

Pearling: Stroke segmentation with crusted pearl strings

B. Whited¹, J. Rossignac¹, G. Slabaugh², T. Fang², and G. Unal²

¹ Georgia Institute of Technology, Graphics, Visualization and Usability Center,
Atlanta, GA 30332

brian.whited@gatech.edu, jarek@cc.gatech.edu

² Siemens Corporate Research, Intelligent Vision and Reasoning Department,
Princeton, NJ 08540

{greg.slabaugh, tong.fang, gozde.unal}@siemens.com

Abstract. We introduce a novel segmentation technique, called *Pearling*, for the semi-automatic extraction of idealized models of networks of strokes (variable width curves) in images. These networks may for example represent roads in an aerial photograph, vessels in a medical scan, or strokes in a drawing. The operator seeds the process by selecting representative areas of good (stroke interior) and bad colors. Then, the operator may either provide a rough trace through a particular path in the stroke graph or simply pick a starting point (seed) on a stroke and a direction of growth. Pearling computes in realtime the centerlines of the strokes, the bifurcations, and the thickness function along each stroke, hence producing a purified medial axis transform of a desired portion of the stroke graph. No prior segmentation or thresholding is required. Simple gestures may be used to trim or extend the selection or to add branches. The realtime performance and reliability of Pearling results from a novel disk-sampling approach, which traces the strokes by optimizing the positions and radii of a discrete series of disks (pearls) along the stroke. A continuous model is defined through subdivision. By design, the idealized pearl string model is slightly wider than necessary to ensure that it contains the stroke boundary. A narrower core model that fits inside the stroke is computed simultaneously. The difference between the pearl string and its core contains the boundary of the stroke and may be used to capture, compress, visualize, or analyze the raw image data along the stroke boundary.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we present *Pearling*, for the extraction and modeling of stroke-like structures in images. This work is motivated by the need for semi-automatic segmentation tools, particularly in the analysis of medical images. Indeed, every year millions of medical images are taken, many of which are used to support clinical applications involving diagnosis (e.g., stenosis, aneurysm, etc.) surgical planning, anatomic modeling and simulation, and treatment verification. These applications either benefit from, or are required to have, a geometric model of the important structures (blood vessel, airway, etc.) being studied. Segmentation of stroke-like structures such as blood vessels is a fundamental problem in medical image processing, and arises in other contexts including industrial applications as well as aerial/satellite image analysis.

With manual segmentation techniques, it is possible to obtain highly accurate results. However, these methods typically require an excessive amount of tedious labor to

be practical in a clinical workflow. While fully automatic segmentation methods can be desirable in these applications, given the poor contrast, noise, and clutter that is common to medical images, it is often difficult for fully automatic segmentation methods to yield robust results. Furthermore, often one is interested in extracting only a subset, for example a specific path through a branching network of stroke-like structures. Therefore, there is a salient need for interactive segmentation methods that are *mostly* automatic, but do accept input from the operator to guide the segmentation in a particular direction, quickly correct for errant segmentations, and add branches to an existing segmentation result. Crucial to such a semi-automatic segmentation method is computational efficiency, so that the operator will not have to wait for segmentation results while interacting with the data. Furthermore, to support further analysis or close-up visualization it may be important to identify the portion of the image (crust) that surrounds the stroke boundary.

1.1 Related Work

Given its clinical importance, the problem of vessel segmentation has received a fair amount of attention in the literature. Kirbas et al. [1] present a recent survey that provide a recent survey of techniques for vessel segmentation. They conclude that there is no single vessel segmentation approach that is robust, automatic, and fast, and that successfully extracts the vasculature across all imaging modalities and different anatomic regions. Following their conclusion, we step away from total automation and instead focus in interactive segmentation, providing an efficient system for an operator to quickly extract the region and branches of interest.

