

The International Brain Tumor Segmentation (BraTS) Cluster of Challenges: Structured description of the challenge design

CHALLENGE ORGANIZATION

Title

Use the title to convey the essential information on the challenge mission.

The International Brain Tumor Segmentation (BraTS) Cluster of Challenges

Challenge acronym

Preferable, provide a short acronym of the challenge (if any).

BraTS

Challenge abstract

Provide a summary of the challenge purpose. This should include a general introduction in the topic from both a biomedical as well as from a technical point of view and clearly state the envisioned technical and/or biomedical impact of the challenge.

The International Brain Tumor Segmentation (BraTS) challenge. BraTS, since 2012, has focused on the generation of a benchmarking environment and dataset for the delineation of adult brain gliomas. The focus of this year's challenge remains the generation of a common benchmarking environment, but its dataset is substantially expanded to ~4,500 cases towards addressing additional i) populations (e.g., sub-Saharan Africa patients), ii) tumors (e.g., meningioma), iii) clinical concerns (e.g., missing data), and iv) technical considerations (e.g., augmentations). Specifically, the focus of BraTS 2023 is to identify the current state-of-the-art algorithms for addressing (Task 1) the same adult glioma population as in the RSNA-ANSR-MICCAI BraTS challenge, as well as (Task 2) the underserved sub-Saharan African brain glioma patient population, (Task 3) intracranial meningioma, (Task 4) brain metastasis, (Task 5) pediatric brain tumor patients, (Task 6) global & local missing data, (Task 7) useful augmentation techniques, and importantly (Task 8) the algorithmic generalizability across Tasks 1-5. Details for each 'Task' are listed in the rest of this documents. Notably, all data are routine clinically-acquired, multi-site multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging (mpMRI) scans of brain tumor patients. The BraTS 2023 challenge participants are able to obtain the training and validation data of the challenge at any point from the Synapse platform. These data will be used to develop, containerize, and evaluate their algorithms in unseen validation data until August 2023, when the organizers will stop accepting new submissions and evaluate the submitted algorithms in the hidden testing data. Ground truth reference annotations for all datasets are created and approved by expert neuroradiologists for every subject included in the training, validation, and testing datasets to quantitatively evaluate the performance of the participating algorithms.

Challenge keywords

List the primary keywords that characterize the challenge.

Brain Tumors, Segmentation, Generalizability, Synthesis, Augmentation, Cancer, Challenge, Glioma, Glioblastoma,

Diffuse Glioma, Meningioma, Metastasis, Pediatrics, sub-Saharan Africa, Health Disparities, Health Inequities, DIPG, DMG, Midline Glioma, RSNA, ASNR, MICCAI, NCI, DREAM, PrecisionFDA

Year

The challenge will take place in ...

2023

FURTHER INFORMATION FOR MICCAI ORGANIZERS

Workshop

If the challenge is part of a workshop, please indicate the workshop.

Following previous BraTS instances, BraTS 2023 will also be associated with the MICCAI Brain Lesion (BrainLes) workshop 2023

Duration

How long does the challenge take?

Full day.

Expected number of participants

Please explain the basis of your estimate (e.g. numbers from previous challenges) and/or provide a list of potential participants and indicate if they have already confirmed their willingness to contribute.

Given that the RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS 2021 [1-4] challenge had >2,300 submissions, we can conservatively estimate ~1,000 participating teams for this year's challenge.

It is worth noting the number of teams participating in the BraTS challenge has continuously increased during the past 10 years (2012:n=10, 2013: n=10, 2014: n=10, 2015: n=12, 2016: n=19, 2017: n=53, 2018: n=63, 2019: n=72, 2020: n=78, 2021: n>2,300). Notably, we strongly believe that the last participation increase (from 78 to 2,300) is a result of multiple factors (challenge's maturity, involvement of RSNA & ASNR, professional evaluation through Synapse and Kaggle) that will be carried forward to this year's challenge thereby guaranteeing broad participation.

We will also advertise the event in related mailing lists (e.g., CVML; visionlist@visionscience.com; cvnet@mail.ewind.com; MIPS@LISTSERV.CC.EMORY.EDU), NCI's CBIIT blog posts and tweets, and we intend to send an email to all the above and notify them about this year's challenge.

Finally, since we will specifically focus on assessing generalizability across brain tumors and patient populations (including the Africa-BraTS collection), we will also advertise the event in ML communities in Africa to strengthen the local participation. Communities we will consider include the "Data Science Nigeria" (DSN, <https://www.datasciencenigeria.org>), the "African Institute of Mathematical Sciences" (<https://aims.edu.gh>), the "African Centre of Excellence in Data Science" (ACE-DS, <https://aceds.ur.ac.rw/>), and the "INDABA" (<https://deeplearningindaba.com>).

Publication and future plans

Please indicate if you plan to coordinate a publication of the challenge results.

We intend to coordinate 2 publication plans immediately after the challenge.

Plan 1:

The configuration of combining BraTS with BrainLes provides the BraTS participants with the option to extend their individual papers to 12-14 pages, and hence publish their methods in the workshop's LNCS post-conference proceedings. We have already been performing this configuration for BraTS, since 2015.

Plan 2:

Furthermore, we intend to coordinate journal manuscripts focusing on publishing and summarizing the results of each BraTS 2023, making a comprehensive meta-analysis to inform the community about the obtained results.

Space and hardware requirements

Organizers of on-site challenges must provide a fair computing environment for all participants. For instance, algorithms should run on the same computing platform provided to all.

Hardware requirements in case of an in-person meeting: 1 projector, 2 microphones, loudspeakers

BraTS is an off-site challenge, where 1) during the training phase algorithms are trained using the participants' computing infrastructure, and 2) during the validation and final testing/ranking phase using the organizers' infrastructure (i.e., Synapse – SAGE Bionetworks).

TASK: TASK 1: Segmentation of Brain Glioma (Continuous Updates of the RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS challenge)

SUMMARY

Abstract

Provide a summary of the challenge purpose. This should include a general introduction in the topic from both a biomedical as well as from a technical point of view and clearly state the envisioned technical and/or biomedical impact of the challenge.

Brain tumors are among the deadliest types of cancer. Specifically, glioblastoma, and diffuse astrocytic glioma with molecular features of glioblastoma (WHO Grade 4 astrocytoma), are the most common and aggressive malignant primary tumor of the central nervous system in adults, with extreme intrinsic heterogeneity in appearance, shape, and histology, with a median survival of approximately 12 months. Brain tumors in general are challenging to diagnose, hard to treat and inherently resistant to conventional therapy because of the challenges in delivering drugs to the brain. Years of extensive research to improve diagnosis, characterization, and treatment have decreased mortality rates in the U.S. by 7% over the past 30 years. Although modest, these research innovations have not translated to improvements in survival for adults and children in low- and middle-income countries, particularly in sub-Saharan African (SSA) populations.

The Brain Tumor Segmentation (BraTS) 2023 challenge seeks current updates on the RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS 2021 challenge, enabled by the automated continuous benchmark of algorithmic developments through the Synapse platform. Specifically, the focus of BraTS 2023 is to identify the current state-of-the-art segmentation algorithms for brain diffuse glioma patients and their sub-regions, trained using the 2021 dataset and evaluated on i) the specific 2021 testing dataset of adult-type diffuse glioma. All challenge data are routine clinically-acquired, multi-institutional multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging (mpMRI) scans of brain tumor patients.

The BraTS 2023 challenge participants are able to obtain the training and validation data of the RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS 2021 challenge at any point from the Synapse platform. These data will be used to develop, containerize, and evaluate their algorithms in unseen validation data until July 2023, when the organizers will stop accepting new submissions and evaluate the submitted algorithms in the hidden 2021 testing data. Ground truth reference annotations for all datasets are created and approved by expert neuroradiologists for every subject included in the training, validation, and testing datasets to quantitatively evaluate the performance of the participating algorithms.

Keywords

List the primary keywords that characterize the task.

Glioma, Segmentation, Challenge, Brain Tumor, BraTS, Cancer, Glioblastoma, health disparities, RSNA, ASNR, MICCAI, NCI, DREAM, diffuse glioma,

ORGANIZATION

Organizers

a) Provide information on the organizing team (names and affiliations).

Organizing team:

(The names below indicate the people responsible for organizing and reporting the continuous evaluation results of the RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS 2021 challenge. However, the complete organizing team for the RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS 2021 challenge was larger and indicated in the Synapse evaluation platform (www.synapse.org/brats) and in the respective design document (<https://zenodo.org/record/4575162#.Y5IUVZ7MJpl>.)

=====

Spyridon Bakas & Ujjwal Baid – [Lead Organizer - Contact Person]

Affiliation: Center for AI and Data Science for Integrated Diagnostics (AI2D), University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Keyvan Farahani, Ph.D.

Center for Biomedical Informatics and Information Technology National Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health

Jake Albrecht

Sage Bionetworks

James Eddy, Ph.D.

Sage Bionetworks

Timothy Bergquist

Sage Bionetworks

Thomas Yu

Sage Bionetworks

Verena Chung

Sage Bionetworks

Russell (Taki) Shinohara, Ph.D.

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Clinical Evaluators and Annotation Approvers:

=====

Michel Bilello, MD, Ph.D.,

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Suyash Mohan, MD, Ph.D.

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Satyam Ghodasara (Approver Coordinator)
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

+ 60 ASNR member neuroradiologists involved in the ground truth generation (listed in the BraTS 2021 paper and in the evaluation platform (www.synapse.org/brats))

Annotation Volunteers
(in order of decreasing data contributions)
=====

Evan Calabrese, MD, PHD, Department of Radiology & Biomedical Imaging, University of California San Francisco, CA, USA

Ahmed W. Moawad, MBBS, Mercy Catholic Medical Center, Darby, PA, USA

Jeffrey Rudie, MD, PHD, Department of Radiology & Biomedical Imaging, University of California San Francisco, CA, USA

Luiz Otavio Coelho, MD, Diagnóstico Avançado por Imagem, Curitiba, Brazil and Hospital Erasto Gaertner, Curitiba, Brazil

Olivia McDonnell, Department of Medical Imaging, Gold Coast University Hospital, Southport, Australia

Elka Miller, MD, Department of Radiology, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada

Fanny E. Morón, MD, Department of Radiology, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, Tex, USA

Mark C. Oswood, MD, PHD, Department of Radiology, Hennepin Healthcare, Minneapolis, MN, USA

Robert Y. Shih, MD, Uniformed Services University, Bethesda, MD, USA

Loizos Siakallis, MD, Institute of Neurology, University College London, London, United Kingdom

Yulia Bronstein, MD, Virtual Radiologic Professionals, LLC - Branson, Eden Prairie, MN, USA

James R. Mason, DO, MPH, University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

Anthony F. Miller, MD, Hahnemann University Hospital Drexel University College of Medicine, PA, USA

Gagandeep Choudhary, MD, MBMS, Department of Radiology, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, OR, USA

Aanchal Agarwal, MBBS, Dr Jones and Partners Medical Imaging, South Australia

Cristina H. Besada, MD, PHD, Department of Neuroradiology, Hospital Italiano de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina

Jamal J. Derakhshan, MD, PHD, Mallinckrodt Institute of Radiology, Washington University in St. Louis, MO, USA

Mariana Cardoso Diogo, MD, Neuroradiology Department, Hospital Garcia de Orta EPE, Almada, Portugal

Daniel D. Do-Dai, MD, Department of Radiology, Tufts Medical Center, Boston, MA, USA.

Luciano Farage, MD, Centro Universitario Euro-Americana (UNIEURO), Brasília, DF, Brazil

John L. Go, MD, Department of Radiology, Division of Neuroradiology, University of Southern California, Keck School of Medicine, Los Angeles, CA, USA.

Mohiuddin Hadi, MD, Radiology (Neuroradiology Section), University of Louisville, Louisville, KY, USA

Virginia B. Hill, MD, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL, USA

Michael Iv, MD, Stanford Hospital and Clinics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

David Joyner, MD, Department of Radiology and Medical Imaging University of Virginia Health System Charlottesville, VA, USA

Christie Lincoln, MD, Department of Radiology, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, Tex, USA

Eyal Lotan, MD, PHD, NYU Langone Medical Center, New York, NY, USA

Asako Miyakoshi, MD, Kaiser Permanente, San Diego, CA, USA

Mariana Sanchez-Montañó, MD, Instituto Nacional de Ciencias Medicas y Nutricion, Mexico City, Mexico

Jaya Nath, MD, Northport VA Medical Center Northport, NY, USA

Xuan V. Nguyen, MD, PHD, Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center, Columbus, OH, USA

Manal Nicolas-Jilwan, MD, University of Virginia Medical Center, Charlottesville, VA, USA

Johanna Ortiz Jimenez, MD, Neuroradiology- Department of Radiology Kingston General Hospital - Queen's University, Kingston, Canada

Kerem Ozturk, MD, Department of Radiology, University of Minnesota Health, Minneapolis, MN, USA

Bojan D. Petrovic, MD, NorthShore University HealthSystem, Chicago, IL, USA

Lubdhra M. Shah, MD, University of Utah Health Sciences Center, Salt Lake City, UT, USA

Chintan Shah, MD, MS, Neuroradiology and Imaging Informatics Imaging Institute, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, OH, USA

Manas Sharma, MD, MBMS, London Health Sciences Centre, London, Ontario, Canada

Onur Simsek, MD, Dr Abdurrahman Yurtaslan Ankara Oncology Training and Research Hospital, University of Health Sciences, Ankara, Turkey

Achint K. Singh, MD, University of Texas Health San Antonio, TX, USA

Salil Soman, MD, MS, Department of Radiology, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

Volodymyr Statsevych, MD, Neuroradiology and Imaging Informatics Imaging Institute, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, OH, USA

Brent D. Weinberg, MD, PHD, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA

Robert J. Young, MD, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY, USA

Ichiro Ikuta, MD, MMSc, Yale University School of Medicine, Department of Radiology & Biomedical Imaging, New Haven, CT, USA

Amit K. Agarwal, MD, MBMS, Mayo Clinic, Jacksonville, FL, USA

Sword Christian Cambron, MD, Dartmouth Hitchcock Medical Center, NH, USA

Richard Silbergleit, MD, Oakland University William Beaumont School of Medicine, Rochester, MI, USA.

Alexandru Dusoi, Radiology Department at Klinikum Hochrhein Waldshut-Tiengen, Germany

Alida A. Postma, MD, PHD, Maastricht University Hospital, Maastricht, The Netherlands

Laurent Letourneau-Guillon , MSc, Radiology department, Centre Hospitalier de l'Universite de Montreal (CHUM) and Centre de Recherche du CHUM (CRCHUM) Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Gloria J. Guzmán Pérez-Carrillo, MD, MSc, Mallinckrodt Institute of Radiology, School of Medicine, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, USA

Atin Saha, MD, Department of Radiology, NewYork-Presbyterian Hospital, Weill Cornell Medical College, New York, NY, USA

Neetu Soni, MD, MBMS, University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics, Iowa City, IA, USA

Greg Zaharchuk, MD, PHD, Department of Radiology Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

Vahe M. Zohrabian, MD, Department of Radiology, Northwell Health, Zucker Hofstra School of Medicine at Northwell, North Shore University Hospital, Hempstead, New York, NY, USA.

Yingming Chen, MD, Department of Medical Imaging, University of Toronto, ON, Canada

Milos M. Cekic, MD, University of California Los Angeles, CA, USA

Akm Rahman, DO, University of Rochester Medical Center, Rochester, NY, USA

Juan E. Small, MD, Lahey Clinic, Burlington, MA, USA

Varun Sethi, MD, Temple University Hospital, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Data Contributors:

=====

Christos Davatzikos, Ph.D., & Spyridon Bakas, Ph.D., CBICA, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA
John Mongan, M.D., Ph.D. & Evan Calabrese, M.D., Ph.D. & Jeffrey D. Rudie, M.D., Ph.D. & Christopher Hess, M.D., Ph.D. & Soonmee Cha, M.D. & Javier Villanueva-Meyer, M.D., University of California San Francisco, CA, USA
John B. Freymann & Justin S. Kirby - on behalf of The Cancer Imaging Archive (TCIA) Cancer Imaging Program, NCI, National Institutes of Health (NIH), USA
Benedikt Wiestler, M.D., & Bjoern Menze, Ph.D., Technical University of Munich, Germany
Bjoern Menze, Ph.D., University of Zurich, Switzerland
Errol Colak, M.D., Priscila Crivellaro, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada
Rivka R. Colen, M.D. University of Pittsburgh Medical Center
Aikaterini Kotrotsou, Ph.D., MD Anderson Cancer Center, TX, USA
Daniel Marcus, Ph.D., & Mikhail Milchenko, Ph.D., & Arash Nazeri, M.D., Washington University School of Medicine in St.Louis, MO, USA
Hassan Fathallah-Shaykh, M.D., Ph.D., University of Alabama at Birmingham, AL, USA
Roland Wiest, M.D., University of Bern, Switzerland
Andras Jakab, M.D., Ph.D., University of Debrecen, Hungary
Marc-Andre Weber, M.D., Heidelberg University, Germany
Abhishek Mahajan, M.D. & Ujjwal Baid, Ph.D., Tata Memorial Center, Mumbai, India, & SGGS Institute of Engineering and Technology, Nanded, India

b) Provide information on the primary contact person.

Spyridon Bakas [Lead Organizer - Contact Person]

Center for AI and Data Science for Integrated Diagnostics (AI2D), University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA
Email id: sbakas@upenn.

Ujjwal Baid [Lead Organizer - Contact Person]

Center for AI and Data Science for Integrated Diagnostics (AI2D), University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA
Email id: baidu@upenn.edu

Life cycle type

Define the intended submission cycle of the challenge. Include information on whether/how the challenge will be continued after the challenge has taken place. Not every challenge closes after the submission deadline (one-time event). Sometimes it is possible to submit results after the deadline (open call) or the challenge is repeated with some modifications (repeated event).

Examples:

- One-time event with fixed conference submission deadline
- Open call (challenge opens for new submissions after conference deadline)
- Repeated event with annual fixed conference submission deadline

Repeated event with annual fixed conference submission deadline

Challenge venue and platform

a) Report the event (e.g. conference) that is associated with the challenge (if any).

MICCAI.

b) Report the platform (e.g. grand-challenge.org) used to run the challenge.

Following our successful collaboration with the Synapse platform (SAGE Bionetworks) since the RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS 2021 challenge [1], we have coordinated with them and following the support from NCI (represented by Dr Keyvan Farahani in the organizing committee - Chair of the NCI AI Challenges Working Group) Synapse will be used as the platform to drive the evaluation of this cluster of challenges.

The National Cancer Institute takes special interest in the BraTS 2023 challenge and is considering providing infrastructural support in a number of ways. Dr Keyvan Farahani, a long-time co-organizer of BraTS challenges and a project scientist on a collaborative NCI Informatics Technology for Cancer Research (ITCR) grant, is the recipient of an NIH Office of Data Science and Strategy (ODSS)-STRIDES award for “a sustainable medical imaging challenge cloud infrastructure,” to further implement open (continuous) challenges by supporting cloud compute and other infrastructures for (a) benchmarking of tools and automated submission of containerized tools for evaluation, (b) hosting of top-ranking tools through NCI FireCloud Resource and public tool repository such as Dockstore or ModelHub, and (c) hosting resulting image annotations as derived data in the Imaging Data Commons (IDC). All aforementioned NCI platforms are implemented on the Google Cloud Platform.

This collaboration with Synapse, enabled by NCI/NIH support through ITCR grant (Jamed Eddy, PI) and other NCI resources represents a major advancement in the challenge design and leveraging of public resources.

c) Provide the URL for the challenge website (if any).

<https://www.med.upenn.edu/cbica/brats2023/> - (Website will be publicly visible after the challenge approval)

Participation policies

a) Define the allowed user interaction of the algorithms assessed (e.g. only (semi-) automatic methods allowed).

Fully automatic.

b) Define the policy on the usage of training data. The data used to train algorithms may, for example, be restricted to the data provided by the challenge or to publicly available data including (open) pre-trained nets.

Participants are allowed to use additional data from publicly available datasets and their own institutions, for further complementing the data, but if they do so, they **MUST** also discuss the potential difference in their results after using only the BraTS 2023 data, since our intention is to solve the particular segmentation problem, but also to provide a fair comparison among the participating methods.

c) Define the participation policy for members of the organizers' institutes. For example, members of the organizers' institutes may participate in the challenge but are not eligible for awards.

May participate but organizers and their immediate groups will not be eligible for awards.

Since organizing institutions are large, other employees from other labs/departments may participate and should be eligible for the awards and to be listed in the leaderboard.

d) Define the award policy. In particular, provide details with respect to challenge prizes.

Following communication with 1) Intel and 2) Neosoma Inc, we have informal confirmation for the sponsorship of monetary awards for the top 3 teams. Formal confirmation can only be provided after the acceptance of the challenge.

Note that Intel has been offering monetary awards during each of BraTS 2018-2022, and Neosoma for BraTS 2021.

NIH/NCI will also provide Certificates of Merit to the top 3 performing teams.

e) Define the policy for result announcement.

Examples:

- Top 3 performing methods will be announced publicly.
- Participating teams can choose whether the performance results will be made public.

Top 3 performing methods will be announced publicly at the conference and the participants will be invited to present their method.

f) Define the publication policy. In particular, provide details on ...

- ... who of the participating teams/the participating teams' members qualifies as author
- ... whether the participating teams may publish their own results separately, and (if so)
- ... whether an embargo time is defined (so that challenge organizers can publish a challenge paper first).

The configuration of combining the BraTS challenge with the BrainLes workshop provides the BraTS participants with the option to extend their papers to 12-14 pages, and hence publish their methods in the workshop's LNCS post-conference proceedings. Furthermore, we intend to coordinate a journal manuscript focusing on publishing and summarizing the results of the challenge.

Submission method

a) Describe the method used for result submission. Preferably, provide a link to the submission instructions.

Examples:

- Docker container on the Synapse platform. Link to submission instructions: <URL>
- Algorithm output was sent to organizers via e-mail. Submission instructions were sent by e-mail.

The participants are required to send the output of their methods to the evaluation platform for the scoring to occur during the training and the validation phases. At the end of the validation phase the participants are asked to identify the method they would like to evaluate in the final testing/ranking phase. The organizers will then confirm receiving the containerized method and will evaluate it in the hidden testing data. The participants will be provided guidelines on the form of the container as we have done in previous years. This will enable confirmation of reproducibility, running of these algorithms to the previous BraTS instances and comparison with results obtained by algorithms of previous years, thereby maximizing solutions in solving the problem of brain tumor segmentation. During the training and validation phases, the participants will have the chance to test the functionality of their submission through both the Cancer Imaging Phenomics Toolkit (CaPTk [5-6], <https://github.com/CBICA/CaPTk>), and the Federated Tumor Segmentation (FeTS) Tool [7] (<https://fets-ai.github.io/Front-End/>) that offer the implementation of the evaluation metrics, as well as via the online evaluation platform (Synapse).

[5] C.Davatzikos, et al. "Cancer imaging phenomics toolkit: quantitative imaging analytics for precision diagnostics and predictive modeling of clinical outcome." *Journal of Medical Imaging*, 5.1:011018, 2018.

<https://doi.org/10.1117/1.jmi.5.1.011018>

[6] S.Pati, et al. "The cancer imaging phenomics toolkit (CaPTk): technical overview." International MICCAI Brainlesion Workshop. Springer, Cham, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46643-5_38

[7] S.Pati, et al, "The federated tumor segmentation (FeTS) tool: an open-source solution to further solid tumor research", Phys. Med. Biol. 67(20), 204002, 2022. DOI: 10.1088/1361-6560/ac9449

b) Provide information on the possibility for participating teams to evaluate their algorithms before submitting final results. For example, many challenges allow submission of multiple results, and only the last run is officially counted to compute challenge results.

We intend to release the validation set in April together with the training set, allowing participants to tune their methods in the unseen validation data. The validation data ground truth will not be provided to the participants, but multiple submissions to the online evaluation platform will be allowed for the validation phase. Only 2 submissions will be allowed in the final testing/ranking data/phase.

Challenge schedule

Provide a timetable for the challenge. Preferably, this should include

- the release date(s) of the training cases (if any)
- the registration date/period
- the release date(s) of the test cases and validation cases (if any)
- the submission date(s)
- associated workshop days (if any)
- the release date(s) of the results

Registration dates: From now until submission deadline of short papers reporting method and preliminary results (see below).

17 April 2023: Availability of training data (with ground truth labels) and validation data (without ground truth labels).

31 July 2023: Submission of short papers reporting method & preliminary results.

1-7 August 2023: Submission of containerized algorithm to the evaluation platform.

11 – 25 August 2023: Evaluation on testing data (by the organizers - only for participants with submitted papers).

8 September 2023: Contacting top performing methods for preparing slides for oral presentation.

8-12 October 2023: Announcement of final top 3 ranked teams: Challenge at MICCAI

30 November 2023: Camera-ready submission of extended papers for inclusion in the associated workshop proceedings

Ethics approval

Indicate whether ethics approval is necessary for the data. If yes, provide details on the ethics approval, preferably institutional review board, location, date and number of the ethics approval (if applicable). Add the URL or a reference to the document of the ethics approval (if available).

We are already in close coordination with The Cancer Imaging Archive (TCIA) and the Imaging Data Commons (IDC) of the National Institutes of Health (NIH), to release the training and validation data following their standard licensing (<https://wiki.cancerimagingarchive.net/display/Public/Data+Usage+Policies+and+Restrictions>).

The TCIA has already approved this, and we are now in the process of submission (includes a detailed curation process specific to TCIA). The cloud-based IDC is routinely updated with new collections from TCIA. IDC public

collections are now part of the Google Public Datasets Program. This will effectively make all the BraTS data available in the Google Marketplace, increasing the potential for access to the data and downstream AI developments using Google's AI resources. IDC data are also expected to be available through the AWS (Amazon Web Services) Marketplace.

Informed consent was obtained from all subjects at their respective institutions, and the protocol for releasing the data was approved by the institutional review board of the data-contributing institution.

Data usage agreement

Clarify how the data can be used and distributed by the teams that participate in the challenge and by others during and after the challenge. This should include the explicit listing of the license applied.

Examples:

- CC BY (Attribution)
- CC BY-SA (Attribution-ShareAlike)
- CC BY-ND (Attribution-NoDerivs)
- CC BY-NC (Attribution-NonCommercial)
- CC BY-NC-SA (Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike)
- CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs)

CC BY.

Additional comments: Additional comments: CC-BY, but if any of the non-TCIA contributors object to this license, the specific subset of the BraTS data will be released under a CC-BY-NC license.

Code availability

a) Provide information on the accessibility of the organizers' evaluation software (e.g. code to produce rankings). Preferably, provide a link to the code and add information on the supported platforms.

The preprocessing tools, evaluation metrics, and the ranking code used during the whole challenge's lifecycle will be made available through the Cancer Imaging Phenomics Toolkit (CaPTk [5-6], <https://github.com/CBICA/CaPTk>), and the Federated Tumor Segmentation (FeTS) Platform [7] (<https://fets-ai.github.io/Front-End/>).

[5] C.Davatzikos, et al. "Cancer imaging phenomics toolkit: quantitative imaging analytics for precision diagnostics and predictive modeling of clinical outcome." *Journal of medical imaging*, 5.1:011018, 2018.

<https://doi.org/10.1117/1.jmi.5.1.011018>

[6] S.Pati, et al. "The cancer imaging phenomics toolkit (CaPTk): technical overview." *International MICCAI Brainlesion Workshop*. Springer, Cham, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46643-5_38

[7] S.Pati, et al, "The federated tumor segmentation (FeTS) tool: an open-source solution to further solid tumor research", *Phys. Med. Biol.* 67(20), 204002, 2022. DOI: 10.1088/1361-6560/ac9449

b) In an analogous manner, provide information on the accessibility of the participating teams' code.

The participants are required to submit their containerized algorithm, during or after the validation phase. Specific instructions for the containerization will be provided after the challenge approval. These instructions will be very similar to what we were requesting participants to provide during the BraTS 2021 and 2022 challenges.

The National Cancer Institute takes special interest in the BraTS 2023 challenge and is considering providing

infrastructural support in a number of ways. Dr Keyvan Farahani, a long time co-organizer of BraTS challenges and a project scientist on a collaborative NCI Informatics Technology for Cancer Research (ITCR) grant, is the recipient of an NIH Office of Data Science and Strategy (ODSS)-STRIDES award for “a sustainable medical imaging challenge cloud infrastructure,” to further implement open (continuous) challenges by supporting cloud compute and other infrastructures for (a) benchmarking of tools and automated submission of containerized tools for evaluation, (b) hosting of top-ranking tools through NCI FireCloud Resource and public tool repository such as Dockstore or ModelHub, and (c) hosting resulting image annotations as derived data in the Imaging Data Commons (IDC) on the Google Cloud Platform.

Conflicts of interest

Provide information related to conflicts of interest. In particular provide information related to sponsoring/funding of the challenge. Also, state explicitly who had/will have access to the test case labels and when.

Monetary awards are expected by Intel and Neosoma Inc

Spyridon Bakas, Ujjwal Baid, SAGE Bionetworks, and the clinical evaluators will have access to the validation, and test case labels.

MISSION OF THE CHALLENGE

Field(s) of application

State the main field(s) of application that the participating algorithms target.

Examples:

- Diagnosis
- Education
- Intervention assistance
- Intervention follow-up
- Intervention planning
- Prognosis
- Research
- Screening
- Training
- Cross-phase

Treatment planning, Intervention planning, Assistance, Research, Surgery, Diagnosis, Training, CAD, Education, Decision support.

Task category(ies)

State the task category(ies).

Examples:

- Classification
- Detection
- Localization
- Modeling
- Prediction
- Reconstruction
- Registration
- Retrieval
- Segmentation
- Tracking

Segmentation.

Cohorts

We distinguish between the target cohort and the challenge cohort. For example, a challenge could be designed around the task of medical instrument tracking in robotic kidney surgery. While the challenge could be based on ex vivo data obtained from a laparoscopic training environment with porcine organs (challenge cohort), the final biomedical application (i.e. robotic kidney surgery) would be targeted on real patients with certain characteristics defined by inclusion criteria such as restrictions regarding sex or age (target cohort).

a) Describe the target cohort, i.e. the subjects/objects from whom/which the data would be acquired in the final biomedical application.

Retrospective multi-institutional cohort of patients, diagnosed with de novo diffuse gliomas of the brain, clinically scanned with mpMRI acquisition protocol including i) pre-contrast and ii) contrast-enhanced T1-weighted, iii) T2-weighted and iv) T2-weighted Fluid Attenuated Inversion Recovery (FLAIR) MRI.

b) Describe the challenge cohort, i.e. the subject(s)/object(s) from whom/which the challenge data was acquired.

Retrospective multi-institutional cohort of patients, diagnosed with de novo diffuse gliomas of the brain, clinically scanned with mpMRI acquisition protocol including i) pre-contrast and ii) contrast-enhanced T1-weighted, iii) T2-weighted and iv) T2-weighted Fluid Attenuated Inversion Recovery (FLAIR) MRI.

Imaging modality(ies)

Specify the imaging technique(s) applied in the challenge.

MRI

Context information

Provide additional information given along with the images. The information may correspond ...

a) ... directly to the image data (e.g. tumor volume).

... directly to the image data (i.e., tumor sub-region volumes)

b) ... to the patient in general (e.g. sex, medical history).

N/A

Target entity(ies)

a) Describe the data origin, i.e. the region(s)/part(s) of subject(s)/object(s) from whom/which the image data would be acquired in the final biomedical application (e.g. brain shown in computed tomography (CT) data, abdomen shown in laparoscopic video data, operating room shown in video data, thorax shown in fluoroscopy video). If necessary, differentiate between target and challenge cohort.

Brain mpMRI scans.

b) Describe the algorithm target, i.e. the structure(s)/subject(s)/object(s)/component(s) that the participating algorithms have been designed to focus on (e.g. tumor in the brain, tip of a medical instrument, nurse in an operating theater, catheter in a fluoroscopy scan). If necessary, differentiate between target and challenge cohort.

Tumor in the brain.

Assessment aim(s)

Identify the property(ies) of the algorithms to be optimized to perform well in the challenge. If multiple properties are assessed, prioritize them (if appropriate). The properties should then be reflected in the metrics applied (see below, parameter metric(s)), and the priorities should be reflected in the ranking when combining multiple metrics that assess different properties.

- Example 1: Find highly accurate liver segmentation algorithm for CT images.
- Example 2: Find lung tumor detection algorithm with high sensitivity and specificity for mammography images.

Corresponding metrics are listed below (parameter metric(s)).

Sensitivity, Specificity, Precision.

Additional points: Dice, Hausdorff 95th percentile

DATA SETS**Data source(s)**

a) Specify the device(s) used to acquire the challenge data. This includes details on the device(s) used to acquire the imaging data (e.g. manufacturer) as well as information on additional devices used for performance assessment (e.g. tracking system used in a surgical setting).

The exact scanners and their technical specifications used for acquiring the TCIA cohort has been listed in the data reference published in our related manuscripts [1,2,4]. Since then, multiple institutions have contributed data to create the current RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS dataset and these are listed in the latest BraTS arxiv paper [1]. We are currently in coordination with TCIA to make the complete BraTS 2021-2023 dataset permanently available through their portal. All the acquisition details will be included together with the data availability in TCIA, and subsequently in IDC, including Google and AWS Marketplaces, as part of their Public Datasets Programs.

[1] U. Baid, et al., "The RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS 2021 Benchmark on Brain Tumor Segmentation and Radiogenomic Classification", arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.02314

[2] S. Bakas, et al., "Identifying the best machine learning algorithms for brain tumor segmentation, progression assessment, and overall survival prediction in the BRATS challenge", arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.02629

[4] S. Bakas, H. Akbari, A. Sotiras, M. Bilello, M. Rozycki, J.S. Kirby, et al., "Advancing The Cancer Genome Atlas glioma MRI collections with expert segmentation labels and radiomic features", Nature Scientific Data, 4:170117 (2017) DOI: 10.1038/sdata.2017.117

b) Describe relevant details on the imaging process/data acquisition for each acquisition device (e.g. image acquisition protocol(s)).

The acquisition protocols are different across (and within each) contributing institution, as these represent scans of real routine clinical practice. Specific details (e.g., echo time, repetition time, original acquisition plane) of each scan of each patient will be published as supplementary material together with the challenge meta-analysis manuscript.

c) Specify the center(s)/institute(s) in which the data was acquired and/or the data providing platform/source (e.g. previous challenge). If this information is not provided (e.g. for anonymization reasons), specify why.

The provided data describe mpMRI scans, acquired with different clinical protocols and various scanners from:

University of Pennsylvania (PA, USA),
University of Alabama at Birmingham (AL, USA),
Heidelberg University (Germany),
University of Bern (Switzerland),
University of Debrecen (Hungary),
Henry Ford Hospital (MI, USA),
University of California (CA, USA),
MD Anderson Cancer Center (TX, USA),
Emory University (GA, USA),
Mayo Clinic (MN, USA),
Thomas Jefferson University (PA, USA),
Duke University School of Medicine (NC, USA),
Saint Joseph Hospital and Medical Center (AZ, USA),
Case Western Reserve University (OH, USA),
University of North Carolina (NC, USA),
Fondazione IRCCS Istituto Neurologico C. Besta, (Italy),
Ivy Glioblastoma Atlas Project,
MD Anderson Cancer Center (TX, USA),
Washington University in St. Louis (MO, USA),
Tata Memorial Center (India),
University of Pittsburgh Medical Center (PA, USA),
University of California San Francisco (CA, USA),
Unity Health,
University Hospital of Zurich.

Note that data from institutions 6-17 are provided through The Cancer Imaging Archive (TCIA - <http://www.cancerimagingarchive.net/>), supported by the Cancer Imaging Program (CIP) of the National Cancer Institute (NCI) of the National Institutes of Health (NIH).

d) Describe relevant characteristics (e.g. level of expertise) of the subjects (e.g. surgeon)/objects (e.g. robot) involved in the data acquisition process (if any).

People involved in MRI acquisition for suspected and diagnosis of brain tumors during standard clinical practice.

Training and test case characteristics

a) State what is meant by one case in this challenge. A case encompasses all data that is processed to produce one result that is compared to the corresponding reference result (i.e. the desired algorithm output).

Examples:

- Training and test cases both represent a CT image of a human brain. Training cases have a weak annotation (tumor present or not and tumor volume (if any)) while the test cases are annotated with the tumor contour (if any).
- A case refers to all information that is available for one particular patient in a specific study. This information always includes the image information as specified in data source(s) (see above) and may include context information (see above). Both training and test cases are annotated with survival (binary) 5 years after (first) image was taken.

A case describes multi-parametric MRI scans for a single patient at a single timepoint. The exact scans included for one case are i) unenhanced and ii) contrast-enhanced T1-weighted, iii) T2-weighted and iv) T2 Fluid Attenuated Inversion Recovery (FLAIR) MRI.

Please note that all sequences included for each case of the provided dataset, represent the sequences with the best image quality available in the acquiring institution for this particular case. There was no inclusion/exclusion criterion applied that related to 3d acquisitions, or the exact type of pulse sequence (for example MPAGE). We, instead, accepted all types of T1 acquisitions (with the exception of T1 FLAIR, as we did not want to mix the fluid suppressed values with non-flair scans) and then we applied the harmonized preprocessing protocol we have been using in BraTS, across the complete data. This preprocessing ensures all scans have 3D representations on a specific resolution (1mm^3), and aligned to the same anatomical atlas.

b) State the total number of training, validation and test cases.

Training data: 1,251 cases

Validation data: 219 cases

Testing data: 570 cases

c) Explain why a total number of cases and the specific proportion of training, validation and test cases was chosen.

Based on availability.

The data was split in these numbers between training, validation, and testing after considering the number of cases used as test cases in previous instances of BraTS and the fact that the organizers did not want to reveal ground truth labels of previous test cases, to avoid compromising ranking the participants.

d) Mention further important characteristics of the training, validation and test cases (e.g. class distribution in classification tasks chosen according to real-world distribution vs. equal class distribution) and justify the choice.

N/A

Annotation characteristics

a) Describe the method for determining the reference annotation, i.e. the desired algorithm output. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary. Possible methods include manual image annotation, in silico ground truth generation and annotation by automatic methods.

If human annotation was involved, state the number of annotators.

Reference approved from at least 2 experienced neuroradiologists, following annotations from 60 clinical neuroradiologists (volunteers from ASNR)

b) Provide the instructions given to the annotators (if any) prior to the annotation. This may include description of a training phase with the software. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary. Preferably, provide a link to the annotation protocol.

The data considered in this task of the BraTS 2023 challenge follows the paradigm of the BraTS 2021-2022 challenge data. The annotation of these data followed a pre-defined clinically-approved annotation protocol (defined by expert neuroradiologists), which was provided to all clinical annotators, describing in detail instructions on what the segmentations of each tumor sub-region should describe (see below for the summary of the specific instructions). The annotators were given the flexibility to use their tool of preference for making the annotations, and also follow either a complete manual annotation approach, or a hybrid approach where an automated approach is used to produce some initial annotations followed by their manual refinements.

Summary of specific instructions:

- i) the enhancing tumor (when present) delineates the hyperintense signal of the T1-Gd, after excluding the vessels.
- ii) the necrotic core (when present) outlines regions appearing dark in both T1 and T1-Gd images (denoting necrosis/cysts), and darked regions in T1-Gd that appear brighter in T1.
- iii) the tumor core, which is the union of the enhancing tumor and the necrotic core described in (i) and (ii) above.
- iv) the farthest tumor extent including the edema (what is called the whole tumor), delineates the tissue represented by the abnormal T2-FLAIR envelope.

c) Provide details on the subject(s)/algorithm(s) that annotated the cases (e.g. information on level of expertise such as number of years of professional experience, medically-trained or not). Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary.

Each case was assigned to a pair of annotator-approver. Annotators spanned across various experience levels and clinical/academic ranks, while the approvers were the 2 experienced board-certified neuroradiologists (with >15 years of experience), listed in the “Organizers” section as “clinical evaluators and annotation approvers”. The annotators were given the flexibility to use their tool of preference for making the annotations, and also follow either a complete manual annotation approach, or a hybrid approach where an automated approach is used to produce some initial annotations followed by their manual refinements. Once the annotators were satisfied with the produced annotations, they were passing these to the corresponding approver. The approver is then responsible for signing off these annotations. Specifically, the approver would review the tumor annotations, in tandem with the corresponding MRI scans, and if the annotations were not of satisfactory quality they would be sent back to the annotators for further refinements. This iterative approach was followed for all cases, until their respective annotations reached satisfactory quality (according to the approver) for being publicly available and noted as final ground truth segmentation labels for these scans.

d) Describe the method(s) used to merge multiple annotations for one case (if any). Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary.

