

Synthetic Data in Radiological Imaging: Current State and Future Outlook

E. Sizikova, A. Badal, J. G. Delfino, M. Lago, B. Nelson, N. Saharkhiz,
B. Sahiner, G. Zamzmi, A. Badano*

Office of Science and Engineering Laboratories
Center for Devices and Radiological Health
U.S. Food and Drug Administration
Silver Spring, MD 20993 USA

Abstract: A key challenge for the development and deployment of artificial intelligence (AI) solutions in radiology is solving the associated data limitations. Obtaining sufficient and representative patient datasets with appropriate annotations may be burdensome due to high acquisition cost, safety limitations, patient privacy restrictions or low disease prevalence rates. In silico data offers a number of potential advantages to patient data, such as diminished patient harm, reduced cost, simplified data acquisition, scalability, improved quality assurance testing, and a mitigation approach to data imbalances. We summarize key research trends and practical uses for synthetically generated data for radiological applications of AI. Specifically, we discuss different types of techniques for generating synthetic examples, their main application areas, and related quality control assessment issues. We also discuss current approaches for evaluating synthetic imaging data. Overall, synthetic data holds great promise in addressing current data availability gaps, but additional work is needed before its full potential is realized.

Keywords: Radiology; In Silico Medicine; Synthetic Data; Simulations; Digital Twins

1 Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) applications are becoming more and more prevalent in radiology and other types of medical imaging applications. AI techniques are used to aid clinical professionals in faster and more accurate detection of findings, optimize image quality while reducing dose, and improve other facets of analyzing complex and multidimensional radiological data. A key feature of AI is its reliance on large-scale datasets for learning meaningful features. The goal of this paper is to review and discuss the emerging use of synthetic data for AI applications in radiology.

AI applications are often reliant on neural networks to perform predictions such as classification, segmentation or detection of objects of interest. Neural networks require large and diverse data collections to perform appropriate training and evaluation procedures. However, collecting sufficient examples from real patient sources comes with limitations due to patient privacy concerns, acquisition and annotation

*Corresponding author email: elena.sizikova@fda.hhs.gov

Dataset	Anatomy	Imaging Modality	Data Generation Technique	Task
pGAN [1] ^a	Vertebral units	MRI	GAN	Unit classification
SinGAN-Seg [2] ^a	Colon	Endoscopy	GAN	Polyp segmentation
COVID-19 chest X-rays [3] ^a	Chest	X-ray	GAN	Image classification
Med-DDPM [4]	Brain	MRI	DDPM	Brain tumor segmentation
Echo from noise [5] ^a	Heart	Ultrasound	DDPM	Cardiac segmentation
Awesome Lungs [6] ^a	Lung	CT, X-Ray	DDPM	Lung disease diagnosis
Synthetic CSAW 100k Mammograms [7] ^a	Breast	DM	DDPM	Classification masking of cancer
Sarno [8] ^a	Breast	CT, DM, DBT	Physical modeling	Development of a platform for virtual clinical trials
VICTRE [9] ^a	Breast	DM, DBT	Physical modeling	Lesion detection
M-SYNTH [10] ^a	Breast	DM	Physical modeling	Lesion detection
Synthetic renal ASL data [11] ^a	Kidney	MRI	Physical modeling	Registration, quantification, segmentation

^a Publicly available dataset, according to the publisher

Table 1. List of available synthetic radiologic datasets.

difficulties, high cost, and other challenges common to obtaining and sharing medical imaging datasets. Synthetically generated radiological data has been proposed to address some of these challenges and has become increasingly popular and realistic. Such data has been explored across different research domains, but the lack of consistent terminology has prevented a more unified and systematic study of synthetic data for radiology. For instance, the AI community has widely explored generative model techniques for the generation of synthetic data [12, 13], while the biomedical and clinical community have studied digital twin [14] and in silico medicine applications [9]. A summary of existing synthetic radiological datasets can be found in Table 1. The potential benefits of the use of synthetic radiological data are:

- **Reduced patient harm or risk.** Patient medical procedures (including imaging acquisition data collection) comes with inherent health risks (e.g., radiation exposure) or privacy risks (e.g., leak of Personal Identifiable Information (PII)), while the use of synthetic data typically relieves these risks.
- **Reduced time, lowered cost, and simplified acquisition.** Synthetic examples are often much easier and cost efficient to acquire, preprocess, store and maintain than patient data.
- **Scalability.** Large volumes of synthetic examples can be generated on demand when larger sample sizes are needed.
- **Quality assurance.** Synthetic examples can serve as a test-bed for evaluating AI algorithms to rapidly test comparative trends, or potentially support safety and effectiveness evaluations.
- **Mitigation of data imbalances.** Synthetic examples can be conditionally generated according to manually specified distributions, addressing known class imbalances. The resulting process may address imbalances and minimize bias, increasing diversity and enriching patient datasets. Conditional generation allows creating rare cases or under-represented populations.

To date, synthetic data use has been explored in a variety of radiological AI uses. First, and most commonly, synthetic examples have been used as a source of rich and annotated training datasets, either on their own or combined with real patient examples to train an AI model, filling in gaps in data availability, particularly for underrepresented subgroups. Second, synthetic data can be used for generating standardized testing examples that would be otherwise too difficult to acquire from real patients. One notable emerging application is the use of synthetic data for in silico clinical trials. To accomplish these goals, synthetic data generators are becoming increasingly realistic and can be tuned to mimic properties of a radiologic device and the human anatomy (see Figure 1 for an example).




Figure 1. Properties of the digital object and acquisition system models can be controlled during synthetic data generation process. Shown is the variation in imaging dose (number of Monte Carlo histories) generated with the VICTRE pipeline for digital mammography simulation [9] for a digital breast model [15] with fatty breast density and mass model [16] with 5 mm radius (adapted from [10]).

The limitations of synthetic data depend on how synthetic examples were generated, how realistic they are, and whether their use has more benefits than shortcomings. We argue that this choice is application dependent. Synthetic data applications in radiology have been explored by the biomedical engineering, AI and clinical communities, but the differences in terminology and disconnect have prevented a more unified integration. To address existing gaps, we summarize the key uses of synthetic data for AI across radiological modalities to identify current and future trends in both ongoing research and current applications.

2 Terminology

A general definition of synthetic data in health care has been proposed as artificial data that mimic the properties and relationships seen in real patient data [17]. Synthetic examples are examples that have been partially or fully generated using computational techniques rather than acquired from a human subject by a physical system. The techniques used to generate synthetic examples (images and objects), described later in this article, vary in the fundamental origin of the information and are typically either knowledge-based or image-based approaches.

The terms *in silico* imaging and *in silico* trials are closely related concepts which encompass computational approaches for generating data and evaluating imaging technology using computational models. *In silico medicine* refers to the discipline that encompasses the use of patient-specific computer simulations involving all aspects of the prevention, diagnosis, prognostic assessment, and treatment of disease [18]. In turn, as defined in [19], *in silico imaging trials* are “computational studies that seek to ascertain the performance of a medical device for the intended population, collecting this information entirely in the digital world via computer simulations”. Badano et al. [19] discusses techniques for generating digital cohorts, referring to groups of digital stochastic human models that share common characteristics and are selected for participation within *in silico* trials.

