

Shallow learning enables real-time inference of molecular composition from broadband spectroscopy of brain tissue

Ivan Ezhov^{a,†,*}, Kevin Scibilia^{a,†}, Luca Giannoni^{b,c}, Florian Kofler^f, Ivan Iliash^a, Felix Hsieh^a, Suprosanna Shit^a, Charly Caredda^e, Fred Lange^d, Ilias Tachtsidis^d, Daniel Rueckert^{a,g}

^aTechnical University of Munich, Germany

^bUniversity of Florence, Italy

^cEuropean Laboratory for Non-Linear Spectroscopy, Italy

^dUniversity College London, United Kingdom

^eUniv Lyon, INSA-Lyon, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, UJM-Saint Etienne, CNRS, Inserm, CREATIS UMR 5220, France

^fHelmholtz AI, Helmholtz Munich, Germany

^gImperial College London, United Kingdom

Abstract. Optical imaging modalities such as near-infrared spectroscopy (NIRS) and hyperspectral imaging (HSI) represent a promising alternative for low-cost, non-invasive, and fast monitoring of functional and structural properties of living tissue. Particularly, the possibility of extracting the molecular composition of the tissue from the optical spectra in real-time deems the spectroscopy techniques as a unique diagnostic tool. However, due to a lack of paired optical and molecular profiling studies, building a mapping between a spectral signature and a corresponding set of molecular concentrations is still an unsolved problem. Furthermore, no established methods exist to streamline the inference of the biochemical composition from the optical spectrum for real-time applications such as surgical monitoring.

In this paper, we analyse a technique for fast and accurate inference of changes in the molecular composition of brain tissue. We base our method on the Beer-Lambert law to analytically connect the spectra with concentrations and use a deep-learning approach to significantly speed up the concentration inference compared to traditional optimization methods. We test our approach on real data obtained from the broadband NIRS- and HSI-based optical monitoring of brain tissue. The results demonstrate that the proposed method enables real-time molecular composition inference while maintaining the accuracy of traditional linear and non-linear optimization solvers.

Keywords: broadband near-infrared spectroscopy, hyperspectral, machine learning, brain imaging, Beer-Lambert law.

* Corresponding author, ivan.ezhov@tum.de

† The authors contributed equally

1 Introduction

Various biomedical applications such as histopathology or neurosurgery require access to rapid monitoring of intrinsic tissue properties. In particular, neuronavigation would benefit by having structural and functional information of brain tissue in real-time.¹⁻³ Spatially-resolved maps of the tissue characteristics would allow bypassing invasive disease diagnostics, e.g., biopsy, which halt

the operation. Instead, a surgical decision could be made during the operation, reducing its time and preserving a healthy brain.

Optical sensing modalities, such as near-infrared spectroscopy (NIRS) and hyperspectral imaging (HSI), emerge as promising technologies to address these clinical needs.^{4,5} These techniques can probe biological matter utilizing non-ionizing electromagnetic radiation within the visible and near-infrared ranges. The spectral instrumentation is inexpensive, allows for continuous tissue monitoring, and can be easily adapted for the complex context of the operating room.⁶

The overarching principle behind spectroscopy-based molecular characterization is to relate the reflection spectrum obtained upon illumination of the tissue surface with its optical properties. The molecules constituting the tissue have unique absorption dependency on the optical radiation frequency, and thus, the reflection should exhibit molecular absorption signatures in its frequency dependency.

However, several other physical factors contribute to shaping the measured reflectance spectra. These include light scattering on the surface and within tissue volume, autofluorescence, and background illumination.⁷ Disentangling these phenomena from a reflectance spectrum is often an ambiguous, ill-posed problem, yet it is crucial for deducing the relation between the reflection and molecular composition. Another complication is a scarcity of available studies in which optical monitoring and biochemical composition analysis are performed simultaneously.

Analytical and statistical approaches exist aiming to unmix optical spectra into the physical phenomena defining the spectra profile under a limited data regime.⁸⁻¹⁴ The first family of methods mitigates the data scarcity by introducing a physical prior to establish the spectrochemical link. Typically, the Beer-Lambert law^{5,15} is used to provide such a link by describing the incoming light's energy dissipation as an exponentially decaying function:

$$\log(I_R(\lambda)/I_0(\lambda)) = - \left[\sum_i c_i \mu_a^i(\lambda) + s \mu_s(\lambda) \right] \cdot l + U \quad (1)$$

Here, $I_R(\lambda)$ and $I_0(\lambda)$ are the intensities of the reflected and the incoming light, μ_a and μ_s are the absorption and scattering coefficients, the index i denotes the molecule constituting the tissue such as water, fat, hemoglobin and cytochromes, c_i denotes the corresponding concentration, and s is the weight of scattering in the total light energy dissipation. The remaining quantities are λ , which is the light wavelength, l is the light pathlength*, and U describes other physical factors contributing to the energy dissipation of the incoming light or other sources of the optical signal captured by the light detectors or cameras. Now, in the case of changes in molecular composition over the course of optical monitoring, one can assume that the effects contributing to U either stay constant (e.g., which is a fair assumption for ambient illumination) or change notably less than the total absorption[§]. Under this assumption, subtraction of two reflection spectra, $\log I_R^2 - \log I_R^1$ (coming from two different points in time or in space), would cancel out or make negligible the term $\delta U = U^2 - U^1$ in the following equation:

$$\log(I_R^2(\lambda)/I_R^1(\lambda)) = - \left[\sum_i \delta c_i \mu_a^i(\lambda) + \delta(s \mu_s(\lambda)) \right] \cdot l + \delta U \quad (2)$$

In such a differential form, the Beer-Lambert law can now be used to identify molecular composition. For this, standard least-squares optimization algorithms (or non-negative matrix factorization^{10,17}) can be employed to minimize the difference between the real spectra and the spectra

*Even though several works demonstrate importance of wavelength-dependent definition of the pathlength,¹⁶ in what follows, for simplicity, we opted for constant pathlength independent of the wavelength.