No Aggregation

Data pre-processing method(s)

Describe the method(s) used for pre-processing the raw training data before it is provided to the participating teams. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary.

The exact preprocessing pipeline applied to all the data considered in the BraTS 2023 challenge is identical with the one evaluated and followed by the BraTS 2017-2022 challenges. Specifically, following the conversion of the raw scans from their original DICOM file format to NIfTI file format [10], we first perform a re-orientation of all input scans (T1, T1- Gd, T2, T2-FLAIR) to the LPS/RAI orientation, and then register all of them to the same anatomical atlas (i.e., SRI-24 [9]) and interpolating to the same resolution as this atlas (1 mm³). The exact registration process comprises the following steps:

STEP 1: N4 Bias field correction (notably the application of N4 bias field correction is a temporary step. Taking into consideration we have previously [4] shown that use of non-parametric, non-uniform intensity normalization (i.e., N4) to correct for intensity non-uniformities caused by the inhomogeneity of the scanner's magnetic field during image acquisition obliterates the MRI signal relating to the abnormal/tumor regions, we intentionally use N4 bias field correction in the preprocessing pipeline to facilitate a more optimal rigid registration across the difference MRI sequences. However, after obtaining the related information (i.e., transformation matrices), we discard the bias field corrected scans, and we apply this transformation matrix towards the final co-registered output images used in the challenge).

STEP 2: Rigid Registration of T1, T2, T2-FLAIR to the T1-Gd scan, and obtain the corresponding transformation matrix.

STEP 3: Rigid Registration of T1-Gd scan to the SRI-24 atlas [9], and obtain the corresponding transformation matrix.

STEP 4: Join the obtained transformation matrices and applying aggregated transformation to the LPS-oriented scans.

STEP 5: After completion of the registration process, we perform brain extraction to remove any apparent non-brain tissue (e.g., neck fat, skull, eyeballs) based on a deep-learning approach we developed in house, focusing on scans with apparent brain tumors and exhaustively evaluated it in both private and public multi-institutional data [11]. We then manually assessed all scans for confirming the correct brain extraction (i.e., skull stripping), where the complete brain region is included, and all non-brain tissue is excluded. This whole pipeline, and its source code are available through the CaPTk [5-6](<https://github.com/CBICA/CaPTk>) and FeTS [7] (<https://fets-ai.github.io/Front-End/>) platforms.

[4] S. Bakas, H. Akbari, A. Sotiras, M. Bilello, M. Rozycki, J.S. Kirby, et al., "Advancing The Cancer Genome Atlas glioma MRI collections with expert segmentation labels and radiomic features", *Nature Scientific Data*, 4:170117, 2017. DOI: 10.1038/sdata.2017.117

[9] T. Rohlfing, et al. The SRI24 multichannel atlas of normal adult human brain structure. *Hum Brain Mapp.* 31(5):798-819, 2010.

[10] R.Cox, J.Ashburner, H.Breman, K.Fissell, C.Haselgrove, C.Holmes, J.Lancaster, D.Rex, S.Smith, J.Woodward, "A (Sort of) new image data format standard: NIfTI-1: WE 150", *Neuroimage*, 22, 2004.

[11] S.Thakur, J.Doshi, S.Pati, S.Rathore, C.Sako, M.Bilello, S.M.Ha, G.Shukla, A.Flanders, A.Kotrotsou, M.Milchenko, S.Liem, G.S.Alexander, J.Lombardo, J.D.Palmer, P.LaMontagne, A.Nazeri, S.Talbar, U.Kulkarni, D.Marcus, R.Colen, C.Davatzikos, G.Erus, S.Bakas, "Brain Extraction on MRI Scans in Presence of Diffuse Glioma: Multi-institutional Performance Evaluation of Deep Learning Methods and Robust Modality-Agnostic Training", *NeuroImage*, 220: 117081, 2020. DOI: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.117081

Sources of error

a) Describe the most relevant possible error sources related to the image annotation. If possible, estimate the magnitude (range) of these errors, using inter-and intra-annotator variability, for example. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases, if necessary.

Study and evaluation of the effect of this error is addressed by the uncertainty task of BraTS 2019-2020 (i.e., to quantify the uncertainty in the tumor segmentations) [8] and is outside the scope of the BraTS 2022 challenge.

[8] R.Mehta, et al, "QU-BraTS: MICCAI BraTS 2020 Challenge on Quantifying Uncertainty in Brain Tumor Segmentation-Analysis of Ranking Scores and Benchmarking Results", Journal of Machine Learning for Biomedical Imaging, 1, 26, 2022

b) In an analogous manner, describe and quantify other relevant sources of error.

N/A

ASSESSMENT METHODS

Metric(s)

a) Define the metric(s) to assess a property of an algorithm. These metrics should reflect the desired algorithm properties described in assessment aim(s) (see above). State which metric(s) were used to compute the ranking(s) (if any).

- Example 1: Dice Similarity Coefficient (DSC)
- Example 2: Area under curve (AUC)

Dice Similarity Coefficient (DSC),

95% Hausdorff distance (HD),

Sensitivity,

Specificity,

Precision

The regions evaluated using these metrics describe the whole tumor, the tumor core, and the enhancing tumor (when present). Note that the tumor core includes the part of the tumor that is typically resected (i.e., enhancing, non-enhancing, and necrotic tumor), and the whole tumor describes all tumor sub-regions (i.e., tumor core and edema/invasion).

b) Justify why the metric(s) was/were chosen, preferably with reference to the biomedical application.

In terms of the assessed and evaluated tumor sub-regions:

- i) the enhancing tumor describes the regions of active tumor and based on this, clinical practice characterizes the extent of resection.
- ii) the tumor core (incl. the necrotic component) describes what is typically resected during a surgical procedure.
- iii) the whole tumor as it defines the whole extent of the tumor, including the peritumoral edematous tissue and highly infiltrated area.

In terms of evaluation metrics, we use:

- i) the Dice Similarity Coefficient, which is commonly used in the assessment of segmentation performance,

- ii) the 95% Hausdorff distance as opposed to standard HD, in order to avoid outliers having too much weight,
- iii) Sensitivity and Specificity to determine whether an algorithm has the tendency to over- or undersegment.
- iv) Precision to complement the metric of Sensitivity (also known as recall).

Ranking method(s)

a) Describe the method used to compute a performance rank for all submitted algorithms based on the generated metric results on the test cases. Typically the text will describe how results obtained per case and metric are aggregated to arrive at a final score/ranking.

For ranking of multidimensional outcomes (or metrics), for each team, we will compute the summation of their ranks across the average of the metrics described above as a univariate overall summary measure. This measure will decide the overall ranking for each specific team. To visualize the results in an intuitive fashion, we propose to visualize the outcome via an augmented version of radar plot [6].

[12] Duan R, Tong J, Lin L, Levine LD, Sammel MD, Stoddard J, Li T, Schmid CH, Chu H, Chen Y. PALM: Patient centered Treatment Ranking via Large-scale Multivariate Network Meta-analysis. medRxiv. 2020 Jan 1

b) Describe the method(s) used to manage submissions with missing results on test cases.

If an algorithm fails to produce a result metric for a specific test case, this metric will be set to its worst possible value (0 for the DSC and the image diagonal for the HD).

c) Justify why the described ranking scheme(s) was/were used.

Following discussions with the biostatistician involved in the design of this challenge (Dr Shinohara), and also while considering transparency and fairness to the participants.

Statistical analyses

- a) Provide details for the statistical methods used in the scope of the challenge analysis. This may include
- description of the missing data handling,
 - details about the assessment of variability of rankings,
 - description of any method used to assess whether the data met the assumptions, required for the particular statistical approach, or
 - indication of any software product that was used for all data analysis methods.

Similar to BraTS 2017-2022, uncertainties in rankings will be assessed using permutational analyses [3]. Performance for the segmentation task will be assessed based on relative performance of each team on each tumor tissue class and for each segmentation measure. These will be combined by averaging ranks for the measures, and statistical significance will be evaluated only for the segmentation performance measures and will be quantified by permuting the relative ranks for each segmentation measure and tissue class per subject of the testing data.

[2] S. Bakas et al., "Identifying the Best Machine Learning Algorithms for Brain Tumor Segmentation, Progression Assessment, and Overall Survival Prediction in the BRATS Challenge," arXiv:1811.02629 [cs, stat], Apr. 2019, Accessed: Dec. 10, 2020. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1811.02629>.

b) Justify why the described statistical method(s) was/were used.

This permutation testing would reflect differences in performance that exceeded those that might be expected by

chance.

Further analyses

Present further analyses to be performed (if applicable), e.g. related to

- combining algorithms via ensembling,
- inter-algorithm variability,
- common problems/biases of the submitted methods, or
- ranking variability.

N/A

TASK: TASK 2: Segmentation of Brain Glioma in Sub-Saharan Africa patient population (Africa- BraTS)

SUMMARY

Abstract

Provide a summary of the challenge purpose. This should include a general introduction in the topic from both a biomedical as well as from a technical point of view and clearly state the envisioned technical and/or biomedical impact of the challenge.

Brain tumors are among the deadliest type of cancer. Approximately 80% of individuals with Glioblastoma (GB) die within two years of diagnosis[1]. Brain tumors in general are challenging to diagnose, hard to treat and inherently resistant to conventional therapy. Years of extensive research to improve diagnosis and treatment of GB have decreased mortality rates in the U.S by 7% over the past 30 years². Although modest, these research innovations have not translated to improvements in survival for adults and children in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), particularly in African populations where death rates in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) rose by ~25% on average while decreasing by up to 30% in the Global North[2]. Long-term survival with GB is associated with identification of appropriate pathological features on brain MRI and confirmation by histopathology. Since 2021, the BraTS Challenge have evaluated state-of-the art machine learning methods to detect, characterize, and classify brain GB. However, it is unclear if the state-of-the art methods can be widely implemented in SSA given the extensive use of lower quality MRI technology, which produces poorer image contrast and resolution and more importantly, the propensity for late presentation of disease at advanced stages and unique characteristics of GB in SSA (i.e., suspected higher rates of gliosis).

The Africa-BraTS Challenge provides an opportunity to include brain MRI GB cases from SSA in global efforts through the BraTS Challenge to develop and evaluate computer-aided-diagnostic (CAD) methods for detection and characterization of GB in resource-limited settings, where the potential for CAD tools to transform healthcare are more likely[3].

1. Poon MTC, Sudlow CLM, Figueroa JD, Brennan PM. Longer-term (2 years) survival in patients with glioblastoma in population-based studies pre- and post-2005: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Sci Rep. 2020 Jul 15;10(1):11622. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-68011-4>
2. GBD 2016 Brain and Other CNS Cancer Collaborators. Global, regional, and national burden of brain and other CNS cancer, 1990-2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. Lancet Neurol. 2019 Apr;18(4):376-393. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422\(18\)30468-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(18)30468-X)
3. Anazodo UC, Adewole M, Dako F. AI for Population and Global Health in Radiology. Radiology:Artificial Intelligence, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1148/ryai.220107>

Keywords

List the primary keywords that characterize the task.

Glioma, Segmentation, Challenge, Sub-Saharan Africa, Brain Tumor, BraTS, MICCAI, NCI, DREAM

ORGANIZATION

Organizers

a) Provide information on the organizing team (names and affiliations).

Organizing team:

=====

Udunna Anazodo, Ph.D. — [Lead Organizer - Contact Person]

Montreal Neurological Institute, McGill University

Ujjwal Baid, PhD

Center for AI and Data Science for Integrated Diagnostics (AI2D), University of Pennsylvania,
Philadelphia, PA, USA

Maruf Adewole, MSc

Medical Artificial Intelligence (MAI) Lab, Crestview Radiology, Lagos, Nigeria

Spyridon Bakas

Center for AI and Data Science for Integrated Diagnostics (AI2D), University of Pennsylvania,
Philadelphia, PA, USA

Farouk Dako

Center for Global Health, Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania,
USA

Keyvan Farahani, Ph.D.

Center for Biomedical Informatics and Information Technology National
Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health

Jake Albrecht

Sage Bionetworks

James Eddy, Ph.D.

Sage Bionetworks

Timothy Bergquist

Sage Bionetworks

Thomas Yu

Sage Bionetworks

Verena Chung

Sage Bionetworks

Russell (Taki) Shinohara, Ph.D.

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Clinical Evaluators and Annotation Approvers:


=====

Oluyemisi Toyobo

Crestview Radiology Ltd. Lagos, Nigeria.

Aaron Mintz

Washington University, St Louis, MO, USA

 kola Omidiji
University Teaching Hospital, Lagos Nigeria

Annotation Volunteers

(in order of decreasing data contributions)

=====

~~Olubukola Omidiji~~

~~Lagos University Teaching Hospital, Lagos Nigeria~~

~~The lead organizer is in the process of recruiting another 15 radiology residents from an identified cohort of 83 residents~~

~~from Nigeria. The names of them will be updated in the design document upon challenge acceptance.~~

Data Contributors:

=====

Abiodun Fatade, MBBS

Crestview Radiology, Lagos, Nigeria

Olubukola Omidiji, MBBS

Lagos University Teaching Hospital, Lagos Nigeria.

Rachel Akinola, MBBS

Lagos State University Teaching Hospital, Lagos Nigeria

O.O Olatunji, MBBS

The National Hospital, Abuja, Nigeria

~~M.A Suwaid, MBBS~~

~~Aminu Kano Teaching Hospital, Lagos, Nigeria~~

b) Provide information on the primary contact person.

Udunna Anazodo [Lead Organizer - Contact Person]

Montreal Neurlogical Institute, McGill University

Email id: udunna.anazodo@mcgill.ca

Life cycle type

Define the intended submission cycle of the challenge. Include information on whether/how the challenge will be continued after the challenge has taken place. Not every challenge closes after the submission deadline (one-time event). Sometimes it is possible to submit results after the deadline (open call) or the challenge is repeated with some modifications (repeated event).

Examples:

- One-time event with fixed conference submission deadline
- Open call (challenge opens for new submissions after conference deadline)
- Repeated event with annual fixed conference submission deadline

Repeated event with annual fixed conference submission deadline

Challenge venue and platform

a) Report the event (e.g. conference) that is associated with the challenge (if any).

MICCAI.

b) Report the platform (e.g. grand-challenge.org) used to run the challenge.

Following our successful collaboration with the Synapse platform (SAGE Bionetworks) since the RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS 2021 challenge [1], we have coordinated with them and following the support from NCI (represented by Dr Keyvan Farahani in the organizing committee - Chair of the NCI AI Challenges Working Group) Synapse will be used as the platform to drive the evaluation of this cluster of challenges.

The National Cancer Institute takes special interest in the BraTS 2023 challenge and is considering providing infrastructural support in a number of ways. Dr Keyvan Farahani, a long-time co-organizer of BraTS challenges and a project scientist on a collaborative NCI Informatics Technology for Cancer Research (ITCR) grant, is the recipient of an NIH Office of Data Science and Strategy (ODSS)-STRIDES award for “a sustainable medical imaging challenge cloud infrastructure,” to further implement open (continuous) challenges by supporting cloud compute and other infrastructures for (a) benchmarking of tools and automated submission of containerized tools for evaluation, (b) hosting of top-ranking tools through NCI FireCloud Resource and public tool repository such as Dockstore or ModelHub, and (c) hosting resulting image annotations as derived data in the Imaging Data Commons (IDC). All aforementioned NCI platforms are implemented on the Google Cloud Platform.

This collaboration with Synapse, enabled by NCI/NIH support through ITCR grant (Jamed Eddy, PI) and other NCI resources represents a major advancement in the challenge design and leveraging of public resources.

c) Provide the URL for the challenge website (if any).

<https://www.med.upenn.edu/cbica/brats2023/> - (Website will be publicly visible after the challenge approval)

Participation policies

a) Define the allowed user interaction of the algorithms assessed (e.g. only (semi-) automatic methods allowed).

Fully automatic.

b) Define the policy on the usage of training data. The data used to train algorithms may, for example, be restricted to the data provided by the challenge or to publicly available data including (open) pre-trained nets.

Participants are allowed to use additional data from publicly available datasets and their own institutions, for further complementing the data, but if they do so, they **MUST** also discuss the potential difference in their results after using only the BraTS 2023 data, since our intention is to solve the particular segmentation problem, but also to provide a fair comparison among the participating methods.

c) Define the participation policy for members of the organizers' institutes. For example, members of the organizers' institutes may participate in the challenge but are not eligible for awards.

May participate but organizers and their immediate groups will not be eligible for awards.

Since organizing institutions are large, other employees from other labs/departments may participate and should be eligible for the awards and to be listed in the leaderboard.

d) Define the award policy. In particular, provide details with respect to challenge prizes.

Following communication with 1) Intel and 2) Neosoma Inc, we have informal confirmation for the sponsorship of monetary awards for the top 3 teams. Formal confirmation can only be provided after the acceptance of the challenge. Note that Intel has been offering monetary awards during each of BraTS 2018-2022, and Neosoma for BraTS 2021.

The Lacuna Fund awarded to Dr Anazodo (Drs Bakas & Farouk, Co-Is) provides monetary awards for top performing teams from Africa to receive in conjunction with other available monetary awards. NIH/NCI will also provide Certificates of Merit to the top 3 performing teams.

e) Define the policy for result announcement.

Examples:

- Top 3 performing methods will be announced publicly.
- Participating teams can choose whether the performance results will be made public.

Top 3 performing methods will be announced publicly at the conference and the participants will be invited to present their method.

f) Define the publication policy. In particular, provide details on ...

- ... who of the participating teams/the participating teams' members qualifies as author
- ... whether the participating teams may publish their own results separately, and (if so)
- ... whether an embargo time is defined (so that challenge organizers can publish a challenge paper first).

The configuration of combining the BraTS challenge with the BrainLes workshop provides the BraTS participants with the option to extend their papers to 12-14 pages, and hence publish their methods in the workshop's LNCS post-conference proceedings. Furthermore, we intend to coordinate a journal manuscript focusing on publishing and summarizing the results of the challenge.

Submission method

a) Describe the method used for result submission. Preferably, provide a link to the submission instructions.

Examples:

- Docker container on the Synapse platform. Link to submission instructions: <URL>
- Algorithm output was sent to organizers via e-mail. Submission instructions were sent by e-mail.

The participants are required to send the output of their methods to the evaluation platform for the scoring to occur during the training and the validation phases. At the end of the validation phase the participants are asked to identify the method they would like to evaluate in the final testing/ranking phase. The organizers will then confirm receiving the containerized method and will evaluate it in the hidden testing data. The participants will be provided guidelines on the form of the container as we have done in previous years. This will enable confirmation of reproducibility, running of these algorithms to the previous BraTS instances and comparison with results obtained by algorithms of previous years, thereby maximizing solutions in solving the problem of brain tumor segmentation. During the training and validation phases, the participants will have the chance to test the functionality of their submission through both the Cancer Imaging Phenomics Toolkit (CaPTk [5-6], <https://github.com/CBICA/CaPTk>), and the Federated Tumor Segmentation (FeTS) Tool [7] (<https://fets-ai.github.io/Front-End/>) that offer the implementation of the evaluation metrics, as well as via the online evaluation platform (Synapse).

[5] C.Davatzikos, et al. "Cancer imaging phenomics toolkit: quantitative imaging analytics for precision diagnostics and predictive modeling of clinical outcome." *Journal of Medical Imaging*, 5.1:011018, 2018.

<https://doi.org/10.1117/1.jmi.5.1.011018>

[6] S.Pati, et al. "The cancer imaging phenomics toolkit (CaPTk): technical overview." International MICCAI Brainlesion Workshop. Springer, Cham, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46643-5_38

[7] S.Pati, et al, "The federated tumor segmentation (FeTS) tool: an open-source solution to further solid tumor research", Phys. Med. Biol. 67(20), 204002, 2022. DOI: 10.1088/1361-6560/ac9449

b) Provide information on the possibility for participating teams to evaluate their algorithms before submitting final results. For example, many challenges allow submission of multiple results, and only the last run is officially counted to compute challenge results.

We intend to release the validation set in April together with the training set, allowing participants to tune their methods in the unseen validation data. The validation data ground truth will not be provided to the participants, but multiple submissions to the online evaluation platform will be allowed for the validation phase. Only 2 submissions will be allowed in the final testing/ranking data/phase.

Challenge schedule

Provide a timetable for the challenge. Preferably, this should include

- the release date(s) of the training cases (if any)
- the registration date/period
- the release date(s) of the test cases and validation cases (if any)
- the submission date(s)
- associated workshop days (if any)
- the release date(s) of the results

Registration dates: From now until submission deadline of short papers reporting method and preliminary results (see below).

1 May 2023: Availability of training data (with ground truth labels) and validation data (without ground truth labels).

31 July 2023: Submission of short papers reporting method & preliminary results.

1-7 August 2023: Submission of containerized algorithm to the evaluation platform.

11 – 25 August 2023: Evaluation on testing data (by the organizers - only for participants with submitted papers).

8 September 2023: Contacting top performing methods for preparing slides for oral presentation.

8-12 October 2023: Announcement of final top 3 ranked teams: Challenge at MICCAI

30 November 2023: Camera-ready submission of extended papers for inclusion in the associated workshop proceedings

Ethics approval

Indicate whether ethics approval is necessary for the data. If yes, provide details on the ethics approval, preferably institutional review board, location, date and number of the ethics approval (if applicable). Add the URL or a reference to the document of the ethics approval (if available).

We are already in close coordination with The Cancer Imaging Archive (TCIA) and the Imaging Data Commons (IDC)

of the National Institutes of Health (NIH), to release the training and validation data following their standard licensing (<https://wiki.cancerimagingarchive.net/display/Public/Data+Usage+Policies+and+Restrictions>).

The TCIA has already approved this, and we are now in the process of submission (includes a detailed curation

process specific to TCIA). The cloud-based IDC is routinely updated with new collections from TCIA. IDC public collections are now part of the Google Public Datasets Program. This will effectively make all the BraTS data available in the Google Marketplace, increasing the potential for access to the data and downstream AI developments using Google's AI resources. IDC data are also expected to be available through the AWS (Amazon Web Services) Marketplace.

The brain MRI for Africa BraTS challenge is specifically retrospectively collected images where patient informed consent was not feasible. However institutional research ethics was approved by the Western University Health Research Ethics Board (REB #121287) and local sites contributing data are encouraged to also obtain local study ethics were available.

Data usage agreement

Clarify how the data can be used and distributed by the teams that participate in the challenge and by others during and after the challenge. This should include the explicit listing of the license applied.

Examples:

- CC BY (Attribution)
- CC BY-SA (Attribution-ShareAlike)
- CC BY-ND (Attribution-NoDerivs)
- CC BY-NC (Attribution-NonCommercial)
- CC BY-NC-SA (Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike)
- CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs)

CC BY.

Additional comments: Additional comments: CC-BY, but if any of the non-TCIA contributors object to this license, the specific subset of the BraTS data will be released under a CC-BY-NC license.

Code availability

a) Provide information on the accessibility of the organizers' evaluation software (e.g. code to produce rankings). Preferably, provide a link to the code and add information on the supported platforms.

The preprocessing tools, evaluation metrics, and the ranking code used during the whole challenge's lifecycle will be made available through the Cancer Imaging Phenomics Toolkit (CaPTk [5-6], <https://github.com/CBICA/CaPTk>), and the Federated Tumor Segmentation (FeTS) Platform [7] (<https://fets-ai.github.io/Front-End/>).

[5] C.Davatzikos, et al. "Cancer imaging phenomics toolkit: quantitative imaging analytics for precision diagnostics and predictive modeling of clinical outcome." *Journal of medical imaging*, 5.1:011018, 2018.

<https://doi.org/10.1117/1.jmi.5.1.011018>

[6] S.Pati, et al. "The cancer imaging phenomics toolkit (CaPTk): technical overview." *International MICCAI Brainlesion Workshop*. Springer, Cham, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46643-5_38

[7] S.Pati, et al, "The federated tumor segmentation (FeTS) tool: an open-source solution to further solid tumor research", *Phys. Med. Biol.* 67(20), 204002, 2022. DOI: 10.1088/1361-6560/ac9449

b) In an analogous manner, provide information on the accessibility of the participating teams' code.

The participants are required to submit their containerized algorithm, during or after the validation phase. Specific instructions for the containerization will be provided after the challenge approval. These instructions will be very

similar to what we were requesting participants to provide during the BraTS 2021 and 2022 challenges.

The National Cancer Institute takes special interest in the BraTS 2023 challenge and is considering providing infrastructural support in a number of ways. Dr Keyvan Farahani, a long time co-organizer of BraTS challenges and a project scientist on a collaborative NCI Informatics Technology for Cancer Research (ITCR) grant, is the recipient of an NIH Office of Data Science and Strategy (ODSS)-STRIDES award for “a sustainable medical imaging challenge cloud infrastructure,” to further implement open (continuous) challenges by supporting cloud compute and other infrastructures for (a) benchmarking of tools and automated submission of containerized tools for evaluation, (b) hosting of top-ranking tools through NCI FireCloud Resource and public tool repository such as Dockstore or ModelHub, and (c) hosting resulting image annotations as derived data in the Imaging Data Commons (IDC) on the Google Cloud Platform.

Conflicts of interest

Provide information related to conflicts of interest. In particular provide information related to sponsoring/funding of the challenge. Also, state explicitly who had/will have access to the test case labels and when.

Monetary awards are expected by Intel and Neosoma Inc and have been secured from Lacuna Fund.

Spyridon Bakas, Ujjwal Baid, Maruf Adewole, SAGE Bionetworks, and the clinical evaluators will have access to the validation, and test case labels.

MISSION OF THE CHALLENGE

Field(s) of application

State the main field(s) of application that the participating algorithms target.

Examples:

- Diagnosis
- Education
- Intervention assistance
- Intervention follow-up
- Intervention planning
- Prognosis
- Research
- Screening
- Training
- Cross-phase

Intervention planning, Treatment planning, Assistance, Research, Surgery, Diagnosis, Training, CAD, Education, Decision support.

Task category(ies)

State the task category(ies).

Examples:

- Classification
- Detection
- Localization
- Modeling
- Prediction
- Reconstruction
- Registration
- Retrieval
- Segmentation
- Tracking

Segmentation.

Cohorts

We distinguish between the target cohort and the challenge cohort. For example, a challenge could be designed around the task of medical instrument tracking in robotic kidney surgery. While the challenge could be based on ex vivo data obtained from a laparoscopic training environment with porcine organs (challenge cohort), the final biomedical application (i.e. robotic kidney surgery) would be targeted on real patients with certain characteristics defined by inclusion criteria such as restrictions regarding sex or age (target cohort).

a) Describe the target cohort, i.e. the subjects/objects from whom/which the data would be acquired in the final biomedical application.

Retrospective multi-institutional cohort of patients, diagnosed with de novo diffuse gliomas of the brain, clinically scanned with mpMRI acquisition protocol including i) pre-contrast and ii) contrast-enhanced T1-weighted, iii) T2-weighted and iv) T2-weighted Fluid Attenuated Inversion Recovery (FLAIR) MRI.

b) Describe the challenge cohort, i.e. the subject(s)/object(s) from whom/which the challenge data was acquired.

Retrospective multi-institutional cohort of patients, diagnosed with de novo diffuse gliomas of the brain, clinically scanned with mpMRI acquisition protocol including i) pre-contrast and ii) contrast-enhanced T1-weighted, iii) T2-weighted and iv) T2-weighted Fluid Attenuated Inversion Recovery (FLAIR) MRI.

Imaging modality(ies)

Specify the imaging technique(s) applied in the challenge.

MRI

Context information

Provide additional information given along with the images. The information may correspond ...

a) ... directly to the image data (e.g. tumor volume).

... directly to the image data (i.e., tumor sub-region volumes)

b) ... to the patient in general (e.g. sex, medical history).

N/A

Target entity(ies)

a) Describe the data origin, i.e. the region(s)/part(s) of subject(s)/object(s) from whom/which the image data would be acquired in the final biomedical application (e.g. brain shown in computed tomography (CT) data, abdomen shown in laparoscopic video data, operating room shown in video data, thorax shown in fluoroscopy video). If necessary, differentiate between target and challenge cohort.

Brain mpMRI scans.

b) Describe the algorithm target, i.e. the structure(s)/subject(s)/object(s)/component(s) that the participating algorithms have been designed to focus on (e.g. tumor in the brain, tip of a medical instrument, nurse in an operating theater, catheter in a fluoroscopy scan). If necessary, differentiate between target and challenge cohort.

Tumor in the brain.

Assessment aim(s)

Identify the property(ies) of the algorithms to be optimized to perform well in the challenge. If multiple properties are assessed, prioritize them (if appropriate). The properties should then be reflected in the metrics applied (see below, parameter metric(s)), and the priorities should be reflected in the ranking when combining multiple metrics that assess different properties.

- Example 1: Find highly accurate liver segmentation algorithm for CT images.
- Example 2: Find lung tumor detection algorithm with high sensitivity and specificity for mammography images.

Corresponding metrics are listed below (parameter metric(s)).

Sensitivity, Specificity, Precision.

Additional points: Dice, Hausdorff 95th percentile

DATA SETS**Data source(s)**

a) Specify the device(s) used to acquire the challenge data. This includes details on the device(s) used to acquire the imaging data (e.g. manufacturer) as well as information on additional devices used for performance assessment (e.g. tracking system used in a surgical setting).

The exact scanners and their technical specifications used for acquiring the TCIA cohort has been listed in the data reference published in our related manuscripts [1,2,4]. Since then, multiple institutions have contributed data to create the current RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS dataset and these are listed in the latest BraTS arxiv paper [1]. We are currently in coordination with TCIA to make the complete BraTS 2021-2023 dataset permanently available through their portal. All the acquisition details will be included together with the data availability in TCIA, and subsequently in IDC, including Google and AWS Marketplaces, as part of their Public Datasets Programs.

[1] U. Baid, et al., "The RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS 2021 Benchmark on Brain Tumor Segmentation and Radiogenomic Classification", arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.02314

[2] S.Bakas, et al., "Identifying the best machine learning algorithms for brain tumor segmentation, progression assessment, and overall survival prediction in the BRATS challenge", arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.02629

[4] S. Bakas, H. Akbari, A. Sotiras, M. Bilello, M. Rozycki, J.S. Kirby, et al., "Advancing The Cancer Genome Atlas glioma MRI collections with expert segmentation labels and radiomic features", Nature Scientific Data, 4:170117 (2017) DOI: 10.1038/sdata.2017.117

b) Describe relevant details on the imaging process/data acquisition for each acquisition device (e.g. image acquisition protocol(s)).

The acquisition protocols are different across (and within each) contributing institution, as these represent scans of real routine clinical practice. Specific details (e.g., echo time, repetition time, original acquisition plane) of each scan of each patient will be published as supplementary material together with the challenge meta-analysis manuscript.

c) Specify the center(s)/institute(s) in which the data was acquired and/or the data providing platform/source (e.g. previous challenge). If this information is not provided (e.g. for anonymization reasons), specify why.

The provided data describe mpMRI scans, acquired with different clinical protocols and various scanners from: Crestview Radiology, Lagos, Nigeria (1.5 T Siemens)

Lagos University Teaching Hospital, Lagos Nigeria (1.5T Toshiba/Canon)

Lagos State University Teaching Hospital, Lagos Nigeria (1.5T Siemens)

The National Hospital, Abuja, Nigeria (1.5 T Toshiba)

~~Aminu Kano Teaching Hospital, Lagos, Nigeria (1.5 T Siemens)~~

d) Describe relevant characteristics (e.g. level of expertise) of the subjects (e.g. surgeon)/objects (e.g. robot) involved in the data acquisition process (if any).

People involved in MRI acquisition for suspected and diagnosis of brain tumors during standard clinical practice.

Training and test case characteristics

a) State what is meant by one case in this challenge. A case encompasses all data that is processed to produce one result that is compared to the corresponding reference result (i.e. the desired algorithm output).

Examples:

- Training and test cases both represent a CT image of a human brain. Training cases have a weak annotation (tumor present or not and tumor volume (if any)) while the test cases are annotated with the tumor contour (if any).
- A case refers to all information that is available for one particular patient in a specific study. This information always includes the image information as specified in data source(s) (see above) and may include context information (see above). Both training and test cases are annotated with survival (binary) 5 years after (first) image was taken.

A case describes multi-parametric MRI scans for a single patient at a single timepoint. The exact scans included for one case are i) unenhanced and ii) contrast-enhanced T1-weighted, iii) T2-weighted and iv) T2 Fluid Attenuated Inversion Recovery (FLAIR) MRI.

Please note that all sequences included for each case of the provided dataset, represent the sequences with the best image quality available in the acquiring institution for this particular case. There was no inclusion/exclusion criterion applied that related to 3d acquisitions, or the exact type of pulse sequence (for example MPRAGE). We, instead, accepted all types of T1 acquisitions (with the exception of T1 FLAIR, as we did not want to mix the fluid suppressed values with non-flair scans) and then we applied the harmonized preprocessing protocol we have been using in BraTS, across the complete data. This preprocessing ensures all scans have 3D representations on a specific resolution (1mm³), and aligned to the same anatomical atlas.

b) State the total number of training, validation and test cases.

Training data: 200 cases

Validation data: 20 cases

Testing data: 80 cases

c) Explain why a total number of cases and the specific proportion of training, validation and test cases was chosen.

Based on availability.

d) Mention further important characteristics of the training, validation and test cases (e.g. class distribution in classification tasks chosen according to real-world distribution vs. equal class distribution) and justify the choice.

N/A

Annotation characteristics

a) Describe the method for determining the reference annotation, i.e. the desired algorithm output. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary. Possible methods include manual image annotation, in silico ground truth generation and annotation by automatic methods.

If human annotation was involved, state the number of annotators.

Reference approved from at least 2 experienced neuroradiologists, following annotations from 60 clinical neuroradiologists (volunteers from ASNR, ARIN, or other African Imaging Societies)

b) Provide the instructions given to the annotators (if any) prior to the annotation. This may include description of a training phase with the software. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary. Preferably, provide a link to the annotation protocol.

The data considered in this task of the BraTS 2023 challenge follows the paradigm of the BraTS 2021-2022 challenge data. The annotation of these data followed a pre-defined clinically-approved annotation protocol (defined by expert neuroradiologists), which was provided to all clinical annotators, describing in detail instructions on what the segmentations of each tumor sub-region should describe (see below for the summary of the specific instructions). The annotators were given the flexibility to use their tool of preference for making the annotations, and also follow either a complete manual annotation approach, or a hybrid approach where an automated approach is used to produce some initial annotations followed by their manual refinements.

Summary of specific instructions:

- i) the enhancing tumor (when present) delineates the hyperintense signal of the T1-Gd, after excluding the vessels.
- ii) the necrotic core (when present) outlines regions appearing dark in both T1 and T1-Gd images (denoting necrosis/cysts), and darkened regions in T1-Gd that appear brighter in T1.
- iii) the tumor core, which is the union of the enhancing tumor and the necrotic core described in (i) and (ii) above.
- iv) the farthest tumor extent including the edema (what is called the whole tumor), delineates the tissue represented by the abnormal T2-FLAIR envelope.

c) Provide details on the subject(s)/algorithm(s) that annotated the cases (e.g. information on level of expertise such as number of years of professional experience, medically-trained or not). Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary.

Each case was assigned to a pair of annotator-approver. Annotators spanned across various experience levels and clinical/academic ranks, while the approvers were the 2 experienced board-certified neuroradiologists (with >15 years of experience), listed in the “Organizers” section as “clinical evaluators and annotation approvers”. The

annotators were given the flexibility to use their tool of preference for making the annotations, and also follow either a complete manual annotation approach, or a hybrid approach where an automated approach is used to produce some initial annotations followed by their manual refinements. Once the annotators were satisfied with the produced annotations, they were passing these to the corresponding approver. The approver is then responsible for signing off these annotations. Specifically, the approver would review the tumor annotations, in tandem with the corresponding MRI scans, and if the annotations were not of satisfactory quality they would be sent back to the annotators for further refinements. This iterative approach was followed for all cases, until their respective annotations reached satisfactory quality (according to the approver) for being publicly available and noted as final ground truth segmentation labels for these scans.

d) Describe the method(s) used to merge multiple annotations for one case (if any). Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary.

No Aggregation

Data pre-processing method(s)

Describe the method(s) used for pre-processing the raw training data before it is provided to the participating teams. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary.

The exact preprocessing pipeline applied to all the data considered in the BraTS 2023 challenge is identical with the one evaluated and followed by the BraTS 2017-2022 challenges. Specifically, following the conversion of the raw scans from their original DICOM file format to NIfTI file format [10], we first perform a re-orientation of all input scans (T1, T1- Gd, T2, T2-FLAIR) to the LPS/RAI orientation, and then register all of them to the same anatomical atlas (i.e., SRI-24 [9]) and interpolating to the same resolution as this atlas (1 mm³). The exact registration process comprises the following steps:

STEP 1: N4 Bias field correction (notably the application of N4 bias field correction is a temporary step. Taking into consideration we have previously [4] shown that use of non-parametric, non-uniform intensity normalization (i.e., N4) to correct for intensity non-uniformities caused by the inhomogeneity of the scanner's magnetic field during image acquisition obliterates the MRI signal relating to the abnormal/tumor regions, we intentionally use N4 bias field correction in the preprocessing pipeline to facilitate a more optimal rigid registration across the difference MRI sequences. However, after obtaining the related information (i.e., transformation matrices), we discard the bias field corrected scans, and we apply this transformation matrix towards the final co-registered output images used in the challenge).

STEP 2: Rigid Registration of T1, T2, T2-FLAIR to the T1-Gd scan, and obtain the corresponding transformation matrix.

STEP 3: Rigid Registration of T1-Gd scan to the SRI-24 atlas [9], and obtain the corresponding transformation matrix.

STEP 4: Join the obtained transformation matrices and applying aggregated transformation to the LPS-oriented scans.

STEP 5: After completion of the registration process, we perform brain extraction to remove any apparent non-brain tissue (e.g., neck fat, skull, eyeballs) based on a deep-learning approach we developed in house, focusing on scans with apparent brain tumors and exhaustively evaluated it in both private and public multi-institutional data [11]. We then manually assessed all scans for confirming the correct brain extraction (i.e., skull stripping), where the complete brain region is included, and all non-brain tissue is excluded. This whole pipeline, and its source code are available through the CaPTk [5-6](<https://github.com/CBICA/CaPTk>) and FeTS [7] (<https://fets-ai.github.io/Front-End/>) platforms.

- [4] S. Bakas, H. Akbari, A. Sotiras, M. Bilello, M. Rozycki, J.S. Kirby, et al., "Advancing The Cancer Genome Atlas glioma MRI collections with expert segmentation labels and radiomic features", *Nature Scientific Data*, 4:170117, 2017. DOI: 10.1038/sdata.2017.117
- [9] T. Rohlfing, et al. The SRI24 multichannel atlas of normal adult human brain structure. *Hum Brain Mapp.* 31(5):798-819, 2010.
- [10] R.Cox, J.Ashburner, H.Breman, K.Fissell, C.Haselgrove, C.Holmes, J.Lancaster, D.Rex, S.Smith, J.Woodward, "A (Sort of) new image data format standard: NIfTI-1: WE 150", *Neuroimage*, 22, 2004.
- [11] S.Thakur, J.Doshi, S.Pati, S.Rathore, C.Sako, M.Bilello, S.M.Ha, G.Shukla, A.Flanders, A.Kotrotsou, M.Milchenko, S.Liem, G.S.Alexander, J.Lombardo, J.D.Palmer, P.LaMontagne, A.Nazeri, S.Talbar, U.Kulkarni, D.Marcus, R.Colen, C.Davatzikos, G.Erus, S.Bakas, "Brain Extraction on MRI Scans in Presence of Diffuse Glioma: Multi-institutional Performance Evaluation of Deep Learning Methods and Robust Modality-Agnostic Training", *NeuroImage*, 220: 117081, 2020. DOI: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.117081

Sources of error

a) Describe the most relevant possible error sources related to the image annotation. If possible, estimate the magnitude (range) of these errors, using inter-and intra-annotator variability, for example. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases, if necessary.