Manuscript	Model Type	Imaging Modality	Anatomic Site	Comments
Techniques for Synthetic Data Generation				
Goodfellow [20]	GAN	Multiple	Multiple	Original GAN implementation
Kossen [21]	GAN	MRI	Brain	Differentially private generation of image patches for brain vessel segmentation
Jiang [22]	GAN	CT	Lung	Adversarial domain adaptation (CT to MRI) for improved tumor segmentation
Xia [23]	GAN	MRI	Brain	Creation of patient-specific healthy examples from given pathological ones
Zhu [24]	GAN	Any	Any	CycleGAN: unpaired image-to-image translation
Bora [25]	GAN	Any	Any	AmbientGAN: generative learning approach from noisy inputs
Zhou [26]	GAN	Multiple	MRI	Generative learning on noisy, multi-resolution inputs applied to brain and knee data
Liu [27]	GAN	CT	Liver	Synthetic lesion synthesis for improved tumor segmentation
Jiang [28]	GAN	CT	Chest and Torso	COVID-19 CT synthesis using conditional generative learning
Kobyzev [29]	NF	Any	Any	Original Normalizing Flows (NF) implementation
Denker [30]	NF	CT	Chest and Torso	Conditional NF for low-dose CT reconstruction
Hajji [31]	NF	Multiple	Multiple	Comparison of NF to other generative models in medical image generation
Kingma [32]	VAE	Any	Any	Original VAE (VAE) implementation
Ahmad [33]	VAE and GAN	MRI	Brain	VAE-GAN implementation for brain tumor MRI generation to avoid mode collapse
Cui [34]	VAE	PET	Chest and Torso	Denoising and uncertainty estimation for PET
Ho [35]	DDPM	Any	Any	Original diffusion model implementation
Khosravi [36]	DDPM	X-ray	Pelvis	Diffusion models for few-shot segmentation
Pinaya [7]	Generative (multiple)	Multiple	Multiple	MONAI: generative AI library for medical imaging
Gosselin [37]	Patient-Based Model	MRI	Whole Body	Virtual Population VIP3.0: High-resolution models created from patient MRI
Solomon [38]	Patient-Based Model	CT	Multiple	A simulation model for lung, liver and renal lesions
Tomic [39]	Patient-Based Model	Any	Breast	A growing tumor model for breast cancer analysis
Al Khalil [40]	Patient-Based Model	MRI	Cardiac	A set of simulated models for cardiac segmentation analysis
Segars [41]	Patient-Based Model	PET-CT	Whole Body	Extended set of pediatric XCAT phantoms
Hoe [42]	Patient-Based Model	Any	Liver	CT-derived pediatric liver lesion model
Shaheen [43]	Patient-Based Model	Multiple	Breast	An MRI-derived lesion model for DM and DBT analysis
Sarno [8]	Patient-Based Model	CT	Breast	A set of digital CT breast phantoms designed for virtual clinical trials
Sauer [44]	Patient-Based Model	CT	Lung	A growing lesion model for lung analysis applications
Graff [15]	KB Model	Multiple	Breast	A high-resolution breast phantom
de Sistiernes [16]	KB Model	Multiple	Breast	A growing breast lesion model
Sengupta [45]	KB Model	Multiple	Breast	A growing breast lesion model
Sizikova [10]	KB Model	DM	Breast	A simulated image dataset for comparative analysis of mammography AI
Abadi [46]	Imaging Simulator	CT	Any	DukeSim: a scanner-specific CT simulation framework
Wu [47]	Imaging Simulator	Multiple	Any	XCIST: An X-ray/CT simulation framework
Badal [48]	Imaging Simulator	Multiple	Multiple	Acceleration of Monte Carlo simulations in imaging using a GPU
Badal [49]	Imaging Simulator	Multiple	Breast	MC-GPU: DM and DBT breast imaging simulation framework
Sarrut [50]	Imaging Simulator	Multiple	Multiple	OpenGATE: an open-source Monte Carlo toolkit for medical physics
Liu [51]	Imaging Simulator	MRI	Multiple	MRI-Lab: MRI simulation framework
Unberath [52]	Imaging Simulator	X-ray	Multiple	DeepDRR: simulation of X-ray from CT
Jensen [53]	Imaging Simulator	Ultrasound	Multiple	Field: ultrasound simulation framework
Maier [54]	Hybrid, Physics-Informed	CT	Any	Deep scatter estimation (CT) for real time X-ray scatter in cone-beam CT
Horger [55]	Hybrid, Physics-Informed	Any	Any	Efficient NN-based noise sampling for physics simulations
Maier [56]	Hybrid, Physics-Informed	X-ray	Any	Precision learning: incorporating priors into data-driven material decomposition
Applications				
Teixeira [57]	GAN	X-ray	Chest and Torso	X-ray synthesis from surface geometry
Frid-Adar [58]	GAN	CT	Liver	Generative lesion synthesis
Azizmohammadi [59]	GAN	X-ray	Heart	Generative learning to predict angiography frames
Ben-Cohen [60]	GAN	Multiple	Liver	CT to PET cross-modal synthesis for improved lesion detection
Mahmood [61]	GAN	Endoscopy	Chest and Torso	Reverse domain adaptation to match real and synthetic images
Shin [62]	GAN	MRI	Brain	Synthesis of abnormal images for improved tumor segmentation
Lewis [63]	GAN	Multiple	Chest and Torso	CT generation from X-ray for low-resource environments
Korkinof [64]	GAN	DM	Breast	MammoGAN: generative synthesis of mammograms
Sun [1]	GAN	MRI	Vertebrae	Private data sharing of medical images
Thambawita [2]	GAN	Endoscopy	Gastrointestinal (GI)	SinGAN-Seg: synthetic data generation for improving polyp segmentation
Zunair [3]	GAN	X-ray	Chest and Torso	Synthetic COVID-19 chest X-ray dataset created using CycleGAN
Salem [65]	Generative	MRI	Brain	Multiple Sclerosis (MS) lesion synthesis
Prados [66]	Generative	MRI	Brain	Pathology inpainting in MRI for Multiple Sclerosis (MS) applications
Konukoglu [67]	Generative	MRI	Any	MRI artifact reduction
Li [68]	VAE	MRI	Lung	Cross-modality synthesis for improved tumor segmentation
Chambon [69]	DDPM	X-ray	Chest and Torso	RoentGen: text-to-image synthesis of X-rays
Stojanovski [5]	DDPM	Ultrasound	Cardiac	Generation of synthetic ultrasound images for improved segmentation
Ali [6]	DDPM	Multiple	Chest and Torso	Spot the fake lungs: generation of synthetic X-ray and CT lung images
Gao [70]	Patient-Based Model	CT	Multiple	SyntheX: CT to X-ray simulation using DeepDRR
Xanthis [71]	Patient-Based Model	MRI	Heart	Simulation of synthetic images via XCAT for improved segmentation
de Dumast [72]	Patient-Based Model	MRI	Fetal	Simulation of fetal brain MRI from a phantom for domain adaptation
Pezeshk [73]	Patient-Based Model	CT	Lung	Synthetic data generation using lesion insertion
Brumer [11]	Patient-Based Model	MRI	Kidney	Arterial spin labeling (ASL) analysis using synthetic data generated from XCAT
Badano [9]	KB Model	Multiple	Breast	VICTRE: virtual clinical trial for comparing DM and DBT
Kadia [74]	KB Model	CT	Any	A lung lesion model for improvement of segmentation performance
Gong [75]	KB Model	Multiple	Breast	Simulations-based comparison of DM, DBT, and cone-beam CT imaging
Nelson [76]	KB Model	CT	Multiple	Assessment of DL-based CT denoising using computer simulations
Li [77]	KB Model	CT	Lung	A lung nodule model for pediatric CT
Cha [78]	Any	DM	Breast	Analysis of data augmentation via synthetic data for breast mass detection
Surveys and Overviews				
Kazerouni [12]	Survey/Overview			Survey of DDPM models in medical imaging
Singh [13]	Survey/Overview			Survey of GAN models in medical imaging
Pesapane [14]	Survey/Overview			Discussion of digital twins in radiology
Badano [19]	Survey/Overview			Survey of techniques for generating synthetic data models
Xu [79]	Survey/Overview			Survey of computational phantom use for radiation dose quantification
Segars [80]	Survey/Overview			Survey of 4-D XCAT applications
Kainz [81]	Survey/Overview			Survey of computational human phantoms
Killeen [82]	Survey/Overview			Survey of in silico simulation for minimally invasive surgery applications
Rodero [83]	Survey/Overview			Survey of in silico clinical trials for cardiac applications
Guan [84]	Survey/Overview			Survey of domain adaptation for medical image analysis
Candemir [85]	Survey/Overview			Survey of techniques for training radiologic deep learning models in data-limited scenarios
Boulangier [86]	Survey/Overview			Survey of data-driven methods for CT synthesis from MRI
Edmund [87]	Survey/Overview			Survey of CT substitution methods in MRI-only imaging
DuMont Schütte [88]	Survey/Overview			Benchmark of GAN techniques on chest X-ray and brain CT with a study of data sharing applications
Castiglioni [89]	Survey/Overview			Survey of medical imaging AI systems used as clinical decision support tools
Kelkar [90]	Survey/Overview			Overview of GAN assessment in medical imaging
Dar [91]	Survey/Overview			Assessment of data memorization in medical DDPM models
Shorten [92]	Survey/Overview			Survey of image data augmentation in deep learning

Table 2. Types of models, application modalities and anatomies analyzed using synthetic data.

3 Techniques for Synthetic Data Generation

Techniques for synthetic imaging data generation can be broadly grouped into three categories: statistical generative modeling, physics-based modeling, and hybrid, physics-informed modeling. A summary of popular models, applicable imaging modalities anatomies can be found in Table 2.

3.1 Statistical Generative Models

Generative models learn to synthesize outputs (images) that capture patterns and structures observed from existing patient images [13] by processing the distribution of pixel intensities. Most recent models are based on various neural network architectures developed in the ML community.

Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs). The key idea behind GANs, a popular type of generative model, involves two competing networks [20]: the first network (generator) aims to synthesize data that resembles the distribution of real data while the second network (discriminator) aims to differentiate the synthetic data from the real data. The GAN training process is adversarial and approximately solves a min-max optimization problem, with the objective of creating new data that matches the statistical distribution of training data. GANs have been used for generating synthetic training images [13], creating annotations [21], cross-domain [22] and pseudo-healthy synthesis [23]. Extensions of GANs include CycleGAN [24], which enables image domain transformation without the need for paired data, and AmbientGAN [25], which learns implicit generative models from lossy measurements of the distribution of interest. Both variants have found numerous applications in medical imaging [26].

