Trustworthy Contrast-enhanced Brain MRI Synthesis with Deep Evidential Regression

Jiyao Liu¹, Yuxin Li², Shangqi Gao², Yuncheng Zhou², Xin Gao², Ningsheng Xu¹, Xiao-Yong Zhang¹, and Xiahai Zhuang²

¹ Institute of Science and Technology for Brain-Inspired Intelligence, Fudan University, Shanghai
² School of Data Science, Fudan University, Shanghai

Abstract. Contrast-enhanced brain MRI (CE-MRI) is a valuable diagnostic technique but may pose health risks and incur high costs. To create safer alternatives, multi-modality medical image translation aims to synthesize CE-MRI images from other available modalities. Although existing methods can generate promising predictions, they still face two challenges, i.e., exhibiting over-confidence and lacking interpretability on predictions. To address the above challenges, this paper introduces TrustI2I, a novel trustworthy method that reformulates multi-to-one medical image translation problem as a multimodal regression problem, aiming to build an uncertainty-aware and reliable system. Specifically, our method leverages deep evidential regression to estimate prediction uncertainties and employs an explicit intermediate and late fusion strategy based on the Mixture of Normal Inverse Gamma (MoNIG) distribution, enhancing both synthesis quality and interpretability. Additionally, we incorporate uncertainty calibration to improve the reliability of uncertainty. Validation on the BraTS2018 dataset demonstrates that our approach surpasses current methods, producing higher-quality images with rational uncertainty estimation.

Keywords: Medical image translation \cdot Uncertainty \cdot Interpretability \cdot Trustworthy

1 Introduction

Contrast-enhanced Brain MRI (CE-MRI) offers vital insights for the accurate diagnosis, characterization, and treatment of tumors. However, acquiring CE-MRI images typically involves injecting a gadolinium-based contrast agent, which has raised recent concerns due to its potential accumulation in the body [15]. Medical image translation technology enables the generation of alternative CE-MRI images in a safe and cost-effective manner [20, 26].

Multi-to-one translation strategies leverage complementary information from multiple source modalities to synthesize target modality [9, 22, 25, 27]. These strategies integrate source modalities at various stages: early (image-level) fusion [5, 22], intermediate (feature-level) fusion [9, 27], and late (prediction-level) fusion.

2 J Liu et al.

Although multi-modality medical image translation has been well studied, it still faces two main limitations: 1) **Little uncertainty-aware**. Current approaches hardly identify cases where confident predictions are not possible, *i.e.*, *can I trust the results generated? Is it reliable for diagnosis?* 2) **Lack of interpretability**. The implicit nature of modality fusion compromises interpretability, *i.e.*, how are different modalities integrated and how do they contribute to the final prediction?

To deploy reliable medical image analysis systems in real-world medical applications, it is crucial to estimate and quantify the uncertainty associated with predictions [8,24]. Uncertainty is typically categorized into two types: aleatoric uncertainty (AU), which arises from the inherent variability or randomness in the data, and epistemic uncertainty (EU), which relates to the model itself caused by a lack of knowledge [12]. Various methods can be employed to measure the uncertainty, such as Bayesian-based methods [6,18], deep ensembles [4] and MC dropout [7], but these methods are computationally expensive. Evidential learning [1,21] offers a direct approach to the estimation of uncertainty.

Uncertainty-aware frameworks provide insight to guide multi-modality fusion, along with the mixture rules using different source modalities, which enhances interpretability and robustness. Recent works have proposed to address uncertainty-guided multi-model fusion tasks such as classification [8] and regression [17] tasks. However, many of these approaches focus on late fusion, which may not fully capture the interactive features across modalities that could enhance the final prediction.

To solve the above issues, we proposed a novel trustworthy framework for multi-to-one medical image translation. Specifically, we propose an evidential estimator within a fully probabilistic framework to quantify uncertainty. Our model explicitly integrates multiple source modalities through intermediate feature fusion and late fusion, guided by the estimated uncertainties and employing the Mixture of Normal-inverse Gamma (MoNIG) rule to enhance both regression accuracy and interpretability. Additionally, we introduce an uncertainty calibration strategy to improve the reliability of uncertainty estimations.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

(1) We rethink the multi-to-one medical image translation problem as a multimodal regression problem, aiming to build an uncertainty-aware and reliable system. (2) We design interpretable intermediate and late fusion strategies that dynamically incorporate uncertainties to leverage each modality effectively. (3) Experimental results demonstrate that the proposed method improves the quality of synthesized CE-MRI, providing reliable uncertainty estimates and offering a reference for prediction error.

2 Methodology

We propose a novel trustworthy framework that reformulates the multi-to-one medical image translation problem into a multimodal regression problem. In Sec.2.1, we introduce deep evidential regression to multi-to-one medical image



Fig. 1. TrustI2I framework: (a) Multi-modality images are translated to local predictions by an evidential estimator. (b) Stage I's encoded features are dynamically fused into a global prediction. The overall distribution is obtained by the mixture of both local and global predictions using MoNIG rules. (c) and (d) show the uncertainty calibration and probabilistic graph of our framework.

translation, aiming to build an uncertainty-aware system. In Sec. 2.2, we construct an explicit intermediate and late fusion strategy for local and global predictions. In Sec. 2.3, we present an uncertainty calibration algorithm designed to ensure reliable estimation of uncertainties. Sec. 2.4 introduces our network architecture and training strategy. Fig. 1 shows the overall framework of our approach.

