

[MICCAI 2017](#)**Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention**

Sep 10, 2017 - Sep 14, 2017, Quebec, Canada

Reviews For Paper**Paper ID** 199**Title** Misdirected Registration Uncertainty**Masked Reviewer ID:** Assigned_Reviewer_1**Review:**

| Question | |
|---|--|
| Overall opinion of the paper | Borderline Reject |
| Summary of the paper (few lines) | This paper presents a set of toy examples and experiments aimed at studying the transformation uncertainties provided by probabilistic image registration algorithms and how these uncertainties are (not) related to registration uncertainty. |
| Clarity of the presentation, organization | Has some issues |
| Major strengths of the paper (bulleted list) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the topic is an interesting and valid one. I personally think (although this is debatable) that, for conventional images where many large uniform regions are present, transformation uncertainty may be misleading about the quality of registration : if this large region is a single structure, a transformation uncertainty in the middle of it won't affect the resulting segmentation - if accepted, this paper could foster a good discussion on the topic of registration uncertainty with the MICCAI participants which is the goal of a conference |
| Major weaknesses of the paper (bulleted list) | <p>The paper however suffers from presentation and examples issues :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I feel the examples chosen do not highlight the real problems (this is a personal view that I will try to explain in the detailed comments), and lack some context especially on the content of the reference image and structures of the floating image that would help understanding their results - I have difficulties with the fact of saying that intensities are correlated with good registration : Rohlfing had made a paper on registration evaluation that highlighted this point (Image Similarity and Tissue Overlaps as Surrogates for Image Registration Accuracy: Widely Used but Unreliable), and it depends on the chosen metric, the images, etc. - the problem is however real, but to me depends on what is called a good registration which depends on the application. This fact is not highlighted enough in the paper |
| Detailed Comments | <p>The weaknesses I highlight require some more details and explanation. First of all, I was interested by the paper and it made me have a large internal debate on registration evaluation and uncertainty on transformations and what they meant. All this to say the topic is definitely interesting and could foster an interesting discussion and I thank the authors for looking at this rarely looked at topic.</p> <p>However, I would tend to reject the paper since I feel it is taking the problem in the wrong way and/or missing some context in the experiments. For example I have the feeling that the paper misses the fact that registration uncertainty is strongly linked to its goal. If the goal is the alignment of structures, then the uncertainty is truly important at the borders of those structures. On the contrary uncertainty on the intensities has been shown to be unreliable in at least some cases.</p> <p>In the case of the paper, the context is missing : the evaluation has to be put in perspective of what the goal of the small examples would be (reference image,</p> |

goal of the registration...). The proposed examples may be just right but without the context, it gives the impression that the authors say that because all voxels have the same intensity around, the most probable displacement **is wrong**. I tend not to agree with this: it all depends on the intensity and structure on the reference image. It might just be that this pixel is the right one in a complex structure and the others are all wrong. In other words, all intensities of lower probable pairings may be the same but that does not make it the truth. This is to me well illustrated by Fig 6.d e, which are exactly this case and as the authors mention happen a lot in the images they saw.

All this to say the paper could be of broad interest to the community to make people think more about **registration evaluation and uncertainty** and not take everything for granted. But I would suggest to the authors to include more context and perhaps show contradictory examples depending on the goal of the study (segmentation, longitudinal following-up, etc.) and explaining well the context.

Masked Reviewer ID: Assigned_Reviewer_2

Review:

| Question | |
|---|---|
| Overall opinion of the paper | Strong Reject |
| Summary of the paper (few lines) | The paper proposes a different approach to evaluating uncertainty of image registration. Rather than basing it on uncertainty in the transformation locally, it is based on uncertainty in intensity locally . |
| Clarity of the presentation, organization | Good |
| Major strengths of the paper (bulleted list) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - may spark discussion - questions current standards |
| Major weaknesses of the paper (bulleted list) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - underlying idea of proposed approach is invalid |
| Detailed Comments | <p>I applaud papers that propose fundamentally different ideas and that question standard practice. However, in this particular case I disagree with the basic assumption of the authors. The authors find existing methods are flawed in basing uncertainty of image registration on the uncertainty of the transformation to be applied. If a number of potential transformations are all equally likely, the uncertainty is high, according to existing methods. The authors claim this uncertainty should be related to intensity. If all these transformations result in the same intensity at the transformed voxel, the uncertainty should be considered low. This is what I disagree with. Image registration is about geometrical alignment of images, not about making them look similar. The goal is to align corresponding points in the anatomy. Even if other transformations would result in the same intensity for a given voxel, the geometrical alignment is only correct for one of those transformations. To give a counterexample, with the proposed uncertainty measure, a voxel on the boundary of a structure would have large uncertainty: roughly half the transformations would lead to one intensity (the structure) and the other half to another intensity (neighbouring tissue). Most would consider registration uncertainty relatively low at boundaries, because incorrect transformations (perpendicular to the boundary) are clear. I suggest the authors read the paper by Torsten Rohlfing (TMI 2012) in which he introduces the Completely Useless Registration Tool (and shows why it is an incorrect approach).</p> |

Masked Reviewer ID: Assigned Reviewer 3

Review:

| Question | |
|---|--|
| Overall opinion of the paper | Reject |
| Summary of the paper (few lines) | The paper discusses uncertainty quantification in deformable image registration. Instead of using a measure that quantifies the distribution of local registration energies over displacements (termed as registration uncertainty), they propose to include/use the intensities of those potential transformations/displacements and measure the entropy? thereof. The paper presents a number of hypothetical (constructed) examples, where this approach could be advantageous. |
| Clarity of the presentation, organization | Needs lots of work |
| Major strengths of the paper (bulleted list) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in principle the idea of accounting for intensity distributions in registration uncertainty quantification seems promising - the literature overview of probabilistic registration is good |
| Major weaknesses of the paper (bulleted list) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no validation, only anecdotal results and hypothetical experiments - many repetitive paragraphs and poor flow of the argumentation - even the selected visual results in Fig. 6 show no clear advantage of MLI vs I(dm) an reveal large estimation errors - the limitations of RW-registration in terms of the regularisation between displacements are not discussed (see 6) - the use of intensities for uncertainty is problematic, if one considers contrast variations or locally changing noise levels. |
| Detailed Comments | <p>The paper is rather a discussion of open questions with anecdotal visual results and does not provide a quantitative evaluation. It is furthermore very much related to the article "Reinterpreting the Transformation Posterior in Probabilistic Image Registration" on ArXiv, which has very similar figures but merely proposes to measure also the distribution of underlying labels (used for probabilistic segmentation propagation) rather than only intensities. I personally thought the ArXiv version was better.</p> <p>An important drawback of the authors' point of view is that the matching of intensities could/should be part of the registration cost function and would therefore be already included in the 'transformation uncertainty'. Therefore taking this into account once more does not make much sense in my opinion (and would be similar as increasing its weight in the registration energy). I think the example in Fig. 2 is very unrealistic, why would the single 'outlier' intensity not incur a low displacement probability?</p> <p>RW-registration is usually limited by the assumption of a Pott's regularisation model (see Grady's original papers for details), which is not very realistic for smooth transformations and would have an immense impact on the study of registration uncertainty. Andrews et al. discussed this problem in detail in "Topology preservation and anatomical feasibility in random walker image registration" S Andrews, L Tang, G Hamarneh (MICCAI2014).</p> |