Normalizing Flow (NF). Normalizing flows are part of the generative model family that learn an invertible transformation, typically represented by a neural network, from a well-understood base distribution (e.g., multivariate Gaussian) to a complex data distribution [29]. This base distribution serves as the starting point (“prior”) from which data is generated. NF learns a series of transformations to morph this base distribution to the target data distribution, enabling the generation of synthetic data that mimics the original. As compared to GANs, NFs offer an opportunity for a more profound interaction with the inherent data properties. While NFs do not inherently model physical properties of the data, their ability to provide exact likelihood evaluation allows them to better capture these properties if they significantly influence the data distribution. Nevertheless, incorporating domain-specific knowledge or physical laws directly into the flow structure is still an active area of research [29]. In radiology, NFs have recently gained some attention in applications such as image reconstruction [30] and data augmentation [31].

Variational Autoencoders (VAEs). VAEs leverage the principles of autoencoding and variational inference [32], and consist of two components: an encoder network and a decoder network. The encoder transforms the input data into a specific distribution in the latent space. The decoder samples points from this latent distribution and attempts to reconstruct the original data. Through this process, VAEs can learn a stochastic, continuous bidirectional mapping between the data and latent space. When only a limited number of training examples are available, combining variational inference with GANs may help avoid mode collapse, i.e., generation of uniform or blurry examples [33].

Denosing Diffusion Probabilistic Models (DDPMs). DDPMs are a type of generative model that represents image formation as a diffusion process. This process starts with the actual data and gradually adds noise until a simple noise distribution is reached [35]. To generate new data, the procedure is reversed by taking a sample from the simple noise distribution and iteratively applying a learned denoising operation, until the original data distribution is recovered. Here, noise operations are typically parametrized by a deep neural network, allowing the model to learn complex transformations between the noise and

data distributions. By using a noisy and stochastic transition process, DDPMs are able to model a wide variety of data distributions. Compared to GANs and VAEs, DDPMs may be easier to train and have a faster inference time [12].

3.2 Physical Modeling

Synthetic data generation using physical modeling typically includes two components [19]: a digital model representing a patient or patient populations, and a digital model of an acquisition device (imaging system).

3.2.1 Digital Human Models

Digital human models for computational simulations have been developed extensively over the past decades for different applications, particularly radiation dosimetry [79]. Recent research has focused on the development of models with increased spatial resolution and anatomical realism. The level of detail and anatomic diversity in these models depend on the method of generation and the range of anatomy covered (whole body or specific regions). The majority of digital human models are derived from detailed segmentations of tomographic images of patients [80]. The voxelized organs resulting from the segmentation process can be converted to surface mesh models to allow modifications and repositioning. Each organ is then assigned appropriate material properties depending on the intended use of the model. An early example is the Virtual Population VIP3.0 [37], a collection of digital human models developed for electromagnetic (EM) exposure evaluations. Another popular digital human model, the Extended Cardiac Torso (XCAT) phantom [80], used a few reference surface phantoms and registered them to patient images to create large cohorts of digital models. The XCAT incorporates respiratory and cardiac motion, and has sufficient resolution to be used in imaging. Detailed digital human models have been used extensively in a range of applications [81], ranging from developing image processing and reconstruction methods to motion compensation. Anatomic models of specific parts of the body are also commonly used, particularly for breast imaging applications. For example, a procedurally-generated stochastic breast model including a skin layer, blood vessels, glandular ducts, fat and other components was created by Graff et al. [15], and used in the evaluation of full-field digital mammography and tomosynthesis in the Virtual Imaging Clinical Trial for Regulatory Evaluation (VICTRE) project [9].

3.2.2 Digital Acquisition Device Models

Radiological images can be reliably simulated *in silico* because the physical processes underlying the generation, propagation and detection of radiation (from optical light to gamma rays) are well understood. Physics-based digital replicas of radiation sources and detectors, coupled with realistic transport of radiation through digital phantoms, are used to create synthetic images that reproduce the features of images acquired with physical devices. The required accuracy of the image generation process depends on the context of use (COU) of the images. Typically, more realistic images can be generated by implementing more sophisticated physics models, at the expense of increasing the computational complexity. As an example, x-ray projections of digital phantoms can be efficiently simulated using Siddon's ray-tracing algorithm, which models x-rays as straight lines from the source to the center of each pixel. However, if the pixel noise statistics or the contribution from scattered radiation are relevant to the context of use, more sophisticated Monte Carlo (MC) methods that track the interactions of individual x-rays might be necessary.

Numerous software packages have been developed to simulate different imaging modalities. For example, DukeSim [46] and XCIST [47] simulate commercial computed tomography (CT) scanners using

a combination of ray-tracing and MC methods. MC-GPU [48, 49] implements a GPU-accelerated MC code for cone-beam computed tomography (CT), mammography and tomosynthesis (as shown in Fig. 1). Nuclear medicine applications can be simulated with the MC tools from the OpenGATE Collaboration [50]. Simulation packages for imaging modalities not using ionizing radiation such as magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) [51] and ultrasound [53] are also available. A comprehensive review of various simulation frameworks for visible light (endoscopic), ultrasound and x-ray imaging, as well as their applications in intelligent surgical systems is given by [82].

3.3 Hybrid, Physics-Informed Models

Although recent advances in parallel computing, including graphical processing units (GPU), have allowed for complex physics-based simulations, such simulations may still often be prohibitive due to the computational overhead. Hybrid, physics-informed models address this concern by accelerating select components of synthetic data generation with deep learning. Alternatively, physics-informed neural networks embed physical constraints to create more realistic outputs or reduce the amount of training samples needed to learn a task. For example, deepDRR [52] speeds up generation of fluoroscopy and digital radiology from computed tomography (CT) scans by performing ML for scatter estimation and material decomposition, while retaining an analytic approach for other pipeline components. There are several other examples. [54] proposed a deep scatter estimation (DSE) technique that is within 2% of traditional Monte Carlo simulations used for cone beam CT acquisition. In fact, a neural network (NN) can learn to sample from a given probability density function (PDF) with high sampling efficiency [55], making it useful for noise modeling in physical simulations [93]. Finally, when known operators are combined together with NNs to inform the latter about known prior information during the training and inference, a NN may require less training data, training iterations, or achieve better performance levels [56].

3.4 Synthesizing Disease Models

The lack of well-curated and labeled data is particularly acute for diseased cases. Synthetic examples generated using generative modelling have been explored for creating various types of lesions [27, 65, 74]. Alternatively, lesions could also be synthetically in-painted (i.e., removed) to reduce impact on image processing tasks such as registration or segmentation [66]. In silico, knowledge-based models of disease have been developed for various organs [16, 38, 83]. An important consideration for lesion models is their growth pattern [39, 45], since lesion presentation may be affected by properties of the surrounding tissue.

3.5 Limitations of Data Generation Techniques

Statistical generative models are typically trained using images (e.g., collections of x-rays) and are able to rapidly generate examples from the learnt generative distributions. However, they may not learn appropriate physical constraints or causal links between attributes and physical findings, and thus often suffer from generating hallucinated findings or unrealistic anatomy. On the other hand, physics-based approaches are grounded in physiology naturally embedded in the digital human model, and are able to generate high-quality and fully-detailed outputs controlled by the input parametrization. These approaches, however, may require more time-consuming and computationally intensive simulations. In addition, physical modelling approaches are constrained by the variability of the parameter space of the digital human model and acquisition system, but the complexity of the model can be adjusted based on the task of interest. Hybrid, physics-informed models are typically designed to accelerate components of physics-based approaches using neural networks, which may result in loss of realism,

limited variability or constrained generalization [52]. The *generative learning trilemma* states that current data generation approaches cannot generate high-quality, diverse samples fast enough [94]. On the other hand, generative models and mechanistic physical models may be complementary [95].

Patient-Derived Models. All models (whether generative or physics-based), that are created solely based on a fixed set of patients are limited to properties (e.g., presence of disease) observed during training, rather than full object properties that may characterize the population of interest. For example, patients with advanced breast cancer may be not captured by a patient-derived model that did not include such patients in the training set. Such properties are better captured by knowledge-based models, derived from physical or biological measurements, to the extent that the knowledge is representative of the patient population. In addition, patient-derived models may be constrained by the quality and resolution of the training data, including noise, artifacts, contrast constraints, and missing data.

Null Space. Image-based methods, whether parametric or generative, are limited by the existence of a null space, which results from mapping a continuous object to a discrete image by an acquisition system, resulting in an unavoidable loss of information [96]. This limitation can be addressed by either learning from object models (typically via physics-based simulations) or by modifying the generative model training process to capture image degradation during training [26].