§In certain scenarios, even changes in scattering are not expected since it is a rather bulk effect dependent on the density of the probed matter rather than molecule-specific one.

obtained from the modified Beer-Lambert law. As a result of the minimization, the optimal values of the set of concentration changes $\{\delta c_i = c_i^2 - c_i^1\}$ are obtained (alongside the scattering parameters).

The overarching drawback of this approach is the computational time it takes to infer the biochemical composition. For example, the optimization methods take a subsecond time to infer the composition of a single spectrum containing a number of wavelengths typical for bNIRS and HSI (a few hundred). However, when using modalities providing high spatial resolution imaging for real-time applications, one needs to solve the optimization task in a subsecond time for as many spectra as there are spatial pixels, as every pixel contains its own spectrum. For modalities like HSI, the number of pixels can be easily in the order of 10^5 . Providing subsecond timings for simultaneous inference on such an amount of spectra poses a challenge for traditional methods.

Related work and contribution. There are numerous studies analyzing the application of machine learning methods to achieve fast inversion of the physical models based on Beer-Lambert law or Monte-Carlo simulations.¹⁸⁻²⁴ Predominantly they imply training a machine learning model on synthetic data generated by following the chosen physical formalism, and then evaluating the trained model on real spectra. While proven to work for the use cases mentioned in the cited works, this approach might be inferior as synthetic data generators likely underestimate the complexity of real data. To mitigate this, we tested different strategies for model training using only the *synthetic data* as in previous works or incorporating *real data* via traditional optimization in the training procedure.

Moreover, we test the proposed method on its ability to approximate physical models of varying complexity: *linear* (absorption only) and *non-linear* (absorption combined with scattering).

While evaluated independently in previous works, here we also analyse our approach to explicitly compare both models in terms of spectral fit. This comparison is motivated by a desire to elucidate the conditions under which the linear model (that can be easily solved using, e.g. pseudoinverse) is appropriate for describing the light-brain matter interaction process.

Furthermore, given that the work is carried out within the HyperProbe project²⁵ aiming to achieve real-time brain tissue monitoring, the present paper evaluates the *computational timing* for the biochemical composition inference across different methods and hardware platforms. To reinforce the comparison, in contrast to previous works manually choosing the hyperparameters' values of the machine learning methods, we used the AutoML technique²⁶ to identify the most optimal hyperparameters set.

Finally, to our knowledge, this is the first work that applies a neural-network-based approach to provide real-time inference of chromophore composition from *in-vivo brain tissue* spectroscopy measurements.²⁷⁻³⁵ We evaluate and discuss applicability of the method on broadband NIRS (transmission mode)³⁶ and hyperspectral (reflection mode)³⁷ measurements of brain tissue.

2 Method

As mentioned in the introduction, inference of absolute chromophore concentrations from an optical spectrum is a challenging task due to multiple physical effects shaping the reflection spectrum. Thus, we instead aim to predict the changes in concentrations from changes in the spectra, Eq. 2.

Datasets creation. In our method, we use a supervised data-driven approach by creating a dataset of attenuation-concentration pairs to train a neural network (by attenuation, or more precisely the change of it, we imply the logarithm of the reflection: $\Delta A = \log I_R^2 - \log I_R^1$). We employ two




Fig 1: The general pipeline describing the learnable approach for inferring molecular concentrations' changes $\{\delta c_i\}$ from changes in the reflection spectra. The pipeline involves training on a dataset which is generated by the means of a physical Beer-Lambert model. According to the model, the light reflection is shaped by the absorption μ_a and scattering μ_s .

different strategies to create the dataset:

a) The first strategy directly utilizes the modified Beer-Lambert law to generate the training dataset pairs $(\Delta A, \{\delta c_i\})$ with ΔA being the difference in attenuation between two spectra and $\{\delta c_i\}$ the corresponding differences in concentration of chromophores. For each chromophore, we randomly sample values for changes in the molecular composition $\{\delta c_i\}$ using the uniform distribution within physiologically plausible ranges.

If scattering is included in Eq. 2, we may assume it to be of rational form:

$$s\mu_s(\lambda) = s \left(\frac{\lambda}{500nm} \right)^{-b} \quad (3)$$

with the scaling of the anisotropy $g = 0.9$ included in $s = s'/(1 - g)$.^{5,38} In the differential form,

we obtain

$$\delta(s\mu_s(\lambda)) = s_2 \left(\frac{\lambda}{500nm} \right)^{-b_2} - s_1 \left(\frac{\lambda}{500nm} \right)^{-b_1} \quad (4)$$


and therefore also uniformly sample parameters s_1, s_2, b_1, b_2 within plausible ranges.³⁸ Subsequently, we input the obtained values into the modified Beer-Lambert law to obtain synthetic differential attenuations $\Delta A(\lambda)$. This difference in attenuation ΔA as input and the corresponding $\{\delta c_i\}$ as output are then used for training.

b) Given that the distribution of the synthetic spectra obtained according to the strategy described above can be notably different from the distribution of real spectra, this can result in an unsatisfactory network prediction accuracy. Therefore, in addition to (a), we evaluate another strategy for creating a dataset trying to bridge the gap between the physical model and real data. For this, we use traditional least squares minimization to fit the changes in the real reflectance spectrum with the modified Beer-Lambert law. The concentrations $\{\delta c_i\}$ found upon the optimization and the corresponding ΔA constitute the training samples.