Other recent vessel segmentation approaches in the medical imaging literature include [2], who model vessel segments using superellipsoids, [3], who implement co-dimension two level set flows, and [4], who apply a Bayesian classifier to feature vectors produced using Gabor wavelets. While elegant, these techniques require significant computational resources. Fast methods such as [5] perform the segmentation on slices made in a direction orthogonal to the vessel centerline or intensity maxima [6] and then extract the vessel geometry by connecting the results. More closely related to our work is [7], who build tunnels modeled as a union of spheres, placed through protein molecules using a Voronoi diagram pre-computed on a segmented version of the image. Unlike this work, our method is image-based and designed for segmentation, placing the pearls using local pixel intensity inside each pearl.

Several authors proposed to compute skeletons through the advection of mass along the distance field [8] [9]. The thinning methods [10] and the methods based on distance transform [11] for extracting a skeleton are not easily applicable to our problem of rapidly segmenting a subset of the volume because they are global and hence slow and require the precomputation of a distance field. The distance field pre-computation may be avoided in methods that use a general scalar field [12]. Minimal paths through vessels have been computed using fast marching techniques [13] that backtrack along a distance field [14] computed with a Riemannian metric.

Also related is the computation of the medial axis transform [15]. Once an image is segmented and pixels have been identified that are in the stroke network, techniques for selecting the center line and medial axis could be used. Pearling produces directly the

purified result that could be derived by removing automatically small branches from the MAT and selecting a desired portion of the graph, all without requiring a prior segmentation.

The application of this technique to tracing 3D networks of vessels has been discussed [16], but is not the same paradigm as input is more tedious and requires a different user interaction.

1.2 Our contribution

Pearling is a novel method for segmentation of stroke networks in images. Pearling performs a segmentation and idealization simultaneously by computing an ordered series of *pearls*, which are disks of possibly different radii. Starting with an initial pearl given by the operator, as well as an initial direction, pearling iteratively computes the position and radius of an adjacent pearl based on the image data, so that the newly placed pearl fits properly along the stroke, slightly building bulging out on both sides. The method proceeds in this fashion, producing a string or network of strings of pearls that provide a discrete representation of the stroke geometry. Pearling is robust to fluctuations in image intensities (due to noise, etc.) as the forces acting on a pearl are integrated over the region inside the pearl. A final smooth contour representing the stroke network is then obtained by estimating continuous functions that interpolate the discrete series of pearls. As we will show, pearling is computationally efficient and well suited to user interactivity. This interactivity affords operator guidance of the segmentation in a particular direction as well as operator correction of errant segmentation results.

In addition to pearls, we introduce the concepts of core and crust. The core of the pearling model is computed by reducing the radius of each pearl while keeping its center in place. The radius is chosen to be as large as possible, while ensuring that a given majority of pixels inside the core pearl are good. The difference between the “outer” pearl model and its core is the crust, which may be used to capture, compress, archive, transmit, visualize, or analyze the original data along the stroke border. We show in Section 3 that the crust is a narrow band around the stroke border computed through region growing techniques.

2 Methodology

Pearling allows the operator to extract a higher level idealized parametric representation of each stroke. This representation is called a *string*. As shown in Figure 1, it comprises an ordered series of pearls (or disks), each defined by the location \mathbf{c}_i of its center, by its radius r_i , and a time value t_i , and possibly other attributes a_i . The continuous model of the corresponding stroke that is recovered by Pearling is defined as the region W swept by a pearl whose center $\mathbf{c}(t)$ and radius $r(t)$ are both continuous and smooth functions of the time parameter t . These functions interpolate the centers and radii of the string of pearls for given values t_i of time. For a network of strokes, multiple strings will be defined which meet at bifurcation pearls, which will be defined later.




Fig. 1. Representation of Pearling, which consists of an ordered series of pearls. Continuous functions that interpolate the pearls are also shown: the blue curve interpolates the pearl centers, and the red and green curves interpolate the outside and inside edges of the pearls, respectively.