Realism. A key concern in the use of any synthetic data is its realism, i.e., the size of the distribution gap between real and synthetic examples, particularly in areas that affect device performance. Prior to integration of real and synthetic datasets, some pre-processing methods can be implemented to reduce the distribution gap, either using engineered features or learnt image transformations [24, 70, 84]. However, the problem of mitigating the ‘synth2real’ gap still remains a hurdle. Also, one of the drawbacks of using statistical generative models for data augmentation is that the supplementary generated examples may not extend beyond the training distribution of the model.

4 Applications

4.1 Algorithm Development and Training

Synthetic examples have been widely used as a source of training data, either on their own or combined with real patient images. This approach has been well-explored across many types of radiological imaging [85]. For instance, [57] showed that augmenting limited patient x-rays with synthetic images reduced marker localization error. [78] demonstrated that the addition of synthetic mammograms generated using *in silico* imaging improved performance according to breast mass detection free-response receiver operating characteristic (FROC) as compared to results from patient data alone. Several studies have used GANs for data augmentation and improved the performance of their algorithms, as seen in liver lesion classification on CT images [58], brain segmentation on CT and MRI images [97]. Synthetic images can address class imbalance concerns, but only if the synthetic images deviate sufficiently from the existing patient data [85].

Image Reconstruction and Cross-modality Synthesis. There has been a number of works that aim to predict one modality (e.g., CT) from another (e.g., x-ray) for improving image quality and decreasing number of artifacts [67], reducing radiation exposure [59], and improving prediction accuracy (e.g., lesion detection [60]). CT prediction from MRI has been particularly well-explored [86], as tissue electron density information from CT is needed for radiotherapy planning [87].

Source of Annotations. A significant advantage of synthetically generated examples is that they can be generated to include pixel-level annotations needed for training AI algorithms, thus reducing the annotation burden while retaining or even improving accuracy [40, 70], since pixel-level labels are particularly challenging to annotate. Segmentation supervision for images can be obtained either using deep conditional generation [28] (i.e., generating images conditionally on an input segmentation mask) or using simulation [61, 71] (where segmentation truth is obtained from a digital model).

4.2 Algorithm Testing

Synthetic data can be used for generating standardized testing examples that would be otherwise too difficult to acquire from patient images [41, 75]. When a synthetic dataset is used for testing, it is particularly important to ensure that this dataset is representative of the intended patient population in order for performance estimates to be accurate. Thus, compared to the scenario where synthetic data is used for training, the evaluation requirements for synthetic testing data are more stringent.

Sizikova et al. [10] introduced the idea of using synthetic images for comparative performance testing in medical imaging, where AI is evaluated on known trends with respect to physical properties (e.g., mass size). For this application, physics-based synthetic simulations are particularly useful since they can be used to easily re-generate examples with modifications to physical properties (e.g., size or radiation dose), while obtaining similar patient examples may not be practically possible. An emerging application of synthetic data is within *in silico* clinical trials, where results from computer simulations are used in development or regulatory evaluation of a medicinal product, device, or intervention [18, 83]. Here, synthetic data complements patient data for evaluation of novel treatment methodologies or medical devices. [9] has shown that an *in silico* clinical trial comparing digital mammography (DM) and digital breast tomosynthesis (DBT) imaging modalities replicated the results of an *in situ* (non synthetic) clinical study involving hundreds of enrolled women. As discussed in [98], *in silico* trials are not identical to their *in situ* counterparts, and could provide evidence not found in traditional clinical trials [99].

4.3 Patient Privacy Preservation

Synthetic data can act as an anonymization tool to protect patient characteristics while sharing data. For instance, a recent study [88] has evaluated the quality of GAN-generated synthetic chest radiographs as an alternative to sharing patient chest radiographs and brain CT, and showed that NN performance matched closely when trained on either synthetic or real examples, but suffered when a larger number of classes (labels) was considered. However, the risk of generative models inadvertently memorizing specific data points, thereby compromising patient privacy, cannot be ignored [100]. We refer the reader to [101] for a discussion of synthetic healthcare data privacy and associated risk mitigation measures. Finally, a recent set of recommendations for utilizing and evaluating differential privacy (AI) published by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) can be found in [102].

4.4 Addressing Bias and Other Limitations of Patient Datasets

4.4.1 Class Imbalance and Modality Availability

Many datasets are prone to data imbalance, i.e., an uneven data distribution across classes, due to, for instance, the secondary use of data [103]. A popular technique to address this issue in imaging studies is the use of resampling techniques that synthetically resize training datasets to obtain more balanced distributions [89]. Algorithmic fairness approaches [104] may be used to balance out uneven distributions in available patient datasets. [36, 105] demonstrated the benefits of synthetic radiologic data created using

generative models conditioned on various input attributes, such as examples with limited annotations or less frequent categories, to address class imbalances arising from existing data. As discussed in Section 4.1, synthetic data can also be used to impute missing information.

4.4.2 Enrichment of Underrepresented Populations

An attractive feature of synthetic data is that it can be used to generate examples from known and underrepresented populations, such as patients with rare diseases and protected populations. For instance, [62] reported the creation of synthetic training data by inserting rare abnormal tumors into MRIs and demonstrated that this process improved model performance on patient examples. In another work, [63] investigated TB classification using synthetically generated CT over patient X-ray alone, and discussed the potential applications of synthetic data in supplementing costly imaging procedures for resource-poor communities.

Protected populations are also notoriously difficult to obtain data points from, and are a potential candidate for synthetic data use. For example, pediatric patients represent 20% of the US population, but make up only 5% of imaging studies [106]. Pediatric radiology datasets are particularly difficult to acquire due to a lack of domain specialist annotators, lower study numbers, added safety concerns and regulatory requirements, all of which contribute to a lack of AI applications for these patients [107]. [76] simulated pediatric-size phantoms to evaluate AI denoising algorithms in newborn to adolescent sizes. [42] demonstrated that synthetically generated pediatric liver CT images with in-painted lesions were indistinguishable to real counterparts when read by radiologists. [77] showed that CT images of synthetic and patient lung nodules in pediatric patients were perceptually indistinguishable. Finally, [72] explored applications of synthetic data to AI-based segmentation of brain tissues in fetal MRI.

Considerations. A key challenge in synthetic data use for underrepresented populations is that it is inherently hard to find samples to build a robust training dataset for the data generation model to ensure that it does not perpetuate existing biases [108]. While approaches such as class-specific few-shot learning [69, 109] may mitigate the issue, under such conditions, physical modeling, which typically requires fewer parameters, may be advantageous. In either case, attention must be given not to perpetuate existing biases present in the data or the knowledge model.

5 Data Assessment Metrics

Fidelity and Utility. Evaluating synthetic radiological data is important to ensure that the generated data can serve its intended purpose. Synthetic data is often assessed in terms of its *fidelity*, i.e., whether it captures statistical inter-relationships of patient datasets, or its *utility*, i.e., whether it achieves similar results (e.g., downstream task performance) as patient data. A high-fidelity dataset therefore should have high utility [17], however, high utility may not be necessary for applications such as an understanding of relative trends. Fidelity metrics (e.g., Frechet Inception Distance (FID)) may capture summary statistics, single or pairwise distributional patterns, more complex interrelationships between variables in the synthetic and/or patient data points and or consistency with clinical domain expertise [90]. As the number of data dimensions increase, measuring fidelity becomes increasingly complex due to the exponentially increasing number of interrelationships [110].

Types of Utility Metrics. As discussed in [17], utility metrics measure distance between patient and synthetic data and could be grouped into work-aware evaluations (metrics that compare real and synthetic data performance in tasks of interest), generic utility measures (metrics that compare general distance

metrics between real and synthetic data), and subjective assessments (metrics that compare perceptual quality of synthetic and patient data based on domain expert assessment in a user study). How to evaluate synthetic radiological data is an on-going and open research problem. [64] compared synthetic and real examples using distributions of top five moments. Work-aware evaluations (alternatively, task-based performance) is another popular method of evaluating synthetic data [58], particularly when the underlying real data distribution is unknown. Objective assessment of image quality in medical applications has been extensively studied [111]. While current metrics provide some level of assessment for synthetic radiological data, they have limitations [110, 112], and may overlook issues such as hallucinations and memorization in synthetic radiological data [113].

Subjective Assessment. Subjective assessment metrics [114] typically include user studies or visual clinical assessments with reader studies. One well-known example is the visual Turing test (sometimes known as a “fool the human” study design), a commonplace approach to evaluate the realism of synthetic images [73] that derives from Turing’s work on machine intelligence [115]. In a Turing test, radiologists are tasked with distinguishing between synthetic and real images. Several studies found that the performance of radiologists is at almost guessing levels [16, 38, 73], since a visual Turing test includes subjective and highly noisy nature of the interrogator [115]. [43] described a study where five radiologists were asked to evaluate mammography and breast tomosynthesis (DBT) images, comparing mass appearance in patient images and in images where MRI-derived, spiculated lesions were artificially inserted. Results showed that humans were only marginally capable of distinguishing synthetic from natural masses with an area-under-the-ROC curve averaged across observers of 0.54 (95% confidence interval [0.50, 0.66]) for the 2D study and 0.67 (95% confidence interval [0.55, 0.79]) for tomosynthesis. It is important to note that the result of the Turing test (whether human readers can correctly identify synthetic samples) may or may not be relevant for determining whether computational models and simulation tools are useful for evaluating new imaging systems [116].