Study and evaluation of the effect of this error is addressed by the uncertainty task of BraTS 2019-2020 (i.e., to quantify the uncertainty in the tumor segmentations) [8] and is outside the scope of the BraTS 2022 challenge.

[8] R.Mehta, et al, "QU-BraTS: MICCAI BraTS 2020 Challenge on Quantifying Uncertainty in Brain Tumor Segmentation-Analysis of Ranking Scores and Benchmarking Results", *Journal of Machine Learning for Biomedical Imaging*, 1, 26, 2022

b) In an analogous manner, describe and quantify other relevant sources of error.

N/A

ASSESSMENT METHODS

Metric(s)

a) Define the metric(s) to assess a property of an algorithm. These metrics should reflect the desired algorithm properties described in assessment aim(s) (see above). State which metric(s) were used to compute the ranking(s) (if any).

- Example 1: Dice Similarity Coefficient (DSC)
- Example 2: Area under curve (AUC)

Dice Similarity Coefficient (DSC),

95% Hausdorff distance (HD),

Sensitivity,

Specificity,

Precision

The regions evaluated using these metrics describe the whole tumor, the tumor core, and the enhancing tumor (when present). Note that the tumor core includes the part of the tumor that is typically resected (i.e., enhancing, non-enhancing, and necrotic tumor), and the whole tumor describes all tumor sub-regions (i.e., tumor core and

edema/invasion).

b) Justify why the metric(s) was/were chosen, preferably with reference to the biomedical application.

In terms of the assessed and evaluated tumor sub-regions:

- i) the enhancing tumor describes the regions of active tumor and based on this, clinical practice characterizes the extent of resection.
- ii) the tumor core (incl. the necrotic component) describes what is typically resected during a surgical procedure.
- iii) the whole tumor as it defines the whole extent of the tumor, including the peritumoral edematous tissue and highly infiltrated area.

In terms of evaluation metrics, we use:

- i) the Dice Similarity Coefficient, which is commonly used in the assessment of segmentation performance,
- ii) the 95% Hausdorff distance as opposed to standard HD, in order to avoid outliers having too much weight,
- iii) Sensitivity and Specificity to determine whether an algorithm has the tendency to over- or undersegment.
- iv) Precision to complement the metric of Sensitivity (also known as recall).

Ranking method(s)

a) Describe the method used to compute a performance rank for all submitted algorithms based on the generated metric results on the test cases. Typically the text will describe how results obtained per case and metric are aggregated to arrive at a final score/ranking.

For ranking of multidimensional outcomes (or metrics), for each team, we will compute the summation of their ranks across the average of the metrics described above as a univariate overall summary measure. This measure will decide the overall ranking for each specific team. To visualize the results in an intuitive fashion, we propose to visualize the outcome via an augmented version of radar plot [6].

[12] Duan R, Tong J, Lin L, Levine LD, Sammel MD, Stoddard J, Li T, Schmid CH, Chu H, Chen Y. PALM: Patient centered Treatment Ranking via Large-scale Multivariate Network Meta-analysis. medRxiv. 2020 Jan 1

b) Describe the method(s) used to manage submissions with missing results on test cases.

If an algorithm fails to produce a result metric for a specific test case, this metric will be set to its worst possible value (0 for the DSC and the image diagonal for the HD).

c) Justify why the described ranking scheme(s) was/were used.

Following discussions with the biostatistician involved in the design of this challenge (Dr Shinohara), and also while considering transparency and fairness to the participants.

Statistical analyses

- a) Provide details for the statistical methods used in the scope of the challenge analysis. This may include
- description of the missing data handling,
 - details about the assessment of variability of rankings,
 - description of any method used to assess whether the data met the assumptions, required for the particular statistical approach, or
 - indication of any software product that was used for all data analysis methods.

Similar to BraTS 2017-2022, uncertainties in rankings will be assessed using permutational analyses [3]. Performance for the segmentation task will be assessed based on relative performance of each team on each tumor tissue class and for each segmentation measure. These will be combined by averaging ranks for the measures, and statistical significance will be evaluated only for the segmentation performance measures and will be quantified by permuting the relative ranks for each segmentation measure and tissue class per subject of the testing data.

[2] S. Bakas et al., "Identifying the Best Machine Learning Algorithms for Brain Tumor Segmentation, Progression Assessment, and Overall Survival Prediction in the BRATS Challenge," arXiv:1811.02629 [cs, stat], Apr. 2019, Accessed: Dec. 10, 2020. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1811.02629>.

b) Justify why the described statistical method(s) was/were used.

This permutation testing would reflect differences in performance that exceeded those that might be expected by chance.

Further analyses

Present further analyses to be performed (if applicable), e.g. related to

- combining algorithms via ensembling,
- inter-algorithm variability,
- common problems/biases of the submitted methods, or
- ranking variability.

N/A

TASK: TASK 3: Segmentation of Intracranial Meningioma

SUMMARY

Abstract

Provide a summary of the challenge purpose. This should include a general introduction in the topic from both a biomedical as well as from a technical point of view and clearly state the envisioned technical and/or biomedical impact of the challenge.

Meningioma is the most common primary intracranial tumor and can result in significant morbidity and mortality for affected patients. Most meningiomas are benign (approximately 80%) and are typically well controlled with surgical resection and/or radiation therapy. However, higher grade meningiomas (World Health Organization [WHO] grades 2 and 3) are associated with significantly higher morbidity and mortality rates and often recur despite optimal management. Currently there is no reliable noninvasive method for identifying meningioma grade, assessing aggressiveness, or predicting recurrence and survival.

Automated tumor segmentation on brain MRI has matured into a clinically viable tool that can provide objective assessments of tumor volume and can assist in surgical planning, radiotherapy, and treatment response assessment. However, to date most tumor segmentation studies have focused on gliomas. Meningiomas, while typically more circumscribed than gliomas, provide additional technical challenges given their extra-axial location and propensity for skull-base involvement.

The purpose of this challenge is to develop an automated intracranial meningioma brain MRI segmentation algorithm. This algorithm, if successful, will provide an important tool for objective assessment of tumor volume as well as surgical and radiotherapy planning. In addition, this algorithm will provide a starting point for future studies focused on identifying meningioma grade, assessing aggressiveness, and predicting risk of recurrence. The first phase of this task (corresponding to the current proposal) will focus on multicompartiment segmentation of preoperative meningioma using the four standard structural MRI contrasts: T1-weighted, T2-weighted, T2-weighted FLAIR, and T1-weighted postcontrast. Segmented compartments will include the tumor (including any non-enhancing and/or calcified components) as well as any surrounding brain parenchymal signal abnormality (reflecting edematous and/or inflamed brain). All intracranial meningiomas will be included in the challenge dataset regardless of location.

Keywords

List the primary keywords that characterize the task.

Meningioma, Segmentation, Challenge, brain tumor, neuro-oncology, MICCAI, NCI, DREAM

ORGANIZATION

Organizers

a) Provide information on the organizing team (names and affiliations).

Organizing team:

=====

Evan Calabrese MD PhD – [Lead Organizer]

Duke University Medical Center, Department of Radiology

Walter Wiggins MD PhD

Duke University Medical Center, Department of Radiology

Zachary Reitman MD PhD

Duke University Medical Center, Department of Radiation Oncology

Chunhao Wang PhD

Duke University Medical Center, Department of Radiation Oncology

Dominic LaBella MD

Duke University Medical Center, Department of Radiation Oncology

Spyridon Bakas

Center for AI and Data Science for Integrated Diagnostics (AI2D), University of Pennsylvania,
Philadelphia, PA, USA

Ujjwal Baid

Center for AI and Data Science for Integrated Diagnostics (AI2D), University of Pennsylvania,
Philadelphia, PA, USA

Keyvan Farahani PhD

Center for Biomedical Informatics and Information Technology National
Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health

Jake Albrecht

Sage Bionetworks

James Eddy PhD

Sage Bionetworks

Timothy Bergquist

Sage Bionetworks

Thomas Yu

Sage Bionetworks

Verena Chung

Sage Bionetworks

Russell (Taki) Shinohara PhD

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Clinical Evaluators and Annotation Approvers:

=====

Evan Calabrese MD PhD

Duke University Medical Center, Department of Radiology

Walter Wiggins MD PhD

Duke University Medical Center, Department of Radiology

Annotation Volunteers

=====

Evan Calabrese MD PhD

Duke University Medical Center, Department of Radiology

Zachary Reitman MD PhD

Duke University Medical Center, Department of Radiation Oncology

Dominic LaBella MD

Duke University Medical Center, Department of Radiation Oncology

Goldey Khanna MD

Thomas Jefferson University Medical Center, Department of Neurosurgery

Data Contributors:

=====

Evan Calabrese MD PhD – [Lead Organizer - Contact Person edc15@duke.edu]

Duke University Medical Center, Department of Radiology

Javier Villanueva-Meyer MD

University of California San Francisco, Department of Radiology & Biomedical Imaging

Zachary Reitman MD PhD

Duke University Medical Center, Department of Radiation Oncology

Chunhao Wang PhD

Duke University Medical Center, Department of Radiation Oncology

John Kirkpatrick MD PhD

Duke University Medical Center, Department of Radiation Oncology

Spyridon Bakas, PhD, & Ujjwal Baid, PhD

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Goldey Khanna MD

Thomas Jefferson University Medical Center, Department of Neurosurgery

b) Provide information on the primary contact person.

Evan Calabrese MD PhD [Lead Organizer - Contact Person]

Assistant Professor, Duke University Medical Center, Department of Radiology

Email id: edc15@duke.edu

Life cycle type

Define the intended submission cycle of the challenge. Include information on whether/how the challenge will be continued after the challenge has taken place. Not every challenge closes after the submission deadline (one-time event). Sometimes it is possible to submit results after the deadline (open call) or the challenge is repeated with some modifications (repeated event).

Examples:

- One-time event with fixed conference submission deadline
- Open call (challenge opens for new submissions after conference deadline)
- Repeated event with annual fixed conference submission deadline

Repeated event with annual fixed conference submission deadline

Challenge venue and platform

a) Report the event (e.g. conference) that is associated with the challenge (if any).

MICCAI.

b) Report the platform (e.g. grand-challenge.org) used to run the challenge.

Following our successful collaboration with the Synapse platform (SAGE Bionetworks) since the RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS 2021 challenge [1], we have coordinated with them and following the support from NCI (represented by Dr Keyvan Farahani in the organizing committee - Chair of the NCI AI Challenges Working Group) Synapse will be used as the platform to drive the evaluation of this cluster of challenges.

The National Cancer Institute takes special interest in the BraTS 2023 challenge and is considering providing infrastructural support in a number of ways. Dr Keyvan Farahani, a long-time co-organizer of BraTS challenges and a project scientist on a collaborative NCI Informatics Technology for Cancer Research (ITCR) grant, is the recipient of an NIH Office of Data Science and Strategy (ODSS)-STRIDES award for “a sustainable medical imaging challenge cloud infrastructure,” to further implement open (continuous) challenges by supporting cloud compute and other infrastructures for (a) benchmarking of tools and automated submission of containerized tools for evaluation, (b) hosting of top-ranking tools through NCI FireCloud Resource and public tool repository such as Dockstore or ModelHub, and (c) hosting resulting image annotations as derived data in the Imaging Data Commons (IDC). All aforementioned NCI platforms are implemented on the Google Cloud Platform.

This collaboration with Synapse, enabled by NCI/NIH support through ITCR grant (Jamed Eddy, PI) and other NCI resources represents a major advancement in the challenge design and leveraging of public resources.

c) Provide the URL for the challenge website (if any).

<https://www.med.upenn.edu/cbica/brats2023/> - (Website will be publicly visible after the challenge approval)

Participation policies

a) Define the allowed user interaction of the algorithms assessed (e.g. only (semi-) automatic methods allowed).

Fully automatic.

b) Define the policy on the usage of training data. The data used to train algorithms may, for example, be restricted to the data provided by the challenge or to publicly available data including (open) pre-trained nets.

Participants are allowed to use additional data from publicly available datasets and their own institutions, for further complementing the data, but if they do so, they **MUST** also discuss the potential difference in their results after using only the BraTS 2023 data, since our intention is to solve the particular segmentation problem, but also to provide a fair comparison among the participating methods.

c) Define the participation policy for members of the organizers' institutes. For example, members of the organizers' institutes may participate in the challenge but are not eligible for awards.

May participate but organizers and their immediate groups will not be eligible for awards.

Since organizing institutions are large, other employees from other labs/departments may participate and should be eligible for the awards and to be listed in the leaderboard.

d) Define the award policy. In particular, provide details with respect to challenge prizes.

Following communication with 1) Intel and 2) Neosoma Inc, we have informal confirmation for the sponsorship of monetary awards for the top 3 teams. Formal confirmation can only be provided after the acceptance of the challenge.

Note that Intel has been offering monetary awards during each of BraTS 2018-2022, and Neosoma for BraTS 2021.

NIH/NCI will also provide Certificates of Merit to the top 3 performing teams.

e) Define the policy for result announcement.

Examples:

- Top 3 performing methods will be announced publicly.
- Participating teams can choose whether the performance results will be made public.

Top 3 performing methods will be announced publicly at the conference and the participants will be invited to present their method.

f) Define the publication policy. In particular, provide details on ...

- ... who of the participating teams/the participating teams' members qualifies as author
- ... whether the participating teams may publish their own results separately, and (if so)
- ... whether an embargo time is defined (so that challenge organizers can publish a challenge paper first).

The configuration of combining the BraTS challenge with the BrainLes workshop provides the BraTS participants with the option to extend their papers to 12-14 pages, and hence publish their methods in the workshop's LNCS post-conference proceedings. Furthermore, we intend to coordinate a journal manuscript focusing on publishing and summarizing the results of the challenge.

Submission method

a) Describe the method used for result submission. Preferably, provide a link to the submission instructions.

Examples:

- Docker container on the Synapse platform. Link to submission instructions: <URL>
- Algorithm output was sent to organizers via e-mail. Submission instructions were sent by e-mail.

The participants are required to send the output of their methods to the evaluation platform for the scoring to occur during the training and the validation phases. At the end of the validation phase the participants are asked to identify the method they would like to evaluate in the final testing/ranking phase. The organizers will then confirm receiving the containerized method and will evaluate it in the hidden testing data. The participants will be provided guidelines on the form of the container as we have done in previous years. This will enable confirmation of reproducibility, running of these algorithms to the previous BraTS instances and comparison with results obtained by algorithms of previous years, thereby maximizing solutions in solving the problem of brain tumor segmentation. During the training and validation phases, the participants will have the chance to test the

functionality of their submission through both the Cancer Imaging Phenomics Toolkit (CaPTk [5-6], <https://github.com/CBICA/CaPTk>), and the Federated Tumor Segmentation (FeTS) Tool [7] (<https://fets-ai.github.io/Front-End/>) that offer the implementation of the evaluation metrics, as well as via the online evaluation platform (Synapse).

[5] C.Davatzikos, et al. "Cancer imaging phenomics toolkit: quantitative imaging analytics for precision diagnostics and predictive modeling of clinical outcome." *Journal of Medical Imaging*, 5.1:011018, 2018.

<https://doi.org/10.1117/1.jmi.5.1.011018>

[6] S.Pati, et al. "The cancer imaging phenomics toolkit (CaPTk): technical overview." *International MICCAI Brainlesion Workshop*. Springer, Cham, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46643-5_38

[7] S.Pati, et al, "The federated tumor segmentation (FeTS) tool: an open-source solution to further solid tumor research", *Phys. Med. Biol.* 67(20), 204002, 2022. DOI: 10.1088/1361-6560/ac9449

b) Provide information on the possibility for participating teams to evaluate their algorithms before submitting final results. For example, many challenges allow submission of multiple results, and only the last run is officially counted to compute challenge results.

We intend to release the validation set in April together with the training set, allowing participants to tune their methods in the unseen validation data. The validation data ground truth will not be provided to the participants, but multiple submissions to the online evaluation platform will be allowed for the validation phase. Only 2 submissions will be allowed in the final testing/ranking data/phase.

Challenge schedule

Provide a timetable for the challenge. Preferably, this should include

- the release date(s) of the training cases (if any)
- the registration date/period
- the release date(s) of the test cases and validation cases (if any)
- the submission date(s)
- associated workshop days (if any)
- the release date(s) of the results

Registration dates: From now until submission deadline of short papers reporting method and preliminary results (see below).

17 April 2023: Availability of training data (with ground truth labels) and validation data (without ground truth labels).

31 July 2023: Submission of short papers reporting method & preliminary results.

1-7 August 2023: Submission of containerized algorithm to the evaluation platform.

11 – 25 August 2023: Evaluation on testing data (by the organizers - only for participants with submitted papers).

8 September 2023: Contacting top performing methods for preparing slides for oral presentation.

8-12 October 2023: Announcement of final top 3 ranked teams: Challenge at MICCAI

30 November 2023: Camera-ready submission of extended papers for inclusion in the associated workshop proceedings

Ethics approval

Indicate whether ethics approval is necessary for the data. If yes, provide details on the ethics approval, preferably institutional review board, location, date and number of the ethics approval (if applicable). Add the URL or a reference to the document of the ethics approval (if available).

We are already in close coordination with The Cancer Imaging Archive (TCIA) and the Imaging Data Commons (IDC) of the National Institutes of Health (NIH), to release the training and validation data following their standard licensing (<https://wiki.cancerimagingarchive.net/display/Public/Data+Usage+Policies+and+Restrictions>).

The TCIA has already approved this, and we are now in the process of submission (includes a detailed curation process specific to TCIA). The cloud-based IDC is routinely updated with new collections from TCIA. IDC public collections are now part of the Google Public Datasets Program. This will effectively make all the BraTS data available in the Google Marketplace, increasing the potential for access to the data and downstream AI developments using Google's AI resources. IDC data are also expected to be available through the AWS (Amazon Web Services) Marketplace.

Informed consent was obtained from all subjects at their respective institutions, and the protocol for releasing the data was approved by the institutional review board of the data-contributing institution.

Data usage agreement

Clarify how the data can be used and distributed by the teams that participate in the challenge and by others during and after the challenge. This should include the explicit listing of the license applied.

Examples:

- CC BY (Attribution)
- CC BY-SA (Attribution-ShareAlike)
- CC BY-ND (Attribution-NoDerivs)
- CC BY-NC (Attribution-NonCommercial)
- CC BY-NC-SA (Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike)
- CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs)

CC BY.

Additional comments: Additional comments: CC-BY, but if any of the non-TCIA contributors object to this license, the specific subset of the BraTS data will be released under a CC-BY-NC license.

Code availability

a) Provide information on the accessibility of the organizers' evaluation software (e.g. code to produce rankings). Preferably, provide a link to the code and add information on the supported platforms.

The preprocessing tools, evaluation metrics, and the ranking code used during the whole challenge's lifecycle will be made available through the Cancer Imaging Phenomics Toolkit (CaPTk [5-6], <https://github.com/CBICA/CaPTk>), and the Federated Tumor Segmentation (FeTS) Platform [7] (<https://fets-ai.github.io/Front-End/>).

[5] C.Davatzikos, et al. "Cancer imaging phenomics toolkit: quantitative imaging analytics for precision diagnostics and predictive modeling of clinical outcome." *Journal of medical imaging*, 5.1:011018, 2018.
<https://doi.org/10.1117/1.jmi.5.1.011018>

[6] S.Pati, et al. "The cancer imaging phenomics toolkit (CaPTk): technical overview." International MICCAI Brainlesion Workshop. Springer, Cham, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46643-5_38

[7] S.Pati, et al, "The federated tumor segmentation (FeTS) tool: an open-source solution to further solid tumor research", Phys. Med. Biol. 67(20), 204002, 2022. DOI: 10.1088/1361-6560/ac9449

b) In an analogous manner, provide information on the accessibility of the participating teams' code.

The participants are required to submit their containerized algorithm, during or after the validation phase. Specific instructions for the containerization will be provided after the challenge approval. These instructions will be very similar to what we were requesting participants to provide during the BraTS 2021 and 2022 challenges.

The National Cancer Institute takes special interest in the BraTS 2023 challenge and is considering providing infrastructural support in a number of ways. Dr Keyvan Farahani, a long time co-organizer of BraTS challenges and a project scientist on a collaborative NCI Informatics Technology for Cancer Research (ITCR) grant, is the recipient of an NIH Office of Data Science and Strategy (ODSS)-STRIDES award for "a sustainable medical imaging challenge cloud infrastructure," to further implement open (continuous) challenges by supporting cloud compute and other infrastructures for (a) benchmarking of tools and automated submission of containerized tools for evaluation, (b) hosting of top-ranking tools through NCI FireCloud Resource and public tool repository such as Dockstore or ModelHub, and (c) hosting resulting image annotations as derived data in the Imaging Data Commons (IDC) on the Google Cloud Platform.

Conflicts of interest

Provide information related to conflicts of interest. In particular provide information related to sponsoring/funding of the challenge. Also, state explicitly who had/will have access to the test case labels and when.

Monetary awards are expected by Intel and Neosoma Inc

Spyridon Bakas, Ujjwal Baid, Evan Calabrese, SAGE Bionetworks, and the clinical evaluators will have access to the validation, and test case labels.

MISSION OF THE CHALLENGE

Field(s) of application

State the main field(s) of application that the participating algorithms target.

Examples:

- Diagnosis
- Education
- Intervention assistance
- Intervention follow-up
- Intervention planning
- Prognosis
- Research
- Screening
- Training
- Cross-phase

Intervention planning, Treatment planning, Assistance, Research, Surgery, Diagnosis, Training, CAD, Education, Decision support.

Task category(ies)

State the task category(ies).

Examples:

- Classification
- Detection
- Localization
- Modeling
- Prediction
- Reconstruction
- Registration
- Retrieval
- Segmentation
- Tracking

Segmentation.

Cohorts

We distinguish between the target cohort and the challenge cohort. For example, a challenge could be designed around the task of medical instrument tracking in robotic kidney surgery. While the challenge could be based on ex vivo data obtained from a laparoscopic training environment with porcine organs (challenge cohort), the final biomedical application (i.e. robotic kidney surgery) would be targeted on real patients with certain characteristics defined by inclusion criteria such as restrictions regarding sex or age (target cohort).

a) Describe the target cohort, i.e. the subjects/objects from whom/which the data would be acquired in the final biomedical application.

Retrospective multi-institutional cohort of patients, diagnosed with meningioma, clinically scanned with mpMRI acquisition protocol including i) pre-contrast and ii) contrast-enhanced T1-weighted, iii) T2-weighted and iv) T2-weighted Fluid Attenuated Inversion Recovery (FLAIR) MRI.

b) Describe the challenge cohort, i.e. the subject(s)/object(s) from whom/which the challenge data was acquired.

Retrospective multi-institutional cohort of patients, diagnosed with meningioma, clinically scanned with mpMRI acquisition protocol including i) pre-contrast and ii) contrast-enhanced T1-weighted, iii) T2-weighted and iv) T2-weighted Fluid Attenuated Inversion Recovery (FLAIR) MRI.

Imaging modality(ies)

Specify the imaging technique(s) applied in the challenge.

MRI

Context information

Provide additional information given along with the images. The information may correspond ...

a) ... directly to the image data (e.g. tumor volume).

... directly to the image data (i.e., tumor sub-region volumes)

b) ... to the patient in general (e.g. sex, medical history).

N/A

Target entity(ies)

a) Describe the data origin, i.e. the region(s)/part(s) of subject(s)/object(s) from whom/which the image data would be acquired in the final biomedical application (e.g. brain shown in computed tomography (CT) data, abdomen shown in laparoscopic video data, operating room shown in video data, thorax shown in fluoroscopy video). If necessary, differentiate between target and challenge cohort.

Brain mpMRI scans.

b) Describe the algorithm target, i.e. the structure(s)/subject(s)/object(s)/component(s) that the participating algorithms have been designed to focus on (e.g. tumor in the brain, tip of a medical instrument, nurse in an operating theater, catheter in a fluoroscopy scan). If necessary, differentiate between target and challenge cohort.

Tumor in the brain.

Assessment aim(s)

Identify the property(ies) of the algorithms to be optimized to perform well in the challenge. If multiple properties are assessed, prioritize them (if appropriate). The properties should then be reflected in the metrics applied (see below, parameter metric(s)), and the priorities should be reflected in the ranking when combining multiple metrics that assess different properties.

- Example 1: Find highly accurate liver segmentation algorithm for CT images.
- Example 2: Find lung tumor detection algorithm with high sensitivity and specificity for mammography images.

Corresponding metrics are listed below (parameter metric(s)).

Sensitivity, Specificity, Precision.

Additional points: Dice, Hausdorff 95th percentile

DATA SETS**Data source(s)**

a) Specify the device(s) used to acquire the challenge data. This includes details on the device(s) used to acquire the imaging data (e.g. manufacturer) as well as information on additional devices used for performance assessment (e.g. tracking system used in a surgical setting).

The exact scanners and their technical specifications used for acquiring the TCIA cohort has been listed in the data reference published in our related manuscripts [1,2,4]. Since then, multiple institutions have contributed data to create the current RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS dataset and these are listed in the latest BraTS arxiv paper [1]. We are currently in coordination with TCIA to make the complete BraTS 2021-2023 dataset permanently available through their portal. All the acquisition details will be included together with the data availability in TCIA, and subsequently in IDC, including Google and AWS Marketplaces, as part of their Public Datasets Programs.

[1] U. Baid, et al., "The RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS 2021 Benchmark on Brain Tumor Segmentation and Radiogenomic Classification", arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.02314

[2] S. Bakas, et al., "Identifying the best machine learning algorithms for brain tumor segmentation, progression assessment, and overall survival prediction in the BRATS challenge", arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.02629

[4] S. Bakas, H. Akbari, A. Sotiras, M. Bilello, M. Rozycki, J.S. Kirby, et al., "Advancing The Cancer Genome Atlas

glioma MRI collections with expert segmentation labels and radiomic features", Nature Scientific Data, 4:170117 (2017) DOI: 10.1038/sdata.2017.117

b) Describe relevant details on the imaging process/data acquisition for each acquisition device (e.g. image acquisition protocol(s)).

The acquisition protocols are different across (and within each) contributing institution, as these represent scans of real routine clinical practice. Specific details (e.g., echo time, repetition time, original acquisition plane) of each scan of each patient will be published as supplementary material together with the challenge meta-analysis manuscript.

c) Specify the center(s)/institute(s) in which the data was acquired and/or the data providing platform/source (e.g. previous challenge). If this information is not provided (e.g. for anonymization reasons), specify why.

The provided data describe mpMRI scans, acquired with different clinical protocols and various scanners from: Duke University, University California San Francisco, University of Pennsylvania, Thomas Jefferson University, Cornell University.

d) Describe relevant characteristics (e.g. level of expertise) of the subjects (e.g. surgeon)/objects (e.g. robot) involved in the data acquisition process (if any).

People involved in MRI acquisition for suspected and diagnosis of brain tumors during standard clinical practice.

Training and test case characteristics

a) State what is meant by one case in this challenge. A case encompasses all data that is processed to produce one result that is compared to the corresponding reference result (i.e. the desired algorithm output).

Examples:

- Training and test cases both represent a CT image of a human brain. Training cases have a weak annotation (tumor present or not and tumor volume (if any)) while the test cases are annotated with the tumor contour (if any).
- A case refers to all information that is available for one particular patient in a specific study. This information always includes the image information as specified in data source(s) (see above) and may include context information (see above). Both training and test cases are annotated with survival (binary) 5 years after (first) image was taken.

A case describes multi-parametric MRI scans for a single patient at a single timepoint. The exact scans included for one case are i) unenhanced and ii) contrast-enhanced T1-weighted, iii) T2-weighted and iv) T2 Fluid Attenuated Inversion Recovery (FLAIR) MRI.

Please note that all sequences included for each case of the provided dataset, represent the sequences with the best image quality available in the acquiring institution for this particular case. There was no inclusion/exclusion criterion applied that related to 3d acquisitions, or the exact type of pulse sequence (for example MPAGE). We, instead, accepted all types of T1 acquisitions (with the exception of T1 FLAIR, as we did not want to mix the fluid suppressed values with non-flair scans) and then we applied the harmonized preprocessing protocol we have been using in BraTS, across the complete data. This preprocessing ensures all scans have 3D representations on a specific resolution (1mm^3), and aligned to the same anatomical atlas.

b) State the total number of training, validation and test cases.

Training data: 700 cases

Validation data: 100 cases

Testing data: 300 cases

c) Explain why a total number of cases and the specific proportion of training, validation and test cases was chosen.

Based on availability.

d) Mention further important characteristics of the training, validation and test cases (e.g. class distribution in classification tasks chosen according to real-world distribution vs. equal class distribution) and justify the choice.

N/A

Annotation characteristics

a) Describe the method for determining the reference annotation, i.e. the desired algorithm output. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary. Possible methods include manual image annotation, in silico ground truth generation and annotation by automatic methods.

If human annotation was involved, state the number of annotators.

Reference approved from at least 2 experienced neuroradiologists, following annotations from 60 clinical neuroradiologists (volunteers from ASNR)

b) Provide the instructions given to the annotators (if any) prior to the annotation. This may include description of a training phase with the software. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary. Preferably, provide a link to the annotation protocol.

The data considered in this task of the BraTS 2023 challenge follows the paradigm of the BraTS 2021-2022 challenge data. The annotation of these data followed a pre-defined clinically-approved annotation protocol (defined by expert neuroradiologists), which was provided to all clinical annotators, describing in detail instructions on what the segmentations of each tumor sub-region should describe (see below for the summary of the specific instructions). The annotators were given the flexibility to use their tool of preference for making the annotations, and also follow either a complete manual annotation approach, or a hybrid approach where an automated approach is used to produce some initial annotations followed by their manual refinements.

Summary of specific instructions:

- i) the enhancing tumor (when present) delineates the hyperintense signal of the T1-Gd, after excluding the vessels.
- ii) the necrotic core (when present) outlines regions appearing dark in both T1 and T1-Gd images (denoting necrosis/cysts), and darkened regions in T1-Gd that appear brighter in T1.
- iii) the tumor core, which is the union of the enhancing tumor and the necrotic core described in (i) and (ii) above.
- iv) the farthest tumor extent including the edema (what is called the whole tumor), delineates the tissue represented by the abnormal T2-FLAIR envelope.

c) Provide details on the subject(s)/algorithm(s) that annotated the cases (e.g. information on level of expertise such as number of years of professional experience, medically-trained or not). Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary.

Each case was assigned to a pair of annotator-approver. Annotators spanned across various experience levels and clinical/academic ranks, while the approvers were 2 board-certified neuroradiologists, listed in the “Organizers” section as “clinical evaluators and annotation approvers”. The annotators were given the flexibility to use their

tool of preference for making the annotations, and also follow either a complete manual annotation approach, or a hybrid approach where an automated approach is used to produce some initial annotations followed by their manual refinements. Once the annotators were satisfied with the produced annotations, they were passing these to the corresponding approver. The approver is then responsible for signing off these annotations. Specifically, the approver would review the tumor annotations, in tandem with the corresponding MRI scans, and if the annotations were not of satisfactory quality they would be sent back to the annotators for further refinements. This iterative approach was followed for all cases, until their respective annotations reached satisfactory quality (according to the approver) for being publicly available and noted as final ground truth segmentation labels for these scans.

d) Describe the method(s) used to merge multiple annotations for one case (if any). Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary.

No Aggregation

Data pre-processing method(s)

Describe the method(s) used for pre-processing the raw training data before it is provided to the participating teams. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary.

The exact preprocessing pipeline applied to all the data considered in the BraTS 2023 challenge is identical with the one evaluated and followed by the BraTS 2017-2022 challenges. Specifically, following the conversion of the raw scans from their original DICOM file format to NIfTI file format [10], we first perform a re-orientation of all input scans (T1, T1- Gd, T2, T2-FLAIR) to the LPS/RAI orientation, and then register all of them to the same anatomical atlas (i.e., SRI-24 [9]) and interpolating to the same resolution as this atlas (1 mm³). The exact registration process comprises the following steps:

STEP 1: N4 Bias field correction (notably the application of N4 bias field correction is a temporary step. Taking into consideration we have previously [4] shown that use of non-parametric, non-uniform intensity normalization (i.e., N4) to correct for intensity non-uniformities caused by the inhomogeneity of the scanner's magnetic field during image acquisition obliterates the MRI signal relating to the abnormal/tumor regions, we intentionally use N4 bias field correction in the preprocessing pipeline to facilitate a more optimal rigid registration across the difference MRI sequences. However, after obtaining the related information (i.e., transformation matrices), we discard the bias field corrected scans, and we apply this transformation matrix towards the final co-registered output images used in the challenge).

STEP 2: Rigid Registration of T1, T2, T2-FLAIR to the T1-Gd scan, and obtain the corresponding transformation matrix.

STEP 3: Rigid Registration of T1-Gd scan to the SRI-24 atlas [9], and obtain the corresponding transformation matrix.

STEP 4: Join the obtained transformation matrices and applying aggregated transformation to the LPS-oriented scans.

STEP 5: After completion of the registration process, we perform brain extraction to remove any apparent non-brain tissue (e.g., neck fat, skull, eyeballs) based on a deep-learning approach we developed in house, focusing on scans with apparent brain tumors and exhaustively evaluated it in both private and public multi-institutional data [11]. We then manually assessed all scans for confirming the correct brain extraction (i.e., skull stripping), where the complete brain region is included, and all non-brain tissue is excluded. This whole pipeline, and its source code are available through the CaPTk [5-6](<https://github.com/CBICA/CaPTk>) and FeTS [7] (<https://fets-ai.github.io/Front-End/>) platforms.

- [4] S. Bakas, H. Akbari, A. Sotiras, M. Bilello, M. Rozycki, J.S. Kirby, et al., "Advancing The Cancer Genome Atlas glioma MRI collections with expert segmentation labels and radiomic features", *Nature Scientific Data*, 4:170117, 2017. DOI: 10.1038/sdata.2017.117
- [9] T. Rohlfing, et al. The SRI24 multichannel atlas of normal adult human brain structure. *Hum Brain Mapp.* 31(5):798-819, 2010.
- [10] R.Cox, J.Ashburner, H.Breman, K.Fissell, C.Haselgrove, C.Holmes, J.Lancaster, D.Rex, S.Smith, J.Woodward, "A (Sort of) new image data format standard: NIfTI-1: WE 150", *Neuroimage*, 22, 2004.
- [11] S.Thakur, J.Doshi, S.Pati, S.Rathore, C.Sako, M.Bilello, S.M.Ha, G.Shukla, A.Flanders, A.Kotrotsou, M.Milchenko, S.Liem, G.S.Alexander, J.Lombardo, J.D.Palmer, P.LaMontagne, A.Nazeri, S.Talbar, U.Kulkarni, D.Marcus, R.Colen, C.Davatzikos, G.Erus, S.Bakas, "Brain Extraction on MRI Scans in Presence of Diffuse Glioma: Multi-institutional Performance Evaluation of Deep Learning Methods and Robust Modality-Agnostic Training", *NeuroImage*, 220: 117081, 2020. DOI: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.117081

Sources of error

a) Describe the most relevant possible error sources related to the image annotation. If possible, estimate the magnitude (range) of these errors, using inter-and intra-annotator variability, for example. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases, if necessary.

Study and evaluation of the effect of this error is addressed by the uncertainty task of BraTS 2019-2020 (i.e., to quantify the uncertainty in the tumor segmentations) [8] and is outside the scope of the BraTS 2022 challenge.

[8] R.Mehta, et al, "QU-BraTS: MICCAI BraTS 2020 Challenge on Quantifying Uncertainty in Brain Tumor Segmentation-Analysis of Ranking Scores and Benchmarking Results", *Journal of Machine Learning for Biomedical Imaging*, 1, 26, 2022

b) In an analogous manner, describe and quantify other relevant sources of error.

N/A

ASSESSMENT METHODS

Metric(s)

a) Define the metric(s) to assess a property of an algorithm. These metrics should reflect the desired algorithm properties described in assessment aim(s) (see above). State which metric(s) were used to compute the ranking(s) (if any).

- Example 1: Dice Similarity Coefficient (DSC)
- Example 2: Area under curve (AUC)

Dice Similarity Coefficient (DSC),

95% Hausdorff distance (HD),

Sensitivity,

Specificity,

Precision

The regions evaluated using these metrics describe the whole tumor, the tumor core, and the enhancing tumor (when present). Note that the tumor core includes the part of the tumor that is typically resected (i.e., enhancing, non-enhancing, and necrotic tumor), and the whole tumor describes all tumor sub-regions (i.e., tumor core and

edema/invasion).

b) Justify why the metric(s) was/were chosen, preferably with reference to the biomedical application.

In terms of the assessed and evaluated tumor sub-regions:

- i) the enhancing tumor describes the regions of active tumor and based on this, clinical practice characterizes the extent of resection.
- ii) the tumor core (incl. the necrotic component) describes what is typically resected during a surgical procedure.
- iii) the whole tumor as it defines the whole extent of the tumor, including the peritumoral edematous tissue and highly infiltrated area.

In terms of evaluation metrics, we use:

- i) the Dice Similarity Coefficient, which is commonly used in the assessment of segmentation performance,
- ii) the 95% Hausdorff distance as opposed to standard HD, in order to avoid outliers having too much weight,
- iii) Sensitivity and Specificity to determine whether an algorithm has the tendency to over- or undersegment.
- iv) Precision to complement the metric of Sensitivity (also known as recall).

Ranking method(s)

a) Describe the method used to compute a performance rank for all submitted algorithms based on the generated metric results on the test cases. Typically the text will describe how results obtained per case and metric are aggregated to arrive at a final score/ranking.

For ranking of multidimensional outcomes (or metrics), for each team, we will compute the summation of their ranks across the average of the metrics described above as a univariate overall summary measure. This measure will decide the overall ranking for each specific team. To visualize the results in an intuitive fashion, we propose to visualize the outcome via an augmented version of radar plot [6].

[12] Duan R, Tong J, Lin L, Levine LD, Sammel MD, Stoddard J, Li T, Schmid CH, Chu H, Chen Y. PALM: Patient centered Treatment Ranking via Large-scale Multivariate Network Meta-analysis. medRxiv. 2020 Jan 1

b) Describe the method(s) used to manage submissions with missing results on test cases.

If an algorithm fails to produce a result metric for a specific test case, this metric will be set to its worst possible value (0 for the DSC and the image diagonal for the HD).

c) Justify why the described ranking scheme(s) was/were used.

Following discussions with the biostatistician involved in the design of this challenge (Dr Shinohara), and also while considering transparency and fairness to the participants.

Statistical analyses

- a) Provide details for the statistical methods used in the scope of the challenge analysis. This may include
- description of the missing data handling,
 - details about the assessment of variability of rankings,
 - description of any method used to assess whether the data met the assumptions, required for the particular statistical approach, or
 - indication of any software product that was used for all data analysis methods.

Similar to BraTS 2017-2022, uncertainties in rankings will be assessed using permutational analyses [3]. Performance for the segmentation task will be assessed based on relative performance of each team on each tumor tissue class and for each segmentation measure. These will be combined by averaging ranks for the measures, and statistical significance will be evaluated only for the segmentation performance measures and will be quantified by permuting the relative ranks for each segmentation measure and tissue class per subject of the testing data.

[2] S. Bakas et al., "Identifying the Best Machine Learning Algorithms for Brain Tumor Segmentation, Progression Assessment, and Overall Survival Prediction in the BRATS Challenge," arXiv:1811.02629 [cs, stat], Apr. 2019, Accessed: Dec. 10, 2020. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1811.02629>.

b) Justify why the described statistical method(s) was/were used.

This permutation testing would reflect differences in performance that exceeded those that might be expected by chance.

Further analyses

Present further analyses to be performed (if applicable), e.g. related to

- combining algorithms via ensembling,
- inter-algorithm variability,
- common problems/biases of the submitted methods, or
- ranking variability.

N/A

TASK: TASK 4: Segmentation of Brain Metastases

SUMMARY

Abstract

Provide a summary of the challenge purpose. This should include a general introduction in the topic from both a biomedical as well as from a technical point of view and clearly state the envisioned technical and/or biomedical impact of the challenge.