Fig. 2. Two adjacent Pearls (green) and their cores (cyan) with their centers connected (magenta) overlaid on top a stroke (black) and the crust region defined by the continuous set of pearls minus their cores (red)

2.1 Estimation of pearls

Pearling starts with an initial seed, \mathbf{c}_0 , which is a point either provided by an operator or by an algorithm. Typically, \mathbf{c}_0 should be chosen to lie close to the centerline of a stroke and possibly at the end of one of the strokes of the desired structure. Pearling then uses an iterative process to construct an ordered series of pearls, one at a time. During that process, at each step, the center \mathbf{c}_i and radius r_i of the current pearl is chosen so as to maximize r_i subject to image data, given the constraint that the distance d_i between \mathbf{c}_i and the center \mathbf{c}_{i-1} of the previous pearl is bound by functions $d_{min}(r_{i-1}, r_i)$ and $d_{max}(r_{i-1}, r_i)$. We use linear functions $d_{min,max}(r_{i-1}, r_i) = ar_{i-1} + br_i$, and with bounds $d_{min}(r_{i-1}, r_i) = r_i/2$ and $d_{max}(r_{i-1}, r_i) = r_{i-1} + r_i$. It is important that d_i be allowed to fluctuate in order to capture rapid changes in thickness and allow convergence to local minima.

Let \mathbf{c}_{i-1} be the center of the previous pearl seed, as shown in Figure 2. Let \mathbf{c}_i be the center of the next pearl, and let r_i be its radius. The objective is to find the optimal values of \mathbf{c}_i and r_i that place the i th pearl in the stroke. The location of \mathbf{c}_i may be specified in polar coordinates around \mathbf{c}_{i-1} . In order to adjust the values of r_i and \mathbf{c}_i so that the pearl better fits snugly astride the stroke, we define two functions: $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{c}_i, r_i)$ and $g(\mathbf{c}_i, r_i)$, as described below.

Center estimation. The function $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{c}_i, r_i)$ returns a gradient indicating the direction in which \mathbf{c}_i should be adjusted and the amount of the adjustment. This adjustment can

then be converted to an angle relative to \mathbf{c}_{i-1} and applied to o_i . $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{c}_i, r_i)$ takes the form,

$$\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{c}_i, r_i) = \frac{15}{2\pi r_i^2} \int_{\mathbf{x} \in P_i} \phi(\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{c}_i - \mathbf{x}) \left(1 - \frac{\|\mathbf{c}_i - \mathbf{x}\|^2}{r_i^2}\right) d\mathbf{x} \quad (1)$$

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \hat{p}_{\text{out}}(I(\mathbf{x})) > \hat{p}_{\text{in}}(I(\mathbf{x})) \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

The function $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{c}_i, r_i)$ sums the vectors $(\mathbf{c}_i - \mathbf{x})$, where \mathbf{x} is the vector coordinate of the the current pixel, across the entire area of pixels for pearl P_i , using only those pixels such that $\phi(\mathbf{x}) = 1$, i.e., pixels determined to be outside the stroke. Each of these vectors is weighted by its distance from \mathbf{c}_i such that pixels nearer \mathbf{c}_i have a stronger influence on the result, as reflected in the $\left(1 - \frac{\|\mathbf{c}_i - \mathbf{x}\|^2}{r_i^2}\right)$ component of Equation 1. Intuitively, Equation 2 states that each point inside the i th pearl but outside the stroke imparts a force on the pearl that pushes it away from the stroke boundary. When the forces are balanced on all sides of the pearl, the pearl is typically centered in the vessel. The $\frac{15}{2\pi r_i^2}$ is a normalization factor computed by looking at the case where a pearl is cut into two equal halves by a linear boundary separating good and bad pixels. By assuming this ideal case, we can compute the factor by calculating the offset needed to move this pearl half the minimum distance that would move it entirely in the good region.