Future Directions A number of existing metrics for evaluating synthetic data already exist today [112]. One future direction would involve establishing a standardized and comprehensive framework that can provide a holistic evaluation of synthetic data, ensuring that metrics are tailored to the application and offering a multifaceted view of performance, verifying that the synthetic data meets its intended purpose.

6 Challenges for the Use of Synthetic Data

As in other fields, applications of synthetic data in radiological imaging suffer from data complexity (multi-scale models spanning several scientific disciplines), disclosure limitations (no robust platform to develop and disseminate models), data privacy and data ownership concerns. Below, we discuss some existing challenges associated with practical use and evaluation of synthetic radiological data.

6.1 Scientific Challenges

To ensure the safety and effectiveness of new biomedical technologies developed or evaluated with synthetic data, additional research is needed to better understand the uncertainty and bias of synthetic data generation approaches. An open area of research is the development of metrics for characterizing individual or population representation in a synthetic dataset and for evaluating the reliability of algorithm performance (e.g., does the algorithm performance reported on a synthetic dataset match the performance on a real patient dataset). In addition, techniques to ensure unbiased outcomes from utilizing synthetic data need to be developed, in particular, to ensure that using synthetic data does

not lead to shortcuts as compared to real examples. Moreover, statistical methods that optimize the incorporation of synthetic data into small patient test datasets need to be investigated. Finally, there is a need for methods and tools to quantify and improve the generalizability of the synthetic data when replicating different scenarios in terms of the clinical settings, population characteristics, and imaging device properties. In this context, methods and techniques to safely reuse synthetic data in the development and evaluation stages of new technology, as well as in post-market “in-the-wild” monitoring programs are needed including sound methods for data reuse and for practical and efficient data sequestration strategies.

6.2 Evaluation Challenges

The key challenge of using synthetic data in the context of medical device evaluation concerns validation requirements that should be sufficiently strict to support the data usage. Synthetic data may be used in multiple ways within the context of regulatory evaluations with different evidentiary requirements. Regardless of the specific application, evidence must exist to show that synthetic data within a regulatory submission can be sufficiently relied upon to support the claims made. Depending on how the synthetic data is used, this may include synthetic examples with patient data, cross-validation of synthetic data using different data generation techniques, or distribution gap analysis between patient and synthetic data. The greater the prominence of synthetic data in the submission, the higher the evidentiary requirements. As an example, a computer-aided diagnostic device may use a data augmentation strategy incorporating synthetic examples into its training data. Validation of such supplementary data may include demonstrating that the synthetic data distribution follows a similar distribution in specific features as with real data, and that its use improves performance of the studied algorithm in real data. Primary research supporting the safety and effectiveness of the device would continue to come from a robust test set of real patients.

As all models carry inherent assumptions, ensuring congruence between the use of the synthetic data in technology assessment and the original purpose of the data generation model is essential. The US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) applies the term “*Context of Use (COU)*” to describe the way the synthetic data/algorithm/model is to be used. For a radiological device reliant on an AI algorithm, the context of use is the specific role and scope of the device, a detailed description of what will be modeled and how the device outputs will be used to answer specific questions of interest¹. The context of use, the influence of the model in the regulatory decision, and the consequences of decision on patients, inform the validation and performance criteria necessary for the synthetic data to be relied upon for regulatory purposes.

7 Summary

Synthetic data shows great promise in advancing radiological imaging, especially AI-based technologies. Developing or evaluating these technologies with synthetic data allows conserving resources and can help to ensure that device approvals consider the entire intended patient population. Looking forward, a recent study [117] introduced the concept of a metaverse of “medical technology and AI” (MeTAI) that would augment regulatory evaluation of medical devices with virtual patient and scanner models, highlighting the interplay of synthetic data and healthcare applications. Badano et al. demonstrated this proof of concept for mammographic imaging with the VICTRE trial [9]. Continued development and

¹See FDA guidance titled “*Assessing the Credibility of Computational Modeling and Simulation in Medical Device Submissions*” [<https://www.fda.gov/media/154985/download>].

refinement of synthetic data generation techniques and applications in radiology are needed to make that future the next reality.

References

- [1] Hanxi Sun, Jason Plawinski, Sajanth Subramaniam, Amir Jamaludin, Timor Kadir, Aimee Readie, Gregory Ligozio, David Ohlssen, Mark Baillie, and Thibaud Coroller. A deep learning approach to private data sharing of medical images using conditional GANs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.13199*, 2021.
- [2] Vajira Thambawita, Pegah Salehi, Sajad Amouei Sheshkal, Steven A Hicks, Hugo L Hammer, Sravanthi Parasa, Thomas de Lange, Pål Halvorsen, and Michael A Riegler. SinGAN-Seg: synthetic training data generation for medical image segmentation. *PLOS One*, 17(5):e0267976, 2022.
- [3] Hasib Zunair and A Ben Hamza. Synthesis of COVID-19 chest X-rays using unpaired image-to-image translation. *Social Network Analysis and Mining (SNAM)*, 11(1):1–12, 2021.
- [4] Zolnamar Dorjsembe, Hsing-Kuo Pao, Sodtavilan Odonchimed, and Furen Xiao. Conditional diffusion models for semantic 3D brain MRI synthesis. *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, 2024.
- [5] David Stojanovski, Uxio Hermida, Pablo Lamata, Arian Beqiri, and Alberto Gomez. Echo from noise: synthetic ultrasound image generation using diffusion models for real image segmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.05424*, 2023.
- [6] Hazrat Ali, Shafaq Murad, and Zubair Shah. Spot the fake lungs: Generating synthetic medical images using neural diffusion models. In *Irish Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Cognitive Science (AICS)*, pages 32–39. Springer, 2022.
- [7] Walter HL Pinaya, Mark S Graham, Eric Kerfoot, Petru-Daniel Tudosiu, Jessica Dafflon, Virginia Fernandez, Pedro Sanchez, Julia Wolleb, Pedro F da Costa, Ashay Patel, et al. Generative AI for medical imaging: extending the MONAI framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15208*, 2023.
- [8] Antonio Sarno, Giovanni Mettivier, Francesca di Franco, Antonio Varallo, Kristina Bliznakova, Andrew M. Hernandez, John M. Boone, and Paolo Russo. Dataset of patient-derived digital breast phantoms for in silico studies in breast computed tomography, digital breast tomosynthesis, and digital mammography. *Medical Physics*, 48(5):2682–2693, 2021.
- [9] Aldo Badano, Christian G Graff, Andreu Badal, Diksha Sharma, Rongping Zeng, Frank W Samuelson, Stephen J Glick, and Kyle J Myers. Evaluation of digital breast tomosynthesis as replacement of full-field digital mammography using an in silico imaging trial. *JAMA Network Open*, 1(7):e185474–e185474, 2018.

- [10] Elena Sizikova, Niloufar Saharkhiz, Diksha Sharma, Miguel Lago, Berkman Sahiner, Jana Gut Delfino, and Aldo Badano. Knowledge-based in silico models and dataset for the comparative evaluation of mammography ai for a range of breast characteristics, lesion conspicuities and doses. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2023.
- [11] Irène Brumer, Dominik F Bauer, Lothar R Schad, and Frank G Zöllner. Synthetic arterial spin labeling MRI of the kidneys for evaluation of data processing pipeline. *Diagnostics*, 12(8):1854, 2022.
- [12] Amirhossein Kazerouni, Ehsan Khodapanah Aghdam, Moein Heidari, Reza Azad, Mohsen Fayyaz, Ilker Hacihaliloglu, and Dorit Merhof. Diffusion models in medical imaging: A comprehensive survey. *Medical Image Analysis*, page 102846, 2023.
- [13] Nripendra Kumar Singh and Khalid Raza. Medical image generation using generative adversarial networks: A review. *Health Informatics: A Computational Perspective in Healthcare*, pages 77–96, 2021.
- [14] Filippo Pesapane, Anna Rotili, Silvia Penco, Luca Nicosia, and Enrico Cassano. Digital twins in radiology. *Journal of Clinical Medicine (JCM)*, 11(21):6553, 2022.
- [15] Christian G Graff. A new, open-source, multi-modality digital breast phantom. In *Medical Imaging 2016: Physics of Medical Imaging*, volume 9783, pages 72–81. SPIE, 2016.
- [16] Luis de Sisternes, Jovan G Brankov, Adam M Zysk, Robert A Schmidt, Robert M Nishikawa, and Miles N Wernick. A computational model to generate simulated three-dimensional breast masses. *Medical Physics*, 42(2):1098–1118, 2015.
- [17] Puja Myles, Johan Ordish, and Allan Tucker. The potential synergies between synthetic data and in silico trials in relation to generating representative virtual population cohorts. *Progress in Biomedical Engineering*, page 013001, 2023.
- [18] Marco Viceconti, Adriano Henney, and Edwin Morley-Fletcher. In silico clinical trials: how computer simulation will transform the biomedical industry. *International Journal of Clinical Trials (IJCT)*, 3(2):37–46, 2016.
- [19] A Badano, M Lago, E Sizikova, JG Delfino, S Guan, MA Anastasio, and B Sahiner. The stochastic digital human is now enrolling for in silico imaging trials—methods and tools for generating digital cohorts. *Progress in Biomedical Engineering*, 2023.
- [20] Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative adversarial networks. *Communications of the ACM*, 63(11):139–144, 2020.
- [21] Tabea Kossen, Manuel A Hirzel, Vince I Madai, Franziska Boenisch, Anja Hennemuth, Kristian Hildebrand, Sebastian Pokutta, Kartikey Sharma, Adam Hilbert, Jan Sobesky, et al. Toward sharing brain images: Differentially private TOF-MRA images with segmentation labels using generative adversarial networks. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 5:85, 2022.