Background: Clinical monitoring of metastatic disease to the brain is laborious and time-consuming, especially in the setting of multiple metastases (multiple lesions on the same patient) and when performed manually. Response assessment in brain metastases based on maximal unidimensional diameter as per the RANO-BM guideline is commonly performed, however, accurate volumetric lesion and peri-lesional edema estimates can be crucial for clinical decision-making and enhance outcome prediction. The unique challenge of performing segmentations in brain metastases is that they are commonly small and detection and segmentation of lesions that are smaller than 10 mm has not demonstrated high dice coefficients in prior publications. This limitation in size is different from previously performed MICCAI BraTS challenges (on glioma segmentation), because gliomas are usually much larger on presentation scans and higher dice coefficients were achieved on prior glioma segmentation challenges. We propose that machine learning based auto-segmentation approach of brain metastases and perilesional edema will improve the time-efficiency, reproducibility and robustness against inter-rater variability.

Brain metastases are the most common CNS malignancy in adults and evaluation of brain metastases in clinical practice is commonly limited to comparison to one prior imaging study due to common presentation of multiple metastases in single patient. Detailed analysis of multiple patient lesions on multiple serial scans is impossible in current clinical practice because of the time it requires to assess a study. Therefore, development of automated segmentation tools for brain metastases are critical for providing high level of patient care. In addition, accurate detection of small metastatic lesions that are smaller than 10 mm and are an average of 1-2 mm is critical for patient prognosis and missing even a single lesion can result in patient requiring repeat interventions and experience delay in treatment. In addition, gross total volume of brain metastases in a patient is an important predictor of patient outcomes and is not currently available in clinical practice due to lack of volumetric segmentation tools that can be translated. Therefore, it is critical to develop novel segmentation algorithms for small brain metastases that detect and accurately volumetrically segment all lesions. Many of the algorithms that were developed for gliomas demonstrate high dice scores for larger metastases but their performance significantly drops off for small metastases. This challenge will be critical for development of novel segmentation and detection algorithms for brain metastases that are common in clinical practice and will provide algorithms that can be readily translated into clinical practice.

Keywords

List the primary keywords that characterize the task.

Metastasis, Segmentation, Challenge, brain tumor, neuro-oncology, MICCAI, NCI, DREAM

ORGANIZATION

Organizers

a) Provide information on the organizing team (names and affiliations).

Organizing team:

=====

Mariam Aboian – [Lead Organizer - Contact Person]

Yale University School of Medicine

Jeffrey D. Rudie, MD, PhD

University of California San Diego

Spyridon Bakas, Ph.D.

Center for AI and Data Science for Integrated Diagnostics (AI2D), University of Pennsylvania,
Philadelphia, PA, USA

Ujjwal Baid, Ph.D.

Center for AI and Data Science for Integrated Diagnostics (AI2D), University of Pennsylvania,
Philadelphia, PA, USA

Keyvan Farahani, Ph.D.

Center for Biomedical Informatics and Information Technology National
Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health

Jake Albrecht

Sage Bionetworks

James Eddy, Ph.D.

Sage Bionetworks

Timothy Bergquist

Sage Bionetworks

Thomas Yu

Sage Bionetworks

Verena Chung

Sage Bionetworks

Russell (Taki) Shinohara, Ph.D.

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Clinical Evaluators and Annotation Approvers:

=====

Ichiro Ikuta, MD

Mayo Clinic College of Medicine

Sandra Abi Fadel, MD

Yale University School of Medicine

Annotation Volunteers

(in order of decreasing data contributions)

=====

Anastasia Janas, Yale University School of Medicine

The lead organizers is currently in recruitment of additional neuroradiology residents from Yale University.

Data Contributors:

=====

Jeffrey Rudie, MD/PhD

University of California San Diego

Mariam Aboian, MD/PhD

Yale University School of Medicine

John Mongan

University of California San Diego

Spyridon Bakas, PhD

University of Pennsylvania

b) Provide information on the primary contact person.

Mariam Aboian [Lead Organizer - Contact Person]

Affiliation: Yale University School of Medicine

Email id: mariam.aboian@yale.edu

Life cycle type

Define the intended submission cycle of the challenge. Include information on whether/how the challenge will be continued after the challenge has taken place. Not every challenge closes after the submission deadline (one-time event). Sometimes it is possible to submit results after the deadline (open call) or the challenge is repeated with some modifications (repeated event).

Examples:

- One-time event with fixed conference submission deadline
- Open call (challenge opens for new submissions after conference deadline)
- Repeated event with annual fixed conference submission deadline

Repeated event with annual fixed conference submission deadline

Challenge venue and platform

a) Report the event (e.g. conference) that is associated with the challenge (if any).

MICCAI.

b) Report the platform (e.g. grand-challenge.org) used to run the challenge.

Following our successful collaboration with the Synapse platform (SAGE Bionetworks) since the RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS 2021 challenge [1], we have coordinated with them and following the support from NCI (represented by Dr Keyvan Farahani in the organizing committee - Chair of the NCI AI Challenges Working Group) Synapse will be used as the platform to drive the evaluation of this cluster of challenges.

The National Cancer Institute takes special interest in the BraTS 2023 challenge and is considering providing

infrastructural support in a number of ways. Dr Keyvan Farahani, a long-time co-organizer of BraTS challenges and a project scientist on a collaborative NCI Informatics Technology for Cancer Research (ITCR) grant, is the recipient of an NIH Office of Data Science and Strategy (ODSS)-STRIDES award for “a sustainable medical imaging challenge cloud infrastructure,” to further implement open (continuous) challenges by supporting cloud compute and other infrastructures for (a) benchmarking of tools and automated submission of containerized tools for evaluation, (b) hosting of top-ranking tools through NCI FireCloud Resource and public tool repository such as Dockstore or ModelHub, and (c) hosting resulting image annotations as derived data in the Imaging Data Commons (IDC). All aforementioned NCI platforms are implemented on the Google Cloud Platform.

This collaboration with Synapse, enabled by NCI/NIH support through ITCR grant (Jamed Eddy, PI) and other NCI resources represents a major advancement in the challenge design and leveraging of public resources.

c) Provide the URL for the challenge website (if any).

<https://www.med.upenn.edu/cbica/brats2023/> - (Website will be publicly visible after the challenge approval)

Participation policies

a) Define the allowed user interaction of the algorithms assessed (e.g. only (semi-) automatic methods allowed).

Fully automatic.

b) Define the policy on the usage of training data. The data used to train algorithms may, for example, be restricted to the data provided by the challenge or to publicly available data including (open) pre-trained nets.

Participants are allowed to use additional data from publicly available datasets and their own institutions, for further complementing the data, but if they do so, they **MUST** also discuss the potential difference in their results after using only the BraTS 2023 data, since our intention is to solve the particular segmentation problem, but also to provide a fair comparison among the participating methods.

c) Define the participation policy for members of the organizers' institutes. For example, members of the organizers' institutes may participate in the challenge but are not eligible for awards.

May participate but organizers and their immediate groups will not be eligible for awards.

Since organizing institutions are large, other employees from other labs/departments may participate and should be eligible for the awards and to be listed in the leaderboard.

d) Define the award policy. In particular, provide details with respect to challenge prizes.

Following communication with 1) Intel and 2) Neosoma Inc, we have informal confirmation for the sponsorship of monetary awards for the top 3 teams. Formal confirmation can only be provided after the acceptance of the challenge.

Note that Intel has been offering monetary awards during each of BraTS 2018-2022, and Neosoma for BraTS 2021.

NIH/NCI will also provide Certificates of Merit to the top 3 performing teams.

e) Define the policy for result announcement.

Examples:

- Top 3 performing methods will be announced publicly.
- Participating teams can choose whether the performance results will be made public.

Top 3 performing methods will be announced publicly at the conference and the participants will be invited to present their method.

f) Define the publication policy. In particular, provide details on ...

- ... who of the participating teams/the participating teams' members qualifies as author
- ... whether the participating teams may publish their own results separately, and (if so)
- ... whether an embargo time is defined (so that challenge organizers can publish a challenge paper first).

The configuration of combining the BraTS challenge with the BrainLes workshop provides the BraTS participants with the option to extend their papers to 12-14 pages, and hence publish their methods in the workshop's LNCS post-conference proceedings. Furthermore, we intend to coordinate a journal manuscript focusing on publishing and summarizing the results of the challenge.

Submission method

a) Describe the method used for result submission. Preferably, provide a link to the submission instructions.

Examples:

- Docker container on the Synapse platform. Link to submission instructions: <URL>
- Algorithm output was sent to organizers via e-mail. Submission instructions were sent by e-mail.

The participants are required to send the output of their methods to the evaluation platform for the scoring to occur during the training and the validation phases. At the end of the validation phase the participants are asked to identify the method they would like to evaluate in the final testing/ranking phase. The organizers will then confirm receiving the containerized method and will evaluate it in the hidden testing data. The participants will be provided guidelines on the form of the container as we have done in previous years. This will enable confirmation of reproducibility, running of these algorithms to the previous BraTS instances and comparison with results obtained by algorithms of previous years, thereby maximizing solutions in solving the problem of brain tumor segmentation. During the training and validation phases, the participants will have the chance to test the functionality of their submission through both the Cancer Imaging Phenomics Toolkit (CaPTk [5-6], <https://github.com/CBICA/CaPTk>), and the Federated Tumor Segmentation (FeTS) Tool [7] (<https://fets-ai.github.io/Front-End/>) that offer the implementation of the evaluation metrics, as well as via the online evaluation platform (Synapse).

[5] C.Davatzikos, et al. "Cancer imaging phenomics toolkit: quantitative imaging analytics for precision diagnostics and predictive modeling of clinical outcome." *Journal of Medical Imaging*, 5.1:011018, 2018.

<https://doi.org/10.1117/1.jmi.5.1.011018>

[6] S.Pati, et al. "The cancer imaging phenomics toolkit (CaPTk): technical overview." *International MICCAI Brainlesion Workshop*. Springer, Cham, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46643-5_38

[7] S.Pati, et al, "The federated tumor segmentation (FeTS) tool: an open-source solution to further solid tumor research", *Phys. Med. Biol.* 67(20), 204002, 2022. DOI: 10.1088/1361-6560/ac9449

b) Provide information on the possibility for participating teams to evaluate their algorithms before submitting final results. For example, many challenges allow submission of multiple results, and only the last run is officially counted to compute challenge results.

We intend to release the validation set in April together with the training set, allowing participants to tune their methods in the unseen validation data. The validation data ground truth will not be provided to the participants, but multiple submissions to the online evaluation platform will be allowed for the validation phase. Only 2

submissions will be allowed in the final testing/ranking data/phase.

Challenge schedule

Provide a timetable for the challenge. Preferably, this should include

- the release date(s) of the training cases (if any)
- the registration date/period
- the release date(s) of the test cases and validation cases (if any)
- the submission date(s)
- associated workshop days (if any)
- the release date(s) of the results

Registration dates: From now until submission deadline of short papers reporting method and preliminary results (see below).

17 April 2023: Availability of training data (with ground truth labels) and validation data (without ground truth labels).

31 July 2023: Submission of short papers reporting method & preliminary results.

1-7 August 2023: Submission of containerized algorithm to the evaluation platform.

11 – 25 August 2023: Evaluation on testing data (by the organizers - only for participants with submitted papers).

8 September 2023: Contacting top performing methods for preparing slides for oral presentation.

8-12 October 2023: Announcement of final top 3 ranked teams: Challenge at MICCAI

30 November 2023: Camera-ready submission of extended papers for inclusion in the associated workshop proceedings

Ethics approval

Indicate whether ethics approval is necessary for the data. If yes, provide details on the ethics approval, preferably institutional review board, location, date and number of the ethics approval (if applicable). Add the URL or a reference to the document of the ethics approval (if available).

We are already in close coordination with The Cancer Imaging Archive (TCIA) and the Imaging Data Commons (IDC) of the National Institutes of Health (NIH), to release the training and validation data following their standard licensing (<https://wiki.cancerimagingarchive.net/display/Public/Data+Usage+Policies+and+Restrictions>).

The TCIA has already approved this, and we are now in the process of submission (includes a detailed curation process specific to TCIA). The cloud-based IDC is routinely updated with new collections from TCIA. IDC public collections are now part of the Google Public Datasets Program. This will effectively make all the BraTS data available in the Google Marketplace, increasing the potential for access to the data and downstream AI developments using Google's AI resources. IDC data are also expected to be available through the AWS (Amazon Web Services) Marketplace.

Informed consent was obtained from all subjects at their respective institutions, and the protocol for releasing the data was approved by the institutional review board of the data-contributing institution.

Data usage agreement

Clarify how the data can be used and distributed by the teams that participate in the challenge and by others during and after the challenge. This should include the explicit listing of the license applied.

Examples:

- CC BY (Attribution)
- CC BY-SA (Attribution-ShareAlike)
- CC BY-ND (Attribution-NoDerivs)
- CC BY-NC (Attribution-NonCommercial)
- CC BY-NC-SA (Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike)
- CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs)

CC BY.

Additional comments: Additional comments: CC-BY, but if any of the non-TCIA contributors object to this license, the specific subset of the BraTS data will be released under a CC-BY-NC license.

Code availability

a) Provide information on the accessibility of the organizers' evaluation software (e.g. code to produce rankings). Preferably, provide a link to the code and add information on the supported platforms.

The preprocessing tools, evaluation metrics, and the ranking code used during the whole challenge's lifecycle will be made available through the Cancer Imaging Phenomics Toolkit (CaPTk [5-6], <https://github.com/CBICA/CaPTk>), and the Federated Tumor Segmentation (FeTS) Platform [7] (<https://fets-ai.github.io/Front-End/>).

[5] C.Davatzikos, et al. "Cancer imaging phenomics toolkit: quantitative imaging analytics for precision diagnostics and predictive modeling of clinical outcome." *Journal of medical imaging*, 5.1:011018, 2018.

<https://doi.org/10.1117/1.jmi.5.1.011018>

[6] S.Pati, et al. "The cancer imaging phenomics toolkit (CaPTk): technical overview." *International MICCAI Brainlesion Workshop*. Springer, Cham, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46643-5_38

[7] S.Pati, et al, "The federated tumor segmentation (FeTS) tool: an open-source solution to further solid tumor research", *Phys. Med. Biol.* 67(20), 204002, 2022. DOI: 10.1088/1361-6560/ac9449

b) In an analogous manner, provide information on the accessibility of the participating teams' code.

The participants are required to submit their containerized algorithm, during or after the validation phase. Specific instructions for the containerization will be provided after the challenge approval. These instructions will be very similar to what we were requesting participants to provide during the BraTS 2021 and 2022 challenges.

The National Cancer Institute takes special interest in the BraTS 2023 challenge and is considering providing infrastructural support in a number of ways. Dr Keyvan Farahani, a long time co-organizer of BraTS challenges and a project scientist on a collaborative NCI Informatics Technology for Cancer Research (ITCR) grant, is the recipient of an NIH Office of Data Science and Strategy (ODSS)-STRIDES award for "a sustainable medical imaging challenge cloud infrastructure," to further implement open (continuous) challenges by supporting cloud compute and other infrastructures for (a) benchmarking of tools and automated submission of containerized tools for evaluation, (b) hosting of top-ranking tools through NCI FireCloud Resource and public tool repository such as Dockstore or ModelHub, and (c) hosting resulting image annotations as derived data in the Imaging Data Commons (IDC) on the Google Cloud Platform.

Conflicts of interest

Provide information related to conflicts of interest. In particular provide information related to sponsoring/funding of the challenge. Also, state explicitly who had/will have access to the test case labels and when.

Monetary awards are expected by Intel and Neosoma Inc

Spyridon Bakas, Ujjwal Baid, Mariam Aboian, Jeffrey Rudie, SAGE Bionetworks, and the clinical evaluators will have access to the validation, and test case labels.

MISSION OF THE CHALLENGE

Field(s) of application

State the main field(s) of application that the participating algorithms target.

Examples:

- Diagnosis
- Education
- Intervention assistance
- Intervention follow-up
- Intervention planning
- Prognosis
- Research
- Screening
- Training
- Cross-phase

Intervention planning, Treatment planning, Assistance, Research, Surgery, Diagnosis, Training, CAD, Education, Decision support.

Task category(ies)

State the task category(ies).

Examples:

- Classification
- Detection
- Localization
- Modeling
- Prediction
- Reconstruction
- Registration
- Retrieval
- Segmentation
- Tracking

Segmentation.

Cohorts

We distinguish between the target cohort and the challenge cohort. For example, a challenge could be designed around the task of medical instrument tracking in robotic kidney surgery. While the challenge could be based on ex vivo data obtained from a laparoscopic training environment with porcine organs (challenge cohort), the final biomedical application (i.e. robotic kidney surgery) would be targeted on real patients with certain characteristics defined by inclusion criteria such as restrictions regarding sex or age (target cohort).

a) Describe the target cohort, i.e. the subjects/objects from whom/which the data would be acquired in the final biomedical application.

Retrospective multi-institutional cohort of patients, diagnosed with metastases, clinically scanned with mpMRI acquisition protocol including i) pre-contrast and ii) contrast-enhanced T1-weighted, iii) T2-weighted and iv) T2-weighted Fluid Attenuated Inversion Recovery (FLAIR) MRI.

b) Describe the challenge cohort, i.e. the subject(s)/object(s) from whom/which the challenge data was acquired.

Retrospective multi-institutional cohort of patients, diagnosed with metastases, clinically scanned with mpMRI acquisition protocol including i) pre-contrast and ii) contrast-enhanced T1-weighted, iii) T2-weighted and iv) T2-weighted Fluid Attenuated Inversion Recovery (FLAIR) MRI.

Imaging modality(ies)

Specify the imaging technique(s) applied in the challenge.

MRI

Context information

Provide additional information given along with the images. The information may correspond ...

a) ... directly to the image data (e.g. tumor volume).

... directly to the image data (i.e., tumor sub-region volumes)

b) ... to the patient in general (e.g. sex, medical history).

N/A

Target entity(ies)

a) Describe the data origin, i.e. the region(s)/part(s) of subject(s)/object(s) from whom/which the image data would be acquired in the final biomedical application (e.g. brain shown in computed tomography (CT) data, abdomen shown in laparoscopic video data, operating room shown in video data, thorax shown in fluoroscopy video). If necessary, differentiate between target and challenge cohort.

Brain mpMRI scans.

b) Describe the algorithm target, i.e. the structure(s)/subject(s)/object(s)/component(s) that the participating algorithms have been designed to focus on (e.g. tumor in the brain, tip of a medical instrument, nurse in an operating theater, catheter in a fluoroscopy scan). If necessary, differentiate between target and challenge cohort.

Tumor in the brain.

Assessment aim(s)

Identify the property(ies) of the algorithms to be optimized to perform well in the challenge. If multiple properties are assessed, prioritize them (if appropriate). The properties should then be reflected in the metrics applied (see below, parameter metric(s)), and the priorities should be reflected in the ranking when combining multiple metrics that assess different properties.

- Example 1: Find highly accurate liver segmentation algorithm for CT images.
- Example 2: Find lung tumor detection algorithm with high sensitivity and specificity for mammography images.

Corresponding metrics are listed below (parameter metric(s)).

Sensitivity, Specificity, Precision.

Additional points: Dice, Hausdorff 95th percentile

DATA SETS

Data source(s)

a) Specify the device(s) used to acquire the challenge data. This includes details on the device(s) used to acquire the imaging data (e.g. manufacturer) as well as information on additional devices used for performance assessment (e.g. tracking system used in a surgical setting).

The exact scanners and their technical specifications used for acquiring the TCIA cohort has been listed in the data reference published in our related manuscripts [1,2,4]. Since then, multiple institutions have contributed data to create the current RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS dataset and these are listed in the latest BraTS arxiv paper [1]. We are currently in coordination with TCIA to make the complete BraTS 2021-2023 dataset permanently available through their portal. All the acquisition details will be included together with the data availability in TCIA, and subsequently in IDC, including Google and AWS Marketplaces, as part of their Public Datasets Programs.

[1] U. Baid, et al., "The RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS 2021 Benchmark on Brain Tumor Segmentation and Radiogenomic Classification", arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.02314

[2] S. Bakas, et al., "Identifying the best machine learning algorithms for brain tumor segmentation, progression assessment, and overall survival prediction in the BRATS challenge", arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.02629

[4] S. Bakas, H. Akbari, A. Sotiras, M. Bilello, M. Rozycki, J.S. Kirby, et al., "Advancing The Cancer Genome Atlas glioma MRI collections with expert segmentation labels and radiomic features", Nature Scientific Data, 4:170117 (2017) DOI: 10.1038/sdata.2017.117

b) Describe relevant details on the imaging process/data acquisition for each acquisition device (e.g. image acquisition protocol(s)).

The acquisition protocols are different across (and within each) contributing institution, as these represent scans of real routine clinical practice. Specific details (e.g., echo time, repetition time, original acquisition plane) of each scan of each patient will be published as supplementary material together with the challenge meta-analysis manuscript.

c) Specify the center(s)/institute(s) in which the data was acquired and/or the data providing platform/source (e.g. previous challenge). If this information is not provided (e.g. for anonymization reasons), specify why.

The provided data describe mpMRI scans, acquired with different clinical protocols and various scanners from:
University of California San Francisco (UCSF)
Yale University School of Medicine

d) Describe relevant characteristics (e.g. level of expertise) of the subjects (e.g. surgeon)/objects (e.g. robot) involved in the data acquisition process (if any).

People involved in MRI acquisition for suspected and diagnosis of brain tumors during standard clinical practice.

Training and test case characteristics

a) State what is meant by one case in this challenge. A case encompasses all data that is processed to produce one result that is compared to the corresponding reference result (i.e. the desired algorithm output).

Examples:

- Training and test cases both represent a CT image of a human brain. Training cases have a weak annotation (tumor present or not and tumor volume (if any)) while the test cases are annotated with the tumor contour (if any).
- A case refers to all information that is available for one particular patient in a specific study. This information always includes the image information as specified in data source(s) (see above) and may include context information (see above). Both training and test cases are annotated with survival (binary) 5 years after (first) image was taken.

A case describes multi-parametric MRI scans for a single patient at a single timepoint. The exact scans included for one case are i) unenhanced and ii) contrast-enhanced T1-weighted, iii) T2-weighted and iv) T2 Fluid Attenuated Inversion Recovery (FLAIR) MRI.

Please note that all sequences included for each case of the provided dataset, represent the sequences with the best image quality available in the acquiring institution for this particular case. There was no inclusion/exclusion criterion applied that related to 3d acquisitions, or the exact type of pulse sequence (for example MPAGE). We, instead, accepted all types of T1 acquisitions (with the exception of T1 FLAIR, as we did not want to mix the fluid suppressed values with non-flair scans) and then we applied the harmonized preprocessing protocol we have been using in BraTS, across the complete data. This preprocessing ensures all scans have 3D representations on a specific resolution (1mm^3), and aligned to the same anatomical atlas.

b) State the total number of training, validation and test cases.

Training data: 613 cases

Validation data: 80 cases

Testing data: 170 cases

c) Explain why a total number of cases and the specific proportion of training, validation and test cases was chosen.

Based on availability.

d) Mention further important characteristics of the training, validation and test cases (e.g. class distribution in classification tasks chosen according to real-world distribution vs. equal class distribution) and justify the choice.

N/A

Annotation characteristics

a) Describe the method for determining the reference annotation, i.e. the desired algorithm output. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary. Possible methods include manual image annotation, in silico ground truth generation and annotation by automatic methods.

If human annotation was involved, state the number of annotators.

Reference approved from at least 2 experienced neuroradiologists, following annotations from 60 clinical neuroradiologists (volunteers from ASNR)

b) Provide the instructions given to the annotators (if any) prior to the annotation. This may include description of a training phase with the software. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary. Preferably, provide a link to the annotation protocol.

The data considered in this task of the BraTS 2023 challenge follows the paradigm of the BraTS 2021-2022 challenge data. The annotation of these data followed a pre-defined clinically-approved annotation protocol (defined by expert neuroradiologists), which was provided to all clinical annotators, describing in detail instructions on what the segmentations of each tumor sub-region should describe (see below for the summary of the specific instructions). The annotators were given the flexibility to use their tool of preference for making the annotations, and also follow either a complete manual annotation approach, or a hybrid approach where an automated approach is used to produce some initial annotations followed by their manual refinements.

Summary of specific instructions:

- i) the enhancing tumor (when present) delineates the hyperintense signal of the T1-Gd, after excluding the vessels.
- ii) the necrotic core (when present) outlines regions appearing dark in both T1 and T1-Gd images (denoting necrosis/cysts), and darked regions in T1-Gd that appear brighter in T1.
- iii) the tumor core, which is the union of the enhancing tumor and the necrotic core described in (i) and (ii) above.
- iv) the farthest tumor extent including the edema (what is called the whole tumor), delineates the tissue represented by the abnormal T2-FLAIR envelope.

c) Provide details on the subject(s)/algorithm(s) that annotated the cases (e.g. information on level of expertise such as number of years of professional experience, medically-trained or not). Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary.

Each case was assigned to a pair of annotator-approver. Annotators spanned across various experience levels and clinical/academic ranks, while the approver is an experienced board-certified neuroradiologist (with >5 years of experience), listed in the “Organizers” section as “clinical evaluators and annotation approvers”. The annotators were given the flexibility to use their tool of preference for making the annotations, and also follow either a complete manual annotation approach, or a hybrid approach where an automated approach is used to produce some initial annotations followed by their manual refinements. Once the annotators were satisfied with the produced annotations, they were passing these to the corresponding approver. The approver is then responsible for signing off these annotations. Specifically, the approver would review the tumor annotations, in tandem with the corresponding MRI scans, and if the annotations were not of satisfactory quality they would be sent back to the annotators for further refinements. This iterative approach was followed for all cases, until their respective annotations reached satisfactory quality (according to the approver) for being publicly available and noted as final ground truth segmentation labels for these scans.

d) Describe the method(s) used to merge multiple annotations for one case (if any). Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary.

No Aggregation

Data pre-processing method(s)

Describe the method(s) used for pre-processing the raw training data before it is provided to the participating teams. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary.

The exact preprocessing pipeline applied to all the data considered in the BraTS 2023 challenge is identical with the one evaluated and followed by the BraTS 2017-2022 challenges. Specifically, following the conversion of the

raw scans from their original DICOM file format to NIfTI file format [10], we first perform a re-orientation of all input scans (T1, T1- Gd, T2, T2-FLAIR) to the LPS/RAI orientation, and then register all of them to the same anatomical atlas (i.e., SRI-24 [9]) and interpolating to the same resolution as this atlas (1 mm³). The exact registration process comprises the following steps:

STEP 1: N4 Bias field correction (notably the application of N4 bias field correction is a temporary step. Taking into consideration we have previously [4] shown that use of non-parametric, non-uniform intensity normalization (i.e., N4) to correct for intensity non-uniformities caused by the inhomogeneity of the scanner's magnetic field during image acquisition obliterates the MRI signal relating to the abnormal/tumor regions, we intentionally use N4 bias field correction in the preprocessing pipeline to facilitate a more optimal rigid registration across the difference MRI sequences. However, after obtaining the related information (i.e., transformation matrices), we discard the bias field corrected scans, and we apply this transformation matrix towards the final co-registered output images used in the challenge).

STEP 2: Rigid Registration of T1, T2, T2-FLAIR to the T1-Gd scan, and obtain the corresponding transformation matrix.

STEP 3: Rigid Registration of T1-Gd scan to the SRI-24 atlas [9], and obtain the corresponding transformation matrix.

STEP 4: Join the obtained transformation matrices and applying aggregated transformation to the LPS-oriented scans.

STEP 5: After completion of the registration process, we perform brain extraction to remove any apparent non-brain tissue (e.g., neck fat, skull, eyeballs) based on a deep-learning approach we developed in house, focusing on scans with apparent brain tumors and exhaustively evaluated it in both private and public multi-institutional data [11]. We then manually assessed all scans for confirming the correct brain extraction (i.e., skull stripping), where the complete brain region is included, and all non-brain tissue is excluded. This whole pipeline, and its source code are available through the CaPTk [5-6](<https://github.com/CBICA/CaPTk>) and FeTS [7] (<https://fets-ai.github.io/Front-End/>) platforms.

[4] S. Bakas, H. Akbari, A. Sotiras, M. Bilello, M. Rozycki, J.S. Kirby, et al., "Advancing The Cancer Genome Atlas glioma MRI collections with expert segmentation labels and radiomic features", *Nature Scientific Data*, 4:170117, 2017. DOI: 10.1038/sdata.2017.117

[9] T. Rohlfing, et al. The SRI24 multichannel atlas of normal adult human brain structure. *Hum Brain Mapp.* 31(5):798-819, 2010.

[10] R.Cox, J.Ashburner, H.Breman, K.Fissell, C.Haselgrove, C.Holmes, J.Lancaster, D.Rex, S.Smith, J.Woodward, "A (Sort of) new image data format standard: NIfTI-1: WE 150", *Neuroimage*, 22, 2004.

[11] S.Thakur, J.Doshi, S.Pati, S.Rathore, C.Sako, M.Bilello, S.M.Ha, G.Shukla, A.Flanders, A.Kotrotsou, M.Milchenko, S.Liem, G.S.Alexander, J.Lombardo, J.D.Palmer, P.LaMontagne, A.Nazeri, S.Talbar, U.Kulkarni, D.Marcus, R.Colen, C.Davatzikos, G.Erus, S.Bakas, "Brain Extraction on MRI Scans in Presence of Diffuse Glioma: Multi-institutional Performance Evaluation of Deep Learning Methods and Robust Modality-Agnostic Training", *NeuroImage*, 220: 117081, 2020. DOI: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.117081

Sources of error

a) Describe the most relevant possible error sources related to the image annotation. If possible, estimate the magnitude (range) of these errors, using inter-and intra-annotator variability, for example. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases, if necessary.

Study and evaluation of the effect of this error is addressed by the uncertainty task of BraTS 2019-2020 (i.e., to

quantify the uncertainty in the tumor segmentations) [8] and is outside the scope of the BraTS 2022 challenge.

[8] R.Mehta, et al, "QU-BraTS: MICCAI BraTS 2020 Challenge on Quantifying Uncertainty in Brain Tumor Segmentation-Analysis of Ranking Scores and Benchmarking Results", Journal of Machine Learning for Biomedical Imaging, 1, 26, 2022

b) In an analogous manner, describe and quantify other relevant sources of error.

N/A

ASSESSMENT METHODS

Metric(s)

a) Define the metric(s) to assess a property of an algorithm. These metrics should reflect the desired algorithm properties described in assessment aim(s) (see above). State which metric(s) were used to compute the ranking(s) (if any).

- Example 1: Dice Similarity Coefficient (DSC)
- Example 2: Area under curve (AUC)

Dice Similarity Coefficient (DSC),

95% Hausdorff distance (HD),

Sensitivity,

Specificity,

Precision

The regions evaluated using these metrics describe the whole tumor, the tumor core, and the enhancing tumor (when present). Note that the tumor core includes the part of the tumor that is typically resected (i.e., enhancing, non-enhancing, and necrotic tumor), and the whole tumor describes all tumor sub-regions (i.e., tumor core and edema/invasion).

b) Justify why the metric(s) was/were chosen, preferably with reference to the biomedical application.

In terms of the assessed and evaluated tumor sub-regions:

- i) the enhancing tumor describes the regions of active tumor and based on this, clinical practice characterizes the extent of resection.
- ii) the tumor core (incl. the necrotic component) describes what is typically resected during a surgical procedure.
- iii) the whole tumor as it defines the whole extent of the tumor, including the peritumoral edematous tissue and highly infiltrated area.

In terms of evaluation metrics, we use:

- i) the Dice Similarity Coefficient, which is commonly used in the assessment of segmentation performance,
- ii) the 95% Hausdorff distance as opposed to standard HD, in order to avoid outliers having too much weight,
- iii) Sensitivity and Specificity to determine whether an algorithm has the tendency to over- or undersegment.
- iv) Precision to complement the metric of Sensitivity (also known as recall).

Ranking method(s)

a) Describe the method used to compute a performance rank for all submitted algorithms based on the generated metric results on the test cases. Typically the text will describe how results obtained per case and metric are aggregated to arrive at a final score/ranking.

For ranking of multidimensional outcomes (or metrics), for each team, we will compute the summation of their ranks across the average of the metrics described above as a univariate overall summary measure. This measure will decide the overall ranking for each specific team. To visualize the results in an intuitive fashion, we propose to visualize the outcome via an augmented version of radar plot [6].

[12] Duan R, Tong J, Lin L, Levine LD, Sammel MD, Stoddard J, Li T, Schmid CH, Chu H, Chen Y. PALM: Patient centered Treatment Ranking via Large-scale Multivariate Network Meta-analysis. medRxiv. 2020 Jan 1

b) Describe the method(s) used to manage submissions with missing results on test cases.

If an algorithm fails to produce a result metric for a specific test case, this metric will be set to its worst possible value (0 for the DSC and the image diagonal for the HD).

c) Justify why the described ranking scheme(s) was/were used.

Following discussions with the biostatistician involved in the design of this challenge (Dr Shinohara), and also while considering transparency and fairness to the participants.

Statistical analyses

a) Provide details for the statistical methods used in the scope of the challenge analysis. This may include

- description of the missing data handling,
- details about the assessment of variability of rankings,
- description of any method used to assess whether the data met the assumptions, required for the particular statistical approach, or
- indication of any software product that was used for all data analysis methods.

Similar to BraTS 2017-2022, uncertainties in rankings will be assessed using permutational analyses [3].

Performance for the segmentation task will be assessed based on relative performance of each team on each tumor tissue class and for each segmentation measure. These will be combined by averaging ranks for the measures, and statistical significance will be evaluated only for the segmentation performance measures and will be quantified by permuting the relative ranks for each segmentation measure and tissue class per subject of the testing data.

[2] S. Bakas et al., "Identifying the Best Machine Learning Algorithms for Brain Tumor Segmentation, Progression Assessment, and Overall Survival Prediction in the BRATS Challenge," arXiv:1811.02629 [cs, stat], Apr. 2019, Accessed: Dec. 10, 2020. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1811.02629>.

b) Justify why the described statistical method(s) was/were used.

This permutation testing would reflect differences in performance that exceeded those that might be expected by chance.

Further analyses

Present further analyses to be performed (if applicable), e.g. related to

- combining algorithms via ensembling,
- inter-algorithm variability,
- common problems/biases of the submitted methods, or
- ranking variability.

N/A

TASK: TASK 5: Segmentation of Pediatric Brain Tumors

SUMMARY

Abstract

Provide a summary of the challenge purpose. This should include a general introduction in the topic from both a biomedical as well as from a technical point of view and clearly state the envisioned technical and/or biomedical impact of the challenge.

Brain tumors are among the deadliest types of cancer and the BraTS Challenge has a successful history of resource creation for the segmentation and analysis of most common and aggressive malignant primary tumor of the central nervous system in adults, namely the glioblastoma multiforme (GBM). Although rare, pediatric tumors of the brain and central nervous system are the most common cause of disease related death in children. Brain tumors in general are challenging to diagnose, hard to treat and inherently resistant to conventional therapy because of the challenges in delivering drugs to the brain. While pediatric tumors may share certain similarities with adult tumors, their imaging and clinical presentations differs. For example, GBMs and pediatric diffuse midline gliomas (DMGs) are both high grade gliomas with short overall survival of about 11-13 months on average. GBMs are found in 3 in 100,000 people, DMGs are about three times rarer. While GBMs are usually found in the frontal or/and temporal lobes at an average age of 64 years, DMGs are usually located in the pons and often diagnose between 5 and 10 years of age. Enhancing tumor region on post-gadolinium T1-weighted MRI and necrotic region are common imaging findings in GBM. But these imaging characteristics are less common or clear in DMGs. Thus, pediatric brain tumors require dedicated imaging tools that help in their characterization and facilitate their diagnosis/prognosis. In 2021, we organized the first initiative to include pediatric brain tumors, specifically DMGs in the test set of the BraTS challenge and results were promising. These findings encouraged us to organize a larger and more diverse initiative in 2022 with multi-institutional pediatric data. In BraTS 2023 challenge on pediatric brain tumors, we aim to create a BraTS pediatric cohort, collected through a few consortiums, including Children's Brain Tumor Network (CBTN) and Pacific Neuro-Oncology Consortium Foundation (PNOC). The challenge participants will be able to obtain the training and validation data of the RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS 2021 challenge, as well as to new pediatric data and other types of tumors included in the 2023 challenge, at any point from the Synapse platform. These data will be used to develop, containerize, and evaluate their algorithms in unseen validation data until July 2023, when the organizers will stop accepting new submissions and evaluate the submitted algorithms in the pediatric patient population.

Keywords

List the primary keywords that characterize the task.

Pediatric, Rare Diseases, Segmentation, Challenge, brain tumor, Diffuse Midline Glioma, PNOC, CBTN, MICCAI, NCI, DREAM

ORGANIZATION

Organizers

a) Provide information on the organizing team (names and affiliations).

Organizing team:

=====

Marius George Linguraru, D.Phil., M.A., M.Sc. — [Lead Organizer - Contact Person]

Children's National Hospital / George Washington University

Anahita Fathi Kazerooni, PhD, MSc – [Co-Lead Organizer]
Children's Hospital of Philadelphia / University of Pennsylvania

Xinyang Liu Ph.D.
Children's National Hospital

Zhifan Jiang Ph.D.
Children's National Hospital

Ariana Familiar, PhD
Children's Hospital of Philadelphia

Spyridon Bakas
Center for AI and Data Science for Integrated Diagnostics (AI2D), University of Pennsylvania,
Philadelphia, PA, USA

Ujjwal Baid
Center for AI and Data Science for Integrated Diagnostics (AI2D), University of Pennsylvania,
Philadelphia, PA, USA

Keyvan Farahani, Ph.D.
Center for Biomedical Informatics and Information Technology, National
Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health

Jake Albrecht
Sage Bionetworks

James Eddy, Ph.D.
Sage Bionetworks

Timothy Bergquist
Sage Bionetworks

Thomas Yu
Sage Bionetworks

Verena Chung
Sage Bionetworks

Russell (Taki) Shinohara, Ph.D.
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Clinical Evaluators and Annotation Approvers:

=====

Arastoo Vossough, MD
Children's Hospital of Philadelphia
Data Contributors:

=====

We already have data available from Children's National Hospital and Children's Hospital of Philadelphia (as a part of the international Children's Brain Tumor Network (CBTN) consortium) from the pediatric component of the challenge we organized in conjunction with BraTS 2021. In addition, we are in coordination with other members of CBTN and the PNOC, another international initiative in pediatric neuro-oncology. Both consortia build data repositories (including imaging) and disease and scientific expertise for the advancement of diagnostic and therapeutic methods for pediatric brain tumors. With the support of these initiatives, we aim to identify multiple sources of data for the challenge.

Miriam Bornhorst, MD
Children's National Hospital
Anahita Fathi Kazerooni, PhD
Children's Hospital of Philadelphia
Ali Nabavizadeh, MD
Children's Hospital of Philadelphia
Mariam Aboian, MD
Yale University
Andras Jakab, PhD
University of Zurich
Natasha Lepore, PhD
Children's Hospital of Los Angeles
Marius George Linguraru, DPhil
Children's National Hospital
Joshua Palmer, MD
Ohio State University
Antonio Porras, PhD
Children's Hospital Colorado
Kristin Swanson, PhD
Mayo Clinic

b) Provide information on the primary contact person.

Marius George Linguraru, D.Phil., M.A., M.Sc. — [Lead Organizer - Contact Person]
Children's National Hospital / George Washington University
Email id: mlingura@childrensnational.org

Life cycle type

Define the intended submission cycle of the challenge. Include information on whether/how the challenge will be continued after the challenge has taken place. Not every challenge closes after the submission deadline (one-time event). Sometimes it is possible to submit results after the deadline (open call) or the challenge is repeated with some modifications (repeated event).

Examples:

- One-time event with fixed conference submission deadline
- Open call (challenge opens for new submissions after conference deadline)
- Repeated event with annual fixed conference submission deadline

Repeated event with annual fixed conference submission deadline

Challenge venue and platform

a) Report the event (e.g. conference) that is associated with the challenge (if any).

MICCAI.

b) Report the platform (e.g. grand-challenge.org) used to run the challenge.

Following our successful collaboration with the Synapse platform (SAGE Bionetworks) since the RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS 2021 challenge [1], we have coordinated with them and following the support from NCI (represented by Dr Keyvan Farahani in the organizing committee - Chair of the NCI AI Challenges Working Group) Synapse will be used as the platform to drive the evaluation of this cluster of challenges.