Network and optimization details. The training was performed using a multi-layer perceptron (MLP) neural network for both approaches. The network takes as input a one-dimensional vector of attenuation difference and outputs molecular concentration changes.

We trained both networks with early stopping when they reached convergence. To find the optimal network architecture, we used the Ray Tune library²⁶ to validate different MLP architectures (width, number of hidden layers, and activation functions), learning rates, and batch sizes.

Least squares optimization for the Beer-Lambert law, excluding the scattering effect, can be performed via multiplication of the observed attenuation with the pseudoinverse of the absorption



(a)



(b)

Fig 2: Two strategies for collecting the training dataset. Strategy (a) in which we train a network on synthetic attenuation-concentration pairs generated from the modified Beer-Lambert law. Strategy (b) in which the training is performed on pairs of real attenuation and concentrations obtained through the least-squares fit to the corresponding real spectra.

coefficients.⁵ In order to perform the nonlinear least-squared optimization for the Beer-Lambert law model including scattering, we used the publicly available solver of the SciPy library.³⁹ We used the least-squares minimization obtained predictions as the ground truth to validate all the trained networks.

3 Results

3.1 Data.

For our experiments, we applied two types of modified Beer-Lambert law formulation, with and without scattering, to two types of spectral datasets: broadband NIRS data for which the spectra were measured in light transmission mode³⁶ and hyperspectral data which were obtained in non-contact reflection mode.³⁷

Broadband NIRS. The first dataset is composed of broadband NIRS spectra from a study analyzing 27 piglets’ brains in which a hypoxia-ischemia (HI) state was induced.³⁶ The piglets were monitored for several hours, during which the carotid arteries were surgically isolated, and a step-wise hypoxia took place for 15-20min. This produced a significant hypoxic-ischaemic effect that changed the metabolic status of the brain and, in some instances, caused further brain injury. The details of the intervention protocol are described in.³⁶ The measurements contain around eight thousand spectra per piglet, of which we use the first thousand measurements. The distance between each measured time point is between 10.0 and 10.5 seconds, i.e. we only consider the first ~ 2.5 hours of measurement. For all piglets, this is sufficient to observe HI and recovery after HI. As Eq. 2 requires defining a baseline spectrum, analogously to,³⁶ we used a spectrum at the very beginning of optical monitoring (i.e., before HI) for the baseline. We normalized the spectra with respect to dark noise and white reference. The normalized bNIRS spectra before and after the intervention inducing hypoxia are shown in Fig. 3 (left), and predictions of the concentrations change over the course of the optical monitoring are shown in Fig. 3 (right). Out of the 27 piglets in the dataset, 25 had data available during HI, such that 19 were used for training, two for validation, and four for testing. For this dataset, we predict three types of molecules: oxyhemoglobin, deoxyhe-




Fig 3: Optical spectra from the broadband bNIRS study in³⁶ before, during and after inducing HI in the piglet’s brain (left). On the right, predictions of the molecular concentration change $\{\delta c_{HbO_2}, \delta c_{Hbb}, \delta c_{diffCCO}\}$ over the course of the optical monitoring (for the Beer-Lambert model *without* scattering). The vertical lines denote the time points corresponding to the normalized reflection spectra on the left.

moglobin, and differential cytochrome-c-oxidase (CCO)[†], i.e. $\{\delta c_i\} = \{\delta c_{HbO_2}, \delta c_{Hbb}, \delta c_{diffCCO}\}$, where $\delta c_{diffCCO} = \delta c_{oxCCO} - \delta c_{redCCO}$. We neglected the potential contribution to the spectra from water and fat due to their minimal change in concentrations during the 2.5 hours of monitoring.^{36,41}

Hyperspectral data. The second dataset we used consists of hyperspectral data from the Helicoid project.³⁷ The Helicoid dataset comprises brain HSI images obtained in surgical conditions from 22 patients diagnosed with glioma. The HSI images provide a high spectral resolution of 826 bands spread between 400 and 1000 nm and a 2D spatial resolution of a few hundred pixels in each dimension. The images were also expert-annotated into three tissue classes: normal and tumor tissues, as well as blood vessels. Typical hyperspectral image and corresponding spectra are shown in Fig. 4. Different from the bNIRS dataset, we used a spectrum of the pixel belonging to the blood vessel class as a baseline spectrum. We then subtracted the baseline spectrum from all

[†]As the total CCO concentration may be assumed to not change within a few hours, the oxidized-reduced difference spectrum $\mu_a^{diffCCO}$ may be used to infer changes of both oxidized and reduced CCO.⁴⁰




Fig 4: Optical spectra from the HSI study of patients diagnosed with glioma³⁷ for different tissue types: tumor, normal tissue, and blood vessels (left). On the right is a typical RGB image of the brain surface, which is obtained from the HSI volume. The dots correspond to the spectra on the left image.

other spectra in the same image. In other words, we performed the differential spectroscopy *not in time but in space*.