- [22] Jue Jiang, Yu-Chi Hu, Neelam Tyagi, Pengpeng Zhang, Andreas Rimner, Gig S Mageras, Joseph O Deasy, and Harini Veeraraghavan. Tumor-aware, adversarial domain adaptation from CT to MRI for lung cancer segmentation. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention (MICCAI)*, pages 777–785. Springer, 2018.
- [23] Tian Xia, Agisilaos Chatsias, and Sotirios A Tsaftaris. Pseudo-healthy synthesis with pathology disentanglement and adversarial learning. *Medical Image Analysis*, 64:101719, 2020.
- [24] Jun-Yan Zhu, Taesung Park, Phillip Isola, and Alexei A Efros. Unpaired image-to-image translation using cycle-consistent adversarial networks. In *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 2223–2232, 2017.
- [25] Ashish Bora, Eric Price, and Alexandros G Dimakis. AmbientGAN: generative models from lossy measurements. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2018.
- [26] Weimin Zhou, Sayantan Bhadra, Frank J Brooks, Hua Li, and Mark A Anastasio. Learning stochastic object models from medical imaging measurements by use of advanced ambient generative adversarial networks. *Journal of Medical Imaging (JMI)*, 9(1):015503, 2022.
- [27] Yingao Liu, Fei Yang, and Yidong Yang. Free-form lesion synthesis using a partial convolution generative adversarial network for enhanced deep learning liver tumor segmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.09065*, 2022.
- [28] Yifan Jiang, Han Chen, Murray Loew, and Hanseok Ko. Covid-19 ct image synthesis with a conditional generative adversarial network. *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics (JBHI)*, 25(2):441–452, 2020.
- [29] Ivan Kobyzev, Simon JD Prince, and Marcus A Brubaker. Normalizing flows: An introduction and review of current methods. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence (PAMI)*, 43(11):3964–3979, 2020.
- [30] Alexander Denker, Maximilian Schmidt, Johannes Leuschner, Peter Maass, and Jens Behrmann. Conditional normalizing flows for low-dose computed tomography image reconstruction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.06270*, 2020.
- [31] Mustafa Hajj, Ghada Zamzmi, Rahul Paul, and Lokenda Thukar. Normalizing flow for synthetic medical images generation. In *Healthcare Innovations and Point of Care Technologies (HI-POCT)*, pages 46–49. IEEE, 2022.
- [32] Diederik P Kingma and Max Welling. Auto-encoding variational bayes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114*, 2013.
- [33] Bilal Ahmad, Jun Sun, Qi You, Vasile Palade, and Zhongjie Mao. Brain tumor classification using a combination of variational autoencoders and generative adversarial networks. *Biomedicines*, 10(2):223, 2022.

- [34] Jianan Cui, Yutong Xie, Anand A Joshi, Kuang Gong, Kyungsang Kim, Young-Don Son, Jong-Hoon Kim, Richard Leahy, Huafeng Liu, and Quanzheng Li. PET denoising and uncertainty estimation based on NVAE model using quantile regression loss. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention (MICCAI)*, pages 173–183. Springer, 2022.
- [35] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 33:6840–6851, 2020.
- [36] Bardia Khosravi, Pouria Rouzrokh, John P Mickley, Shahriar Faghani, Kellen Mulford, Linjun Yang, A Noelle Larson, Benjamin M Howe, Bradley J Erickson, Michael J Taunton, et al. Few-shot biomedical image segmentation using diffusion models: beyond image generation. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*, 242:107832, 2023.
- [37] Marie-Christine Gosselin, Esra Neufeld, Heidi Moser, Eveline Huber, Silvia Farcito, Livia Gerber, Maria Jedensjö, Isabel Hilber, Fabienne Di Gennaro, Bryn Lloyd, et al. Development of a new generation of high-resolution anatomical models for medical device evaluation: the Virtual Population 3.0. *Physics in Medicine & Biology*, 59(18):5287, 2014.
- [38] Justin Solomon and Ehsan Samei. A generic framework to simulate realistic lung, liver and renal pathologies in CT imaging. *Physics in Medicine & Biology*, 59(21):6637, 2014.
- [39] Hanna Tomic, Anna Bjerken, Gustav Hellgren, Kristin Johnson, Daniel Förnvik, Sophia Zackrisson, Anders Tingberg, Magnus Dustler, and Predrag R Bakic. Development and evaluation of a method for tumor growth simulation in virtual clinical trials of breast cancer screening. *Journal of Medical Imaging (JMI)*, 9(3):033503–033503, 2022.
- [40] Yasmina Al Khalil, Sina Amirrajab, Cristian Lorenz, Jürgen Weese, and Marcel Breeuwer. Heterogeneous virtual population of simulated CMR images for improving the generalization of cardiac segmentation algorithms. In *MICCAI Simulation and Synthesis in Medical Imaging (SASHIMI)*, pages 68–79. Springer, 2020.
- [41] WP Segars, Hannah Norris, Gregory M Sturgeon, Yakun Zhang, Jason Bond, Anum Minhas, Daniel J Tward, JT Ratnanather, MI Miller, D Frush, et al. The development of a population of 4D pediatric XCAT phantoms for imaging research and optimization. *Medical Physics*, 42(8):4719–4726, 2015.
- [42] Chee L Hoe, Ehsan Samei, Donald P Frush, and David M Delong. Simulation of liver lesions for pediatric CT. *Radiology*, 238(2):699–705, 2006.
- [43] Eman Shaheen, Frederik De Keyzer, Hilde Bosmans, David R Dance, Kenneth C Young, and Chantal Van Ongeval. The simulation of 3d mass models in 2d digital mammography and breast tomosynthesis. *Medical Physics*, 41:081913, 2014.
- [44] Thomas J Sauer, Adrian Bejan, Paul Segars, and Ehsan Samei. Development and CT image-domain validation of a computational lung lesion model for use in virtual imaging trials. *Medical Physics*, 2023.

- [45] Aunnasha Sengupta, Diksha Sharma, and Aldo Badano. Computational model of tumor growth for in silico trials. In *Medical Imaging 2021: Physics of Medical Imaging*, volume 11595, pages 1262–1270. SPIE, 2021.
- [46] Ehsan Abadi, Brian Harrawood, Shobhit Sharma, Anuj Kapadia, William P Segars, and Ehsan Samei. DukeSim: a realistic, rapid, and scanner-specific simulation framework in computed tomography. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging (TMI)*, 38(6):1457–1465, 2018.
- [47] Mingye Wu, Paul FitzGerald, Jiayong Zhang, W Paul Segars, Hengyong Yu, Yongshun Xu, and Bruno De Man. XCIST—an open access x-ray/ct simulation toolkit. *Physics in Medicine & Biology*, 67(19):194002, 2022.
- [48] Andreu Badal and Aldo Badano. Accelerating monte carlo simulations of photon transport in a voxelized geometry using a massively parallel graphics processing unit. *Medical Physics*, 36(11):4878–4880, 2009.
- [49] Andreu Badal, Diksha Sharma, Christian G Graff, Rongping Zeng, and Aldo Badano. Mammography and breast tomosynthesis simulator for virtual clinical trials. *Computer Physics Communications*, 261:107779, 2021.
- [50] David Sarrut, Thomas Baudier, Damian Borys, Ane Etxebeste, Hermann Fuchs, Jan Gajewski, Loïc Grevillot, Sébastien Jan, George C Kagadis, Han Gyu Kang, et al. The OpenGATE ecosystem for monte carlo simulation in medical physics. *Physics in Medicine & Biology*, 67(18):184001, 2022.
- [51] Fang Liu, Julia V Velikina, Walter F Block, Richard Kijowski, and Alexey A Samsonov. Fast realistic MRI simulations based on generalized multi-pool exchange tissue model. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging (TMI)*, 36(2):527–537, 2016.
- [52] Mathias Unberath, Jan-Nico Zaech, Sing Chun Lee, Bastian Bier, Javad Fotouhi, Mehran Armand, and Nassir Navab. DeepDRR—a catalyst for machine learning in fluoroscopy-guided procedures. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention (MICCAI)*. Springer, 2018.
- [53] Jørgen Arendt Jensen. Field: A program for simulating ultrasound systems. *Medical & Biological Engineering & Computing*, 34:351–353, 1997.
- [54] Joscha Maier, Yannick Berker, Stefan Sawall, and Marc Kachelrieß. Deep scatter estimation (dse): feasibility of using a deep convolutional neural network for real-time x-ray scatter prediction in cone-beam ct. In *Medical Imaging 2018: Physics of Medical Imaging*, volume 10573, pages 393–398. SPIE, 2018.
- [55] Felix Horger, Tobias Würfl, Vincent Christlein, and Andreas Maier. Towards arbitrary noise augmentation—deep learning for sampling from arbitrary probability distributions. In *MICCAI Machine Learning for Medical Image Reconstruction (MLMIR) Workshop*, pages 129–137. Springer, 2018.