The National Cancer Institute takes special interest in the BraTS 2023 challenge and is considering providing infrastructural support in a number of ways. Dr Keyvan Farahani, a long-time co-organizer of BraTS challenges and a project scientist on a collaborative NCI Informatics Technology for Cancer Research (ITCR) grant, is the recipient of an NIH Office of Data Science and Strategy (ODSS)-STRIDES award for “a sustainable medical imaging challenge cloud infrastructure,” to further implement open (continuous) challenges by supporting cloud compute and other infrastructures for (a) benchmarking of tools and automated submission of containerized tools for evaluation, (b) hosting of top-ranking tools through NCI FireCloud Resource and public tool repository such as Dockstore or ModelHub, and (c) hosting resulting image annotations as derived data in the Imaging Data Commons (IDC). All aforementioned NCI platforms are implemented on the Google Cloud Platform.

This collaboration with Synapse, enabled by NCI/NIH support through ITCR grant (Jamed Eddy, PI) and other NCI resources represents a major advancement in the challenge design and leveraging of public resources.

c) Provide the URL for the challenge website (if any).

<https://www.med.upenn.edu/cbica/brats2023/> - (Website will be publicly visible after the challenge approval)

Participation policies

a) Define the allowed user interaction of the algorithms assessed (e.g. only (semi-) automatic methods allowed).

Fully automatic.

b) Define the policy on the usage of training data. The data used to train algorithms may, for example, be restricted to the data provided by the challenge or to publicly available data including (open) pre-trained nets.

Participants are allowed to use additional data from publicly available datasets and their own institutions, for further complementing the data, but if they do so, they **MUST** also discuss the potential difference in their results after using only the BraTS 2023 data, since our intention is to solve the particular segmentation problem, but also to provide a fair comparison among the participating methods.

c) Define the participation policy for members of the organizers' institutes. For example, members of the organizers' institutes may participate in the challenge but are not eligible for awards.

May participate but organizers and their immediate groups will not be eligible for awards.

Since organizing institutions are large, other employees from other labs/departments may participate and should be eligible for the awards and to be listed in the leaderboard.

d) Define the award policy. In particular, provide details with respect to challenge prizes.

Following communication with 1) Intel and 2) Neosoma Inc, we have informal confirmation for the sponsorship of monetary awards for the top 3 teams. Formal confirmation can only be provided after the acceptance of the challenge.

Note that Intel has been offering monetary awards during each of BraTS 2018-2022, and Neosoma for BraTS 2021.

NIH/NCI will also provide Certificates of Merit to the top 3 performing teams.

e) Define the policy for result announcement.

Examples:

- Top 3 performing methods will be announced publicly.
- Participating teams can choose whether the performance results will be made public.

Top 3 performing methods will be announced publicly at the conference and the participants will be invited to present their method.

f) Define the publication policy. In particular, provide details on ...

- ... who of the participating teams/the participating teams' members qualifies as author
- ... whether the participating teams may publish their own results separately, and (if so)
- ... whether an embargo time is defined (so that challenge organizers can publish a challenge paper first).

The configuration of combining the BraTS challenge with the BrainLes workshop provides the BraTS participants with the option to extend their papers to 12-14 pages, and hence publish their methods in the workshop's LNCS post-conference proceedings. Furthermore, we intend to coordinate a journal manuscript focusing on publishing and summarizing the results of the challenge.

Submission method

a) Describe the method used for result submission. Preferably, provide a link to the submission instructions.

Examples:

- Docker container on the Synapse platform. Link to submission instructions: <URL>
- Algorithm output was sent to organizers via e-mail. Submission instructions were sent by e-mail.

The participants are required to send the output of their methods to the evaluation platform for the scoring to occur during the training and the validation phases. At the end of the validation phase the participants are asked to identify the method they would like to evaluate in the final testing/ranking phase. The organizers will then confirm receiving the containerized method and will evaluate it in the hidden testing data. The participants will be provided guidelines on the form of the container as we have done in previous years. This will enable confirmation of reproducibility, running of these algorithms to the previous BraTS instances and comparison with results obtained by algorithms of previous years, thereby maximizing solutions in solving the problem of brain tumor segmentation. During the training and validation phases, the participants will have the chance to test the

functionality of their submission through both the Cancer Imaging Phenomics Toolkit (CaPTk [5-6], <https://github.com/CBICA/CaPTk>), and the Federated Tumor Segmentation (FeTS) Tool [7] (<https://fets-ai.github.io/Front-End/>) that offer the implementation of the evaluation metrics, as well as via the online evaluation platform (Synapse).

[5] C.Davatzikos, et al. "Cancer imaging phenomics toolkit: quantitative imaging analytics for precision diagnostics and predictive modeling of clinical outcome." *Journal of Medical Imaging*, 5.1:011018, 2018.

<https://doi.org/10.1117/1.jmi.5.1.011018>

[6] S.Pati, et al. "The cancer imaging phenomics toolkit (CaPTk): technical overview." *International MICCAI Brainlesion Workshop*. Springer, Cham, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46643-5_38

[7] S.Pati, et al, "The federated tumor segmentation (FeTS) tool: an open-source solution to further solid tumor research", *Phys. Med. Biol.* 67(20), 204002, 2022. DOI: 10.1088/1361-6560/ac9449

b) Provide information on the possibility for participating teams to evaluate their algorithms before submitting final results. For example, many challenges allow submission of multiple results, and only the last run is officially counted to compute challenge results.

We intend to release the validation set in April together with the training set, allowing participants to tune their methods in the unseen validation data. The validation data ground truth will not be provided to the participants, but multiple submissions to the online evaluation platform will be allowed for the validation phase. Only 2 submissions will be allowed in the final testing/ranking data/phase.

Challenge schedule

Provide a timetable for the challenge. Preferably, this should include

- the release date(s) of the training cases (if any)
- the registration date/period
- the release date(s) of the test cases and validation cases (if any)
- the submission date(s)
- associated workshop days (if any)
- the release date(s) of the results

Registration dates: From now until submission deadline of short papers reporting method and preliminary results (see below).

17 April 2023: Availability of training data (with ground truth labels) and validation data (without ground truth labels).

31 July 2023: Submission of short papers reporting method & preliminary results.

1-7 August 2023: Submission of containerized algorithm to the evaluation platform.

11 – 25 August 2023: Evaluation on testing data (by the organizers - only for participants with submitted papers).

8 September 2023: Contacting top performing methods for preparing slides for oral presentation.

8-12 October 2023: Announcement of final top 3 ranked teams: Challenge at MICCAI

30 November 2023: Camera-ready submission of extended papers for inclusion in the associated workshop proceedings

Ethics approval

Indicate whether ethics approval is necessary for the data. If yes, provide details on the ethics approval, preferably institutional review board, location, date and number of the ethics approval (if applicable). Add the URL or a reference to the document of the ethics approval (if available).

We are already in close coordination with The Cancer Imaging Archive (TCIA) and the Imaging Data Commons (IDC) of the National Institutes of Health (NIH), to release the training and validation data following their standard licensing (<https://wiki.cancerimagingarchive.net/display/Public/Data+Usage+Policies+and+Restrictions>).

The TCIA has already approved this, and we are now in the process of submission (includes a detailed curation process specific to TCIA). The cloud-based IDC is routinely updated with new collections from TCIA. IDC public collections are now part of the Google Public Datasets Program. This will effectively make all the BraTS data available in the Google Marketplace, increasing the potential for access to the data and downstream AI developments using Google's AI resources. IDC data are also expected to be available through the AWS (Amazon Web Services) Marketplace.

Informed consent was obtained from all subjects at their respective institutions, and the protocol for releasing the data was approved by the institutional review board of the data-contributing institution.

Data usage agreement

Clarify how the data can be used and distributed by the teams that participate in the challenge and by others during and after the challenge. This should include the explicit listing of the license applied.

Examples:

- CC BY (Attribution)
- CC BY-SA (Attribution-ShareAlike)
- CC BY-ND (Attribution-NoDerivs)
- CC BY-NC (Attribution-NonCommercial)
- CC BY-NC-SA (Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike)
- CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs)

CC BY.

Additional comments: Additional comments: CC-BY, but if any of the non-TCIA contributors object to this license, the specific subset of the BraTS data will be released under a CC-BY-NC license.

Code availability

a) Provide information on the accessibility of the organizers' evaluation software (e.g. code to produce rankings). Preferably, provide a link to the code and add information on the supported platforms.

The preprocessing tools, evaluation metrics, and the ranking code used during the whole challenge's lifecycle will be made available through the Cancer Imaging Phenomics Toolkit (CaPTk [5-6], <https://github.com/CBICA/CaPTk>), and the Federated Tumor Segmentation (FeTS) Platform [7] (<https://fets-ai.github.io/Front-End/>).

[5] C.Davatzikos, et al. "Cancer imaging phenomics toolkit: quantitative imaging analytics for precision diagnostics and predictive modeling of clinical outcome." *Journal of medical imaging*, 5.1:011018, 2018.
<https://doi.org/10.1117/1.jmi.5.1.011018>

[6] S.Pati, et al. "The cancer imaging phenomics toolkit (CaPTk): technical overview." International MICCAI Brainlesion Workshop. Springer, Cham, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46643-5_38

[7] S.Pati, et al, "The federated tumor segmentation (FeTS) tool: an open-source solution to further solid tumor research", Phys. Med. Biol. 67(20), 204002, 2022. DOI: 10.1088/1361-6560/ac9449

b) In an analogous manner, provide information on the accessibility of the participating teams' code.

The participants are required to submit their containerized algorithm, during or after the validation phase. Specific instructions for the containerization will be provided after the challenge approval. These instructions will be very similar to what we were requesting participants to provide during the BraTS 2021 and 2022 challenges.

The National Cancer Institute takes special interest in the BraTS 2023 challenge and is considering providing infrastructural support in a number of ways. Dr Keyvan Farahani, a long time co-organizer of BraTS challenges and a project scientist on a collaborative NCI Informatics Technology for Cancer Research (ITCR) grant, is the recipient of an NIH Office of Data Science and Strategy (ODSS)-STRIDES award for "a sustainable medical imaging challenge cloud infrastructure," to further implement open (continuous) challenges by supporting cloud compute and other infrastructures for (a) benchmarking of tools and automated submission of containerized tools for evaluation, (b) hosting of top-ranking tools through NCI FireCloud Resource and public tool repository such as Dockstore or ModelHub, and (c) hosting resulting image annotations as derived data in the Imaging Data Commons (IDC) on the Google Cloud Platform.

Conflicts of interest

Provide information related to conflicts of interest. In particular provide information related to sponsoring/funding of the challenge. Also, state explicitly who had/will have access to the test case labels and when.

Monetary awards are expected by Intel and Neosoma Inc

Marius George Linguraru, Anahita Fathi Kazerooni, Spyridon Bakas, Ujjwal Baid, Xinyang Liu, Zhifan Jiang, Ariana Familiar, SAGE Bionetworks, and the clinical evaluators will have access to the validation, and test case labels.

MISSION OF THE CHALLENGE

Field(s) of application

State the main field(s) of application that the participating algorithms target.

Examples:

- Diagnosis
- Education
- Intervention assistance
- Intervention follow-up
- Intervention planning
- Prognosis
- Research
- Screening
- Training
- Cross-phase

Treatment planning, Intervention planning, Assistance, Research, Surgery, Training, Diagnosis, CAD, Education, Decision support.

Task category(ies)

State the task category(ies).

Examples:

- Classification
- Detection
- Localization
- Modeling
- Prediction
- Reconstruction
- Registration
- Retrieval
- Segmentation
- Tracking

Segmentation.

Cohorts

We distinguish between the target cohort and the challenge cohort. For example, a challenge could be designed around the task of medical instrument tracking in robotic kidney surgery. While the challenge could be based on ex vivo data obtained from a laparoscopic training environment with porcine organs (challenge cohort), the final biomedical application (i.e. robotic kidney surgery) would be targeted on real patients with certain characteristics defined by inclusion criteria such as restrictions regarding sex or age (target cohort).

a) Describe the target cohort, i.e. the subjects/objects from whom/which the data would be acquired in the final biomedical application.

Retrospective multi-institutional cohort of patients, diagnosed with pediatric brain tumor, clinically scanned with mpMRI acquisition protocol including i) pre-contrast and ii) contrast-enhanced T1-weighted, iii) T2-weighted and iv) T2-weighted Fluid Attenuated Inversion Recovery (FLAIR) MRI.

b) Describe the challenge cohort, i.e. the subject(s)/object(s) from whom/which the challenge data was acquired.

Retrospective multi-institutional cohort of patients, diagnosed with pediatric brain tumor, clinically scanned with mpMRI acquisition protocol including i) pre-contrast and ii) contrast-enhanced T1-weighted, iii) T2-weighted and iv) T2-weighted Fluid Attenuated Inversion Recovery (FLAIR) MRI.

Imaging modality(ies)

Specify the imaging technique(s) applied in the challenge.

MRI

Context information

Provide additional information given along with the images. The information may correspond ...

a) ... directly to the image data (e.g. tumor volume).

... directly to the image data (i.e., tumor sub-region volumes)

b) ... to the patient in general (e.g. sex, medical history).

N/A

Target entity(ies)

a) Describe the data origin, i.e. the region(s)/part(s) of subject(s)/object(s) from whom/which the image data would be acquired in the final biomedical application (e.g. brain shown in computed tomography (CT) data, abdomen shown in laparoscopic video data, operating room shown in video data, thorax shown in fluoroscopy video). If necessary, differentiate between target and challenge cohort.

Brain mpMRI scans.

b) Describe the algorithm target, i.e. the structure(s)/subject(s)/object(s)/component(s) that the participating algorithms have been designed to focus on (e.g. tumor in the brain, tip of a medical instrument, nurse in an operating theater, catheter in a fluoroscopy scan). If necessary, differentiate between target and challenge cohort.

Tumor in the brain.

Assessment aim(s)

Identify the property(ies) of the algorithms to be optimized to perform well in the challenge. If multiple properties are assessed, prioritize them (if appropriate). The properties should then be reflected in the metrics applied (see below, parameter metric(s)), and the priorities should be reflected in the ranking when combining multiple metrics that assess different properties.

- Example 1: Find highly accurate liver segmentation algorithm for CT images.
- Example 2: Find lung tumor detection algorithm with high sensitivity and specificity for mammography images.

Corresponding metrics are listed below (parameter metric(s)).

Sensitivity, Specificity, Precision.

Additional points: Dice, Hausdorff 95th percentile

DATA SETS**Data source(s)**

a) Specify the device(s) used to acquire the challenge data. This includes details on the device(s) used to acquire the imaging data (e.g. manufacturer) as well as information on additional devices used for performance assessment (e.g. tracking system used in a surgical setting).

The pediatric brain tumor images collected through CBTN have been acquired on multiple scanners, including 1.5T

and 3T Siemens and GE scanners. We expect to receive data from other institutions across CBTN and PNOC consortiums and will provide their technical specifications in the final BraTS manuscript. Furthermore, all the acquisition details will be included together with the data availability in TCIA, and subsequently in IDC, including Google and AWS Marketplaces, as part of their Public Datasets Programs.

b) Describe relevant details on the imaging process/data acquisition for each acquisition device (e.g. image acquisition protocol(s)).

The acquisition protocols are different across (and within each) contributing institution, as these represent scans of real routine clinical practice. Specific details (e.g., echo time, repetition time, original acquisition plane) of each scan of each patient will be published as supplementary material together with the challenge meta-analysis

manuscript.

c) Specify the center(s)/institute(s) in which the data was acquired and/or the data providing platform/source (e.g. previous challenge). If this information is not provided (e.g. for anonymization reasons), specify why.

The provided data describe mpMRI scans, acquired with different clinical protocols and various scanners from:

Children's National Hospital (CBTN site)

Children's Hospital of Philadelphia (CBTN site)

Other CBTN and/or PNOC sites

d) Describe relevant characteristics (e.g. level of expertise) of the subjects (e.g. surgeon)/objects (e.g. robot) involved in the data acquisition process (if any).

People involved in MRI acquisition for suspected and diagnosis of brain tumors during standard clinical practice.

Training and test case characteristics

a) State what is meant by one case in this challenge. A case encompasses all data that is processed to produce one result that is compared to the corresponding reference result (i.e. the desired algorithm output).

Examples:

- Training and test cases both represent a CT image of a human brain. Training cases have a weak annotation (tumor present or not and tumor volume (if any)) while the test cases are annotated with the tumor contour (if any).
- A case refers to all information that is available for one particular patient in a specific study. This information always includes the image information as specified in data source(s) (see above) and may include context information (see above). Both training and test cases are annotated with survival (binary) 5 years after (first) image was taken.

A case describes multi-parametric MRI scans for a single patient at a single timepoint. The exact scans included for one case are i) unenhanced and ii) contrast-enhanced T1-weighted, iii) T2-weighted and iv) T2 Fluid Attenuated Inversion Recovery (FLAIR) MRI.

Please note that all sequences included for each case of the provided dataset, represent the sequences with the best image quality available in the acquiring institution for this particular case. There was no inclusion/exclusion criterion applied that related to 3d acquisitions, or the exact type of pulse sequence (for example MPRAGE). We, instead, accepted all types of T1 acquisitions (with the exception of T1 FLAIR, as we did not want to mix the fluid suppressed values with non-flair scans) and then we applied the harmonized preprocessing protocol we have been using in BraTS, across the complete data. This preprocessing ensures all scans have 3D representations on a specific resolution (1mm^3), and aligned to the same anatomical atlas.

b) State the total number of training, validation and test cases.

Training data: 100 cases

Validation data: 15 cases

Testing data: 35 cases

c) Explain why a total number of cases and the specific proportion of training, validation and test cases was chosen.

Based on availability.

d) Mention further important characteristics of the training, validation and test cases (e.g. class distribution in classification tasks chosen according to real-world distribution vs. equal class distribution) and justify the choice.

N/A

Annotation characteristics

a) Describe the method for determining the reference annotation, i.e. the desired algorithm output. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary. Possible methods include manual image annotation, in silico ground truth generation and annotation by automatic methods.

If human annotation was involved, state the number of annotators.

Reference approved from at least 2 experienced neuroradiologists, following annotations from 60 clinical neuroradiologists (volunteers from ASNR)

b) Provide the instructions given to the annotators (if any) prior to the annotation. This may include description of a training phase with the software. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary. Preferably, provide a link to the annotation protocol.

The data considered in this task of the BraTS 2023 challenge follows the paradigm of the BraTS 2021-2022 challenge data. The annotation of these data followed a pre-defined clinically-approved annotation protocol (defined by expert neuroradiologists), which was provided to all clinical annotators, describing in detail instructions on what the segmentations of each tumor sub-region should describe (see below for the summary of the specific instructions). The annotators were given the flexibility to use their tool of preference for making the annotations, and also follow either a complete manual annotation approach, or a hybrid approach where an automated approach is used to produce some initial annotations followed by their manual refinements.

Summary of specific instructions:

- i) the enhancing tumor (when present) delineates the hyperintense signal of the T1-Gd, after excluding the vessels.
- ii) the necrotic core (when present) outlines regions appearing dark in both T1 and T1-Gd images (denoting necrosis/cysts), and darked regions in T1-Gd that appear brighter in T1.
- iii) the tumor core, which is the union of the enhancing tumor and the necrotic core described in (i) and (ii) above.
- iv) the farthest tumor extent including the edema (what is called the whole tumor), delineates the tissue represented by the abnormal T2-FLAIR envelope.

c) Provide details on the subject(s)/algorithm(s) that annotated the cases (e.g. information on level of expertise such as number of years of professional experience, medically-trained or not). Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary.

Each case was assigned to a pair of annotator-approver. Annotators spanned across various experience levels and clinical/academic ranks, while the approvers were the 2 experienced board-certified neuroradiologists (with >7 years of experience), listed in the “Organizers” section as “clinical evaluators and annotation approvers”. The annotators were given the flexibility to use their tool of preference for making the annotations, and also follow either a complete manual annotation approach, or a hybrid approach where an automated approach is used to produce some initial annotations followed by their manual refinements. Once the annotators were satisfied with the produced annotations, they were passing these to the corresponding approver. The approver is then responsible for signing off these annotations. Specifically, the approver would review the tumor annotations, in tandem with the corresponding MRI scans, and if the annotations were not of satisfactory quality they would be sent back to the annotators for further refinements. This iterative approach was followed for all cases, until their

respective annotations reached satisfactory quality (according to the approver) for being publicly available and noted as final ground truth segmentation labels for these scans.

d) Describe the method(s) used to merge multiple annotations for one case (if any). Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary.

No Aggregation

Data pre-processing method(s)

Describe the method(s) used for pre-processing the raw training data before it is provided to the participating teams. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary.

The exact preprocessing pipeline applied to all the data considered in the BraTS 2023 challenge is identical with the one evaluated and followed by the BraTS 2017-2022 challenges. Specifically, following the conversion of the raw scans from their original DICOM file format to NIfTI file format [10], we first perform a re-orientation of all input scans (T1, T1- Gd, T2, T2-FLAIR) to the LPS/RAI orientation, and then register all of them to the same anatomical atlas (i.e., SRI-24 [9]) and interpolating to the same resolution as this atlas (1 mm³). The exact registration process comprises the following steps:

STEP 1: N4 Bias field correction (notably the application of N4 bias field correction is a temporary step. Taking into consideration we have previously [4] shown that use of non-parametric, non-uniform intensity normalization (i.e., N4) to correct for intensity non-uniformities caused by the inhomogeneity of the scanner's magnetic field during image acquisition obliterates the MRI signal relating to the abnormal/tumor regions, we intentionally use N4 bias field correction in the preprocessing pipeline to facilitate a more optimal rigid registration across the difference MRI sequences. However, after obtaining the related information (i.e., transformation matrices), we discard the bias field corrected scans, and we apply this transformation matrix towards the final co-registered output images used in the challenge).

STEP 2: Rigid Registration of T1, T2, T2-FLAIR to the T1-Gd scan, and obtain the corresponding transformation matrix.

STEP 3: Rigid Registration of T1-Gd scan to the SRI-24 atlas [9], and obtain the corresponding transformation matrix.

STEP 4: Join the obtained transformation matrices and applying aggregated transformation to the LPS-oriented scans.

STEP 5: After completion of the registration process, we perform brain extraction to remove any apparent non-brain tissue (e.g., neck fat, skull, eyeballs) based on a deep-learning approach we developed in house, focusing on scans with apparent brain tumors and exhaustively evaluated it in both private and public multi-institutional data [11]. We then manually assessed all scans for confirming the correct brain extraction (i.e., skull stripping), where the complete brain region is included, and all non-brain tissue is excluded. This whole pipeline, and its source code are available through the CaPTk [5-6](<https://github.com/CBICA/CaPTk>) and FeTS [7] (<https://fets-ai.github.io/Front-End/>) platforms.

[4] S. Bakas, H. Akbari, A. Sotiras, M. Bilello, M. Rozycki, J.S. Kirby, et al., "Advancing The Cancer Genome Atlas glioma MRI collections with expert segmentation labels and radiomic features", Nature Scientific Data, 4:170117, 2017. DOI: 10.1038/sdata.2017.117

[9] T. Rohlfing, et al. The SRI24 multichannel atlas of normal adult human brain structure. Hum Brain Mapp. 31(5):798-819, 2010.

[10] R.Cox, J.Ashburner, H.Breman, K.Fissell, C.Haselgrove, C.Holmes, J.Lancaster, D.Rex, S.Smith, J.Woodward, "A

(Sort of) new image data format standard: NIfTI-1: WE 150", Neuroimage, 22, 2004.

[11] S.Thakur, J.Doshi, S.Pati, S.Rathore, C.Sako, M.Bilello, S.M.Ha, G.Shukla, A.Flanders, A.Kotrotsou, M.Milchenko, S.Liem, G.S.Alexander, J.Lombardo, J.D.Palmer, P.LaMontagne, A.Nazeri, S.Talbar, U.Kulkarni, D.Marcus, R.Colen, C.Davatzikos, G.Erus, S.Bakas, "Brain Extraction on MRI Scans in Presence of Diffuse Glioma: Multi-institutional Performance Evaluation of Deep Learning Methods and Robust Modality-Agnostic Training", NeuroImage, 220: 117081, 2020. DOI: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.117081

Sources of error

a) Describe the most relevant possible error sources related to the image annotation. If possible, estimate the magnitude (range) of these errors, using inter-and intra-annotator variability, for example. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases, if necessary.

Study and evaluation of the effect of this error is addressed by the uncertainty task of BraTS 2019-2020 (i.e., to quantify the uncertainty in the tumor segmentations) [8] and is outside the scope of the BraTS 2022 challenge.

[8] R.Mehta, et al, "QU-BraTS: MICCAI BraTS 2020 Challenge on Quantifying Uncertainty in Brain Tumor Segmentation-Analysis of Ranking Scores and Benchmarking Results", Journal of Machine Learning for Biomedical Imaging, 1, 26, 2022

b) In an analogous manner, describe and quantify other relevant sources of error.

N/A

ASSESSMENT METHODS

Metric(s)

a) Define the metric(s) to assess a property of an algorithm. These metrics should reflect the desired algorithm properties described in assessment aim(s) (see above). State which metric(s) were used to compute the ranking(s) (if any).

- Example 1: Dice Similarity Coefficient (DSC)
- Example 2: Area under curve (AUC)

Dice Similarity Coefficient (DSC),

95% Hausdorff distance (HD),

Sensitivity,

Specificity,

Precision

The regions evaluated using these metrics describe the whole tumor, the tumor core, and the enhancing tumor (when present). Note that the tumor core includes the part of the tumor that is typically resected (i.e., enhancing, non-enhancing, and necrotic tumor), and the whole tumor describes all tumor sub-regions (i.e., tumor core and edema/invasion).

b) Justify why the metric(s) was/were chosen, preferably with reference to the biomedical application.

In terms of the assessed and evaluated tumor sub-regions:

i) the enhancing tumor describes the regions of active tumor and based on this, clinical practice characterizes the extent of resection.

- ii) the tumor core (incl. the necrotic component) describes what is typically resected during a surgical procedure.
- iii) the whole tumor as it defines the whole extent of the tumor, including the peritumoral edematous tissue and highly infiltrated area.

In terms of evaluation metrics, we use:

- i) the Dice Similarity Coefficient, which is commonly used in the assessment of segmentation performance,
- ii) the 95% Hausdorff distance as opposed to standard HD, in order to avoid outliers having too much weight,
- iii) Sensitivity and Specificity to determine whether an algorithm has the tendency to over- or undersegment.
- iv) Precision to complement the metric of Sensitivity (also known as recall).

Ranking method(s)

a) Describe the method used to compute a performance rank for all submitted algorithms based on the generated metric results on the test cases. Typically the text will describe how results obtained per case and metric are aggregated to arrive at a final score/ranking.

For ranking of multidimensional outcomes (or metrics), for each team, we will compute the summation of their ranks across the average of the metrics described above as a univariate overall summary measure. This measure will decide the overall ranking for each specific team. To visualize the results in an intuitive fashion, we propose to visualize the outcome via an augmented version of radar plot [6].

[12] Duan R, Tong J, Lin L, Levine LD, Sammel MD, Stoddard J, Li T, Schmid CH, Chu H, Chen Y. PALM: Patient centered Treatment Ranking via Large-scale Multivariate Network Meta-analysis. medRxiv. 2020 Jan 1

b) Describe the method(s) used to manage submissions with missing results on test cases.

If an algorithm fails to produce a result metric for a specific test case, this metric will be set to its worst possible value (0 for the DSC and the image diagonal for the HD).

c) Justify why the described ranking scheme(s) was/were used.

Following discussions with the biostatistician involved in the design of this challenge (Dr Shinohara), and also while considering transparency and fairness to the participants.

Statistical analyses

- a) Provide details for the statistical methods used in the scope of the challenge analysis. This may include
- description of the missing data handling,
 - details about the assessment of variability of rankings,
 - description of any method used to assess whether the data met the assumptions, required for the particular statistical approach, or
 - indication of any software product that was used for all data analysis methods.

Similar to BraTS 2017-2022, uncertainties in rankings will be assessed using permutational analyses [3].

Performance for the segmentation task will be assessed based on relative performance of each team on each tumor tissue class and for each segmentation measure. These will be combined by averaging ranks for the measures, and statistical significance will be evaluated only for the segmentation performance measures and will be quantified by permuting the relative ranks for each segmentation measure and tissue class per subject of the testing data.

[2] S. Bakas et al., "Identifying the Best Machine Learning Algorithms for Brain Tumor Segmentation, Progression Assessment, and Overall Survival Prediction in the BRATS Challenge," arXiv:1811.02629 [cs, stat], Apr. 2019, Accessed: Dec. 10, 2020. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1811.02629>.

b) Justify why the described statistical method(s) was/were used.

This permutation testing would reflect differences in performance that exceeded those that might be expected by chance.

Further analyses

Present further analyses to be performed (if applicable), e.g. related to

- combining algorithms via ensembling,
- inter-algorithm variability,
- common problems/biases of the submitted methods, or
- ranking variability.

N/A

TASK: TASK 6: Synthesis for Brain Tumor Segmentation

SUMMARY

Abstract

Provide a summary of the challenge purpose. This should include a general introduction in the topic from both a biomedical as well as from a technical point of view and clearly state the envisioned technical and/or biomedical impact of the challenge.

Manual segmentation of brain tumors in MR images is a tedious task with high variability among raters [1]. Many recent works have developed automated segmentation methods using deep learning (DL) [2–4] to address this issue. These algorithms mostly require four input magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) modalities (typically T1-weighted [T1w] images with and without contrast enhancement, T2-weighted [T2w] images, and FLAIR images) during the inference stage. However, in clinical routine, missing MR sequences, e.g., because of time constraints and/or image artifacts (such as patient motion) are a common challenge. Some sequences, especially FLAIR and T1, are often missing from routine MRI examinations [5]. Therefore, the substitution of missing modalities is desirable and necessary for a more widespread use of such algorithms in clinical routine. This challenge task is divided into a global and a local synthesis part. The first/global part of this task calls for algorithms capable of substituting whole MRI volumes, enabling a straightforward application of BraTS routines in centers with a less extensive imaging protocol or for analyzing historical tumor study datasets. In addition to such a “global” infill of full brain MRI scans, an image needs a “local” infill. Reasons for this may be technical: there may be locally isolated artifacts presented, the field of view is incomplete, or selected 2D slices are corrupted or missing. In those cases, one may want to fill in missing information locally instead of inferring the corrupted image volume as a whole. Our second/local part is calling for algorithms capable of filling in uncorrupted image intensities locally, for a given area, or within a bounding box. As BraTS focuses on brain tumor image analysis, we will call for algorithms capable of filling in healthy-appearing image intensities for arbitrary regions in the image displaying artifacts and the tumor area. Like our global image infill task, this will enable the application of the downstream image processing routines. For example, brain parcellation strictly requires the input of normal-appearing images, which is used in neuro-imaging studies and in brain tumor treatment planning.

The task of generating missing MRI sequences holds promise to address this issue and has attracted growing attention in recent years [6–7]. For example, deep learning networks based on generative adversarial networks (GANs) have been explored for this task with promising results [8–10]. From a technical standpoint, these algorithms need to overcome a multitude of challenges: First, the image resolutions of the individual sequences might differ; for example, FLAIR images tend to be acquired using 2D sequences, leading to anisotropic resolution, matching the resolution of other 3D imaging sequences only poorly. Second, motion artifacts may be presented in some of the sequences. At the same time, MRI bias fields may differ in their local impact on the different image modalities, leading to spatially inconstant artifacts. Third, a general domain shift between the training and test sets due to different acquisition settings and types of scanners can be expected to be present in almost any large and multi-institutional dataset. All these effects must be considered when developing methods for synthesizing MRI locally and globally. Questions about how to deal with these challenges, for example, by choosing adequate metrics or invariance properties of the algorithms and network architecture, have yet to be answered.

In previous BraTS challenges, we have set up publicly available datasets – and algorithms – for multi-modal

brain glioma segmentation [11-12]. In our challenge task for local and global MRI synthesis, we will build on these efforts, and the previously generated data sets, to further the development of much-needed computational tools for data integration and homogenization. It will enable a broader application of the tumor segmentation algorithms developed in previous BraTS editions (that require a fixed set of image modalities), but also a better integration with other downstream routines used for quantitative neuro-image analysis (that only work well for brain images without perturbations from artifacts or lesion). The resulting MRI synthesis is essential to develop effective, generalizable, and reproducible methods for analyzing high-resolution MRI of brain tumors. It will include data from multiple sites well established in previous BraTS challenges, adding new inference tasks beyond image segmentation. Resulting algorithms will have the potential to benefit automated brain (tumor) image processing and improve the clinical risk stratification tools for early interventions, treatments, and care management decisions across hospitals and research institutions worldwide.



Keywords

List the primary keywords that characterize the task.

Image Synthesis, Image Infill, Challenge, Brain Tumor, Segmentation, RSNA, ASNR, MICCAI, NCI, DREAM,

ORGANIZATION

Organizers

a) Provide information on the organizing team (names and affiliations).

Organizing team:

=====

Hongwei Bran Li, [Lead Organizer]

Technical University of Munich, Germany & University of Zurich, Switzerland

Benedikt Wiestler,

Klinikum rechts der Isar, Technical University of Munich, Germany

Juan Eugenio Iglesias,

Athinoula A. Martinos Center for Biomedical Imaging, Harvard Medical School, USA

Syed Muhammad Anwar,

Children's National Hospital, Washington DC, USA and George Washington University, Washington DC, USA

Marius George Linguraru,

Children's National Hospital, Washington DC, USA

Bjoern Menze

University of Zurich, Switzerland

Koen Van Leemput

Technical University of Denmark, Copenhagen, Denmark & Harvard Medical School, Boston, USA

Florian Kofler

Helmholtz Research Center, Munich, Germany

Christina Bukas

Helmholtz Research Center, Munich, Germany

Marie Piraud

Helmholtz Research Center, Munich Germany

Spyridon Bakas

Center for AI and Data Science for Integrated Diagnostics (AI2D), University of Pennsylvania,
Philadelphia, PA, USA

Ujjwal Baid

Center for AI and Data Science for Integrated Diagnostics (AI2D), University of Pennsylvania,
Philadelphia, PA, USA

Jake Albrecht

Sage Bionetworks

James Eddy, Ph.D.

Sage Bionetworks

Timothy Bergquist

Sage Bionetworks

Thomas Yu

Sage Bionetworks

Verena Chung

Sage Bionetworks

Gian Marco Conte

Mayo Clinic Rochester, MN, USA

Clinical Evaluators and Annotation Approvers:

=====

Michel Bilello, MD, Ph.D.,

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Suyash Mohan, MD, Ph.D.

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Satyam Ghodasara (Approver Coordinator)

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

+ 60 ASNR member neuroradiologists involved in the ground truth generation (listed in the BraTS 2021 paper and

in the evaluation platform (www.synapse.org/brats)

Annotation Volunteers

(in order of decreasing data contributions)

=====

Evan Calabrese, MD, PHD, Department of Radiology & Biomedical Imaging, University of California San Francisco, CA, USA

Ahmed W. Moawad, MBBS, Mercy Catholic Medical Center, Darby, PA, USA

Jeffrey Rudie, MD, PHD, Department of Radiology & Biomedical Imaging, University of California San Francisco, CA, USA

Luiz Otavio Coelho, MD, Diagnóstico Avançado por Imagem, Curitiba, Brazil and Hospital Erasto Gaertner, Curitiba, Brazil

Olivia McDonnell, Department of Medical Imaging, Gold Coast University Hospital, Southport, Australia

Elka Miller, MD, Department of Radiology, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada

Fanny E. Morón, MD, Department of Radiology, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, Tex, USA

Mark C. Oswood, MD, PHD, Department of Radiology, Hennepin Healthcare, Minneapolis, MN, USA

Robert Y. Shih, MD, Uniformed Services University, Bethesda, MD, USA

Loizos Siakallis, MD, Institute of Neurology, University College London, London, United Kingdom

Yulia Bronstein, MD, Virtual Radiologic Professionals, LLC - Branson, Eden Prairie, MN, USA

James R. Mason, DO, MPH, University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

Anthony F. Miller, MD, Hahnemann University Hospital Drexel University College of Medicine, PA, USA

Gagandeep Choudhary, MD, MBMS, Department of Radiology, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, OR, USA

Aanchal Agarwal, MBBS, Dr Jones and Partners Medical Imaging, South Australia

Cristina H. Besada, MD, PHD, Department of Neuroradiology, Hospital Italiano de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina

Jamal J. Derakhshan, MD, PHD, Mallinckrodt Institute of Radiology, Washington University in St. Louis, MO, USA

Mariana Cardoso Diogo, MD, Neuroradiology Department, Hospital Garcia de Orta EPE, Almada, Portugal

Daniel D. Do-Dai, MD, Department of Radiology, Tufts Medical Center, Boston, MA, USA.

Luciano Farage, MD, Centro Universitario Euro-Americana (UNIEURO), Brasília, DF, Brazil

John L. Go, MD, Department of Radiology, Division of Neuroradiology, University of Southern California, Keck School of Medicine, Los Angeles, CA, USA.

Mohiuddin Hadi, MD, Radiology (Neuroradiology Section), University of Louisville, Louisville, KY, USA

Virginia B. Hill, MD, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL, USA

Michael Iv, MD, Stanford Hospital and Clinics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

David Joyner, MD, Department of Radiology and Medical Imaging University of Virginia Health System Charlottesville, VA, USA

Christie Lincoln, MD, Department of Radiology, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, Tex, USA

Eyal Lotan, MD, PHD, NYU Langone Medical Center, New York, NY, USA

Asako Miyakoshi, MD, Kaiser Permanente, San Diego, CA, USA

Mariana Sanchez-Montaña, MD, Instituto Nacional de Ciencias Medicas y Nutricion, Mexico City, Mexico

Jaya Nath, MD, Northport VA Medical Center Northport, NY, USA

Xuan V. Nguyen, MD, PHD, Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center, Columbus, OH, USA

Manal Nicolas-Jilwan, MD, University of Virginia Medical Center, Charlottesville, VA, USA

Johanna Ortiz Jimenez, MD, Neuroradiology- Department of Radiology Kingston General Hospital - Queen's University, Kingston, Canada

Kerem Ozturk, MD, Department of Radiology, University of Minnesota Health, Minneapolis, MN, USA

Bojan D. Petrovic, MD, NorthShore University HealthSystem, Chicago, IL, USA

Lubdhra M. Shah, MD, University of Utah Health Sciences Center, Salt Lake City, UT, USA

Chintan Shah, MD, MS, Neuroradiology and Imaging Informatics Imaging Institute, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, OH, USA

Manas Sharma, MD, MBMS, London Health Sciences Centre, London, Ontario, Canada

Onur Simsek, MD, Dr Abdurrahman Yurtaslan Ankara Oncology Training and Research Hospital, University of Health Sciences, Ankara, Turkey

Achint K. Singh, MD, University of Texas Health San Antonio, TX, USA

Salil Soman, MD, MS, Department of Radiology, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

Volodymyr Statsevych, MD, Neuroradiology and Imaging Informatics Imaging Institute, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, OH, USA

Brent D. Weinberg, MD, PHD, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA

Robert J. Young, MD, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY, USA

Ichiro Ikuta, MD, MMSc, Yale University School of Medicine, Department of Radiology & Biomedical Imaging, New Haven, CT, USA

Amit K. Agarwal, MD, MBMS, Mayo Clinic, Jacksonville, FL, USA

Sword Christian Cambron, MD, Dartmouth Hitchcock Medical Center, NH, USA

Richard Silbergleit, MD, Oakland University William Beaumont School of Medicine, Rochester, MI, USA.

Alexandru Duso, Radiology Department at Klinikum Hochrhein Waldshut-Tiengen, Germany

Alida A. Postma, MD, PHD, Maastricht University Hospital, Maastricht, The Netherlands

Laurent Letourneau-Guillon, MSc, Radiology department, Centre Hospitalier de l'Université de Montréal (CHUM) and Centre de Recherche du CHUM (CRCHUM) Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Gloria J. Guzmán Pérez-Carrillo, MD, MSc, Mallinckrodt Institute of Radiology, School of Medicine, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, USA

Atin Saha, MD, Department of Radiology, NewYork-Presbyterian Hospital, Weill Cornell Medical College, New York, NY, USA

Neetu Soni, MD, MBMS, University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics, Iowa City, IA, USA

Greg Zaharchuk, MD, PHD, Department of Radiology Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

Vahe M. Zohrabian, MD, Department of Radiology, Northwell Health, Zucker Hofstra School of Medicine at Northwell, North Shore University Hospital, Hempstead, New York, NY, USA.