Determination of whether a pixel lies inside the stroke or outside the stroke is necessary when computing $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{c}_i, r_i)$, and is achieved using non-parametric density estimation. Before running the algorithm, the operator selects two regions; one inside the stroke and one outside. For a given region, we estimate the density by applying a smoothing kernel K to the pixels in the region's histogram, i.e.,

$$\hat{p} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K\left(\frac{I_i - m}{h}\right), \quad (3)$$

where I_i is the intensity of the i th pixel in the region, m is the mean of intensities of the n pixels in the region, and h is the bandwidth of the estimator. We use a Gaussian kernel, $K(u) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}u^2}$. Performing this estimation on two operator-supplied regions results in two densities, $\hat{p}_{\text{in}}(I)$ and $\hat{p}_{\text{out}}(I)$. During segmentation, an intensity I is classified as outside if $\hat{p}_{\text{out}}(I) > \hat{p}_{\text{in}}(I)$; otherwise it is classified as inside.

Radius estimation. r_i is adjusted to better fit the stroke using the function $g(\mathbf{c}_i, r_i)$, as shown in Equation 4. For robustness, pearls are designed to have a percentage p of their pixels inside the tube and the rest outside the tube, as indicated in Figure 2. In our implementation, $g(\mathbf{c}_i, r_i)$ is positive when less than p percent of the pearl's pixels fit in the tube and negative more than $1 - p$ of the pixels lie outside of the tube. The portion of the enlarged pearl that lies outside of the tube is typically computed by sampling the pearl's interior, however, alternatively one can sample the pearl's boundary. The result of $g(\mathbf{c}_i, r_i)$ is then used to scale r_i to better fit in the tube. $g(\mathbf{c}_i, r_i)$ takes the form,

$$g(\mathbf{c}_i, r_i) = p - \frac{\int_{\mathbf{x} \in P_i} (1 - \phi(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x}}{\int_{\mathbf{x} \in P_i} d\mathbf{x}} \quad (4)$$

Interleaving the estimation and convergence. We interleave the estimation of c_i and r_i for the i th pearl P_i . For a given position c_i and radius r_i , one can update both parameters independently using the results given by $f(r_i, c_i)$ and $g(r_i, c_i)$. In both cases, the quality of the fit is measured and the desired adjustment is computed and returned.

The adjustments of c_i and r_i are done through several iterations while enforcing the constraint on d_i until the adjustment values returned by $f(c_i, r_i)$ and $g(c_i, r_i)$ fall below a given threshold. The process then freezes the current pearl and starts fitting the next one. The growth of a stroke stops when the radius of the next pearl falls outside of a prescribed range, or when another application-dependent criterion is met, such as the detection of an operator-supplied endpoint. The result of this Pearling process is a series of location-radius pairs (c_i, r_i) , which we call the control pearls.

2.2 Direction estimation and Bifurcations

Often in the applications targeted, images contain sharp turns and bifurcations where a stroke will branch into multiple strokes and may even contain loops. We have extended the above process to support these options.




Fig. 3. A pearl shown at a stroke bifurcation along with its set of good pixels in the region bounded by r_i and kr_i . Each connected component C_j is uniquely colored. Vectors D_j (magenta) are shown for the connected components which contain a number of pixels greater than the set threshold.

Once a pearl P_i has converged to fit on a stroke, an analysis of the region around P_i is done in order to decide where to initially position P_{i+1} , taking into account that there could be more than one P_{i+1} or none. This analysis is done on the pixels in a circular band around P_i with an outer radius kr_i where k is some constant. For our results, a value of $k = 1.35$ is used. Each pixel x in this band is then classified using Equation 2. The result gives a classification with $N > 0$ connected components of good pixels. At minimum, there should be a connected component identifying the path from the previous pearl, P_{i-1} . If $N = 1$, then the only possible direction is backwards and pearling stops growing the current branch because its end has been found. If $N > 1$, then the starting position(s) for any subsequent pearl(s) can be chosen using the remaining connected components. For each connected component C_j , an average point is calculated which defines a direction vector D_j from the pearl center c_i . Subsequent

pearls are then initialized to the points on the boundary points of P_i which intersect each D_j . This extension allows pearling to accommodate sharp turns and bifurcations in the stroke structure.