- [56] Andreas Maier, Frank Schebesch, Christopher Syben, Tobias Würfl, Stefan Steidl, Jang-Hwan Choi, and Rebecca Fahrig. Precision learning: towards use of known operators in neural networks. In *International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR)*, pages 183–188. IEEE, 2018.
- [57] Brian Teixeira, Vivek Singh, Terrence Chen, Kai Ma, Birgi Tamersoy, Yifan Wu, Elena Balashova, and Dorin Comaniciu. Generating synthetic x-ray images of a person from the surface geometry. In *Proceedings of the IEEE / CVF Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference (CVPR)*, pages 9059–9067, 2018.
- [58] Maayan Frid-Adar, Idit Diamant, Eyal Klang, Michal Amitai, Jacob Goldberger, and Hayit Greenspan. GAN-based synthetic medical image augmentation for increased CNN performance in liver lesion classification. *Neurocomputing*, 321:321–331, 2018.
- [59] Fariba Azizmohammadi, Iñaki Navarro Castellanos, Joaquim Miró, Paul Segars, Ehsan Samei, and Luc Duong. Generative learning approach for radiation dose reduction in x-ray guided cardiac interventions. *Medical Physics*, 49(6):4071–4081, 2022.
- [60] Avi Ben-Cohen, Eyal Klang, Stephen P Raskin, Shelly Soffer, Simona Ben-Haim, Eli Konen, Michal Marianne Amitai, and Hayit Greenspan. Cross-modality synthesis from CT to PET using FCN and GAN networks for improved automated lesion detection. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, 78:186–194, 2019.
- [61] Faisal Mahmood, Richard Chen, and Nicholas J Durr. Unsupervised reverse domain adaptation for synthetic medical images via adversarial training. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging (TMI)*, 37(12):2572–2581, 2018.
- [62] Hoo-Chang Shin, Neil A Tenenholtz, Jameson K Rogers, Christopher G Schwarz, Matthew L Senjem, Jeffrey L Gunter, Katherine P Andriole, and Mark Michalski. Medical image synthesis for data augmentation and anonymization using generative adversarial networks. In *MICCAI Simulation and Synthesis in Medical Imaging (SASHIMI) 2018*, pages 1–11. Springer, 2018.
- [63] Ashia Lewis, Evanjelin Mahmoodi, Yuyue Zhou, Megan Coffee, and Elena Sizikova. Improving tuberculosis (TB) prediction using synthetically generated computed tomography (CT) images. In *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 3265–3273, 2021.
- [64] Dimitrios Korkinof, Andreas Heindl, Tobias Rijken, Hugh Harvey, and Ben Glocker. Mammogan: high-resolution synthesis of realistic mammograms. *Medical Imaging with Deep Learning (MIDL) Conference*, 2019.
- [65] Mostafa Salem, Sergi Valverde, Mariano Cabezas, Deborah Pareto, Arnau Oliver, Joaquim Salvi, Àlex Rovira, and Xavier Lladó. Multiple sclerosis lesion synthesis in MRI using an encoder-decoder U-NET. *IEEE Access*, 7:25171–25184, 2019.
- [66] Ferran Prados, M Jorge Cardoso, Niamh Cawley, Baris Kanber, Olga Ciccarelli, Claudia AM Gandini Wheeler-Kingshott, and Sébastien Ourselin. Fully automated patch-based

- image restoration: application to pathology inpainting. In *MICCAI Brainlesion: Glioma, Multiple Sclerosis, Stroke and Traumatic Brain Injuries Workshop*, pages 3–15. Springer, 2016.
- [67] Ender Konukoglu, Andre van der Kouwe, Mert Rory Sabuncu, and Bruce Fischl. Example-based restoration of high-resolution magnetic resonance image acquisitions. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention (MICCAI)*, pages 131–138. Springer, 2013.
- [68] Jiaxin Li, Houjin Chen, Yanfeng Li, Yahui Peng, Jia Sun, and Pan Pan. Cross-modality synthesis aiding lung tumor segmentation on multi-modal MRI images. *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control*, 76:103655, 2022.
- [69] P Chambon, C Bluethgen, JB Delbrouck, R Van der Sluijs, M Połacin, JMZ Chaves, TM Abraham, S Purohit, CP Langlotz, and A Chaudhari. Roentgen: vision-language foundation model for chest x-ray generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.12737*, 2022.
- [70] Cong Gao, Benjamin D Killeen, Yicheng Hu, Robert B Grupp, Russell H Taylor, Mehran Armand, and Mathias Unberath. Synthex: scaling up learning-based x-ray image analysis through in silico experiments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.06127*, 2022.
- [71] Christos G Xanthis, Dimitrios Filos, Kostas Haris, and Anthony H Aletras. Simulator-generated training datasets as an alternative to using patient data for machine learning: an example in myocardial segmentation with MRI. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*, 198:105817, 2021.
- [72] Priscille de Dumast, Hamza Kebiri, Kelly Payette, Andras Jakab, H el ene Lajous, and Meritxell Bach Cuadra. Synthetic magnetic resonance images for domain adaptation: Application to fetal brain tissue segmentation. In *International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging (ISBI)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2022.
- [73] Aria Pezeshk, Berkman Sahiner, Rongping Zeng, Adam Wunderlich, Weijie Chen, and Nicholas Petrick. Seamless insertion of pulmonary nodules in chest ct images. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering (TBME)*, 62(12):2812–2827, 2015.
- [74] Dhaval Kadia, Tam V. Nguyen, and Vijayan Asari. Lesion synthesis for robust segmentation of infected lung region on small-scale data. *Social Science Research Network (SSRN)*, 2022.
- [75] Xing Gong, Stephen J Glick, Bob Liu, Aruna A Vedula, and Samta Thacker. A computer simulation study comparing lesion detection accuracy with digital mammography, breast tomosynthesis, and cone-beam CT breast imaging. *Medical Physics*, 33(4):1041–1052, 2006.
- [76] Brandon Nelson, Prabhat Kc, Andreu Badal-Soler, Lu Jiang, Shane Masters, and Rongping Zeng. Pediatric-specific evaluations for deep learning CT denoising. *Zenodo Preprint*, 2013.
- [77] X Li, Ehsan Samei, DM DeLong, RP Jones, AM Gaca, CL Hollingsworth, CM Maxfield, CWT Carrico, and DP Frush. Three-dimensional simulation of lung nodules for paediatric multidetector array CT. *The British Journal of Radiology (BJR)*, 82(977):401–411, 2009.