Besides predicting oxyhemoglobin δ_{CHbO_2} and deoxyhemoglobin δ_{CHHb} , we again infer the differential cytochrome-c-oxidase concentration due to its role in capturing oxidative metabolic activity. We separately predicted oxidized cytochrome-c-oxidase and reduced cytochrome-c-oxidase, as the total CCO concentration may not be assumed to remain constant in space. We also predict water and fat since, for these molecules, one cannot assume minimal concentration change across different tissue types as in the case of the bNIRS spectra. Fig. 5 showcases examples of molecular inference for the HSI images from the Helicoid dataset. Out of the nine patients with glioblastoma in the dataset, six with distinct class labeling were chosen, and three patients were used for training, one for validation, and two for testing. Note that patients might have multiple images taken, such that the training set consists of five, the validation set of one, and the test set of three images.




Fig 5: Examples of HSI images from the Helicoid dataset³⁷ (left). Each pixel in the shown 2D image possesses a spectral signature with 826 bands. From this signature, we predict the molecular concentration change for hemodynamic $\delta c_{HbT} = \delta c_{HbO_2} + \delta c_{HHb}$ (middle), and metabolic $\delta c_{diffCCO} = \delta c_{oxCCO} - \delta c_{redCCO}$ characterization (right). Here, we use the Beer-Lambert model *with* scattering, as it provides a closer fit to real spectra than the model without scattering. We observe that performing the spectral unmixing on the HSI measurement of brain tissue allows us to better contrast the vessel tree (middle) and tumor area (right) than on the RGB image.

3.2 Experiments.

Scattering vs Non-scattering. First, we test different Beer-Lambert law formulations - with and without scattering. This test is motivated by our desire to assess whether a linear model (without scattering) is sufficient to describe the broadband spectroscopy measurement of brain tissue.

Fig. 6 and 7 show spectral fits using both formulations (spectral fits for other piglets are shown in the Appendix). The model with scattering provides a clearly better fit. It allows us to better describe the peak around 760 nm for the bNIRS data, while for the HSI data, the inclusion of scattering is often merely necessary for an accurate fit of the spectra in this wavelength range. This




Fig 6: Comparison between predictions using linear (no scattering) and non-linear (with scattering) models for bNIRS (left) and HSI (right) spectra. The ground truth (GT) attenuation is computed from the real spectra difference. The inclusion of scattering into the formulation of the Beer-Lambert law notably improves the spectral fit to real data.

finding is consistent across the dataset, as shown in table 1.

To show that our model can significantly improve model fits, especially for the higher frequency portion of the spectrum, we evaluate the relative improvement of the scattering model (compared to the non-scattering model) of all piglets for different spectrum bands. This is shown in figure 8, where we observed a mean relative improvement of 15.7% over the full fitting range. Such




Fig 7: On the left, comparison between chromophore predictions using the linear model without scattering ("Standard model") and non-linear model with scattering ("Scattering model") for the bNIRS dataset. On the right, the predicted coefficients s and b for the scattering term in Eq. 3.




Fig 8: Mean relative improvement of the spectral fit MAE for presented scattering model, compared to the linear model, across all piglets in the dataset for all wavelengths (left), in the range 740nm-780nm (middle), and in the range 780nm-900nm (right) in the broadband NIRS dataset. The dashed line signifies improvements below zero, i.e. cases where the spectral fit worsened.

improvement is especially noticeable in the 740nm to 780nm range, where the mean improvement of the distribution almost doubled at 30.8%. The spectral fit does not improve significantly in the 780nm to 900nm range, with the mean relative improvement of the distribution being at merely 5.6%. For one of the 25 piglets, we observed that the spectral fit slightly worsened in the 780nm to 900nm range through the nonlinear model. However, the fitting MAE is only worse by 0.6%, and the spectral fit was still better for the overall range and in the 740nm-780nm range. We therefore can still confidently conclude that the presented model is able to fit the piglets' measured spectra more closely, especially for presumed scattering-dominated bands.

The necessity of the scattering consideration in the Beer-Lambert model for the HSI data can be explained by the more pronounced contribution of the scattering process. For the HSI data, we infer the difference in molecular composition between different spatial locations on an image, i.e., between different tissue types. The scattering property across brain tissues can significantly vary, and thus, the scattering shapes markedly the differential spectra. In contrast, for the bNIRS

data, we perform the differential spectroscopy analysis not in space but in time (comparing two spectra for the same location taken at different time points), meaning that the molecular inference is performed for the same tissue type.




Fig 9: Comparison between inference of the molecular composition using the standard optimization methods and proposed network-based inference for training strategy (a) and (b) on both datasets. The top row compares strategy (a), left, with strategy (b), right, for the bNIRS dataset. The bottom row compares the inference of the hemodynamic signal of the optimization-based result, left, with strategy (a), middle, and strategy (b), right. Despite the fact that the training distribution is different from the test distribution (especially for strategy (a) with synthetic data used for training), the network predictions are closely aligned with the predictions by the standard solver.

Dataset	Individual ID	Spectral MAE		Concentration MAE	
		Non-Scattering	Scattering	Strategy (a)	Strategy (b)
Broadband bNIRS	507	1.23×10^{-2}	8.60×10^{-3}	1.36×10^{-2}	4.32×10^{-3}
	509	1.09×10^{-2}	9.37×10^{-3}	2.46×10^{-2}	4.81×10^{-3}
	511	8.01×10^{-3}	6.60×10^{-3}	1.16×10^{-2}	3.41×10^{-3}
	512	1.20×10^{-2}	1.09×10^{-2}	1.25×10^{-2}	4.59×10^{-3}
HELICoiD	012-01	3.27×10^{-2}	2.49×10^{-2}	1.73×10^{-1}	1.64×10^{-2}
	012-02	2.24×10^{-2}	2.19×10^{-2}	1.50×10^{-1}	2.58×10^{-2}
	015-01	6.33×10^{-2}	2.54×10^{-2}	1.75×10^{-1}	1.54×10^{-2}

Table 1: Quantitative performance comparison of the different Beer-Lambert models and network training strategies on the test set of the two spectral datasets. To compare the two (non-scattering and scattering) models, we compute the mean absolute error of the spectral fit (denoted as ‘Spectral MAE’) between the ground truth observed and predicted signals. The two network training strategies are compared by assessing the mean absolute error of each strategy between the network and optimization-inferred concentrations (denoted as ‘Concentration MAE’) of all considered chromophores. In the case of the HELICoiD dataset, only pixels labeled as normal, tumor, or blood were considered for these computations. The best-performing model and strategy for each individual is highlighted in bold.