A loop in the pearling network can also exist. A simple intersection check between the current pearl and all previous pearls will reveal if such a loop has occurred. In this case, the current pearl is linked to the intersected pearl and its string is ended. The intersected pearl could then become a bifurcation pearl, if it already has more than one adjacent pearl, or it could be the end of another stroke still in the growing phase. If the latter is the case, and two growing strokes collide, they are both ended and become part of the same stroke.

2.3 Building a continuous model




Fig. 4. Subdivision for estimating the continuous canal surface that interpolates the pearls.

A continuous model W of each stroke is obtained by computing continuous functions $\mathbf{c}(t)$ and $r(t)$ that interpolate the discrete set of end, branching and contour pearls. We model W as the union of an infinite set of disks [17], which is and may be expressed in parametric form as $W = \text{Disk}(\mathbf{c}(t), r(t))$ for $t \in [0, 1]$. If we assume that the pearls are more or less uniformly spaced along the stroke, we can define the string as the limit of a four-point subdivision process, which, at each iteration, introduces a new pearl between each pair of consecutive pearls as shown in Fig 4.

3 Results

We now present segmentation results using Pearling. We begin with the segmentation of a satellite image of a river. The original image with the initial inputs is shown in Figure 5 (left). As described, the initial inputs include regions of good and bad pixels (shown in green and red) and an initial point and direction (shown in orange). The algorithm then proceeds, successively adding pearls until no more can be added, the result of which is shown in Figure 5 (center). From the collection of discrete pearls and their cores, we can then extract the continuous model of the crust, as seen red in Figure 5 (right). The yellow region in the figure is the result of a simple region-growing segmentation using




Fig. 5. An unedited grayscale image obtained from satellite imagery of a river shown with the initial inputs(left), the resulting pearling segmentation, computed in 33ms(center), and the crust (red) overlaid atop a simple region-grown segmentation (yellow), showing that the majority of boundary details are contained within the crust.




Fig. 6. An MR angiographic image with centerlines(left) and discrete pearls (right) computed by pearling in 27ms on an image with size 436x168.



Fig. 7. A Chinese character with centerlines(left) and discrete pearls (right) computed by pearling in 37ms on an image with size 236x201.

the same good and bad regions and starting point as pearling. A zoomed-in section shows almost all boundary pixels are contained within the pearling crust.

Figures 6 and 7, present more segmentation results, of an MR angiographic image, and a variable width Chinese character. For each figure, we show the original image with the pearling-computed centerlines (left) and the pearl disks (right). Note that all examples completed in tens of milliseconds.

3.1 User interactivity




Fig. 8. An initial incomplete pearling, with one string selected (yellow) by the operator (left). The result of the deleting the selected string and also the initial input for a new string (orange) by the operator (center), and the result (right).

As Pearling is computationally efficient, it affords the user interaction with data without delays. In Figure 8 (left) we show an example where an operator can select a string by simply moving the mouse over any pearl in the string. Once selected, the branch can then be deleted with the press of a key, as shown in Figure 8 (center). The operator can also add strings to an incomplete segmentation by simply selecting a pearl and drawing a new direction vector from it, as shown in orange in Figure 8 (center). The result of the new string being grown is shown in Figure 8 (right).

For more control, the operator may provide a rough trace of the centerline of a desired stroke. As the operator is manually tracing, pearls are placed at samples along the curve and converge in real-time thus forming the stroke as the operator is tracing it with a stylus. In this mode, the operator uses a stylus to quickly trace a rough curve through the desired stroke structure and then as desired, adds branches. A preset mode or the stylus speed when the stylus is released indicate how far past the release point will pearling grow the stroke structure. As the operator is still tracing the curves, pearling computes the idealized strokes (centerline and radius) and displays them. Each new trace either adds or removes a branch.

4 Conclusion

In this paper we presented Pearling, a new method for semi-automatic segmentation and geometric modeling of stroke-like structures. Pearling performs a segmentation by computing an ordered series of pearls that discretely model the stroke structure geometry. Smoothing is used to define a continuous model. The computational efficiency of Pearling affords efficient user interaction with the segmentation, allowing the operator to correct for errant segmentation results or guide the segmentation in a particular direction through the data.