Yingming Chen, MD, Department of Medical Imaging, University of Toronto, ON, Canada

Milos M. Cekic, MD, University of California Los Angeles, CA, USA

Akm Rahman, DO, University of Rochester Medical Center, Rochester, NY, USA

Juan E. Small, MD, Lahey Clinic, Burlington, MA, USA

Varun Sethi, MD, Temple University Hospital, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Data Contributors:

=====

Christos Davatzikos, Ph.D., & Spyridon Bakas, Ph.D., CBICA, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

John Mongan, M.D., Ph.D. & Evan Calabrese, M.D., Ph.D. & Jeffrey D. Rudie, M.D., Ph.D. & Christopher Hess, M.D., Ph.D. & Soonmee Cha, M.D. & Javier Villanueva-Meyer, M.D., University of California San Francisco, CA, USA
John B. Freymann & Justin S. Kirby - on behalf of The Cancer Imaging Archive (TCIA) Cancer Imaging Program, NCI, National Institutes of Health (NIH), USA
Benedikt Wiestler, M.D., & Bjoern Menze, Ph.D., Technical University of Munich, Germany
Bjoern Menze, Ph.D., University of Zurich, Switzerland
Errol Colak, M.D., Priscila Crivellaro, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada
Rivka R. Colen, M.D. University of Pittsburgh Medical Center
Aikaterini Kotrotsou, Ph.D., MD Anderson Cancer Center, TX, USA
Daniel Marcus, Ph.D., & Mikhail Milchenko, Ph.D., & Arash Nazeri, M.D., Washington University School of Medicine in St.Louis, MO, USA
Hassan Fathallah-Shaykh, M.D., Ph.D., University of Alabama at Birmingham, AL, USA
Roland Wiest, M.D., University of Bern, Switzerland
Andras Jakab, M.D., Ph.D., University of Debrecen, Hungary
Marc-Andre Weber, M.D., Heidelberg University, Germany
Abhishek Mahajan, M.D. & Ujjwal Baid, Ph.D., Tata Memorial Center, Mumbai, India, & SGGS Institute of Engineering and Technology, Nanded, India

b) Provide information on the primary contact person.

Hongwei Bran Li [Lead Organizer - Contact Person]
Technical University of Munich, University of Zurich
Email: hongwei.li@tum.de

Life cycle type

Define the intended submission cycle of the challenge. Include information on whether/how the challenge will be continued after the challenge has taken place. Not every challenge closes after the submission deadline (one-time event). Sometimes it is possible to submit results after the deadline (open call) or the challenge is repeated with some modifications (repeated event).

Examples:

- One-time event with fixed conference submission deadline
- Open call (challenge opens for new submissions after conference deadline)
- Repeated event with annual fixed conference submission deadline

One time event with fixed submission deadline.

Challenge venue and platform

a) Report the event (e.g. conference) that is associated with the challenge (if any).

MICCAI.

b) Report the platform (e.g. grand-challenge.org) used to run the challenge.

Following our successful collaboration with the Synapse platform (SAGE Bionetworks) since the RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS 2021 challenge [1], we have coordinated with them and following the support from NCI (represented by Dr Keyvan Farahani in the organizing committee - Chair of the NCI AI Challenges Working Group) Synapse will be used as the platform to drive the evaluation of this cluster of challenges.

The National Cancer Institute takes special interest in the BraTS 2023 challenge and is considering providing infrastructural support in a number of ways. Dr Keyvan Farahani, a long-time co-organizer of BraTS challenges and a project scientist on a collaborative NCI Informatics Technology for Cancer Research (ITCR) grant, is the recipient of an NIH Office of Data Science and Strategy (ODSS)-STRIDES award for “a sustainable medical imaging challenge cloud infrastructure,” to further implement open (continuous) challenges by supporting cloud compute and other infrastructures for (a) benchmarking of tools and automated submission of containerized tools for evaluation, (b) hosting of top-ranking tools through NCI FireCloud Resource and public tool repository such as Dockstore or ModelHub, and (c) hosting resulting image annotations as derived data in the Imaging Data Commons (IDC). All aforementioned NCI platforms are implemented on the Google Cloud Platform.

This collaboration with Synapse, enabled by NCI/NIH support through ITCR grant (Jamed Eddy, PI) and other NCI resources represents a major advancement in the challenge design and leveraging of public resources.

c) Provide the URL for the challenge website (if any).

<https://www.med.upenn.edu/cbica/brats2023/> - (Website will be publicly visible after the challenge approval)

Participation policies

a) Define the allowed user interaction of the algorithms assessed (e.g. only (semi-) automatic methods allowed).

Fully automatic.

b) Define the policy on the usage of training data. The data used to train algorithms may, for example, be restricted to the data provided by the challenge or to publicly available data including (open) pre-trained nets.

Participants are allowed to use additional data from publicly available datasets and their own institutions, for further complementing the data, but if they do so, they **MUST** also discuss the potential difference in their results after using only the BraTS 2023 data, since our intention is to solve the particular segmentation problem, but also to provide a fair comparison among the participating methods.

c) Define the participation policy for members of the organizers' institutes. For example, members of the organizers' institutes may participate in the challenge but are not eligible for awards.

May participate but organizers and their immediate groups will not be eligible for awards.

Since organizing institutions are large, other employees from other labs/departments may participate and should be eligible for the awards and to be listed in the leaderboard.

d) Define the award policy. In particular, provide details with respect to challenge prizes.

Following communication with 1) Intel and 2) Neosoma Inc, we have informal confirmation for the sponsorship of monetary awards for the top 3 teams. Formal confirmation can only be provided after the acceptance of the challenge.

Note that Intel has been offering monetary awards during each of BraTS 2018-2022, and Neosoma for BraTS 2021.

NIH/NCI will also provide Certificates of Merit to the top 3 performing teams.

e) Define the policy for result announcement.

Examples:

- Top 3 performing methods will be announced publicly.
- Participating teams can choose whether the performance results will be made public.

Top 3 performing methods will be announced publicly at the conference and the participants will be invited to present their method.

f) Define the publication policy. In particular, provide details on ...

- ... who of the participating teams/the participating teams' members qualifies as author
- ... whether the participating teams may publish their own results separately, and (if so)
- ... whether an embargo time is defined (so that challenge organizers can publish a challenge paper first).

The configuration of combining the BraTS challenge with the BrainLes workshop provides the BraTS participants with the option to extend their papers to 12-14 pages, and hence publish their methods in the workshop's LNCS post-conference proceedings. Furthermore, we intend to coordinate a journal manuscript focusing on publishing and summarizing the results of the challenge.

Submission method

a) Describe the method used for result submission. Preferably, provide a link to the submission instructions.

Examples:

- Docker container on the Synapse platform. Link to submission instructions: <URL>
- Algorithm output was sent to organizers via e-mail. Submission instructions were sent by e-mail.

The participants are required to send the output of their methods to the evaluation platform for the scoring to occur during the training and the validation phases. At the end of the validation phase the participants are asked to identify the method they would like to evaluate in the final testing/ranking phase. The organizers will then confirm receiving the containerized method and will evaluate it in the hidden testing data. The participants will be provided guidelines on the form of the container as we have done in previous years. This will enable confirmation of reproducibility, running of these algorithms to the previous BraTS instances and comparison with results obtained by algorithms of previous years, thereby maximizing solutions in solving the problem of brain tumor segmentation. During the training and validation phases, the participants will have the chance to test the functionality of their submission through both the Cancer Imaging Phenomics Toolkit (CaPTk [5-6], <https://github.com/CBICA/CaPTk>), and the Federated Tumor Segmentation (FeTS) Tool [7] (<https://fets-ai.github.io/Front-End/>) that offer the implementation of the evaluation metrics, as well as via the online evaluation platform (Synapse).

[5] C.Davatzikos, et al. "Cancer imaging phenomics toolkit: quantitative imaging analytics for precision diagnostics and predictive modeling of clinical outcome." *Journal of Medical Imaging*, 5.1:011018, 2018.

<https://doi.org/10.1117/1.jmi.5.1.011018>

[6] S.Pati, et al. "The cancer imaging phenomics toolkit (CaPTk): technical overview." *International MICCAI Brainlesion Workshop*. Springer, Cham, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46643-5_38

[7] S.Pati, et al, "The federated tumor segmentation (FeTS) tool: an open-source solution to further solid tumor research", *Phys. Med. Biol.* 67(20), 204002, 2022. DOI: 10.1088/1361-6560/ac9449

b) Provide information on the possibility for participating teams to evaluate their algorithms before submitting final results. For example, many challenges allow submission of multiple results, and only the last run is officially counted to compute challenge results.

We intend to release the validation set in April together with the training set, allowing participants to tune their methods in the unseen validation data. The validation data ground truth will not be provided to the participants, but multiple submissions to the online evaluation platform will be allowed for the validation phase. Only 2

submissions will be allowed in the final testing/ranking data/phase.

Challenge schedule

Provide a timetable for the challenge. Preferably, this should include

- the release date(s) of the training cases (if any)
- the registration date/period
- the release date(s) of the test cases and validation cases (if any)
- the submission date(s)
- associated workshop days (if any)
- the release date(s) of the results

Registration dates: From now until submission deadline of short papers reporting method and preliminary results (see below).

17 April 2023: Availability of training data (with ground truth labels) and validation data (without ground truth labels).

31 July 2023: Submission of short papers reporting method & preliminary results.

1-7 August 2023: Submission of containerized algorithm to the evaluation platform.

11 – 25 August 2023: Evaluation on testing data (by the organizers - only for participants with submitted papers).

8 September 2023: Contacting top performing methods for preparing slides for oral presentation.

8-12 October 2023: Announcement of final top 3 ranked teams: Challenge at MICCAI

30 November 2023: Camera-ready submission of extended papers for inclusion in the associated workshop proceedings

Ethics approval

Indicate whether ethics approval is necessary for the data. If yes, provide details on the ethics approval, preferably institutional review board, location, date and number of the ethics approval (if applicable). Add the URL or a reference to the document of the ethics approval (if available).

We are already in close coordination with The Cancer Imaging Archive (TCIA) and the Imaging Data Commons (IDC) of the National Institutes of Health (NIH), to release the training and validation data following their standard licensing (<https://wiki.cancerimagingarchive.net/display/Public/Data+Usage+Policies+and+Restrictions>).

The TCIA has already approved this, and we are now in the process of submission (includes a detailed curation process specific to TCIA). The cloud-based IDC is routinely updated with new collections from TCIA. IDC public collections are now part of the Google Public Datasets Program. This will effectively make all the BraTS data available in the Google Marketplace, increasing the potential for access to the data and downstream AI developments using Google's AI resources. IDC data are also expected to be available through the AWS (Amazon Web Services) Marketplace.

Informed consent was obtained from all subjects at their respective institutions, and the protocol for releasing the data was approved by the institutional review board of the data-contributing institution.

Data usage agreement

Clarify how the data can be used and distributed by the teams that participate in the challenge and by others during and after the challenge. This should include the explicit listing of the license applied.

Examples:

- CC BY (Attribution)
- CC BY-SA (Attribution-ShareAlike)
- CC BY-ND (Attribution-NoDerivs)
- CC BY-NC (Attribution-NonCommercial)
- CC BY-NC-SA (Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike)
- CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs)

CC BY.

Additional comments: Additional comments: CC-BY, but if any of the non-TCIA contributors object to this license, the specific subset of the BraTS data will be released under a CC-BY-NC license.

Code availability

a) Provide information on the accessibility of the organizers' evaluation software (e.g. code to produce rankings). Preferably, provide a link to the code and add information on the supported platforms.

The preprocessing tools, evaluation metrics, and the ranking code used during the whole challenge's lifecycle will be made available through the Cancer Imaging Phenomics Toolkit (CaPTk [5-6], <https://github.com/CBICA/CaPTk>), and the Federated Tumor Segmentation (FeTS) Platform [7] (<https://fets-ai.github.io/Front-End/>).

[5] C.Davatzikos, et al. "Cancer imaging phenomics toolkit: quantitative imaging analytics for precision diagnostics and predictive modeling of clinical outcome." *Journal of medical imaging*, 5.1:011018, 2018.

<https://doi.org/10.1117/1.jmi.5.1.011018>

[6] S.Pati, et al. "The cancer imaging phenomics toolkit (CaPTk): technical overview." *International MICCAI Brainlesion Workshop*. Springer, Cham, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46643-5_38

[7] S.Pati, et al, "The federated tumor segmentation (FeTS) tool: an open-source solution to further solid tumor research", *Phys. Med. Biol.* 67(20), 204002, 2022. DOI: 10.1088/1361-6560/ac9449

b) In an analogous manner, provide information on the accessibility of the participating teams' code.

The participants are required to submit their containerized algorithm, during or after the validation phase. Specific instructions for the containerization will be provided after the challenge approval. These instructions will be very similar to what we were requesting participants to provide during the BraTS 2021 and 2022 challenges.

The National Cancer Institute takes special interest in the BraTS 2023 challenge and is considering providing infrastructural support in a number of ways. Dr Keyvan Farahani, a long time co-organizer of BraTS challenges and a project scientist on a collaborative NCI Informatics Technology for Cancer Research (ITCR) grant, is the recipient of an NIH Office of Data Science and Strategy (ODSS)-STRIDES award for "a sustainable medical imaging challenge cloud infrastructure," to further implement open (continuous) challenges by supporting cloud compute and other infrastructures for (a) benchmarking of tools and automated submission of containerized tools for evaluation, (b) hosting of top-ranking tools through NCI FireCloud Resource and public tool repository such as Dockstore or ModelHub, and (c) hosting resulting image annotations as derived data in the Imaging Data Commons (IDC) on the Google Cloud Platform.

Conflicts of interest

Provide information related to conflicts of interest. In particular provide information related to sponsoring/funding of the challenge. Also, state explicitly who had/will have access to the test case labels and when.

Monetary awards are expected by Intel and Neosoma Inc

Spyridon Bakas, Ujjwal Baid, SAGE Bionetworks, and the organization team will have access to the validation, and test case labels.

MISSION OF THE CHALLENGE

Field(s) of application

State the main field(s) of application that the participating algorithms target.

Examples:

- Diagnosis
- Education
- Intervention assistance
- Intervention follow-up
- Intervention planning
- Prognosis
- Research
- Screening
- Training
- Cross-phase

Treatment planning, Intervention planning, Assistance, Research, Surgery, Training, Diagnosis, CAD, Education, Decision support.

Task category(ies)

State the task category(ies).

Examples:

- Classification
- Detection
- Localization
- Modeling
- Prediction
- Reconstruction
- Registration
- Retrieval
- Segmentation
- Tracking

Synthesis, Segmentation

Cohorts

We distinguish between the target cohort and the challenge cohort. For example, a challenge could be designed around the task of medical instrument tracking in robotic kidney surgery. While the challenge could be based on ex vivo data obtained from a laparoscopic training environment with porcine organs (challenge cohort), the final biomedical application (i.e. robotic kidney surgery) would be targeted on real patients with certain characteristics defined by inclusion criteria such as restrictions regarding sex or age (target cohort).

a) Describe the target cohort, i.e. the subjects/objects from whom/which the data would be acquired in the final biomedical application.

Retrospective multi-institutional cohort of patients, diagnosed with de novo diffuse gliomas of the brain, clinically scanned with mpMRI acquisition protocol including i) pre-contrast and ii) contrast-enhanced T1-weighted, iii) T2-weighted and iv) T2-weighted Fluid Attenuated Inversion Recovery (FLAIR) MRI.

b) Describe the challenge cohort, i.e. the subject(s)/object(s) from whom/which the challenge data was acquired.

Retrospective multi-institutional cohort of patients, diagnosed with de novo diffuse gliomas of the brain, clinically scanned with mpMRI acquisition protocol including i) pre-contrast and ii) contrast-enhanced T1-weighted, iii) T2-weighted and iv) T2-weighted Fluid Attenuated Inversion Recovery (FLAIR) MRI.

Imaging modality(ies)

Specify the imaging technique(s) applied in the challenge.

MRI

Context information

Provide additional information given along with the images. The information may correspond ...

a) ... directly to the image data (e.g. tumor volume).

... directly to the image data (i.e., tumor sub-region volumes)

b) ... to the patient in general (e.g. sex, medical history).

N/A

Target entity(ies)

a) Describe the data origin, i.e. the region(s)/part(s) of subject(s)/object(s) from whom/which the image data would be acquired in the final biomedical application (e.g. brain shown in computed tomography (CT) data, abdomen shown in laparoscopic video data, operating room shown in video data, thorax shown in fluoroscopy video). If necessary, differentiate between target and challenge cohort.

Brain mpMRI scans.

b) Describe the algorithm target, i.e. the structure(s)/subject(s)/object(s)/component(s) that the participating algorithms have been designed to focus on (e.g. tumor in the brain, tip of a medical instrument, nurse in an operating theater, catheter in a fluoroscopy scan). If necessary, differentiate between target and challenge cohort.

Tumor in the brain.

Assessment aim(s)

Identify the property(ies) of the algorithms to be optimized to perform well in the challenge. If multiple properties are assessed, prioritize them (if appropriate). The properties should then be reflected in the metrics applied (see below, parameter metric(s)), and the priorities should be reflected in the ranking when combining multiple metrics that assess different properties.

- Example 1: Find highly accurate liver segmentation algorithm for CT images.
- Example 2: Find lung tumor detection algorithm with high sensitivity and specificity for mammography images.

Corresponding metrics are listed below (parameter metric(s)).

~~Sensitivity, Specificity, Precision.~~

~~Additional points: In the global infill task, participants have to generate a full image volume that corresponds to the one missing~~

~~image modality (e.g., it will be one of T1w / T2w / T1c / FLAIR). Results will be evaluated regarding the accuracy of the downstream brain tumor image segmentation using Dice scores and 95th percentile Hausdorff distance. We will implement a BraTS algorithm (the UNet pre-trained in the FETS brain tumor segmentation initiative [17]). The same algorithm will be used to evaluate the hidden test data. Segmentation rankings and image similarity rankings will be combined using statistical methods similar to the metric fusion approaches of previous BraTS editions.~~

~~In the local infill task, participants must generate image intensities of healthy-appearing voxels that are locally 'blanked out' (covering the lesion or a local artifact) for all four image modalities. Outside of the blanked-out area(s), the full information on all four image intensities will be available. Results will be evaluated in terms of structural similarity and L2 distance ('residual') of the image synthesized for the infill area and the real image. As the task is to fill in "healthy" appearing images, the infill areas of the evaluation will be localized outside of the tumor. (Unlike glioma segmentation algorithms in the global infill task, there is no consensus on downstream brain parcellation tasks and algorithms. To this end, we will compare brain parcellation results only in the post-challenge result analysis, and it will not contribute to the ranking.) Similarity and residual intensity-based rankings will be combined using statistical methods similar to the metric fusion approaches of previous BraTS editions.~~

~~In the end, there will be two independent rankings: one for global infill and synthesis and one for local infill and synthesis. Participants can choose to participate in both sub-tasks or just in one.~~

DATA SETS

Data source(s)

a) Specify the device(s) used to acquire the challenge data. This includes details on the device(s) used to acquire the imaging data (e.g. manufacturer) as well as information on additional devices used for performance assessment (e.g. tracking system used in a surgical setting).

The exact scanners and their technical specifications used for acquiring the TCIA cohort has been listed in the data reference published in our related manuscripts [1,2,4]. Since then, multiple institutions have contributed data to create the current RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS dataset and these are listed in the latest BraTS arxiv paper [1]. We are currently in coordination with TCIA to make the complete BraTS 2021-2023 dataset permanently available through their portal. All the acquisition details will be included together with the data availability in TCIA, and subsequently in IDC, including Google and AWS Marketplaces, as part of their Public Datasets Programs.

[1] U. Baid, et al., "The RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS 2021 Benchmark on Brain Tumor Segmentation and Radiogenomic Classification", arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.02314

[2] S.Bakas, et al., "Identifying the best machine learning algorithms for brain tumor segmentation, progression assessment, and overall survival prediction in the BRATS challenge", arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.02629

[4] S. Bakas, H. Akbari, A. Sotiras, M. Bilello, M. Rozycki, J.S. Kirby, et al., "Advancing The Cancer Genome Atlas glioma MRI collections with expert segmentation labels and radiomic features", Nature Scientific Data, 4:170117 (2017) DOI: 10.1038/sdata.2017.117

b) Describe relevant details on the imaging process/data acquisition for each acquisition device (e.g. image acquisition protocol(s)).

The acquisition protocols are different across (and within each) contributing institution, as these represent scans of real routine clinical practice. Specific details (e.g., echo time, repetition time, original acquisition plane) of each scan of each patient will be published as supplementary material together with the challenge meta-analysis manuscript.

c) Specify the center(s)/institute(s) in which the data was acquired and/or the data providing platform/source (e.g. previous challenge). If this information is not provided (e.g. for anonymization reasons), specify why.

The provided data describe mpMRI scans, acquired with different clinical protocols and various scanners from:

University of Pennsylvania (PA, USA),
University of Alabama at Birmingham (AL, USA),
Heidelberg University (Germany),
University of Bern (Switzerland),
University of Debrecen (Hungary),
Henry Ford Hospital (MI, USA),
University of California (CA, USA),
MD Anderson Cancer Center (TX, USA),
Emory University (GA, USA),
Mayo Clinic (MN, USA),
Thomas Jefferson University (PA, USA),
Duke University School of Medicine (NC, USA),
Saint Joseph Hospital and Medical Center (AZ, USA),
Case Western Reserve University (OH, USA),
University of North Carolina (NC, USA),
Fondazione IRCCS Istituto Neurologico C. Besta, (Italy),
Ivy Glioblastoma Atlas Project,
MD Anderson Cancer Center (TX, USA),
Washington University in St. Louis (MO, USA),
Tata Memorial Center (India),
University of Pittsburgh Medical Center (PA, USA),
University of California San Francisco (CA, USA),
Unity Health,
University Hospital of Zurich.

Note that data from institutions 6-17 are provided through The Cancer Imaging Archive (TCIA - <http://www.cancerimagingarchive.net/>), supported by the Cancer Imaging Program (CIP) of the National Cancer Institute (NCI) of the National Institutes of Health (NIH).

d) Describe relevant characteristics (e.g. level of expertise) of the subjects (e.g. surgeon)/objects (e.g. robot) involved in the data acquisition process (if any).

People involved in MRI acquisition for suspected and diagnosis of brain tumors during standard clinical practice.

Training and test case characteristics

a) State what is meant by one case in this challenge. A case encompasses all data that is processed to produce one result that is compared to the corresponding reference result (i.e. the desired algorithm output).

Examples:

- Training and test cases both represent a CT image of a human brain. Training cases have a weak annotation (tumor present or not and tumor volume (if any)) while the test cases are annotated with the tumor contour (if any).
- A case refers to all information that is available for one particular patient in a specific study. This information always includes the image information as specified in data source(s) (see above) and may include context information (see above). Both training and test cases are annotated with survival (binary) 5 years after (first) image was taken.

A case describes multi-parametric MRI scans for a single patient at a single timepoint. The exact scans included for one case are i) unenhanced and ii) contrast-enhanced T1-weighted, iii) T2-weighted and iv) T2 Fluid Attenuated Inversion Recovery (FLAIR) MRI.

Please note that all sequences included for each case of the provided dataset, represent the sequences with the best image quality available in the acquiring institution for this particular case. There was no inclusion/exclusion criterion applied that related to 3d acquisitions, or the exact type of pulse sequence (for example MPAGE). We, instead, accepted all types of T1 acquisitions (with the exception of T1 FLAIR, as we did not want to mix the fluid suppressed values with non-flair scans) and then we applied the harmonized preprocessing protocol we have been using in BraTS, across the complete data. This preprocessing ensures all scans have 3D representations on a specific resolution (1mm^3), and aligned to the same anatomical atlas.

b) State the total number of training, validation and test cases.

Training data: 1,251 cases

Validation data: 219 cases

Testing data: 570 cases

c) Explain why a total number of cases and the specific proportion of training, validation and test cases was chosen.

Based on availability.

The data was split in these numbers between training, validation, and testing after considering the number of cases used as test cases in previous instances of BraTS and the fact that the organizers did not want to reveal ground truth labels of previous test cases, to avoid compromising ranking the participants.

d) Mention further important characteristics of the training, validation and test cases (e.g. class distribution in classification tasks chosen according to real-world distribution vs. equal class distribution) and justify the choice.

For the global synthesis task, all four MRI sequences and the segmentation map will be available in the training data. In the validation and test sets, one modality out of four sequences in each case will be randomly dropped to evaluate the performance of submitted image synthesis methods.

For the local infill task, all four image sequences will be available, but selected regions ('bounding boxes') will be indicated that represent the infill areas. Bounding boxes will cover all tumors and similarly sized regions in the remaining healthy part of the brain to enable the use of supervised infill methods. Those bounding boxes that can be used during training, i.e., those with healthy tissue underneath, will be indicated. In the test set, infill areas will be blanked out, i.e., all image intensities inside the infill areas will be set to a predefined value.

Annotation characteristics

a) Describe the method for determining the reference annotation, i.e. the desired algorithm output. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary. Possible methods include manual image annotation, in silico ground truth generation and annotation by automatic methods.

If human annotation was involved, state the number of annotators.

Infill modalities for the global tasks will be chosen randomly; infill areas will cover tumors and artifacts and similarly sized bounding boxes of healthy regions.

b) Provide the instructions given to the annotators (if any) prior to the annotation. This may include description of a training phase with the software. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary. Preferably, provide a link to the annotation protocol.

The data considered in this task of the BraTS 2023 challenge follows the paradigm of the BraTS 2021-2022 challenge data. The annotation of these data followed a pre-defined clinically-approved annotation protocol (defined by expert neuroradiologists), which was provided to all clinical annotators, describing in detail instructions on what the segmentations of each tumor sub-region should describe (see below for the summary of the specific instructions). The annotators were given the flexibility to use their tool of preference for making the annotations, and also follow either a complete manual annotation approach, or a hybrid approach where an automated approach is used to produce some initial annotations followed by their manual refinements.

Summary of specific instructions:

- i) the enhancing tumor (when present) delineates the hyperintense signal of the T1-Gd, after excluding the vessels.
- ii) the necrotic core (when present) outlines regions appearing dark in both T1 and T1-Gd images (denoting necrosis/cysts), and darked regions in T1-Gd that appear brighter in T1.
- iii) the tumor core, which is the union of the enhancing tumor and the necrotic core described in (i) and (ii) above.
- iv) the farthest tumor extent including the edema (what is called the whole tumor), delineates the tissue represented by the abnormal T2-FLAIR envelope.

c) Provide details on the subject(s)/algorithm(s) that annotated the cases (e.g. information on level of expertise such as number of years of professional experience, medically-trained or not). Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary.

Each case was assigned to a pair of annotator-approver. Annotators spanned across various experience levels and clinical/academic ranks, while the approvers were the 2 experienced board-certified neuroradiologists (with >15 years of experience), listed in the “Organizers” section as “clinical evaluators and annotation approvers”. The annotators were given the flexibility to use their tool of preference for making the annotations, and also follow either a complete manual annotation approach, or a hybrid approach where an automated approach is used to produce some initial annotations followed by their manual refinements. Once the annotators were satisfied with the produced annotations, they were passing these to the corresponding approver. The approver is then responsible for signing off these annotations. Specifically, the approver would review the tumor annotations, in tandem with the corresponding MRI scans, and if the annotations were not of satisfactory quality they would be sent back to the annotators for further refinements. This iterative approach was followed for all cases, until their respective annotations reached satisfactory quality (according to the approver) for being publicly available and noted as final ground truth segmentation labels for these scans.

d) Describe the method(s) used to merge multiple annotations for one case (if any). Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary.

No Aggregation

Data pre-processing method(s)

Describe the method(s) used for pre-processing the raw training data before it is provided to the participating teams. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary.

The exact preprocessing pipeline applied to all the data considered in the BraTS 2023 challenge is identical with the one evaluated and followed by the BraTS 2017-2022 challenges. Specifically, following the conversion of the raw scans from their original DICOM file format to NIfTI file format [10], we first perform a re-orientation of all input scans (T1, T1- Gd, T2, T2-FLAIR) to the LPS/RAI orientation, and then register all of them to the same anatomical atlas (i.e., SRI-24 [9]) and interpolating to the same resolution as this atlas (1 mm³). The exact registration process comprises the following steps:

STEP 1: N4 Bias field correction (notably the application of N4 bias field correction is a temporary step. Taking into consideration we have previously [4] shown that use of non-parametric, non-uniform intensity normalization (i.e., N4) to correct for intensity non-uniformities caused by the inhomogeneity of the scanner's magnetic field during image acquisition obliterates the MRI signal relating to the abnormal/tumor regions, we intentionally use N4 bias field correction in the preprocessing pipeline to facilitate a more optimal rigid registration across the difference MRI sequences. However, after obtaining the related information (i.e., transformation matrices), we discard the bias field corrected scans, and we apply this transformation matrix towards the final co-registered output images used in the challenge).

STEP 2: Rigid Registration of T1, T2, T2-FLAIR to the T1-Gd scan, and obtain the corresponding transformation matrix.

STEP 3: Rigid Registration of T1-Gd scan to the SRI-24 atlas [9], and obtain the corresponding transformation matrix.

STEP 4: Join the obtained transformation matrices and applying aggregated transformation to the LPS-oriented scans.

STEP 5: After completion of the registration process, we perform brain extraction to remove any apparent non-brain tissue (e.g., neck fat, skull, eyeballs) based on a deep-learning approach we developed in house, focusing on scans with apparent brain tumors and exhaustively evaluated it in both private and public multi-institutional data [11]. We then manually assessed all scans for confirming the correct brain extraction (i.e., skull stripping), where the complete brain region is included, and all non-brain tissue is excluded. This whole pipeline, and its source code are available through the CaPTk [5-6](<https://github.com/CBICA/CaPTk>) and FeTS [7] (<https://fets-ai.github.io/Front-End/>) platforms.

[4] S. Bakas, H. Akbari, A. Sotiras, M. Bilello, M. Rozycki, J.S. Kirby, et al., "Advancing The Cancer Genome Atlas glioma MRI collections with expert segmentation labels and radiomic features", Nature Scientific Data, 4:170117, 2017. DOI: 10.1038/sdata.2017.117

[9] T. Rohlfing, et al. The SRI24 multichannel atlas of normal adult human brain structure. Hum Brain Mapp. 31(5):798-819, 2010.

[10] R.Cox, J.Ashburner, H.Breman, K.Fissell, C.Haselgrove, C.Holmes, J.Lancaster, D.Rex, S.Smith, J.Woodward, "A (Sort of) new image data format standard: NIfTI-1: WE 150", Neuroimage, 22, 2004.

[11] S.Thakur, J.Doshi, S.Pati, S.Rathore, C.Sako, M.Bilello, S.M.Ha, G.Shukla, A.Flanders, A.Kotrotsou, M.Milchenko,

S.Liem, G.S.Alexander, J.Lombardo, J.D.Palmer, P.LaMontagne, A.Nazeri, S.Talbar, U.Kulkarni, D.Marcus, R.Colen, C.Davatzikos, G.Erus, S.Bakas, "Brain Extraction on MRI Scans in Presence of Diffuse Glioma: Multi-institutional Performance Evaluation of Deep Learning Methods and Robust Modality-Agnostic Training", *NeuroImage*, 220: 117081, 2020. DOI: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.117081

Sources of error

a) Describe the most relevant possible error sources related to the image annotation. If possible, estimate the magnitude (range) of these errors, using inter-and intra-annotator variability, for example. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases, if necessary.

Study and evaluation of the effect of this error is addressed by the uncertainty task of BraTS 2019-2020 (i.e., to quantify the uncertainty in the tumor segmentations) [8] and is outside the scope of the BraTS 2022 challenge.

[8] R.Mehta, et al, "QU-BraTS: MICCAI BraTS 2020 Challenge on Quantifying Uncertainty in Brain Tumor Segmentation-Analysis of Ranking Scores and Benchmarking Results", *Journal of Machine Learning for Biomedical Imaging*, 1, 26, 2022

b) In an analogous manner, describe and quantify other relevant sources of error.

N/A

ASSESSMENT METHODS

Metric(s)

a) Define the metric(s) to assess a property of an algorithm. These metrics should reflect the desired algorithm properties described in assessment aim(s) (see above). State which metric(s) were used to compute the ranking(s) (if any).

- Example 1: Dice Similarity Coefficient (DSC)
- Example 2: Area under curve (AUC)

Segmentation metrics: 1) Dice Similarity Coefficient (DSC), 2) 95th percentile Hausdorff distance (HD). The automated segmentation will be performed by the final FeTS algorithm [17]. The regions evaluated with the two segmentation metrics describe the whole tumor, the tumor core, and the enhancing tumor (when present). Note that the tumor core includes the part of the tumor that is typically resected (i.e., enhancing, non-enhancing, and necrotic tumor), and the whole tumor describes all tumor sub-regions (i.e., tumor core and edema/invasion).

The Structural similarity Index (SSIM) is used to evaluate the quality of brain structures in synthetic images, i.e. to compare synthetic sequences with their physically acquired counterparts, as does the L2 norm distance.



b) Justify why the metric(s) was/were chosen, preferably with reference to the biomedical application.

In terms of the assessed and evaluated three tumor sub-regions:

- i) the enhancing tumor describes the regions of active tumor and based on this, clinical practice characterizes the extent of resection.
- ii) the tumor core (incl. the necrotic component) describes what is typically resected during a surgical procedure.
- iii) the whole tumor as it defines the whole extent of the tumor, including the peritumoral edematous tissue and highly infiltrated area.

In terms of evaluation metrics, we use:

- i) the Dice Similarity Coefficient, which is commonly used in the assessment of segmentation performance,

- ii) the 95th percentile Hausdorff distance as a complementary metric of overlap-based metric. 95th percentile is chose as opposed to standard HD, in order to avoid outliers having too much weight,
- iii) the structural similarity index, which is commonly perceptual metric to quantify image similarity between synthetic images and reference images.

Ranking method(s)

a) Describe the method used to compute a performance rank for all submitted algorithms based on the generated metric results on the test cases. Typically the text will describe how results obtained per case and metric are aggregated to arrive at a final score/ranking.

For ranking of multidimensional outcomes (or metrics), for each team, we will compute the summation of their ranks across the average of the metrics described above as a univariate overall summary measure. This measure will decide the overall ranking for each specific team. To visualize the results in an intuitive fashion, we propose to visualize the outcome via an augmented version of radar plot [6].

[12] Duan R, Tong J, Lin L, Levine LD, Sammel MD, Stoddard J, Li T, Schmid CH, Chu H, Chen Y. PALM: Patient centered Treatment Ranking via Large-scale Multivariate Network Meta-analysis. medRxiv. 2020 Jan 1

b) Describe the method(s) used to manage submissions with missing results on test cases.

If an algorithm fails to produce a result metric for a specific test case (e.g., inconsistent image dimensions between the generated one and reference one), this metric will be set to its worst possible value (0 for the DSC, the image diagonal for the HD and 0 for structural similarity index).

c) Justify why the described ranking scheme(s) was/were used.

Following discussions with the biostatistician involved in the design of this challenge (Dr Shinohara), and also while considering transparency and fairness to the participants.

Statistical analyses

a) Provide details for the statistical methods used in the scope of the challenge analysis. This may include

- description of the missing data handling,
- details about the assessment of variability of rankings,
- description of any method used to assess whether the data met the assumptions, required for the particular statistical approach, or
- indication of any software product that was used for all data analysis methods.

Similar to BraTS 2017-2022, uncertainties in rankings will be assessed using permutational analyses [3].

Performance for the segmentation task will be assessed based on relative performance of each team on each tumor tissue class and for each segmentation measure. These will be combined by averaging ranks for the measures, and statistical significance will be evaluated only for the segmentation performance measures and will be quantified by permuting the relative ranks for each segmentation measure and tissue class per subject of the testing data.

[2] S. Bakas et al., "Identifying the Best Machine Learning Algorithms for Brain Tumor Segmentation, Progression Assessment, and Overall Survival Prediction in the BRATS Challenge," arXiv:1811.02629 [cs, stat], Apr. 2019, Accessed: Dec. 10, 2020. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1811.02629>.

b) Justify why the described statistical method(s) was/were used.

This permutation testing would reflect differences in performance that exceeded those that might be expected by chance.

Further analyses

Present further analyses to be performed (if applicable), e.g. related to

- combining algorithms via ensembling,
- inter-algorithm variability,
- common problems/biases of the submitted methods, or
- ranking variability.

N/A

TASK: TASK 7: Augmentation Techniques for Brain Tumor Segmentation

SUMMARY

Abstract

Provide a summary of the challenge purpose. This should include a general introduction in the topic from both a biomedical as well as from a technical point of view and clearly state the envisioned technical and/or biomedical impact of the challenge.

In the broader machine learning community, the concept of Data Centric machine learning has emerged to improve the performance of models with more meaningful training data. Data augmentation has been shown to improve the robustness of machine learning models, but the types of augmentations that may be useful for biomedical imaging are unknown. Conventional challenges ask participants to submit a model for evaluation on test data. This data-centric challenge will invert the process, asking participants to submit a method to augment training data such that a baseline model will show improved robustness on new data. Participants will submit a docker container that will augment training data (while keeping the number of training cases fixed) from RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS 2021 challenge such that a common baseline U-Net model architecture can be trained on the container output. The trained model will be evaluated on the RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS 2021 test data for Dice coefficient and Hausdorff95 measures of accuracy, with emphasis on the robustness across the test set. Top performing methods may offer insight to augmentation approaches that could be used to generate robust state-of-the-art segmentation models.

This challenge task will be promoted by Sage Bionetworks and PrecisionFDA, in consultation with the NCI/NIH, and the FDA Center for Device and Radiological Health.



Keywords

List the primary keywords that characterize the task.

Augmentation, Segmentation, Challenge, brain tumor, BraTS, Data Centric, RSNA, ASNR, MICCAI, NCI, DREAM,

ORGANIZATION

Organizers

a) Provide information on the organizing team (names and affiliations).

Organizing team:

=====

Jake Albrecht – [Lead Organizer - Contact Person]

Affiliation: Sage Bionetworks

Elaine Johanson

precisionFDA

Spyridon Bakas

Center for AI and Data Science for Integrated Diagnostics (AI2D), University of Pennsylvania,
Philadelphia, PA, USA

Zeke Meier

Booz Allen Hamilton

Keyvan Farahani, Ph.D.

Center for Biomedical Informatics and Information Technology National
Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health

Ujjwal Baid

Center for AI and Data Science for Integrated Diagnostics (AI2D), University of Pennsylvania,
Philadelphia, PA, USA

Timothy Bergquist

Sage Bionetworks

Rong Chai

Sage Bionetworks

Verena Chung

Sage Bionetworks

Russell (Taki) Shinohara, Ph.D.

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Clinical Evaluators and Annotation Approvers:

=====

Michel Bilello, MD, Ph.D.,

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Suyash Mohan, MD, Ph.D.