Synthetic vs Real. Next, we choose the scattering model as the most accurate one and evaluate the proposed machine learning approach in its ability to substitute the physical model. Fig. 9 demonstrates the results of the experiment in which we test the network trained on synthetic data collected according to strategy (a) and on real data according to strategy (b). The latter provides qualitatively closer fits for the shown examples, which is also quantitatively supported as presented in table 1.

Computational time. Importantly, the proposed network-based optimization comes with a significant speed-up in computational time. In Fig. 10, we show a comparative analysis for performing chromophore composition inference using standard least-squares solvers (based on gradient update or pseudoinverse) and our proposed approach. As solving the linear system using the pseudoinverse requires the least amount of matrix multiplication, this method provides the fastest




Fig 10: Comparison between inference time for various optimization approaches for varying number of spectra (from 10 to 10⁵): including the pseudoinverse for the linear model (blue) and optimization-based (red) for the non-linear scattering model (both running on CPU), as well as network-based approach for scattering model running on CPU (orange) and GPU (green).

compute.

However, with the growth of the number of spectra for which we solve the optimization task, the matrix size for the inversion increases, and thus the computational time increases. Starting from ca. 10⁴ amount of spectra, the proposed network having a fixed amount of computational units becomes superior in terms of optimization time. Such runtime will remain approximately constant with a further increasing number of spectra, assuming sufficient GPU memory is available. More importantly, for non-linear systems, which are here represented as a Beer-Lambert model with the inclusion of scattering, one cannot utilize the pseudoinverse and has to resort to non-linear solvers like the ones based on gradient update. Such solvers are two to three orders of magnitude slower than the neural network approach, which has fixed compute time for linear and non-linear systems. As Fig. 10 shows, it takes ca. 0.7 ms for the network to infer biochemical composition for 10⁵ spectra on NVIDIA GeForce MX450 with 2048 MiB.

4 Discussion and Conclusion

As mentioned in the introduction, the objective of this paper is a fewfold:

First, we wanted to address the limitation of the existing machine learning approaches to infer molecular composition using a physical model. Predominantly, the training within these approaches is performed on synthetic data produced by the physical model. However, real spectroscopy measurements include a few factors not considered by the modeling, such as instrumentation and physiological noise or other non-linear optical phenomena. To close the gap between synthetic and real data, several works propose incorporating various kinds of noise into the synthetic data.²⁴ But the realism of the used noise formulations and their sufficiency to close the gap can still be questioned. Instead, the proposed in this paper learning scheme results in training and testing carried out on the same type of data obtained by processing real spectra with traditional least-squares optimisation. Thus, no noise model is required to achieve accurate predictions.

However, we must admit that the predictions by the existing training approach are, nevertheless, close to the ground truth. Intuitively, this behavior is not within expectations as, again, the spectra of synthetic data on which the network was trained and real data on which it was evaluated notably vary. We attribute such behavior to the fact that the main spectral feature that networks learn to focus on is the global functional shape of the spectra. The local behavior of the spectral function is less informative, and thus, the local perturbations, i.e., random noise, do not affect the network performance significantly. This reasoning is further reinforced when comparing the network performance between bNIRS and HSI data. For the HSI data, the noise has a pronounced wavelength dependency, in contrast to bNIRS data (see Fig. 4), which results in the network performance (trained according to the existing approach) degrading more notably compared to bNIRS data.

Another explanation for this behavior can be that here, we try to learn with a neural network a solution to a linear system (or quasi-linear system, in the case of the model with scattering, where

scattering contribution to the reflection spectra is minor compared to the absorption, as for bNIRS data). We hypothesize that upon network training on the dataset representing solutions to linear systems, the network weights are learned to minimize the contribution from non-linear network units (e.g., activation functions), as such units are unnecessary to establish a linear mapping. Generally speaking, the non-linear units are a virtue and a curse of the networks. The virtue, because they allow to learn an arbitrary mapping, and the curse, because it is the very sequential application of non-linear units that blows up the predictions for input data unseen during training. But if the contribution from non-linear units of the network is minimized, we would not expect such blow-ups of the network's predictions.

Second, we want to understand the limits of applicability of the linear model (with no scattering) for describing brain tissue spectroscopy. Note that under the assumption of negligible contribution from scattering in the modified Beer-Lambert law, the Eq. 2 results in a linear system. Such a system can be efficiently solved using the pseudoinverse, achieving close to real-time computation. However, in general, when including non-linear terms in the Beer-Lambert law formulation (scattering, non-linear absorption effects, etc.), the system of equations can not be solved anymore using pseudoinverse. Our analysis reveals that including scattering can often be necessary to describe the spectroscopy measurements, especially for HSI data. But also for the bNIRS data, we have qualitatively observed that the nonlinear model seems to fit the wavelength range between 740nm and 780nm particularly well, Fig. 8. This finding was within expectations since the range between 780nm and 900nm is not regarded to be dominated by changes in scattering and has therefore been widely used in broadband fNIRS technologies with concentrations inferred through the Beer-Lambert law solely considering absorption.³⁶

Importantly, as a by-product of our analysis, when we test the spectral unmixing on the brain

tissue HSI dataset, we observe that the molecular inference driven by the physical model leads to better contrasting the blood vessel tree compared to the RGB image, Fig. 5 (middle), and capturing metabolic activity (right). Both image semantics related to hemodynamic and metabolic tissue properties could be highly valuable in assisting neurosurgeons during the process of tumor removal. Knowledge of the topology of the blood vessel tree would minimize the amount of undesirable resection of the vessels leading to bleeding. In turn, understanding the metabolic activity across the 2D field of view would allow for better separation of pathological tissue from the healthy parenchyma, reducing the time spent on intra- and post-operative biopsy.