- [78] Kenny H Cha, Nicholas Petrick, Aria Pezeshk, Christian G Graff, Diksha Sharma, Andreu Badal, and Berkman Sahiner. Evaluation of data augmentation via synthetic images for improved breast mass detection on mammograms using deep learning. *Journal of Medical Imaging (JMI)*, 7(1):012703–012703, 2020.
- [79] X George Xu. An exponential growth of computational phantom research in radiation protection, imaging, and radiotherapy: a review of the fifty-year history. *Physics in Medicine & Biology*, 59(18):R233, 2014.
- [80] W Paul Segars, Benjamin MW Tsui, Jing Cai, Fang-Fang Yin, George SK Fung, and Ehsan Samei. Application of the 4-D XCAT phantoms in biomedical imaging and beyond. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging (TMI)*, 37(3):680–692, 2017.
- [81] Wolfgang Kainz, Esra Neufeld, Wesley E Bolch, Christian G Graff, Chan Hyeong Kim, Niels Kuster, Bryn Lloyd, Tina Morrison, Paul Segars, Yeon Soo Yeom, et al. Advances in computational human phantoms and their applications in biomedical engineering—a topical review. *IEEE Transactions on Radiation and Plasma Medical Sciences (TRPMS)*, 3(1):1–23, 2018.
- [82] Benjamin D Killeen, Sue Min Cho, Mehran Armand, Russell H Taylor, and Mathias Unberath. In silico simulation: a key enabling technology for next-generation intelligent surgical systems. *Progress in Biomedical Engineering*, 5(3):032001, 2023.
- [83] Cristobal Rodero, Tiffany MG Baptiste, Rosie K Barrows, Hamed Keramati, Charles P Sillett, Marina Strocchi, Pablo Lamata, and Steven A Niederer. A systematic review of cardiac in-silico clinical trials. *Progress in Biomedical Engineering*, 2023.
- [84] Hao Guan and Mingxia Liu. Domain adaptation for medical image analysis: a survey. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering (TBME)*, 69(3):1173–1185, 2021.
- [85] Sema Candemir, Xuan V Nguyen, Les R Folio, and Luciano M Prevedello. Training strategies for radiology deep learning models in data-limited scenarios. *Radiology: Artificial Intelligence*, 3(6):e210014, 2021.
- [86] M Boulanger, Jean-Claude Nunes, H Chourak, A Largent, S Tahri, O Acosta, R De Crevoisier, C Lafond, and A Barateau. Deep learning methods to generate synthetic CT from MRI in radiotherapy: A literature review. *Physica Medica*, 89:265–281, 2021.
- [87] Jens M Edmund and Tufve Nyholm. A review of substitute CT generation for MRI-only radiation therapy. *Radiation Oncology*, 12:1–15, 2017.
- [88] August DuMont Schütte, Jürgen Hetzel, Sergios Gatidis, Tobias Hepp, Benedikt Dietz, Stefan Bauer, and Patrick Schwab. Overcoming barriers to data sharing with medical image generation: a comprehensive evaluation. *NPJ digital medicine*, 4(1):141, 2021.
- [89] Isabella Castiglioni, Leonardo Rundo, Marina Codari, Giovanni Di Leo, Christian Salvatore, Matteo Interlenghi, Francesca Gallivanone, Andrea Cozzi, Natascha Claudia D’Amico, and Francesco Sardanelli. AI applications to medical images: From machine learning to deep learning. *Physica Medica*, 83:9–24, 2021.

- [90] Varun A. Kelkar, Dimitrios S. Gotsis, Frank J. Brooks, Prabhat KC, Kyle J. Myers, Rongping Zeng, and Mark A. Anastasio. Assessing the ability of generative adversarial networks to learn canonical medical image statistics. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, 42(6):1799–1808, 2023.
- [91] Salman Ul Hassan Dar, Arman Ghanaat, Jannik Kahmann, Isabelle Ayx, Theano Papavasiliou, Stefan O Schoenberg, and Sandy Engelhardt. Investigating data memorization in 3D latent diffusion models for medical image synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.01148*, 2023.
- [92] Connor Shorten and Taghi M Khoshgoftaar. A survey on image data augmentation for deep learning. *Journal of Big Data*, 6(1):1–48, 2019.
- [93] Andreas Maier, Christopher Syben, Tobias Lasser, and Christian Riess. A gentle introduction to deep learning in medical image processing. *Zeitschrift für Medizinische Physik*, 29(2):86–101, 2019.
- [94] Zhisheng Xiao, Karsten Kreis, and Arash Vahdat. Tackling the generative learning trilemma with denoising diffusion GANs. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2021.
- [95] Gary An, Michael Döllinger, and Nicole YK Li-Jessen. Integration of machine learning and computer simulation in solving complex physiological and medical questions. *Frontiers in Physiology*, 13:949771, 2022.
- [96] Leo K Tam, Jason P Stockmann, Gigi Galiana, and R Todd Constable. Null space imaging: nonlinear magnetic encoding fields designed complementary to receiver coil sensitivities for improved acceleration in parallel imaging. *Magnetic Resonance in Medicine*, 68(4):1166–1175, 2012.
- [97] Christopher Bowles, Liang Chen, Ricardo Guerrero, Paul Bentley, Roger Gunn, Alexander Hammers, David Alexander Dickie, Maria Valdés Hernández, Joanna Wardlaw, and Daniel Rueckert. GAN augmentation: Augmenting training data using generative adversarial networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.10863*, 2018.
- [98] Aldo Badano. In silico imaging clinical trials: cheaper, faster, better, safer, and more scalable. *Trials*, 22(1):1–7, 2021.
- [99] Owen Faris and Jeffrey Shuren. An FDA viewpoint on unique considerations for medical-device clinical trials. *New England Journal of Medicine (NEJM)*, 376(14):1350–1357, 2017.
- [100] Nicolas Carlini, Jamie Hayes, Milad Nasr, Matthew Jagielski, Vikash Sehwal, Florian Tramèr, Borja Balle, Daphne Ippolito, and Eric Wallace. Extracting training data from diffusion models. In *32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23)*, pages 5253–5270, 2023.
- [101] Mauro Giuffrè and Dennis L Shung. Harnessing the power of synthetic data in healthcare: innovation, application, and privacy. *NPJ Digital Medicine*, 6(1):186, 2023.

- [102] Joseph Near, David Darais, Naomi Lefkowitz, Gary Howarth, et al. Guidelines for evaluating differential privacy guarantees. Technical report, National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), 2023.
- [103] Allan Tucker, Zhenchen Wang, Ylenia Rotalinti, and Puja Myles. Generating high-fidelity synthetic patient data for assessing machine learning healthcare software. *NPJ Digital Medicine*, 3(1):1–13, 2020.
- [104] Moritz Hardt, Eric Price, and Nati Srebro. Equality of opportunity in supervised learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 29, 2016.
- [105] Ira Ktena, Olivia Wiles, Isabela Albuquerque, Sylvestre-Alvise Rebuffi, Ryutaro Tanno, Abhijit Guha Roy, Shekoofeh Azizi, Danielle Belgrave, Pushmeet Kohli, Alan Karthikesalingam, et al. Generative models improve fairness of medical classifiers under distribution shifts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.09218*, 2023.
- [106] Rebecca Smith-Bindman, Marilyn L Kwan, Emily C Marlow, Mary Kay Theis, Wesley Bolch, Stephanie Y Cheng, Erin JA Bowles, James R Duncan, Robert T Greenlee, Lawrence H Kushi, et al. Trends in use of medical imaging in us health care systems and in ontario, canada, 2000-2016. *Jama*, 322(9):843–856, 2019.
- [107] Marla BK Sammer, Yasmin S Akbari, Richard A Barth, Steven L Blumer, Jonathan R Dillman, Shannon G Farmakis, Don Frush, Ami Gokli, Safwan Halabi, Ramesh Iyer, et al. Use of artificial intelligence in radiology: impact on pediatric patients, a white paper from the ACR pediatric AI workgroup. *Journal of the American College of Radiology (JACR)*, 2023.
- [108] Alexandra Sasha Luccioni, Christopher Akiki, Margaret Mitchell, and Yacine Jernite. Stable bias: analyzing societal representations in diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11408*, 2023.
- [109] Nataniel Ruiz, Yuanzhen Li, Varun Jampani, Yael Pritch, Michael Rubinstein, and Kfir Aberman. Dreambooth: Fine tuning text-to-image diffusion models for subject-driven generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE / CVF Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference (CVPR)*, pages 22500–22510, 2023.
- [110] Michael Platzter and Thomas Reutterer. Holdout-based empirical assessment of mixed-type synthetic data. *Frontiers in Big Data*, 4:679939, 2021.
- [111] Harrison H Barrett and Kyle J Myers. *Foundations of image science*. John Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- [112] Ahmed Alaa, Boris Van Breugel, Evgeny S Saveliev, and Mihaela van der Schaar. How faithful is your synthetic data? sample-level metrics for evaluating and auditing generative models. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 290–306. PMLR, 2022.
- [113] Sayantan Bhadra, Varun A Kelkar, Frank J Brooks, and Mark A Anastasio. On hallucinations in tomographic image reconstruction. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging (TMI)*, 40(11):3249–3260, 2021.

- [114] Li Sze Chow and Raveendran Paramesran. Review of medical image quality assessment. *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control*, 27:145–154, 2016.
- [115] Graham Oppy and David Dowe. The Turing test. In Edward N. Zalta, editor, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edward N. Zalta, spring 2016 edition, 2016.
- [116] Aldo Badano. “how much realism is needed?”—the wrong question in silico imagers have been asking. *Medical Physics*, 44(5):1607–1609, 2017.
- [117] Ge Wang, Andreu Badal, Xun Jia, Jonathan S Maltz, Klaus Mueller, Kyle J Myers, Chuang Niu, Michael Vannier, Pingkun Yan, Zhou Yu, et al. Development of metaverse for intelligent healthcare. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 4(11):922–929, 2022.