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Satyam Ghodasara (Approver Coordinator)

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

+ 60 ASNR member neuroradiologists involved in the ground truth generation (listed in the BraTS 2021 paper and
in the evaluation platform (www.synapse.org/brats))

Annotation Volunteers

(in order of decreasing data contributions)

=====

Evan Calabrese, MD, PHD, Department of Radiology & Biomedical Imaging, University of California San Francisco,
CA, USA

Ahmed W. Moawad, MBBS, Mercy Catholic Medical Center, Darby, PA, USA

Jeffrey Rudie, MD, PHD, Department of Radiology & Biomedical Imaging, University of California San Francisco,
CA, USA

Luiz Otavio Coelho, MD, Diagnóstico Avançado por Imagem, Curitiba, Brazil and Hospital Erasto Gaertner,
Curitiba, Brazil

Olivia McDonnell, Department of Medical Imaging, Gold Coast University Hospital, Southport, Australia
Elka Miller, MD, Department of Radiology, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada
Fanny E. Morón, MD, Department of Radiology, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, Tex, USA
Mark C. Oswood, MD, PHD, Department of Radiology, Hennepin Healthcare, Minneapolis, MN, USA
Robert Y. Shih, MD, Uniformed Services University, Bethesda, MD, USA
Loizos Siakallis, MD, Institute of Neurology, University College London, London, United Kingdom
Yulia Bronstein, MD, Virtual Radiologic Professionals, LLC - Branson, Eden Prairie, MN, USA
James R. Mason, DO, MPH, University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, Pittsburgh, PA, USA
Anthony F. Miller, MD, Hahnemann University Hospital Drexel University College of Medicine, PA, USA
Gagandeep Choudhary, MD, MBMS, Department of Radiology, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, OR, USA
Aanchal Agarwal, MBBS, Dr Jones and Partners Medical Imaging, South Australia
Cristina H. Besada, MD, PHD, Department of Neuroradiology, Hospital Italiano de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina
Jamal J. Derakhshan, MD, PHD, Mallinckrodt Institute of Radiology, Washington University in St. Louis, MO, USA
Mariana Cardoso Diogo, MD, Neuroradiology Department, Hospital Garcia de Orta EPE, Almada, Portugal
Daniel D. Do-Dai, MD, Department of Radiology, Tufts Medical Center, Boston, MA, USA.
Luciano Farage, MD, Centro Universitario Euro-Americana (UNIEURO), Brasília, DF, Brazil
John L. Go, MD, Department of Radiology, Division of Neuroradiology, University of Southern California, Keck School of Medicine, Los Angeles, CA, USA.
Mohiuddin Hadi, MD, Radiology (Neuroradiology Section), University of Louisville, Louisville, KY, USA
Virginia B. Hill, MD, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL, USA
Michael Iv, MD, Stanford Hospital and Clinics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA
David Joyner, MD, Department of Radiology and Medical Imaging University of Virginia Health System Charlottesville, VA, USA
Christie Lincoln, MD, Department of Radiology, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, Tex, USA
Eyal Lotan, MD, PHD, NYU Langone Medical Center, New York, NY, USA
Asako Miyakoshi, MD, Kaiser Permanente, San Diego, CA, USA
Mariana Sanchez-Montaña, MD, Instituto Nacional de Ciencias Medicas y Nutricion, Mexico City, Mexico
Jaya Nath, MD, Northport VA Medical Center Northport, NY, USA
Xuan V. Nguyen, MD, PHD, Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center, Columbus, OH, USA
Manal Nicolas-Jilwan, MD, University of Virginia Medical Center, Charlottesville, VA, USA
Johanna Ortiz Jimenez, MD, Neuroradiology- Department of Radiology Kingston General Hospital - Queen's University, Kingston, Canada
Kerem Ozturk, MD, Department of Radiology, University of Minnesota Health, Minneapolis, MN, USA
Bojan D. Petrovic, MD, NorthShore University HealthSystem, Chicago, IL, USA
Lubdhra M. Shah, MD, University of Utah Health Sciences Center, Salt Lake City, UT, USA
Chintan Shah, MD, MS, Neuroradiology and Imaging Informatics Imaging Institute, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, OH, USA
Manas Sharma, MD, MBMS, London Health Sciences Centre, London, Ontario, Canada
Onur Simsek, MD, Dr Abdurrahman Yurtaslan Ankara Oncology Training and Research Hospital, University of Health Sciences, Ankara, Turkey
Achint K. Singh, MD, University of Texas Health San Antonio, TX, USA
Salil Soman, MD, MS, Department of Radiology, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

Volodymyr Statsevych, MD, Neuroradiology and Imaging Informatics Imaging Institute, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, OH, USA

Brent D. Weinberg, MD, PHD, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA

Robert J. Young, MD, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY, USA

Ichiro Ikuta, MD, MMSc, Yale University School of Medicine, Department of Radiology & Biomedical Imaging, New Haven, CT, USA

Amit K. Agarwal, MD, MBMS, Mayo Clinic, Jacksonville, FL, USA

Sword Christian Cambron, MD, Dartmouth Hitchcock Medical Center, NH, USA

Richard Silbergleit, MD, Oakland University William Beaumont School of Medicine, Rochester, MI, USA.

Alexandru Duso, Radiology Department at Klinikum Hochrhein Waldshut-Tiengen, Germany

Alida A. Postma, MD, PHD, Maastricht University Hospital, Maastricht, The Netherlands

Laurent Letourneau-Guillon, MSc, Radiology department, Centre Hospitalier de l'Université de Montréal (CHUM) and Centre de Recherche du CHUM (CRCHUM) Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Gloria J. Guzmán Pérez-Carrillo, MD, MSc, Mallinckrodt Institute of Radiology, School of Medicine, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, USA

Atin Saha, MD, Department of Radiology, NewYork-Presbyterian Hospital, Weill Cornell Medical College, New York, NY, USA

Neetu Soni, MD, MBMS, University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics, Iowa City, IA, USA

Greg Zaharchuk, MD, PHD, Department of Radiology Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

Vahe M. Zohrabian, MD, Department of Radiology, Northwell Health, Zucker Hofstra School of Medicine at Northwell, North Shore University Hospital, Hempstead, New York, NY, USA.

Yingming Chen, MD, Department of Medical Imaging, University of Toronto, ON, Canada

Milos M. Cekic, MD, University of California Los Angeles, CA, USA

Akm Rahman, DO, University of Rochester Medical Center, Rochester, NY, USA

Juan E. Small, MD, Lahey Clinic, Burlington, MA, USA

Varun Sethi, MD, Temple University Hospital, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Data Contributors:

=====

Christos Davatzikos, Ph.D., & Spyridon Bakas, Ph.D., CBICA, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

John Mongan, M.D., Ph.D. & Evan Calabrese, M.D., Ph.D. & Jeffrey D. Rudie, M.D., Ph.D. & Christopher Hess, M.D., Ph.D. & Soonmee Cha, M.D. & Javier Villanueva-Meyer, M.D., University of California San Francisco, CA, USA

John B. Freymann & Justin S. Kirby - on behalf of The Cancer Imaging Archive (TCIA) Cancer Imaging Program, NCI, National Institutes of Health (NIH), USA

Benedikt Wiestler, M.D., & Bjoern Menze, Ph.D., Technical University of Munich, Germany

Bjoern Menze, Ph.D., University of Zurich, Switzerland

Errol Colak, M.D., Priscila Crivellaro, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

Rivka R. Colen, M.D. University of Pittsburgh Medical Center

Aikaterini Kotrotsou, Ph.D., MD Anderson Cancer Center, TX, USA

Daniel Marcus, Ph.D., & Mikhail Milchenko, Ph.D., & Arash Nazeri, M.D., Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis, MO, USA

Hassan Fathallah-Shaykh, M.D., Ph.D., University of Alabama at Birmingham, AL, USA

Roland Wiest, M.D., University of Bern, Switzerland

Andras Jakab, M.D., Ph.D., University of Debrecen, Hungary

Marc-Andre Weber, M.D., Heidelberg University, Germany

Abhishek Mahajan, M.D. & Ujjwal Baid, Ph.D., Tata Memorial Center, Mumbai, India, & SGGS Institute of Engineering and Technology, Nanded, India

b) Provide information on the primary contact person.

Jake Albrecht [Lead Organizer - Contact Person]

Affiliation: Sage Bionetworks

Email id: jake.albrecht@sagebionetworks.org

Life cycle type

Define the intended submission cycle of the challenge. Include information on whether/how the challenge will be continued after the challenge has taken place. Not every challenge closes after the submission deadline (one-time event). Sometimes it is possible to submit results after the deadline (open call) or the challenge is repeated with some modifications (repeated event).

Examples:

- One-time event with fixed conference submission deadline
- Open call (challenge opens for new submissions after conference deadline)
- Repeated event with annual fixed conference submission deadline

One time event with fixed submission deadline.

Challenge venue and platform

a) Report the event (e.g. conference) that is associated with the challenge (if any).

MICCAI.

b) Report the platform (e.g. grand-challenge.org) used to run the challenge.

Following our successful collaboration with the Synapse platform (SAGE Bionetworks) since the RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS 2021 challenge [1], we have coordinated with them and following the support from NCI (represented by Dr Keyvan Farahani in the organizing committee - Chair of the NCI AI Challenges Working Group) Synapse will be used as the platform to drive the evaluation of this cluster of challenges.

The National Cancer Institute takes special interest in the BraTS 2023 challenge and is considering providing infrastructural support in a number of ways. Dr Keyvan Farahani, a long-time co-organizer of BraTS challenges and a project scientist on a collaborative NCI Informatics Technology for Cancer Research (ITCR) grant, is the recipient of an NIH Office of Data Science and Strategy (ODSS)-STRIDES award for “a sustainable medical imaging challenge cloud infrastructure,” to further implement open (continuous) challenges by supporting cloud compute and other infrastructures for (a) benchmarking of tools and automated submission of containerized tools for evaluation, (b) hosting of top-ranking tools through NCI FireCloud Resource and public tool repository such as Dockstore or ModelHub, and (c) hosting resulting image annotations as derived data in the Imaging Data Commons (IDC). All aforementioned NCI platforms are implemented on the Google Cloud Platform.

This collaboration with Synapse, enabled by NCI/NIH support through ITCR grant (Jamed Eddy, PI) and other NCI resources represents a major advancement in the challenge design and leveraging of public resources.

c) Provide the URL for the challenge website (if any).

<https://www.med.upenn.edu/cbica/brats2023/> - (Website will be publicly visible after the challenge approval)

Participation policies

a) Define the allowed user interaction of the algorithms assessed (e.g. only (semi-) automatic methods allowed).

Fully automatic.

b) Define the policy on the usage of training data. The data used to train algorithms may, for example, be restricted to the data provided by the challenge or to publicly available data including (open) pre-trained nets.

Participants are allowed to use additional data from publicly available datasets and their own institutions, for further complementing the data, but if they do so, they **MUST** also discuss the potential difference in their results after using only the BraTS 2023 data, since our intention is to solve the particular segmentation problem, but also to provide a fair comparison among the participating methods.

c) Define the participation policy for members of the organizers' institutes. For example, members of the organizers' institutes may participate in the challenge but are not eligible for awards.

May participate but organizers and their immediate groups will not be eligible for awards.

Since organizing institutions are large, other employees from other labs/departments may participate and should be eligible for the awards and to be listed in the leaderboard.

d) Define the award policy. In particular, provide details with respect to challenge prizes.

Following communication with 1) Intel and 2) Neosoma Inc, we have informal confirmation for the sponsorship of monetary awards for the top 3 teams. Formal confirmation can only be provided after the acceptance of the challenge.

Note that Intel has been offering monetary awards during each of BraTS 2018-2022, and Neosoma for BraTS 2021.

NIH/NCI will also provide Certificates of Merit to the top 3 performing teams.

e) Define the policy for result announcement.

Examples:

- Top 3 performing methods will be announced publicly.
- Participating teams can choose whether the performance results will be made public.

Top 3 performing methods will be announced publicly at the conference and the participants will be invited to present their method.

f) Define the publication policy. In particular, provide details on ...

- ... who of the participating teams/the participating teams' members qualifies as author
- ... whether the participating teams may publish their own results separately, and (if so)
- ... whether an embargo time is defined (so that challenge organizers can publish a challenge paper first).

The configuration of combining the BraTS challenge with the BrainLes workshop provides the BraTS participants with the option to extend their papers to 12-14 pages, and hence publish their methods in the workshop's LNCS post-conference proceedings. Furthermore, we intend to coordinate a journal manuscript focusing on publishing and summarizing the results of the challenge.

Submission method

a) Describe the method used for result submission. Preferably, provide a link to the submission instructions.

Examples:

- Docker container on the Synapse platform. Link to submission instructions: <URL>
- Algorithm output was sent to organizers via e-mail. Submission instructions were sent by e-mail.

The participants are required to send the output of their methods to the evaluation platform for the scoring to occur during the training and the validation phases. At the end of the validation phase the participants are asked to identify the method they would like to evaluate in the final testing/ranking phase. The organizers will then confirm receiving the containerized method and will evaluate it in the hidden testing data. The participants will be provided guidelines on the form of the container as we have done in previous years. This will enable confirmation of reproducibility, running of these algorithms to the previous BraTS instances and comparison with results obtained by algorithms of previous years, thereby maximizing solutions in solving the problem of brain tumor segmentation. During the training and validation phases, the participants will have the chance to test the functionality of their submission through both the Cancer Imaging Phenomics Toolkit (CaPTk [5-6], <https://github.com/CBICA/CaPTk>), and the Federated Tumor Segmentation (FeTS) Tool [7] (<https://fets-ai.github.io/Front-End/>) that offer the implementation of the evaluation metrics, as well as via the online evaluation platform (Synapse).

[5] C.Davatzikos, et al. "Cancer imaging phenomics toolkit: quantitative imaging analytics for precision diagnostics and predictive modeling of clinical outcome." *Journal of Medical Imaging*, 5.1:011018, 2018.

<https://doi.org/10.1117/1.jmi.5.1.011018>

[6] S.Pati, et al. "The cancer imaging phenomics toolkit (CaPTk): technical overview." *International MICCAI Brainlesion Workshop*. Springer, Cham, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46643-5_38

[7] S.Pati, et al, "The federated tumor segmentation (FeTS) tool: an open-source solution to further solid tumor research", *Phys. Med. Biol.* 67(20), 204002, 2022. DOI: 10.1088/1361-6560/ac9449

b) Provide information on the possibility for participating teams to evaluate their algorithms before submitting final results. For example, many challenges allow submission of multiple results, and only the last run is officially counted to compute challenge results.

We intend to release the validation set in April together with the training set, allowing participants to tune their methods in the unseen validation data. The validation data ground truth will not be provided to the participants, but multiple submissions to the online evaluation platform will be allowed for the validation phase. Only 2 submissions will be allowed in the final testing/ranking data/phase.

Challenge schedule

Provide a timetable for the challenge. Preferably, this should include

- the release date(s) of the training cases (if any)
- the registration date/period
- the release date(s) of the test cases and validation cases (if any)
- the submission date(s)
- associated workshop days (if any)
- the release date(s) of the results

Registration dates: From now until submission deadline of short papers reporting method and preliminary results

(see below).

17 April 2023: Availability of training data (with ground truth labels) and validation data (without ground truth labels).

31 July 2023: Submission of short papers reporting method & preliminary results.

1-7 August 2023: Submission of containerized algorithm to the evaluation platform.

11 – 25 August 2023: Evaluation on testing data (by the organizers - only for participants with submitted papers).

8 September 2023: Contacting top performing methods for preparing slides for oral presentation.

8-12 October 2023: Announcement of final top 3 ranked teams: Challenge at MICCAI

30 November 2023: Camera-ready submission of extended papers for inclusion in the associated workshop proceedings

Ethics approval

Indicate whether ethics approval is necessary for the data. If yes, provide details on the ethics approval, preferably institutional review board, location, date and number of the ethics approval (if applicable). Add the URL or a reference to the document of the ethics approval (if available).

We are already in close coordination with The Cancer Imaging Archive (TCIA) and the Imaging Data Commons (IDC) of the National Institutes of Health (NIH), to release the training and validation data following their standard licensing (<https://wiki.cancerimagingarchive.net/display/Public/Data+Usage+Policies+and+Restrictions>).

The TCIA has already approved this, and we are now in the process of submission (includes a detailed curation process specific to TCIA). The cloud-based IDC is routinely updated with new collections from TCIA. IDC public collections are now part of the Google Public Datasets Program. This will effectively make all the BraTS data available in the Google Marketplace, increasing the potential for access to the data and downstream AI developments using Google's AI resources. IDC data are also expected to be available through the AWS (Amazon Web Services) Marketplace.

Informed consent was obtained from all subjects at their respective institutions, and the protocol for releasing the data was approved by the institutional review board of the data-contributing institution.

Data usage agreement

Clarify how the data can be used and distributed by the teams that participate in the challenge and by others during and after the challenge. This should include the explicit listing of the license applied.

Examples:

- CC BY (Attribution)
- CC BY-SA (Attribution-ShareAlike)
- CC BY-ND (Attribution-NoDerivs)
- CC BY-NC (Attribution-NonCommercial)
- CC BY-NC-SA (Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike)
- CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs)

CC BY.

Additional comments: Additional comments: CC-BY, but if any of the non-TCIA contributors object to this license, the specific subset of the BraTS data will be released under a CC-BY-NC license.

Code availability

a) Provide information on the accessibility of the organizers' evaluation software (e.g. code to produce rankings). Preferably, provide a link to the code and add information on the supported platforms.

The preprocessing tools, evaluation metrics, and the ranking code used during the whole challenge's lifecycle will be made available through the Cancer Imaging Phenomics Toolkit (CaPTk [5-6], <https://github.com/CBICA/CaPTk>), and the Federated Tumor Segmentation (FeTS) Platform [7] (<https://fets-ai.github.io/Front-End/>).

[5] C.Davatzikos, et al. "Cancer imaging phenomics toolkit: quantitative imaging analytics for precision diagnostics and predictive modeling of clinical outcome." *Journal of medical imaging*, 5.1:011018, 2018.

<https://doi.org/10.1117/1.jmi.5.1.011018>

[6] S.Pati, et al. "The cancer imaging phenomics toolkit (CaPTk): technical overview." *International MICCAI Brainlesion Workshop*. Springer, Cham, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46643-5_38

[7] S.Pati, et al, "The federated tumor segmentation (FeTS) tool: an open-source solution to further solid tumor research", *Phys. Med. Biol.* 67(20), 204002, 2022. DOI: 10.1088/1361-6560/ac9449

b) In an analogous manner, provide information on the accessibility of the participating teams' code.

The participants are required to submit their containerized algorithm, during or after the validation phase. Specific instructions for the containerization will be provided after the challenge approval. These instructions will be very similar to what we were requesting participants to provide during the BraTS 2021 and 2022 challenges.

The National Cancer Institute takes special interest in the BraTS 2023 challenge and is considering providing infrastructural support in a number of ways. Dr Keyvan Farahani, a long time co-organizer of BraTS challenges and a project scientist on a collaborative NCI Informatics Technology for Cancer Research (ITCR) grant, is the recipient of an NIH Office of Data Science and Strategy (ODSS)-STRIDES award for "a sustainable medical imaging challenge cloud infrastructure," to further implement open (continuous) challenges by supporting cloud compute and other infrastructures for (a) benchmarking of tools and automated submission of containerized tools for evaluation, (b) hosting of top-ranking tools through NCI FireCloud Resource and public tool repository such as Dockstore or ModelHub, and (c) hosting resulting image annotations as derived data in the Imaging Data Commons (IDC) on the Google Cloud Platform.

Conflicts of interest

Provide information related to conflicts of interest. In particular provide information related to sponsoring/funding of the challenge. Also, state explicitly who had/will have access to the test case labels and when.

Monetary awards are expected by Intel and Neosoma Inc

Spyridon Bakas, Ujjwal Baid, SAGE Bionetworks, and the clinical evaluators will have access to the validation, and test case labels.

MISSION OF THE CHALLENGE

Field(s) of application

State the main field(s) of application that the participating algorithms target.

Examples:

- Diagnosis
- Education
- Intervention assistance
- Intervention follow-up
- Intervention planning
- Prognosis
- Research
- Screening
- Training
- Cross-phase

Treatment planning, Intervention planning, Assistance, Research, Surgery, Training, Diagnosis, CAD, Education, Decision support.

Task category(ies)

State the task category(ies).

Examples:

- Classification
- Detection
- Localization
- Modeling
- Prediction
- Reconstruction
- Registration
- Retrieval
- Segmentation
- Tracking

Augmentation, Segmentation

Cohorts

We distinguish between the target cohort and the challenge cohort. For example, a challenge could be designed around the task of medical instrument tracking in robotic kidney surgery. While the challenge could be based on ex vivo data obtained from a laparoscopic training environment with porcine organs (challenge cohort), the final biomedical application (i.e. robotic kidney surgery) would be targeted on real patients with certain characteristics defined by inclusion criteria such as restrictions regarding sex or age (target cohort).

a) Describe the target cohort, i.e. the subjects/objects from whom/which the data would be acquired in the final biomedical application.

Retrospective multi-institutional cohort of patients, diagnosed with de novo diffuse gliomas of the brain, clinically scanned with mpMRI acquisition protocol including i) pre-contrast and ii) contrast-enhanced T1-weighted, iii) T2-weighted and iv) T2-weighted Fluid Attenuated Inversion Recovery (FLAIR) MRI.

b) Describe the challenge cohort, i.e. the subject(s)/object(s) from whom/which the challenge data was acquired.

Retrospective multi-institutional cohort of patients, diagnosed with de novo diffuse gliomas of the brain, clinically

scanned with mpMRI acquisition protocol including i) pre-contrast and ii) contrast-enhanced T1-weighted, iii) T2-weighted and iv) T2-weighted Fluid Attenuated Inversion Recovery (FLAIR) MRI.

Imaging modality(ies)

Specify the imaging technique(s) applied in the challenge.

MRI

Context information

Provide additional information given along with the images. The information may correspond ...

a) ... directly to the image data (e.g. tumor volume).

... directly to the image data (i.e., tumor sub-region volumes)

b) ... to the patient in general (e.g. sex, medical history).

N/A

Target entity(ies)

a) Describe the data origin, i.e. the region(s)/part(s) of subject(s)/object(s) from whom/which the image data would be acquired in the final biomedical application (e.g. brain shown in computed tomography (CT) data, abdomen shown in laparoscopic video data, operating room shown in video data, thorax shown in fluoroscopy video). If necessary, differentiate between target and challenge cohort.

Brain mpMRI scans.

b) Describe the algorithm target, i.e. the structure(s)/subject(s)/object(s)/component(s) that the participating algorithms have been designed to focus on (e.g. tumor in the brain, tip of a medical instrument, nurse in an operating theater, catheter in a fluoroscopy scan). If necessary, differentiate between target and challenge cohort.

Tumor in the brain.

Assessment aim(s)

Identify the property(ies) of the algorithms to be optimized to perform well in the challenge. If multiple properties are assessed, prioritize them (if appropriate). The properties should then be reflected in the metrics applied (see below, parameter metric(s)), and the priorities should be reflected in the ranking when combining multiple metrics that assess different properties.

- Example 1: Find highly accurate liver segmentation algorithm for CT images.
- Example 2: Find lung tumor detection algorithm with high sensitivity and specificity for mammography images.

Corresponding metrics are listed below (parameter metric(s)).

Sensitivity, Specificity, Precision.

Additional points: Dice, Hausdorff 95th percentile

DATA SETS

Data source(s)

a) Specify the device(s) used to acquire the challenge data. This includes details on the device(s) used to acquire the imaging data (e.g. manufacturer) as well as information on additional devices used for performance assessment (e.g. tracking system used in a surgical setting).

The exact scanners and their technical specifications used for acquiring the TCIA cohort has been listed in the data reference published in our related manuscripts [1,2,4]. Since then, multiple institutions have contributed data to create the current RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS dataset and these are listed in the latest BraTS arxiv paper [1]. We are currently in coordination with TCIA to make the complete BraTS 2021-2023 dataset permanently available through their portal. All the acquisition details will be included together with the data availability in TCIA, and subsequently in IDC, including Google and AWS Marketplaces, as part of their Public Datasets Programs.

[1] U. Baid, et al., "The RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS 2021 Benchmark on Brain Tumor Segmentation and Radiogenomic Classification", arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.02314

[2] S.Bakas, et al., "Identifying the best machine learning algorithms for brain tumor segmentation, progression assessment, and overall survival prediction in the BRATS challenge", arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.02629

[4] S. Bakas, H. Akbari, A. Sotiras, M. Bilello, M. Rozycki, J.S. Kirby, et al., "Advancing The Cancer Genome Atlas glioma MRI collections with expert segmentation labels and radiomic features", Nature Scientific Data, 4:170117 (2017) DOI: 10.1038/sdata.2017.117

b) Describe relevant details on the imaging process/data acquisition for each acquisition device (e.g. image acquisition protocol(s)).

The acquisition protocols are different across (and within each) contributing institution, as these represent scans of real routine clinical practice. Specific details (e.g., echo time, repetition time, original acquisition plane) of each scan of each patient will be published as supplementary material together with the challenge meta-analysis manuscript.

c) Specify the center(s)/institute(s) in which the data was acquired and/or the data providing platform/source (e.g. previous challenge). If this information is not provided (e.g. for anonymization reasons), specify why.

The provided data describe mpMRI scans, acquired with different clinical protocols and various scanners from:

University of Pennsylvania (PA, USA),

University of Alabama at Birmingham (AL, USA),

Heidelberg University (Germany),

University of Bern (Switzerland),

University of Debrecen (Hungary),

Henry Ford Hospital (MI, USA),

University of California (CA, USA),

MD Anderson Cancer Center (TX, USA),

Emory University (GA, USA),

Mayo Clinic (MN, USA),

Thomas Jefferson University (PA, USA),

Duke University School of Medicine (NC, USA),

Saint Joseph Hospital and Medical Center (AZ, USA),

Case Western Reserve University (OH, USA),

University of North Carolina (NC, USA),

Fondazione IRCCS Istituto Neurologico C. Besta, (Italy),
Ivy Glioblastoma Atlas Project,
MD Anderson Cancer Center (TX, USA),
Washington University in St. Louis (MO, USA),
Tata Memorial Center (India),
University of Pittsburgh Medical Center (PA, USA),
University of California San Francisco (CA, USA),
Unity Health,
University Hospital of Zurich.

Note that data from institutions 6-17 are provided through The Cancer Imaging Archive (TCIA - <http://www.cancerimagingarchive.net/>), supported by the Cancer Imaging Program (CIP) of the National Cancer Institute (NCI) of the National Institutes of Health (NIH).

d) Describe relevant characteristics (e.g. level of expertise) of the subjects (e.g. surgeon)/objects (e.g. robot) involved in the data acquisition process (if any).

People involved in MRI acquisition for suspected and diagnosis of brain tumors during standard clinical practice.

Training and test case characteristics

a) State what is meant by one case in this challenge. A case encompasses all data that is processed to produce one result that is compared to the corresponding reference result (i.e. the desired algorithm output).

Examples:

- Training and test cases both represent a CT image of a human brain. Training cases have a weak annotation (tumor present or not and tumor volume (if any)) while the test cases are annotated with the tumor contour (if any).
- A case refers to all information that is available for one particular patient in a specific study. This information always includes the image information as specified in data source(s) (see above) and may include context information (see above). Both training and test cases are annotated with survival (binary) 5 years after (first) image was taken.

A case describes multi-parametric MRI scans for a single patient at a single timepoint. The exact scans included for one case are i) unenhanced and ii) contrast-enhanced T1-weighted, iii) T2-weighted and iv) T2 Fluid Attenuated Inversion Recovery (FLAIR) MRI.

Please note that all sequences included for each case of the provided dataset, represent the sequences with the best image quality available in the acquiring institution for this particular case. There was no inclusion/exclusion criterion applied that related to 3d acquisitions, or the exact type of pulse sequence (for example MPRAGE). We, instead, accepted all types of T1 acquisitions (with the exception of T1 FLAIR, as we did not want to mix the fluid suppressed values with non-flair scans) and then we applied the harmonized preprocessing protocol we have been using in BraTS, across the complete data. This preprocessing ensures all scans have 3D representations on a specific resolution (1mm^3), and aligned to the same anatomical atlas.

b) State the total number of training, validation and test cases.

Training data: 1,251 cases

Validation data: 219 cases

Testing data: 570 cases

c) Explain why a total number of cases and the specific proportion of training, validation and test cases was chosen.

Based on availability. The data was split in these numbers between training, validation, and testing after considering the number of cases used as test cases in previous instances of BraTS and the fact that the organizers did not want to reveal ground truth labels of previous test cases, to avoid compromising ranking the participants.

d) Mention further important characteristics of the training, validation and test cases (e.g. class distribution in classification tasks chosen according to real-world distribution vs. equal class distribution) and justify the choice.

N/A

Annotation characteristics

a) Describe the method for determining the reference annotation, i.e. the desired algorithm output. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary. Possible methods include manual image annotation, in silico ground truth generation and annotation by automatic methods.

If human annotation was involved, state the number of annotators.

Reference approved from at least 2 experienced neuroradiologists, following annotations from 60 clinical neuroradiologists (volunteers from ASNR)

b) Provide the instructions given to the annotators (if any) prior to the annotation. This may include description of a training phase with the software. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary. Preferably, provide a link to the annotation protocol.

The data considered in this task of the BraTS 2023 challenge follows the paradigm of the BraTS 2021-2022 challenge data. The annotation of these data followed a pre-defined clinically-approved annotation protocol (defined by expert neuroradiologists), which was provided to all clinical annotators, describing in detail instructions on what the segmentations of each tumor sub-region should describe (see below for the summary of the specific instructions). The annotators were given the flexibility to use their tool of preference for making the annotations, and also follow either a complete manual annotation approach, or a hybrid approach where an automated approach is used to produce some initial annotations followed by their manual refinements.

Summary of specific instructions:

- i) the enhancing tumor (when present) delineates the hyperintense signal of the T1-Gd, after excluding the vessels.
- ii) the necrotic core (when present) outlines regions appearing dark in both T1 and T1-Gd images (denoting necrosis/cysts), and darked regions in T1-Gd that appear brighter in T1.
- iii) the tumor core, which is the union of the enhancing tumor and the necrotic core described in (i) and (ii) above.
- iv) the farthest tumor extent including the edema (what is called the whole tumor), delineates the tissue represented by the abnormal T2-FLAIR envelope.

c) Provide details on the subject(s)/algorithm(s) that annotated the cases (e.g. information on level of expertise such as number of years of professional experience, medically-trained or not). Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary.

Each case was assigned to a pair of annotator-approver. Annotators spanned across various experience levels and clinical/academic ranks, while the approvers were the 2 experienced board-certified neuroradiologists (with >15 years of experience), listed in the “Organizers” section as “clinical evaluators and annotation approvers”. The

annotators were given the flexibility to use their tool of preference for making the annotations, and also follow either a complete manual annotation approach, or a hybrid approach where an automated approach is used to produce some initial annotations followed by their manual refinements. Once the annotators were satisfied with the produced annotations, they were passing these to the corresponding approver. The approver is then responsible for signing off these annotations. Specifically, the approver would review the tumor annotations, in tandem with the corresponding MRI scans, and if the annotations were not of satisfactory quality they would be sent back to the annotators for further refinements. This iterative approach was followed for all cases, until their respective annotations reached satisfactory quality (according to the approver) for being publicly available and noted as final ground truth segmentation labels for these scans.

d) Describe the method(s) used to merge multiple annotations for one case (if any). Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary.

No Aggregation

Data pre-processing method(s)

Describe the method(s) used for pre-processing the raw training data before it is provided to the participating teams. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary.

The exact preprocessing pipeline applied to all the data considered in the BraTS 2023 challenge is identical with the one evaluated and followed by the BraTS 2017-2022 challenges. Specifically, following the conversion of the raw scans from their original DICOM file format to NIfTI file format [10], we first perform a re-orientation of all input scans (T1, T1- Gd, T2, T2-FLAIR) to the LPS/RAI orientation, and then register all of them to the same anatomical atlas (i.e., SRI-24 [9]) and interpolating to the same resolution as this atlas (1 mm³). The exact registration process comprises the following steps:

STEP 1: N4 Bias field correction (notably the application of N4 bias field correction is a temporary step. Taking into consideration we have previously [4] shown that use of non-parametric, non-uniform intensity normalization (i.e., N4) to correct for intensity non-uniformities caused by the inhomogeneity of the scanner's magnetic field during image acquisition obliterates the MRI signal relating to the abnormal/tumor regions, we intentionally use N4 bias field correction in the preprocessing pipeline to facilitate a more optimal rigid registration across the difference MRI sequences. However, after obtaining the related information (i.e., transformation matrices), we discard the bias field corrected scans, and we apply this transformation matrix towards the final co-registered output images used in the challenge).

STEP 2: Rigid Registration of T1, T2, T2-FLAIR to the T1-Gd scan, and obtain the corresponding transformation matrix.

STEP 3: Rigid Registration of T1-Gd scan to the SRI-24 atlas [9], and obtain the corresponding transformation matrix.

STEP 4: Join the obtained transformation matrices and applying aggregated transformation to the LPS-oriented scans.

STEP 5: After completion of the registration process, we perform brain extraction to remove any apparent non-brain tissue (e.g., neck fat, skull, eyeballs) based on a deep-learning approach we developed in house, focusing on scans with apparent brain tumors and exhaustively evaluated it in both private and public multi-institutional data [11]. We then manually assessed all scans for confirming the correct brain extraction (i.e., skull stripping), where the complete brain region is included, and all non-brain tissue is excluded. This whole pipeline, and its source code are available through the CaPTk [5-6](<https://github.com/CBICA/CaPTk>) and FeTS [7] (<https://fets-ai.github.io/Front-End/>) platforms.

- [4] S. Bakas, H. Akbari, A. Sotiras, M. Bilello, M. Rozycki, J.S. Kirby, et al., "Advancing The Cancer Genome Atlas glioma MRI collections with expert segmentation labels and radiomic features", *Nature Scientific Data*, 4:170117, 2017. DOI: 10.1038/sdata.2017.117
- [9] T. Rohlfing, et al. The SRI24 multichannel atlas of normal adult human brain structure. *Hum Brain Mapp.* 31(5):798-819, 2010.
- [10] R.Cox, J.Ashburner, H.Breman, K.Fissell, C.Haselgrove, C.Holmes, J.Lancaster, D.Rex, S.Smith, J.Woodward, "A (Sort of) new image data format standard: NIfTI-1: WE 150", *Neuroimage*, 22, 2004.
- [11] S.Thakur, J.Doshi, S.Pati, S.Rathore, C.Sako, M.Bilello, S.M.Ha, G.Shukla, A.Flanders, A.Kotrotsou, M.Milchenko, S.Liem, G.S.Alexander, J.Lombardo, J.D.Palmer, P.LaMontagne, A.Nazeri, S.Talbar, U.Kulkarni, D.Marcus, R.Colen, C.Davatzikos, G.Erus, S.Bakas, "Brain Extraction on MRI Scans in Presence of Diffuse Glioma: Multi-institutional Performance Evaluation of Deep Learning Methods and Robust Modality-Agnostic Training", *NeuroImage*, 220: 117081, 2020. DOI: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.117081

Sources of error

a) Describe the most relevant possible error sources related to the image annotation. If possible, estimate the magnitude (range) of these errors, using inter-and intra-annotator variability, for example. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases, if necessary.

Study and evaluation of the effect of this error is addressed by the uncertainty task of BraTS 2019-2020 (i.e., to quantify the uncertainty in the tumor segmentations) [8] and is outside the scope of the BraTS 2022 challenge.

[8] R.Mehta, et al, "QU-BraTS: MICCAI BraTS 2020 Challenge on Quantifying Uncertainty in Brain Tumor Segmentation-Analysis of Ranking Scores and Benchmarking Results", *Journal of Machine Learning for Biomedical Imaging*, 1, 26, 2022

b) In an analogous manner, describe and quantify other relevant sources of error.

N/A

ASSESSMENT METHODS

Metric(s)

a) Define the metric(s) to assess a property of an algorithm. These metrics should reflect the desired algorithm properties described in assessment aim(s) (see above). State which metric(s) were used to compute the ranking(s) (if any).

- Example 1: Dice Similarity Coefficient (DSC)
- Example 2: Area under curve (AUC)

Dice Similarity Coefficient (DSC),

95% Hausdorff distance (HD),

Sensitivity,

Specificity,

Precision

The regions evaluated using these metrics describe the whole tumor, the tumor core, and the enhancing tumor (when present). Note that the tumor core includes the part of the tumor that is typically resected (i.e., enhancing, non-enhancing, and necrotic tumor), and the whole tumor describes all tumor sub-regions (i.e., tumor core and

edema/invasion).

b) Justify why the metric(s) was/were chosen, preferably with reference to the biomedical application.

In terms of the assessed and evaluated tumor sub-regions:

- i) the enhancing tumor describes the regions of active tumor and based on this, clinical practice characterizes the extent of resection.
- ii) the tumor core (incl. the necrotic component) describes what is typically resected during a surgical procedure.
- iii) the whole tumor as it defines the whole extent of the tumor, including the peritumoral edematous tissue and highly infiltrated area.

In terms of evaluation metrics, we use:

- i) the Dice Similarity Coefficient, which is commonly used in the assessment of segmentation performance,
- ii) the 95% Hausdorff distance as opposed to standard HD, in order to avoid outliers having too much weight,
- iii) Sensitivity and Specificity to determine whether an algorithm has the tendency to over- or undersegment.
- iv) Precision to complement the metric of Sensitivity (also known as recall).

Ranking method(s)

a) Describe the method used to compute a performance rank for all submitted algorithms based on the generated metric results on the test cases. Typically the text will describe how results obtained per case and metric are aggregated to arrive at a final score/ranking.



For ranking of multidimensional outcomes (or metrics), for each team, we will compute the summation of their ranks across the average of the metrics described above as a univariate overall summary measure. This measure will decide the overall ranking for each specific team. To visualize the results in an intuitive fashion, we propose to visualize the outcome via an augmented version of radar plot [6].

[12] Duan R, Tong J, Lin L, Levine LD, Sammel MD, Stoddard J, Li T, Schmid CH, Chu H, Chen Y. PALM: Patient centered Treatment Ranking via Large-scale Multivariate Network Meta-analysis. medRxiv. 2020 Jan 1

b) Describe the method(s) used to manage submissions with missing results on test cases.

If an algorithm fails to produce a result metric for a specific test case, this metric will be set to its worst possible value (0 for the DSC and the image diagonal for the HD).

c) Justify why the described ranking scheme(s) was/were used.

Following discussions with the biostatistician involved in the design of this challenge (Dr Shinohara), and also while considering transparency and fairness to the participants.

Statistical analyses

a) Provide details for the statistical methods used in the scope of the challenge analysis. This may include

- description of the missing data handling,
- details about the assessment of variability of rankings,
- description of any method used to assess whether the data met the assumptions, required for the particular statistical approach, or
- indication of any software product that was used for all data analysis methods.

Similar to BraTS 2017-2022, uncertainties in rankings will be assessed using permutational analyses [3]. Performance for the segmentation task will be assessed based on relative performance of each team on each tumor tissue class and for each segmentation measure. These will be combined by averaging ranks for the measures, and statistical significance will be evaluated only for the segmentation performance measures and will be quantified by permuting the relative ranks for each segmentation measure and tissue class per subject of the testing data.

[2] S. Bakas et al., "Identifying the Best Machine Learning Algorithms for Brain Tumor Segmentation, Progression Assessment, and Overall Survival Prediction in the BRATS Challenge," arXiv:1811.02629 [cs, stat], Apr. 2019, Accessed: Dec. 10, 2020. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1811.02629>.

b) Justify why the described statistical method(s) was/were used.

This permutation testing would reflect differences in performance that exceeded those that might be expected by chance.

Further analyses

Present further analyses to be performed (if applicable), e.g. related to

- combining algorithms via ensembling,
- inter-algorithm variability,
- common problems/biases of the submitted methods, or
- ranking variability.

N/A

TASK: TASK 8: Generalizability Across Brain Tumors

SUMMARY

Abstract

Provide a summary of the challenge purpose. This should include a general introduction in the topic from both a biomedical as well as from a technical point of view and clearly state the envisioned technical and/or biomedical impact of the challenge.

The International Brain Tumor Segmentation (BraTS) challenge has been focusing, since its inception in 2012, on the generation of a benchmarking environment and dataset for the delineation of adult brain gliomas. The focus of this year BraTS challenge remains the same in terms of generating the common benchmark environment, while the dataset expands into explicitly addressing 1) the same adult glioma population, as well as 2) the underserved sub-Saharan African brain glioma patient population, 3) brain/intracranial meningioma, 4) brain metastasis, and 5) pediatric brain tumor patients.

Although segmentation is the most widely investigated medical image processing task, the various challenges have been organized to focus only on specific clinical tasks. In this challenge we have planned to organize Generalizability Assessment of Segmentation Algorithms Across Brain Tumors. The hypothesis is method capable of performing well on multiple segmentation tasks will generalize well on unseen task.

Specifically, in this task we will be focusing on assessing the algorithmic generalizability beyond each individual patient population, and focus across all of them. Participants can decide if they want to explicitly participate in this part of the competition, or just on one/some of the previous tasks/challenges. Regardless of the participant's choice (which might be driven from accessibility to computational resources), the organizers of the challenge will require the submission of a containerized algorithm that could be retrained by the organizers in the complete dataset enabling the fair comparison across all submission methods in the test datasets across the Tasks/Challenges 1-5.

Keywords

List the primary keywords that characterize the task.

Generalizability, Brain Tumors, Segmentation, Cancer, Challenge, Glioma, Glioblastoma, dipg, dmng, Metastases, Meningioma, RSNA, ASNR, MICCAI, NCI, DREAM, PrecisionFDA, diffuse glioma

ORGANIZATION

Organizers

a) Provide information on the organizing team (names and affiliations).