To conclude, in the paper, we present a data-driven concept for inferring molecular composition change from broadband spectroscopy of brain tissue. We test the approach on various datasets (bNIRS and HSI) and physical models of different complexity (with and without scattering, i.e., linear and non-linear systems). Importantly, we evaluate different training strategies for neural-networks-based molecular prediction substituting the traditional least-squares-fit methods. We achieve a significant speed-up compared to traditional least-squares optimization, reaching sub-second time for inferring molecular composition without a loss of accuracy. Such timing would allow for real-time tissue characterization from bNIRS and HSI imaging modalities.

Disclosures

The authors declare no financial conflict of interest.

Code, Data, and Materials Availability

In support of open science, all our code is available under <https://github.com/HyperProbe/SpectraFit>.

The HSI data is publicly available by the HELICoiD project. The bNIRS data may be obtained

upon request.

Acknowledgments

The HyperProbe consortium has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon Europe research under grant agreement No. 101071040. UCL is supported by UKRI grant No. 10048387.

References

- 1 O. Ganslandt, S. Behari, J. Gralla, *et al.*, “Neuronavigation: concept, techniques and applications.,” *Neurology India* **50**(3), 244 (2002).
- 2 D. A. Orringer, A. Golby, and F. Jolesz, “Neuronavigation in the surgical management of brain tumors: current and future trends,” *Expert review of medical devices* **9**(5), 491–500 (2012).
- 3 I. J. Gerard, M. Kersten-Oertel, J. A. Hall, *et al.*, “Brain shift in neuronavigation of brain tumors: an updated review of intra-operative ultrasound applications,” *Frontiers in Oncology* **10**, 618837 (2021).
- 4 A. N. Sen, S. P. Gopinath, and C. S. Robertson, “Clinical application of near-infrared spectroscopy in patients with traumatic brain injury: a review of the progress of the field,” *Neurophotonics* **3**(3), 031409–031409 (2016).
- 5 L. Giannoni, F. Lange, and I. Tachtsidis, “Hyperspectral imaging solutions for brain tissue metabolic and hemodynamic monitoring: past, current and future developments,” *Journal of Optics* **20**(4), 044009 (2018).
- 6 D. Viderman and Y. G. Abdildin, “Near-infrared spectroscopy in neurocritical care: a review of recent updates,” *World Neurosurgery* **151**, 23–28 (2021).

- 7 G. Lu and B. Fei, “Medical hyperspectral imaging: a review,” *Journal of biomedical optics* **19**(1), 010901–010901 (2014).
- 8 S. Tzoumas and V. Ntziachristos, “Spectral unmixing techniques for optoacoustic imaging of tissue pathophysiology,” *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **375**(2107), 20170262 (2017).
- 9 N. Dobigeon, Y. Altmann, N. Brun, *et al.*, “Linear and nonlinear unmixing in hyperspectral imaging,” in *Data Handling in Science and Technology*, **30**, 185–224, Elsevier (2016).
- 10 G. Lu, X. Qin, D. Wang, *et al.*, “Estimation of tissue optical parameters with hyperspectral imaging and spectral unmixing,” in *Medical Imaging 2015: Biomedical Applications in Molecular, Structural, and Functional Imaging*, **9417**, 199–205, SPIE (2015).
- 11 A. Bateson and B. Curtiss, “A method for manual endmember selection and spectral unmixing,” *Remote Sensing of Environment* **55**(3), 229–243 (1996).
- 12 I. Ezhov, L. Giannoni, S. Shit, *et al.*, “Identifying chromophore fingerprints of brain tumor tissue on hyperspectral imaging using principal component analysis,” in *European Conference on Biomedical Optics*, (2023).
- 13 K. Yokoyama, M. Watanabe, and E. Okada, “Estimation of the optical path length factor for functional imaging of an exposed cortex by principal component analysis,” in *European Conference on Biomedical Optics*, 5138_168, Optica Publishing Group (2003).
- 14 A. O. Gerstner, W. Laffers, F. Bootz, *et al.*, “Hyperspectral imaging of mucosal surfaces in patients,” *Journal of biophotonics* **5**(3), 255–262 (2012).
- 15 I. Oshina and J. Spigulis, “Beer–lambert law for optical tissue diagnostics: current state of the art and the main limitations,” *Journal of biomedical optics* **26**(10), 100901–100901 (2021).