Sometimes the idealized pearling result doesn't contain enough information to perform a more precise analysis, so we presented the concept of a crust around the border region. Important image information, such as the inner wall of an artery, is identified in the crust region and can be used to support a more detailed analysis.

While more comprehensive validation of the algorithm is required, from our experimental results we conclude that Pearling results in highly efficient segmentation of strokes, and holds much promise for semi-automatic image segmentation.

References

1. C. Kirbas, F. Quek, A Review of Vessel Extraction Techniques and Algorithms, *ACM Computing Surveys* 36 (2) (2004) 81–121.
2. J. A. Tyrrell, E. di Tomaso, D. Fuja, R. Tong, K. Kozak, R. Jain, B. Roysam, Robust 3-D Modeling of Vasculature Imagery Using Superellipsoids, *IEEE Trans. on Medical Imaging* 26 (2) (2007) 223–237.
3. L. M. Lorigo, O. D. Faugeras, W. E. L. Grimson, R. Keriven, R. Kikinis, A. Nabavi, C.-F. Westin, CURVES: Curve Evolution for Vessel Segmentation, *Medical Image Analysis* 5 (2001) 195–206.
4. J. Soares, J. Leandro, R. Cesar, H. Jelinek, M. Cree, Retinal Vessel Segmentation Using the 2-D Gabor Wavelet and Supervised Classification, *IEEE Trans. on Med. Img.* 25 (9) (2006) 1214–1222.
5. O. Wink, W. Niessen, M. A. Viergever, Fast delineation and visualization of vessels in 3-d angiographic images, *IEEE Trans. on Medical Imaging* 19 (4) (2000) 337–346.
6. A. Szymczak, A. Tannenbaum, K. Mischaikow, Coronary vessel cores from 3D imagery: a topological approach, in: *Medical Imaging 2005: Image Processing. Proceedings of the SPIE*, Vol. 5747, 2005, pp. 505–513.
7. P. Medek, P. Benes, J. Sochor, Computation of tunnels in protein molecules using Delaunay triangulation, in: *Journal of WSCG*, 2007, p. 8.
8. L. Costa, R. Cesar, *Shape Analysis and Classification*, CRC Press, 2001.
9. A. Telea, J. J. van Wijk, An augmented fast marching method for computing skeletons and centerlines, in: *Symposium on Data Visualisation*, 2002, pp. 251–259.
10. C. Pudney, Distance-ordered homotopic thinning: A skeletonization algorithm for 3D digital images, *IEEE. Trans. on Biomedical Engineering* 72 (3) (1998) 404–413.
11. M. Van Dortmont, H. van de Wetering, A. Telea, Skeletonization and distance transforms of 3d volumes using graphics hardware, in: *DGCI*, 2006, pp. 617–629.
12. N. Cornea, D. Silver, X. Yuan, R. Balasubramanian, Computing hierarchical curve-skeletons of 3d objects, *The Visual Computer* 21 (11) (2005) 945–955.
13. H. Li, A. Yezzi, Vessels as 4D Curves: Global Minimal 4D Paths to 3D Tubular Structure Extraction, in: *Workshop on Mathematical Methods in Biomedical Image Analysis*, 2006.
14. L. D. Cohen, R. Kimmel, Global minimum for active contours models: A minimal path approach, *IJCV* 24 (1) (1997) 57–78.
15. H. Blum, A Transformation for Extracting New Descriptors of Shape, in: W. Wathen-Dunn (Ed.), *Models for the Perception of Speech and Visual Form*, MIT Press, Cambridge, 1967, pp. 362–380.
16. B. Whited, J. Rossignac, G. Slabaugh, T. Fang, G. Unal, Pearling: 3d interactive extraction of tubular structures from volumetric images, in: *MICCAI Workshop: Interaction in Medical Image Analysis and Visualization*, 2007.
17. G. Monge, *Applications de l'analyse à la géométrie*, 5th Edition, Bachelier, Paris, 1894.