifting of the neighbors considered?



Smoothing: Laplace Smoothing with Correction



Literature: Vollmer et al., "Improved Laplacian Smoothing of Noisy Surface Meshes", Eurographics, 1999



Smoothing: Low-pass Filtering

 Alternating implementation of two filters similar to Laplace with different factors α and μ

$$p' = p + \lambda \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} w_i (q_i - p)$$

- Selection of μ : a bit smaller than α
- Default: μ = -1.02 α (Taubin, 1995)



Smoothing: Comparison of Elementary Methods

- Criteria: Quality, volume preservation
- Methods/parameters:
 - Laplace, Laplace with correction, Low-pass
 - Different iteration steps: 5, 10, 20, 50
 - Different weighting factors: 0.05, 0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 0.9
 - Different neighborhood: 1, 2 (topological)

		0				
	Leber	Lymphknoten	Kopfwendemuskel	Beckenknochen	Gefäßbaum	Halsschlagader
Faces	37.148	3.412	9.616	53.930	23.236	1.956
Vertices	18.576	1.708	4.804	27.211	11.820	982
Voxel	1.696.250	1.664	101.035	430.318	96.807	16.404



Smoothing: Comparison of Methods





Smoothing: Comparison of Methods

• All images with smoothing factor 0.5 and 10 iterations



Original V=100%



Laplace V=94,2%



Laplace+HC V=99,7%



Laplace 2. Ordnung+HC V=98,9%



LowPass V=100,4%



LowPass 2. Ordnung V=100,1%



BVM 2015 - Vis & VR in Medicine - Surface Visualization

Smoothing of Surfaces: Comparison of Methods

 Original, low-pass filtering with one neighborhood and extended neighborhood as well as the corresponding curvature values.



Smoothing of Polygonal Surfaces: Recommendations

- A low-pass filter is the best solution for all object classes.
- For smaller objects
 - Topological neighborhood of the size 2, 20-50 iterations, weighting: 0.7
- For flat or larger objects, especially with poblem points:
 - Topological neighborhood: 1, approx. 20 iterations
- For elongated, branching objects:
 - No really good filter (→ Vessel Visualization part will provide appropriate methods)
 - Low-pass filter with topological neighborhood of 1, weighting factor:
 0.5 and 10 iterations



Smoothing of Polygonal Surfaces: Advanced Methods

Distance-Aware Smoothing. Restrict smoothing where it affects distance measurements



Original model



Distance-Aware Laplace





Source: [Mönch, 2010]



Smoothing of Polygonal Surfaces: Advanced Methods

Smoothing is restricted to staircase regions







Source: [Mönch, 2011]

Smoothing of Polygonal Surfaces: Advanced Methods



(From: [Wei, 2015])

 Iterative staircase-aware smoothing (left original surface, second to fifth image: number of iterations is increasing).



Summary

- Surface visualization is essential to show vascular surfaces, skeletal structures and segmented objects
- With a carefully selected isovalue, it may be applied to the original data
- Surface models are used for visualization, biomedical simulation and rapid prototyping (some additional req.s)
- In all applications, smooth and accurate models are desired.
- Smoothness is achieved with local filters that are applied iteratively.
- Advanced methods detect staircasiness and other contextual information to adapt the amount of smoothing.



Surface Visualization: References

R. Bade, J. Haase, and B. Preim (2006). "Comparison of Fundamental Mesh Smoothing Algorithms", Simulation and Visualization, pp. 289-304

M. Desbrun, M. Meyer, P. Schröder, and A. Barr (1999). "Implicit Fairing of Irregular Meshes Using Diffusion and Curvature Flow". In *Proc. of ACM SIGGRAPH*, pp. 317–324, 1999

G. T. Herman and H. K. Liu (1979). "Three-dimensional Display of Human Organs From Computed Tomograms", Computer Graphics and Image Processing, 9(1):1–21

D. Meyers, S. Skinner, K. Sloan (1992). "Surfaces from contours", ACM Transactions on Graphics, Vol. 11(3), pp. 228-258

T. Mönch, S. Adler, P. Hahn, I. Rössling and B. Preim (2010). "Distance-Aware Smoothing of Surface Meshes for Surgical Planning", *Proc. of International Workshop on Digital Engineering* (IWDE), pp. 45-51

Tobias Mönch, Rocco Gasteiger, Gabor Janiga, Holger Theisel, Bernhard Preim: "Context-aware mesh smoothing for biomedical applications". *Computers & Graphics* 35(4): 755-767 (2011)

Tobias Mönch, Kai Lawonn, Christoph Kubisch, Rüdiger Westermann, Bernhard Preim: "Interactive Mesh Smoothing for Medical Applications". *Comput. Graph. Forum* 32(8): 110-121 (2013)

A. Neubauer, S. Wolfsberger, M. Forster, L. Mroz, R. Wegenkittl, and K. Bühler (2004). STEPS - An Application for Simulation of Transsphenoidal Endonasal Pituitary Surgery. In *Proc. of IEEE Visualization*, pp. 513–520, 2004



Surface Visualization: References

G. Nielson and B. Hamann (1991). The Asymptotic Decider: Removing the Ambiguity in Marching Cubes. In *Proc. of IEEE Visualization*, pp. 83–91, 1991.

Will Schroeder, Ken Martin, and Bill Lorensen. *The Visualisation Toolkit*. Kitware, 3rd edition, 2001.

P. Shirley and A. Tuchman (1990). A Polygonal Approximationm to Direct Scalar Volume Rendering. In *Proc. of San Diego Workshop on Volume Visualization*, pp. 63–70, 1990.

Gabriel Taubin (1995). "A Signal Processing Approach to Fair Surface Design", SIGGRAPH, pp. 351-358, 1995

Gabriel Taubin (2000). "Geometric Signal Processing on Polygonal Meshes", *Eurographics, State of the Art-Report*

J. Vollmer, R. Mencel, and H. Müller (1999). "Improved Laplacian Smoothing of Noisy Surface Meshes". In *Proc. of Eurographics*, pp. 131–138, 1999.

M. Wei, L. Zhu, J. Yu, J. Wang, W.-M. Pang, J. Wu, J. Qin, P.-A. Heng: Morphologypreserving smoothing on polygonized isosurfaces of inhomogeneous binary volumes. *Computer-Aided Design* 58: 92-98 (2015)

J. Wilhelms and A. van Gelder. Octrees for Faster Isosurface Generation. ACM Transactions on Graphics, 11(3):201–227, 1992

Yagou et al., Mesh Smoothing Via Mean and Median Filtering, *Geometric Modelling and Processing*, 2002, pp. 124-131