Organizing team:

=====

Spyridon Bakas – [Lead Organizer - Contact Person]

Center for AI and Data Science for Integrated Diagnostics (AI2D), University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Ujjwal Baid

Center for AI and Data Science for Integrated Diagnostics (AI2D), University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Bjoern Menze
University of Zurich

Keyvan Farahani, Ph.D.
Center for Biomedical Informatics and Information Technology National
Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health

Jake Albrecht
Sage Bionetworks

James Eddy, Ph.D.
Sage Bionetworks

Timothy Bergquist
Sage Bionetworks

Thomas Yu
Sage Bionetworks

Verena Chung
Sage Bionetworks

Russell (Taki) Shinohara, Ph.D.
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Clinical Evaluators and Annotation Approvers are the people listed collectively in the previous tasks.

Annotation Volunteers are the people listed collectively in the previous tasks.

Data Contributors are the people listed collectively in the previous tasks.

b) Provide information on the primary contact person.

Spyridon Bakas [Lead Organizer - Contact Person]

Center for AI and Data Science for Integrated Diagnostics (AI2D), University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Email id: sbakas@upenn.

Life cycle type

Define the intended submission cycle of the challenge. Include information on whether/how the challenge will be continued after the challenge has taken place. Not every challenge closes after the submission deadline (one-time event). Sometimes it is possible to submit results after the deadline (open call) or the challenge is repeated with some modifications (repeated event).

Examples:

- One-time event with fixed conference submission deadline
- Open call (challenge opens for new submissions after conference deadline)
- Repeated event with annual fixed conference submission deadline

One time event with fixed submission deadline.

Challenge venue and platform

a) Report the event (e.g. conference) that is associated with the challenge (if any).

MICCAI.

b) Report the platform (e.g. grand-challenge.org) used to run the challenge.

Following our successful collaboration with the Synapse platform (SAGE Bionetworks) since the RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS 2021 challenge [1], we have coordinated with them and following the support from NCI (represented by Dr Keyvan Farahani in the organizing committee - Chair of the NCI AI Challenges Working Group) Synapse will be used as the platform to drive the evaluation of this cluster of challenges.

The National Cancer Institute takes special interest in the BraTS 2023 challenge and is considering providing infrastructural support in a number of ways. Dr Keyvan Farahani, a long-time co-organizer of BraTS challenges and a project scientist on a collaborative NCI Informatics Technology for Cancer Research (ITCR) grant, is the recipient of an NIH Office of Data Science and Strategy (ODSS)-STRIDES award for “a sustainable medical imaging challenge cloud infrastructure,” to further implement open (continuous) challenges by supporting cloud compute and other infrastructures for (a) benchmarking of tools and automated submission of containerized tools for evaluation, (b) hosting of top-ranking tools through NCI FireCloud Resource and public tool repository such as Dockstore or ModelHub, and (c) hosting resulting image annotations as derived data in the Imaging Data Commons (IDC). All aforementioned NCI platforms are implemented on the Google Cloud Platform.

This collaboration with Synapse, enabled by NCI/NIH support through ITCR grant (Jamed Eddy, PI) and other NCI resources represents a major advancement in the challenge design and leveraging of public resources.

c) Provide the URL for the challenge website (if any).

<https://www.med.upenn.edu/cbica/brats2023/> - (Website will be publicly visible after the challenge approval)

Participation policies

a) Define the allowed user interaction of the algorithms assessed (e.g. only (semi-) automatic methods allowed).

Fully automatic.

b) Define the policy on the usage of training data. The data used to train algorithms may, for example, be restricted to the data provided by the challenge or to publicly available data including (open) pre-trained nets.

Participants are allowed to use additional data from publicly available datasets and their own institutions, for further complementing the data, but if they do so, they **MUST** also discuss the potential difference in their results after using only the BraTS 2023 data, since our intention is to solve the particular segmentation problem, but also to provide a fair comparison among the participating methods.

c) Define the participation policy for members of the organizers' institutes. For example, members of the organizers' institutes may participate in the challenge but are not eligible for awards.

May participate but organizers and their immediate groups will not be eligible for awards.

Since organizing institutions are large, other employees from other labs/departments may participate and should be eligible for the awards and to be listed in the leaderboard.

d) Define the award policy. In particular, provide details with respect to challenge prizes.

Following communication with 1) Intel and 2) Neosoma Inc, we have informal confirmation for the sponsorship of monetary awards for the top 3 teams. Formal confirmation can only be provided after the acceptance of the challenge.

Note that Intel has been offering monetary awards during each of BraTS 2018-2022, and Neosoma for BraTS 2021.

NIH/NCI will also provide Certificates of Merit to the top 3 performing teams.

e) Define the policy for result announcement.

Examples:

- Top 3 performing methods will be announced publicly.
- Participating teams can choose whether the performance results will be made public.

Top 3 performing methods will be announced publicly at the conference and the participants will be invited to present their method.

f) Define the publication policy. In particular, provide details on ...

- ... who of the participating teams/the participating teams' members qualifies as author
- ... whether the participating teams may publish their own results separately, and (if so)
- ... whether an embargo time is defined (so that challenge organizers can publish a challenge paper first).

The configuration of combining the BraTS challenge with the BrainLes workshop provides the BraTS participants with the option to extend their papers to 12-14 pages, and hence publish their methods in the workshop's LNCS post-conference proceedings. Furthermore, we intend to coordinate a journal manuscript focusing on publishing and summarizing the results of the challenge.

Submission method

a) Describe the method used for result submission. Preferably, provide a link to the submission instructions.

Examples:

- Docker container on the Synapse platform. Link to submission instructions: <URL>
- Algorithm output was sent to organizers via e-mail. Submission instructions were sent by e-mail.

The participants are required to send the output of their methods to the evaluation platform for the scoring to occur during the training and the validation phases. At the end of the validation phase the participants are asked to identify the method they would like to evaluate in the final testing/ranking phase. The organizers will then confirm receiving the containerized method and will evaluate it in the hidden testing data. The participants will be provided guidelines on the form of the container as we have done in previous years. This will enable confirmation of reproducibility, running of these algorithms to the previous BraTS instances and comparison with results obtained by algorithms of previous years, thereby maximizing solutions in solving the problem of brain tumor segmentation. During the training and validation phases, the participants will have the chance to test the functionality of their submission through both the Cancer Imaging Phenomics Toolkit (CaPTk [5-6], <https://github.com/CBICA/CaPTk>), and the Federated Tumor Segmentation (FeTS) Tool [7] (<https://fets-ai.github.io/Front-End/>) that offer the implementation of the evaluation metrics, as well as via the online evaluation platform (Synapse).

[5] C.Davatzikos, et al. "Cancer imaging phenomics toolkit: quantitative imaging analytics for precision diagnostics

and predictive modeling of clinical outcome." *Journal of Medical Imaging*, 5.1:011018, 2018.

<https://doi.org/10.1117/1.jmi.5.1.011018>

[6] S.Pati, et al. "The cancer imaging phenomics toolkit (CaPTk): technical overview." *International MICCAI Brainlesion Workshop*. Springer, Cham, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46643-5_38

[7] S.Pati, et al, "The federated tumor segmentation (FeTS) tool: an open-source solution to further solid tumor research", *Phys. Med. Biol.* 67(20), 204002, 2022. DOI: 10.1088/1361-6560/ac9449

b) Provide information on the possibility for participating teams to evaluate their algorithms before submitting final results. For example, many challenges allow submission of multiple results, and only the last run is officially counted to compute challenge results.

We intend to release the validation set in April together with the training set, allowing participants to tune their methods in the unseen validation data. The validation data ground truth will not be provided to the participants, but multiple submissions to the online evaluation platform will be allowed for the validation phase. Only 2 submissions will be allowed in the final testing/ranking data/phase.

Challenge schedule

Provide a timetable for the challenge. Preferably, this should include

- the release date(s) of the training cases (if any)
- the registration date/period
- the release date(s) of the test cases and validation cases (if any)
- the submission date(s)
- associated workshop days (if any)
- the release date(s) of the results

Registration dates: From now until submission deadline of short papers reporting method and preliminary results (see below).

1 May 2023: Availability of complete training data (with ground truth labels) and validation data (without ground truth labels).

31 July 2023: Submission of short papers reporting method & preliminary results.

1-7 August 2023: Submission of containerized algorithm to the evaluation platform.

11 – 25 August 2023: Evaluation on testing data (by the organizers - only for participants with submitted papers).

8 September 2023: Contacting top performing methods for preparing slides for oral presentation.

8-12 October 2023: Announcement of final top 3 ranked teams: Challenge at MICCAI

30 November 2023: Camera-ready submission of extended papers for inclusion in the associated workshop proceedings

Ethics approval

Indicate whether ethics approval is necessary for the data. If yes, provide details on the ethics approval, preferably institutional review board, location, date and number of the ethics approval (if applicable). Add the URL or a reference to the document of the ethics approval (if available).

We are already in close coordination with The Cancer Imaging Archive (TCIA) and the Imaging Data Commons (IDC) of the National Institutes of Health (NIH), to release the training and validation data following their standard licensing (<https://wiki.cancerimagingarchive.net/display/Public/Data+Usage+Policies+and+Restrictions>).

The TCIA has already approved this, and we are now in the process of submission (includes a detailed curation process specific to TCIA). The cloud-based IDC is routinely updated with new collections from TCIA. IDC public collections are now part of the Google Public Datasets Program. This will effectively make all the BraTS data available in the Google Marketplace, increasing the potential for access to the data and downstream AI developments using Google's AI resources. IDC data are also expected to be available through the AWS (Amazon Web Services) Marketplace.

Informed consent was obtained from all subjects at their respective institutions, and the protocol for releasing the data was approved by the institutional review board of the data-contributing institution.

Data usage agreement

Clarify how the data can be used and distributed by the teams that participate in the challenge and by others during and after the challenge. This should include the explicit listing of the license applied.

Examples:

- CC BY (Attribution)
- CC BY-SA (Attribution-ShareAlike)
- CC BY-ND (Attribution-NoDerivs)
- CC BY-NC (Attribution-NonCommercial)
- CC BY-NC-SA (Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike)
- CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs)

CC BY.

Additional comments: Additional comments: CC-BY, but if any of the non-TCIA contributors object to this license, the specific subset of the BraTS data will be released under a CC-BY-NC license.

Code availability

a) Provide information on the accessibility of the organizers' evaluation software (e.g. code to produce rankings). Preferably, provide a link to the code and add information on the supported platforms.

The preprocessing tools, evaluation metrics, and the ranking code used during the whole challenge's lifecycle will be made available through the Cancer Imaging Phenomics Toolkit (CaPTk [5-6], <https://github.com/CBICA/CaPTk>), and the Federated Tumor Segmentation (FeTS) Platform [7] (<https://fets-ai.github.io/Front-End/>).

[5] C.Davatzikos, et al. "Cancer imaging phenomics toolkit: quantitative imaging analytics for precision diagnostics and predictive modeling of clinical outcome." *Journal of medical imaging*, 5.1:011018, 2018.

<https://doi.org/10.1117/1.jmi.5.1.011018>

[6] S.Pati, et al. "The cancer imaging phenomics toolkit (CaPTk): technical overview." *International MICCAI Brainlesion Workshop*. Springer, Cham, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46643-5_38

[7] S.Pati, et al, "The federated tumor segmentation (FeTS) tool: an open-source solution to further solid tumor research", *Phys. Med. Biol.* 67(20), 204002, 2022. DOI: 10.1088/1361-6560/ac9449

b) In an analogous manner, provide information on the accessibility of the participating teams' code.

The participants are required to submit their containerized algorithm, during or after the validation phase. Specific instructions for the containerization will be provided after the challenge approval. These instructions will be very similar to what we were requesting participants to provide during the BraTS 2021 and 2022 challenges.

The National Cancer Institute takes special interest in the BraTS 2023 challenge and is considering providing infrastructural support in a number of ways. Dr Keyvan Farahani, a long time co-organizer of BraTS challenges and a project scientist on a collaborative NCI Informatics Technology for Cancer Research (ITCR) grant, is the recipient of an NIH Office of Data Science and Strategy (ODSS)-STRIDES award for “a sustainable medical imaging challenge cloud infrastructure,” to further implement open (continuous) challenges by supporting cloud compute and other infrastructures for (a) benchmarking of tools and automated submission of containerized tools for evaluation, (b) hosting of top-ranking tools through NCI FireCloud Resource and public tool repository such as Dockstore or ModelHub, and (c) hosting resulting image annotations as derived data in the Imaging Data Commons (IDC) on the Google Cloud Platform.

Conflicts of interest

Provide information related to conflicts of interest. In particular provide information related to sponsoring/funding of the challenge. Also, state explicitly who had/will have access to the test case labels and when.

Monetary awards are expected by Intel and Neosoma Inc

Spyridon Bakas, Ujjwal Baid, SAGE Bionetworks, the clinical evaluators, and the individual listed across the previous tasks will have access to the validation, and test case labels.

MISSION OF THE CHALLENGE

Field(s) of application

State the main field(s) of application that the participating algorithms target.

Examples:

- Diagnosis
- Education
- Intervention assistance
- Intervention follow-up
- Intervention planning
- Prognosis
- Research
- Screening
- Training
- Cross-phase

Treatment planning, Intervention planning, Assistance, Research, Surgery, Training, Diagnosis, CAD, Education, Decision support.

Task category(ies)

State the task category(ies).

Examples:

- Classification
- Detection
- Localization
- Modeling
- Prediction
- Reconstruction
- Registration
- Retrieval
- Segmentation
- Tracking

Segmentation.

Cohorts

We distinguish between the target cohort and the challenge cohort. For example, a challenge could be designed around the task of medical instrument tracking in robotic kidney surgery. While the challenge could be based on ex vivo data obtained from a laparoscopic training environment with porcine organs (challenge cohort), the final biomedical application (i.e. robotic kidney surgery) would be targeted on real patients with certain characteristics defined by inclusion criteria such as restrictions regarding sex or age (target cohort).

a) Describe the target cohort, i.e. the subjects/objects from whom/which the data would be acquired in the final biomedical application.

Retrospective multi-institutional cohort of patients, diagnosed with a brain tumor, clinically scanned with mpMRI acquisition protocol including i) pre-contrast and ii) contrast-enhanced T1-weighted, iii) T2-weighted and iv) T2-weighted Fluid Attenuated Inversion Recovery (FLAIR) MRI.

b) Describe the challenge cohort, i.e. the subject(s)/object(s) from whom/which the challenge data was acquired.

Retrospective multi-institutional cohort of patients, diagnosed with brain tumor, clinically scanned with mpMRI acquisition protocol including i) pre-contrast and ii) contrast-enhanced T1-weighted, iii) T2-weighted and iv) T2-weighted Fluid Attenuated Inversion Recovery (FLAIR) MRI.

Imaging modality(ies)

Specify the imaging technique(s) applied in the challenge.

MRI

Context information

Provide additional information given along with the images. The information may correspond ...

a) ... directly to the image data (e.g. tumor volume).

... directly to the image data (i.e., tumor sub-region volumes)

b) ... to the patient in general (e.g. sex, medical history).

N/A

Target entity(ies)

a) Describe the data origin, i.e. the region(s)/part(s) of subject(s)/object(s) from whom/which the image data would be acquired in the final biomedical application (e.g. brain shown in computed tomography (CT) data, abdomen shown in laparoscopic video data, operating room shown in video data, thorax shown in fluoroscopy video). If necessary, differentiate between target and challenge cohort.

Brain mpMRI scans.

b) Describe the algorithm target, i.e. the structure(s)/subject(s)/object(s)/component(s) that the participating algorithms have been designed to focus on (e.g. tumor in the brain, tip of a medical instrument, nurse in an operating theater, catheter in a fluoroscopy scan). If necessary, differentiate between target and challenge cohort.

Tumor in the brain.

Assessment aim(s)

Identify the property(ies) of the algorithms to be optimized to perform well in the challenge. If multiple properties are assessed, prioritize them (if appropriate). The properties should then be reflected in the metrics applied (see below, parameter metric(s)), and the priorities should be reflected in the ranking when combining multiple metrics that assess different properties.

- Example 1: Find highly accurate liver segmentation algorithm for CT images.
- Example 2: Find lung tumor detection algorithm with high sensitivity and specificity for mammography images.

Corresponding metrics are listed below (parameter metric(s)).

Sensitivity, Specificity, Precision.

Additional points: Dice, Hausdorff 95th percentile

DATA SETS**Data source(s)**

a) Specify the device(s) used to acquire the challenge data. This includes details on the device(s) used to acquire the imaging data (e.g. manufacturer) as well as information on additional devices used for performance assessment (e.g. tracking system used in a surgical setting).

The exact scanners and their technical specifications used for acquiring the TCIA cohort has been listed in the data reference published in our related manuscripts [1,2,4]. Since then, multiple institutions have contributed data to create the current RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS dataset and these are listed in the latest BraTS arxiv paper [1]. We are currently in coordination with TCIA to make the complete BraTS 2021-2023 dataset permanently available through their portal. All the acquisition details will be included together with the data availability in TCIA, and subsequently in IDC, including Google and AWS Marketplaces, as part of their Public Datasets Programs.

[1] U. Baid, et al., "The RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS 2021 Benchmark on Brain Tumor Segmentation and Radiogenomic Classification", arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.02314

[2] S. Bakas, et al., "Identifying the best machine learning algorithms for brain tumor segmentation, progression assessment, and overall survival prediction in the BRATS challenge", arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.02629

[4] S. Bakas, H. Akbari, A. Sotiras, M. Bilello, M. Rozycki, J.S. Kirby, et al., "Advancing The Cancer Genome Atlas glioma MRI collections with expert segmentation labels and radiomic features", Nature Scientific Data, 4:170117 (2017) DOI: 10.1038/sdata.2017.117

b) Describe relevant details on the imaging process/data acquisition for each acquisition device (e.g. image acquisition protocol(s)).

The acquisition protocols are different across (and within each) contributing institution, as these represent scans of real routine clinical practice. Specific details (e.g., echo time, repetition time, original acquisition plane) of each scan of each patient will be published as supplementary material together with the challenge meta-analysis manuscript.

c) Specify the center(s)/institute(s) in which the data was acquired and/or the data providing platform/source (e.g. previous challenge). If this information is not provided (e.g. for anonymization reasons), specify why.

The provided data describe mpMRI scans, acquired with different clinical protocols and various scanners as described in the previous tasks.

d) Describe relevant characteristics (e.g. level of expertise) of the subjects (e.g. surgeon)/objects (e.g. robot) involved in the data acquisition process (if any).

People involved in MRI acquisition for suspected and diagnosis of brain tumors during standard clinical practice.

Training and test case characteristics

a) State what is meant by one case in this challenge. A case encompasses all data that is processed to produce one result that is compared to the corresponding reference result (i.e. the desired algorithm output).

Examples:

- Training and test cases both represent a CT image of a human brain. Training cases have a weak annotation (tumor present or not and tumor volume (if any)) while the test cases are annotated with the tumor contour (if any).
- A case refers to all information that is available for one particular patient in a specific study. This information always includes the image information as specified in data source(s) (see above) and may include context information (see above). Both training and test cases are annotated with survival (binary) 5 years after (first) image was taken.

A case describes multi-parametric MRI scans for a single patient at a single timepoint. The exact scans included for one case are i) unenhanced and ii) contrast-enhanced T1-weighted, iii) T2-weighted and iv) T2 Fluid Attenuated Inversion Recovery (FLAIR) MRI.

Please note that all sequences included for each case of the provided dataset, represent the sequences with the best image quality available in the acquiring institution for this particular case. There was no inclusion/exclusion criterion applied that related to 3d acquisitions, or the exact type of pulse sequence (for example MPRAGE). We, instead, accepted all types of T1 acquisitions (with the exception of T1 FLAIR, as we did not want to mix the fluid suppressed values with non-flair scans) and then we applied the harmonized preprocessing protocol we have been using in BraTS, across the complete data. This preprocessing ensures all scans have 3D representations on a specific resolution (1mm^3), and aligned to the same anatomical atlas.

b) State the total number of training, validation and test cases.

Training data: 2,664 cases

Validation data: 434 cases

Testing data: 1,155 cases

c) Explain why a total number of cases and the specific proportion of training, validation and test cases was chosen.

Based on availability. The data was split in these numbers between training, validation, and testing after considering the number of cases used as test cases in previous instances of BraTS and the fact that the organizers did not want to reveal ground truth labels of previous test cases, to avoid compromising ranking the participants.

d) Mention further important characteristics of the training, validation and test cases (e.g. class distribution in classification tasks chosen according to real-world distribution vs. equal class distribution) and justify the choice.

N/A

Annotation characteristics

a) Describe the method for determining the reference annotation, i.e. the desired algorithm output. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary. Possible methods include manual image annotation, in silico ground truth generation and annotation by automatic methods.

If human annotation was involved, state the number of annotators.

Reference approved as described in each of the previous tasks

b) Provide the instructions given to the annotators (if any) prior to the annotation. This may include description of a training phase with the software. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary. Preferably, provide a link to the annotation protocol.

The data considered in this task of the BraTS 2023 challenge follows the paradigm of the BraTS 2021-2022 challenge data. The annotation of these data followed a pre-defined clinically-approved annotation protocol (defined by expert neuroradiologists), which was provided to all clinical annotators, describing in detail instructions on what the segmentations of each tumor sub-region should describe (see below for the summary of the specific instructions). The annotators were given the flexibility to use their tool of preference for making the annotations, and also follow either a complete manual annotation approach, or a hybrid approach where an automated approach is used to produce some initial annotations followed by their manual refinements.

Summary of specific instructions:

- i) the enhancing tumor (when present) delineates the hyperintense signal of the T1-Gd, after excluding the vessels.
- ii) the necrotic core (when present) outlines regions appearing dark in both T1 and T1-Gd images (denoting necrosis/cysts), and darked regions in T1-Gd that appear brighter in T1.
- iii) the tumor core, which is the union of the enhancing tumor and the necrotic core described in (i) and (ii) above.
- iv) the farthest tumor extent including the edema (what is called the whole tumor), delineates the tissue represented by the abnormal T2-FLAIR envelope.

c) Provide details on the subject(s)/algorithm(s) that annotated the cases (e.g. information on level of expertise such as number of years of professional experience, medically-trained or not). Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary.

Each case was assigned to a pair of annotator-approver. Annotators spanned across various experience levels and clinical/academic ranks, while the approvers were the 2 experienced board-certified neuroradiologists (with >15 years of experience), listed in the "Organizers" section as "clinical evaluators and annotation approvers". The annotators were given the flexibility to use their tool of preference for making the annotations, and also follow either a complete manual annotation approach, or a hybrid approach where an automated approach is used to produce some initial annotations followed by their manual refinements. Once the annotators were satisfied with

the produced annotations, they were passing these to the corresponding approver. The approver is then responsible for signing off these annotations. Specifically, the approver would review the tumor annotations, in tandem with the corresponding MRI scans, and if the annotations were not of satisfactory quality they would be sent back to the annotators for further refinements. This iterative approach was followed for all cases, until their respective annotations reached satisfactory quality (according to the approver) for being publicly available and noted as final ground truth segmentation labels for these scans.

d) Describe the method(s) used to merge multiple annotations for one case (if any). Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary.

No Aggregation

Data pre-processing method(s)

Describe the method(s) used for pre-processing the raw training data before it is provided to the participating teams. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary.

The exact preprocessing pipeline applied to all the data considered in the BraTS 2023 challenge is identical with the one evaluated and followed by the BraTS 2017-2022 challenges. Specifically, following the conversion of the raw scans from their original DICOM file format to NIfTI file format [10], we first perform a re-orientation of all input scans (T1, T1- Gd, T2, T2-FLAIR) to the LPS/RAI orientation, and then register all of them to the same anatomical atlas (i.e., SRI-24 [9]) and interpolating to the same resolution as this atlas (1 mm³). The exact registration process comprises the following steps:

STEP 1: N4 Bias field correction (notably the application of N4 bias field correction is a temporary step. Taking into consideration we have previously [4] shown that use of non-parametric, non-uniform intensity normalization (i.e., N4) to correct for intensity non-uniformities caused by the inhomogeneity of the scanner's magnetic field during image acquisition obliterates the MRI signal relating to the abnormal/tumor regions, we intentionally use N4 bias field correction in the preprocessing pipeline to facilitate a more optimal rigid registration across the difference MRI sequences. However, after obtaining the related information (i.e., transformation matrices), we discard the bias field corrected scans, and we apply this transformation matrix towards the final co-registered output images used in the challenge).

STEP 2: Rigid Registration of T1, T2, T2-FLAIR to the T1-Gd scan, and obtain the corresponding transformation matrix.

STEP 3: Rigid Registration of T1-Gd scan to the SRI-24 atlas [9], and obtain the corresponding transformation matrix.

STEP 4: Join the obtained transformation matrices and applying aggregated transformation to the LPS-oriented scans.

STEP 5: After completion of the registration process, we perform brain extraction to remove any apparent non-brain tissue (e.g., neck fat, skull, eyeballs) based on a deep-learning approach we developed in house, focusing on scans with apparent brain tumors and exhaustively evaluated it in both private and public multi-institutional data [11]. We then manually assessed all scans for confirming the correct brain extraction (i.e., skull stripping), where the complete brain region is included, and all non-brain tissue is excluded. This whole pipeline, and its source code are available through the CaPTk [5-6](<https://github.com/CBICA/CaPTk>) and FeTS [7] (<https://fets-ai.github.io/Front-End/>) platforms.

[4] S. Bakas, H. Akbari, A. Sotiras, M. Bilello, M. Rozycki, J.S. Kirby, et al., "Advancing The Cancer Genome Atlas glioma MRI collections with expert segmentation labels and radiomic features", *Nature Scientific Data*, 4:170117,

2017. DOI: 10.1038/sdata.2017.117

[9] T. Rohlfing, et al. The SRI24 multichannel atlas of normal adult human brain structure. Hum Brain Mapp. 31(5):798-819, 2010.

[10] R.Cox, J.Ashburner, H.Breman, K.Fissell, C.Haselgrove, C.Holmes, J.Lancaster, D.Rex, S.Smith, J.Woodward, "A (Sort of) new image data format standard: NIfTI-1: WE 150", Neuroimage, 22, 2004.

[11] S.Thakur, J.Doshi, S.Pati, S.Rathore, C.Sako, M.Bilello, S.M.Ha, G.Shukla, A.Flanders, A.Kotrotsou, M.Milchenko, S.Liem, G.S.Alexander, J.Lombardo, J.D.Palmer, P.LaMontagne, A.Nazeri, S.Talbar, U.Kulkarni, D.Marcus, R.Colen, C.Davatzikos, G.Erus, S.Bakas, "Brain Extraction on MRI Scans in Presence of Diffuse Glioma: Multi-institutional Performance Evaluation of Deep Learning Methods and Robust Modality-Agnostic Training", NeuroImage, 220: 117081, 2020. DOI: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.117081

Sources of error

a) Describe the most relevant possible error sources related to the image annotation. If possible, estimate the magnitude (range) of these errors, using inter-and intra-annotator variability, for example. Provide the information separately for the training, validation and test cases, if necessary.

Study and evaluation of the effect of this error is addressed by the uncertainty task of BraTS 2019-2020 (i.e., to quantify the uncertainty in the tumor segmentations) [8] and is outside the scope of the BraTS 2022 challenge.

[8] R.Mehta, et al, "QU-BraTS: MICCAI BraTS 2020 Challenge on Quantifying Uncertainty in Brain Tumor Segmentation-Analysis of Ranking Scores and Benchmarking Results", Journal of Machine Learning for Biomedical Imaging, 1, 26, 2022

b) In an analogous manner, describe and quantify other relevant sources of error.

N/A

ASSESSMENT METHODS

Metric(s)

a) Define the metric(s) to assess a property of an algorithm. These metrics should reflect the desired algorithm properties described in assessment aim(s) (see above). State which metric(s) were used to compute the ranking(s) (if any).

- Example 1: Dice Similarity Coefficient (DSC)
- Example 2: Area under curve (AUC)

Dice Similarity Coefficient (DSC),

95% Hausdorff distance (HD),

Sensitivity,

Specificity,

Precision

The regions evaluated using these metrics describe the whole tumor, the tumor core, and the enhancing tumor (when present). Note that the tumor core includes the part of the tumor that is typically resected (i.e., enhancing, non-enhancing, and necrotic tumor), and the whole tumor describes all tumor sub-regions (i.e., tumor core and edema/invasion).

b) Justify why the metric(s) was/were chosen, preferably with reference to the biomedical application.

In terms of the assessed and evaluated tumor sub-regions:

- i) the enhancing tumor describes the regions of active tumor and based on this, clinical practice characterizes the extent of resection.
- ii) the tumor core (incl. the necrotic component) describes what is typically resected during a surgical procedure.
- iii) the whole tumor as it defines the whole extent of the tumor, including the peritumoral edematous tissue and highly infiltrated area.

In terms of evaluation metrics, we use:

- i) the Dice Similarity Coefficient, which is commonly used in the assessment of segmentation performance,
- ii) the 95% Hausdorff distance as opposed to standard HD, in order to avoid outliers having too much weight,
- iii) Sensitivity and Specificity to determine whether an algorithm has the tendency to over- or undersegment.
- iv) Precision to complement the metric of Sensitivity (also known as recall).

Ranking method(s)

- a) Describe the method used to compute a performance rank for all submitted algorithms based on the generated metric results on the test cases. Typically the text will describe how results obtained per case and metric are aggregated to arrive at a final score/ranking.

For ranking of multidimensional outcomes (or metrics), for each team, we will compute the summation of their ranks across the average of the metrics described above as a univariate overall summary measure. This measure will decide the overall ranking for each specific team. To visualize the results in an intuitive fashion, we propose to visualize the outcome via an augmented version of radar plot [6].

[12] Duan R, Tong J, Lin L, Levine LD, Sammel MD, Stoddard J, Li T, Schmid CH, Chu H, Chen Y. PALM: Patient centered Treatment Ranking via Large-scale Multivariate Network Meta-analysis. medRxiv. 2020 Jan 1

- b) Describe the method(s) used to manage submissions with missing results on test cases.

If an algorithm fails to produce a result metric for a specific test case, this metric will be set to its worst possible value (0 for the DSC and the image diagonal for the HD).

- c) Justify why the described ranking scheme(s) was/were used.

Following discussions with the biostatistician involved in the design of this challenge (Dr Shinohara), and also while considering transparency and fairness to the participants.

Statistical analyses

- a) Provide details for the statistical methods used in the scope of the challenge analysis. This may include
 - description of the missing data handling,
 - details about the assessment of variability of rankings,
 - description of any method used to assess whether the data met the assumptions, required for the particular statistical approach, or
 - indication of any software product that was used for all data analysis methods.

Similar to BraTS 2017-2022, uncertainties in rankings will be assessed using permutational analyses [3].

Performance for the segmentation task will be assessed based on relative performance of each team on each tumor tissue class and for each segmentation measure. These will be combined by averaging ranks for the

measures, and statistical significance will be evaluated only for the segmentation performance measures and will be quantified by permuting the relative ranks for each segmentation measure and tissue class per subject of the testing data.

[2] S. Bakas et al., "Identifying the Best Machine Learning Algorithms for Brain Tumor Segmentation, Progression Assessment, and Overall Survival Prediction in the BRATS Challenge," arXiv:1811.02629 [cs, stat], Apr. 2019, Accessed: Dec. 10, 2020. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1811.02629>.

b) Justify why the described statistical method(s) was/were used.

This permutation testing would reflect differences in performance that exceeded those that might be expected by chance.

Further analyses

Present further analyses to be performed (if applicable), e.g. related to

- combining algorithms via ensembling,
- inter-algorithm variability,
- common problems/biases of the submitted methods, or
- ranking variability.

N/A

ADDITIONAL POINTS

References

Please include any reference important for the challenge design, for example publications on the data, the annotation process or the chosen metrics as well as DOIs referring to data or code.

Common references for all tasks except Task 6:

- [1] U. Baid, et al., "The RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS 2021 Benchmark on Brain Tumor Segmentation and Radiogenomic Classification", arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.02314
- [2] S. Bakas, et al., "Identifying the best machine learning algorithms for brain tumor segmentation, progression assessment, and overall survival prediction in the BRATS challenge", arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.02629
- [3] B. H. Menze, et al., "The Multimodal Brain Tumor Image Segmentation Benchmark (BRATS)", IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging 34(10), 1993-2024 (2015) DOI: 10.1109/TMI.2014.2377694
- [4] S. Bakas, et al., "Advancing The Cancer Genome Atlas glioma MRI collections with expert segmentation labels and radiomic features", Nature Scientific Data, 4:170117 (2017) DOI: 10.1038/sdata.2017.117
- [5] C. Davatzikos, et al., "Cancer imaging phenomics toolkit: quantitative imaging analytics for precision diagnostics and predictive modeling of clinical outcome." Journal of medical imaging, 5.1:011018 (2018) DOI: 10.1117/1.jmi.5.1.011018
- [6] S. Pati, et al., "The cancer imaging phenomics toolkit (CaPTk): technical overview." International MICCAI Brainlesion Workshop. Springer, Cham (2019) DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-46643-5_38
- [7] S. Pati, et al., "The federated tumor segmentation (FeTS) tool: an open-source solution to further solid tumor research", Phys. Med. Biol. 67(20), 204002, 2022. DOI: 10.1088/1361-6560/ac9449
- [8] R. Mehta, et al., "QU-BraTS: MICCAI BraTS 2020 Challenge on Quantifying Uncertainty in Brain Tumor Segmentation-Analysis of Ranking Scores and Benchmarking Results", Journal of Machine Learning for Biomedical Imaging, 1, 26, 2022

- [9] T. Rohlfing, et al., The SRI24 multichannel atlas of normal adult human brain structure. *Hum Brain Mapp.* 31(5):798-819, 2010.
- [10] R.Cox, et al., "A (Sort of) new image data format standard: NIfTI-1: WE 150", *Neuroimage*, 22, 2004.
- [11] S.Thakur, et al., "Brain Extraction on MRI Scans in Presence of Diffuse Glioma: Multi-institutional Performance Evaluation of Deep Learning Methods and Robust Modality-Agnostic Training", *NeuroImage*, 220: 117081, 2020. DOI: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.117081
- [12] Duan R, et al., PALM: Patient-centered Treatment Ranking via Large-scale Multivariate Network Meta-analysis. *medRxiv*. 2020 Jan 1
- [13] K. Clark, et al., "The Cancer Imaging Archive (TCIA): Maintaining and Operating a Public Information Repository", *Journal of Digital Imaging*, 26(6):1045-1057 (2013)
- [14] L. Maier-Hein, et al., "BIAS: Transparent reporting of biomedical image analysis challenges", *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.04071* (2019)

References only for Task 6

1. "WHO | Causes of child mortality," WHO, 2020.
http://www.who.int/gho/child_health/mortality/causes/en/ (accessed Jun. 07, 2020).
2. Kamnitsas K, Ledig C, Newcombe VFJ, et al. Efficient multi-scale 3D CNN with fully connected CRF for accurate brain lesion segmentation. *Med Image Anal* 2017;36:61–78
3. Wang G, Li W, Ourselin S, Vercauteren T. Automatic Brain Tumor Segmentation Based on Cascaded Convolutional Neural Networks With Uncertainty Estimation. *Front Comput Neurosci* 2019;13:56
4. Pereira S, Pinto A, Alves V, Silva CA. Brain Tumor Segmentation Using Convolutional Neural Networks in MRI Images. *IEEE Trans Med Imaging* 2016;35(5):1240–1251
5. Conte GM, Weston AD, Vogelsang DC, Philbrick KA, Cai JC, Barbera M, Sanvito F, Lachance DH, Jenkins RB, Tobin WO, Eckel-Passow JE. Generative adversarial networks to synthesize missing T1 and FLAIR MRI sequences for use in a multisequence brain tumor segmentation model. *Radiology*. 2021 May;299(2):313-23.
6. Iglesias JE, Konukoglu E, Zikic D, Glocker B, Leemput KV, Fischl B. Is synthesizing MRI contrast useful for inter-modality analysis?. In *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention* 2013 Sep 22 (pp. 631-638). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
7. Anwar SM, Majid M, Qayyum A, Awais M, Alnowami M, Khan MK. Medical image analysis using convolutional neural networks: a review. *Journal of medical systems*. 2018 Nov;42(11):1-3.
8. Li H, Paetzold JC, Sekuboyina A, Kofler F, Zhang J, Kirschke JS, Wiestler B, Menze B. DiamondGAN: unified multi-modal generative adversarial networks for MRI sequences synthesis. In *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention* 2019 Oct 13 (pp. 795-803). Springer, Cham.
9. Thomas MF, Kofler F, Grundl L, Finck T, Li H, Zimmer C, Menze B, Wiestler B. Improving Automated Glioma Segmentation in Routine Clinical Use Through Artificial Intelligence-Based Replacement of Missing Sequences With Synthetic Magnetic Resonance Imaging Scans. *Investigative Radiology*. 2022 Mar 1;57(3):187-93.
10. Iglesias JE, Billot B, Balbastre Y, Tabari A, Conklin J, González RG, Alexander DC, Golland P, Edlow BL, Fischl B, Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative. Joint super-resolution and synthesis of 1 mm isotropic MP-RAGE volumes from clinical MRI exams with scans of different orientation, resolution and contrast. *Neuroimage*. 2021 Aug 15;237:118206.

11. U. Baid, et al., "The RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS 2021 Benchmark on Brain Tumor Segmentation and Radiogenomic Classification", arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.02314
12. S.Bakas, et al., "Identifying the best machine learning algorithms for brain tumor segmentation, progression assessment, and overall survival prediction in the BRATS challenge", arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.02629
13. B. H. Menze, et al., "The Multimodal Brain Tumor Image Segmentation Benchmark (BRATS)", IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging 34(10), 1993-2024 (2015) DOI: 10.1109/TMI.2014.2377694
14. S. Bakas, et al., "Advancing The Cancer Genome Atlas glioma MRI collections with expert segmentation labels and radiomic features", Nature Scientific Data, 4:170117 (2017) DOI: 10.1038/sdata.2017.117
15. C.Davatzikos, et al., "Cancer imaging phenomics toolkit: quantitative imaging analytics for precision diagnostics and predictive modeling of clinical outcome." Journal of medical imaging, 5.1:011018 (2018) DOI: 10.1117/1.jmi.5.1.011018
16. S.Pati, et al., "The cancer imaging phenomics toolkit (CaPTk): technical overview." International MICCAI Brainlesion Workshop. Springer, Cham (2019) DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-46643-5_38
17. S.Pati, et al., "The federated tumor segmentation (FeTS) tool: an open-source solution to further solid tumor research", Phys. Med. Biol. 67(20), 204002, 2022. DOI: 10.1088/1361-6560/ac9449
18. R.Mehta, et al, "QU-BraTS: MICCAI BraTS 2020 Challenge on Quantifying Uncertainty in Brain Tumor Segmentation-Analysis of Ranking Scores and Benchmarking Results", Journal of Machine Learning for Biomedical Imaging, 1, 26, 2022
19. T. Rohlfing, et al., The SRI24 multichannel atlas of normal adult human brain structure. Hum Brain Mapp. 31(5):798-819, 2010.
20. R.Cox, et al., "A (Sort of) new image data format standard: NIfTI-1: WE 150", Neuroimage, 22, 2004.
21. S.Thakur, et al., "Brain Extraction on MRI Scans in Presence of Diffuse Glioma: Multi-institutional Performance Evaluation of Deep Learning Methods and Robust Modality-Agnostic Training", NeuroImage, 220: 117081, 2020. DOI: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.117081
22. Duan R, et al., PALM: Patient-centered Treatment Ranking via Large-scale Multivariate Network Meta-analysis. medRxiv. 2020 Jan 1
23. K. Clark, et al., "The Cancer Imaging Archive (TCIA): Maintaining and Operating a Public Information Repository", Journal of Digital Imaging, 26(6):1045-1057 (2013)
24. L. Maier-Hein, et al., "BIAS: Transparent reporting of biomedical image analysis challenges", arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.04071 (2019)
25. Kofler F, Berger C, Waldmannstetter D, Lipkova J, Ezhov I, Tetteh G, Kirschke J, Zimmer C, Wiestler B, Menze BH. BraTS toolkit: translating BraTS brain tumor segmentation algorithms into clinical and scientific practice. Frontiers in neuroscience. 2020:125

Further comments

Further comments from the organizers.

NA