- 16 A. Bahl, S. Segaud, Y. Xie, *et al.*, “A comparative study of analytical models of diffuse reflectance in homogeneous biological tissues: Gelatin based phantoms and monte carlo experiments,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.12935* (2023).
- 17 C. Caredda, J. E. Cohen, L. Mahieu-Williame, *et al.*, “A priori free spectral unmixing with periodic absorbance changes: application for auto-calibrated intraoperative functional brain mapping,” *Biomedical optics express* **15**(1), 387–412 (2024).
- 18 Y.-W. Chen and S.-H. Tseng, “Efficient construction of robust artificial neural networks for accurate determination of superficial sample optical properties,” *Biomedical optics express* **6**(3), 747–760 (2015).
- 19 S. J. Wirkert, H. Kenngott, B. Mayer, *et al.*, “Robust near real-time estimation of physiological parameters from megapixel multispectral images with inverse monte carlo and random forest regression,” *International journal of computer assisted radiology and surgery* **11**, 909–917 (2016).
- 20 S. Panigrahi and S. Gioux, “Machine learning approach for rapid and accurate estimation of optical properties using spatial frequency domain imaging,” *Journal of biomedical optics* **24**(7), 071606–071606 (2019).
- 21 I. Fredriksson, M. Larsson, and T. Strömberg, “Machine learning for direct oxygen saturation and hemoglobin concentration assessment using diffuse reflectance spectroscopy,” *Journal of Biomedical Optics* **25**(11), 112905–112905 (2020).
- 22 B. H. Hokr and J. N. Bixler, “Machine learning estimation of tissue optical properties,” *Scientific Reports* **11**(1), 6561 (2021).
- 23 T. Manojlović, T. Tomanič, I. Štajduhar, *et al.*, “Rapid extraction of skin physiological pa-

- rameters from hyperspectral images using machine learning,” *Applied Intelligence* **53**(13), 16519–16539 (2023).
- 24 A. Scarbrough, K. Chen, and B. Yu, “Designing a use-error robust machine learning model for quantitative analysis of diffuse reflectance spectra,” *Journal of Biomedical Optics* **29**(1), 015001–015001 (2024).
- 25 L. Giannoni, M. Marradi, M. Marchetti, *et al.*, “Hyperprobe consortium: innovate tumour neurosurgery with innovative photonic solutions,” in *Diffuse Optical Spectroscopy and Imaging IX*, **12628**, 80–87, SPIE (2023).
- 26 R. Liaw, E. Liang, R. Nishihara, *et al.*, “Tune: A research platform for distributed model selection and training,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.05118* (2018).
- 27 M. Mamouei, K. Budidha, N. Baishya, *et al.*, “An empirical investigation of deviations from the beer–lambert law in optical estimation of lactate,” *Scientific Reports* **11**(1), 13734 (2021).
- 28 P.-H. Chou, Y.-H. Yao, R.-X. Zheng, *et al.*, “Deep neural network to differentiate brain activity between patients with first-episode schizophrenia and healthy individuals: a multi-channel near infrared spectroscopy study,” *Frontiers in psychiatry* **12**, 655292 (2021).
- 29 X. Y. Yap, K. S. Chia, and N. A. S. Suarin, “Adaptive artificial neural network in near infrared spectroscopy for standard-free calibration transfer,” *Chemometrics and Intelligent Laboratory Systems* **230**, 104674 (2022).
- 30 N. K. Qureshi, F. M. Noori, A. Abdullah, *et al.*, “Comparison of classification performance for fnirs-bci system,” in *2016 2nd International Conference on Robotics and Artificial Intelligence (ICRAI)*, 54–57, IEEE (2016).

- 31 Y. Altmann, N. Dobigeon, J.-Y. Tourneret, *et al.*, “Nonlinear unmixing of hyperspectral images using radial basis functions and orthogonal least squares,” in *2011 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium*, 1151–1154, IEEE (2011).
- 32 Y. Karamavuş and M. Özkan, “Newborn jaundice determination by reflectance spectroscopy using multiple polynomial regression, neural network, and support vector regression,” *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control* **51**, 253–263 (2019).
- 33 H. Bian, H. Yao, G. Lin, *et al.*, “Multiple kinds of pesticides detection based on back-propagation neural network analysis of fluorescence spectra,” *IEEE Photonics Journal* **12**(2), 1–9 (2020).
- 34 M. Ewerlöf, T. Strömberg, M. Larsson, *et al.*, “Multispectral snapshot imaging of skin micro-circulatory hemoglobin oxygen saturation using artificial neural networks trained on in vivo data,” *Journal of Biomedical Optics* **27**(3), 036004–036004 (2022).
- 35 Z. Zhou, L. Zhao, X. Zhang, *et al.*, “Real-time in-situ optical detection of fluid viscosity based on the beer-lambert law and machine learning,” *Optics Express* **30**(23), 41389–41398 (2022).
- 36 P. Kaynezhad, S. Mitra, G. Bale, *et al.*, “Quantification of the severity of hypoxic-ischemic brain injury in a neonatal preclinical model using measurements of cytochrome-c-oxidase from a miniature broadband-near-infrared spectroscopy system,” *Neurophotonics* **6**(4), 045009–045009 (2019).
- 37 H. Fabelo, S. Ortega, A. Szolna, *et al.*, “In-vivo hyperspectral human brain image database for brain cancer detection,” *IEEE Access* **7**, 39098–39116 (2019).

- 38 S. L. Jacques, “Optical properties of biological tissues: a review,” *Physics in Medicine & Biology* **58**(11), R37 (2013).
- 39 P. Virtanen, R. Gommers, T. E. Oliphant, *et al.*, “Scipy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in python,” *Nature methods* **17**(3), 261–272 (2020).
- 40 G. Bale, C. E. Elwell, and I. Tachtsidis, “From jöbsis to the present day: a review of clinical near-infrared spectroscopy measurements of cerebral cytochrome-c-oxidase,” *Journal of biomedical optics* **21**(9), 091307–091307 (2016).
- 41 L. Giannoni, F. Lange, and I. Tachtsidis, “Investigation of the quantification of hemoglobin and cytochrome-c-oxidase in the exposed cortex with near-infrared hyperspectral imaging: a simulation study,” *Journal of biomedical optics* **25**(4), 046001 (2020).

List of Figures

- 1 The general pipeline describing the learnable approach for inferring molecular concentrations’ changes $\{\delta c_i\}$ from changes in the reflection spectra. The pipeline involves training on a dataset which is generated by the means of a physical Beer-Lambert model. According to the model, the light reflection is shaped by the absorption μ_a and scattering μ_s .
- 2 Two strategies for collecting the training dataset. Strategy (a) in which we train a network on synthetic attenuation-concentration pairs generated from the modified Beer-Lambert law. Strategy (b) in which the training is performed on pairs of real attenuation and concentrations obtained through the least-squares fit to the corresponding real spectra.

- 3 Optical spectra from the broadband bNIRS study in³⁶ before, during and after inducing HI in the piglet's brain (left). On the right, predictions of the molecular concentration change $\{\delta c_{HbO_2}, \delta c_{HHb}, \delta c_{diffCCO}\}$ over the course of the optical monitoring (for the Beer-Lambert model *without* scattering). The vertical lines denote the time points corresponding to the normalized reflection spectra on the left.
- 4 Optical spectra from the HSI study of patients diagnosed with glioma³⁷ for different tissue types: tumor, normal tissue, and blood vessels (left). On the right is a typical RGB image of the brain surface, which is obtained from the HSI volume. The dots correspond to the spectra on the left image.
- 5 Examples of HSI images from the Helicoid dataset³⁷ (left). Each pixel in the shown 2D image possesses a spectral signature with 826 bands. From this signature, we predict the molecular concentration change for hemodynamic $\delta c_{HbT} = \delta c_{HbO_2} + \delta c_{HHb}$ (middle), and metabolic $\delta c_{diffCCO} = \delta c_{oxCCO} - \delta c_{redCCO}$ characterization (right). Here, we use the Beer-Lambert model *with* scattering, as it provides a closer fit to real spectra than the model without scattering. We observe that performing the spectral unmixing on the HSI measurement of brain tissue allows us to better contrast the vessel tree (middle) and tumor area (right) than on the RGB image.
- 6 Comparison between predictions using linear (no scattering) and non-linear (with scattering) models for bNIRS (left) and HSI (right) spectra. The ground truth (GT) attenuation is computed from the real spectra difference. The inclusion of scattering into the formulation of the Beer-Lambert law notably improves the spectral fit to real data.

- 7 On the left, comparison between chromophore predictions using the linear model without scattering ("Standard model") and non-linear model with scattering ("Scattering model") for the bNIRS dataset. On the right, the predicted coefficients s and b for the scattering term in Eq. 3.
- 8 Mean relative improvement of the spectral fit MAE for presented scattering model, compared to the linear model, across all piglets in the dataset for all wavelengths (left), in the range 740nm-780nm (middle), and in the range 780nm-900nm (right) in the broadband NIRS dataset. The dashed line signifies improvements below zero, i.e. cases where the spectral fit worsened.
- 9 Comparison between inference of the molecular composition using the standard optimization methods and proposed network-based inference for training strategy (a) and (b) on both datasets. The top row compares strategy (a), left, with strategy (b), right, for the bNIRS dataset. The bottom row compares the inference of the hemodynamic signal of the optimization-based result, left, with strategy (a), middle, and strategy (b), right. Despite the fact that the training distribution is different from the test distribution (especially for strategy (a) with synthetic data used for training), the network predictions are closely aligned with the predictions by the standard solver.
- 10 Comparison between inference time for various optimization approaches for varying number of spectra (from 10 to 10^5): including the pseudoinverse for the linear model (blue) and optimization-based (red) for the non-linear scattering model (both running on CPU), as well as network-based approach for scattering model running on CPU (orange) and GPU (green).

- 11 On the left, comparison between chromophore predictions using the linear model without scattering ("Standard model") and non-linear model with scattering ("Scattering model") for the bNIRS dataset. On the right, the predicted coefficients s and b for the scattering term in Eq. 3.
- 12 On the left, comparison between chromophore predictions using the linear model without scattering ("Standard model") and non-linear model with scattering ("Scattering model") for the bNIRS dataset. On the right, the predicted coefficients s and b for the scattering term in Eq. 3.

List of Tables

- 1 Quantitative performance comparison of the different Beer-Lambert models and network training strategies on the test set of the two spectral datasets. To compare the two (non-scattering and scattering) models, we compute the mean absolute error of the spectral fit (denoted as 'Spectral MAE') between the ground truth observed and predicted signals. The two network training strategies are compared by assessing the mean absolute error of each strategy between the network and optimization-inferred concentrations (denoted as 'Concentration MAE') of all considered chromophores. In the case of the HELICoiD dataset, only pixels labeled as normal, tumor, or blood were considered for these computations. The best-performing model and strategy for each individual is highlighted in bold.

4.1 Appendix




Fig 11: On the left, comparison between chromophore predictions using the linear model without scattering ("Standard model") and non-linear model with scattering ("Scattering model") for the bNIRS dataset. On the right, the predicted coefficients s and b for the scattering term in Eq. 3.




Fig 12: On the left, comparison between chromophore predictions using the linear model without scattering ("Standard model") and non-linear model with scattering ("Scattering model") for the bNIRS dataset. On the right, the predicted coefficients s and b for the scattering term in Eq. 3.