2.1 Preliminary of Evidence-Based Translation

Consider the multi-to-one medical image translation as a regression problem: given a dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{\{\mathbf{x}_{[m]}^{(i)}\}_{m=1}^{M}, \mathbf{y}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{I}$, where $\mathbf{x}_{[m]}^{(i)}$ represents the *i*-th sample of the *m*-th source modality and $\mathbf{y}^{(i)}$ corresponds to the target modality. The objective is to train a model by minimizing L_1 or L_2 loss between prediction and target. We assume the *j*-th pixel of the synthesized target $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ is drawn from a Gaussian distribution $\hat{y}_j \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_j, \sigma_j^2)$

To incorporate uncertainty into the model, following the approach in [1], we further assume that the mean and variance are drawn from a Gaussian distribution $\mu_j \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\gamma_j, \sigma_j^2 \eta_j^{-1}\right)$, and Inverse-Gamma distribution $\sigma_j^2 \sim \Gamma^{-1}(\alpha_j, \beta_j)$, respectively, where $\gamma_j \in \mathbb{R}$, $\eta_j > 0$, $\alpha_j > 1$, and $\beta_j > 0$. The probabilistic graph is demonstrated in Fig. 1-(d).

Our aim is to infer the posterior via marginalizing over the likelihood parameters, following the Normal Inverse-Gamma (NIG) distribution:

$$p(\mu_j, \sigma_j^2 | \gamma_j, \eta_j, \alpha_j, \beta_j) = \frac{\beta_j^{\alpha_j}}{\Gamma(\alpha_j)} \frac{\sqrt{\eta_j}}{\sigma_j \sqrt{2\pi}} (\frac{1}{\sigma_j^2})^{\alpha_j + 1} \exp\{-\frac{2\beta_j + \eta_j (\mu_j - \gamma_j)^2}{2\sigma_j^2}\}.$$
(1)

4 J Liu et al.

For convenience, the NIG distribution is notated as $\text{NIG}(\gamma, \eta, \alpha, \beta)$.

One principle way to fit this regression model and obtain estimator $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ is to minimize the negative log-likelihood loss [1]:

$$\mathcal{L}^{\text{NLL}} = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \frac{1}{2} \log(\frac{\pi}{\eta_j}) - \alpha_j \log(\omega_j) + (\alpha_j + \frac{1}{2}) \log((y_j - \gamma_j)^2 \eta_j + \omega_j) + \log\phi_j, \quad (2)$$

where, y_j is the *j*-th pixel of the target \mathbf{y} , $\omega_j = 2\beta_j(1+\eta_j)$ and $\phi_j = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha_j)}{\Gamma(\alpha_j + \frac{1}{2})}$. Moreover, [1] recommends incorporating a regularization that penalizes incorrect virtual evidence estimates $2\eta_j + \alpha_j$ scaled on the error of the predictions, thereby refining the total NIG loss:

$$\mathcal{L}^{\text{NIG}} = \mathcal{L}^{\text{NLL}} + \lambda_{\text{R}} \mathcal{L}^{\text{R}},\tag{3}$$

where $\mathcal{L}^{\mathrm{R}} = \sum_{j=1}^{J} |y_j - \gamma_j| \cdot (2\eta_j + \alpha_j)$, and the coefficient $\lambda_{\mathrm{R}} > 0$ balances these two loss terms. Accordingly, given the NIG distribution of likelihood parameters, the AU and EU for each pixel can be computed as,

$$AU \triangleq \mathbb{E}[\sigma_j^2] = \frac{\beta_j}{(\alpha_j - 1)}, \quad EU \triangleq Var[\mu_j] = \frac{\beta_j}{\eta_j(\alpha_j - 1)}, \tag{4}$$

2.2 Mixture of NIG for Multi-modality Fusion

Inspired by multimodal learning, the predicted target from each modality is integrated through an explicit mixture of NIG distributions (MoNIG) rule [17]. Based on the local predictions from each modality, as shown in Fig. 1-(a), we utilize the following operation to obtain a mixture of NIG distributions:

$$\operatorname{NIG}(\boldsymbol{\gamma},\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \operatorname{NIG}_{1}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{[1]},\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[1]},\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{[1]},\boldsymbol{\beta}_{[1]}) \oplus \cdots \oplus \operatorname{NIG}_{M}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{[M]},\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[M]},\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{[M]},\boldsymbol{\beta}_{[M]}),$$
(5)

where \oplus denotes the mixture operation of two NIG distributions. Please refer to the supplementary material for more information.

To integrate multiple source modality information more efficiently and interpretably, we utilize the MoNIG rule in both intermediate and late fusion. Specifically, we first synthesize local predictions from different source modalities (Fig. 1-(a)), and then the global prediction is generated through feature-level fusion (Fig. 1-(b)). Finally, the overall NIG distribution can be derived by applying the MoNIG rule to local and global predictions at the image level, *i.e.* $\text{NIG}_{Comb} = \text{NIG}_1 \oplus \text{NIG}_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus \text{NIG}_M \oplus \text{NIG}_{Gobal}$. More details will be illustrated in Section 2.4.

2.3 Uncertainty Calibration

Because of model misspecification and approximate assumptions, the uncertainty estimates are often inaccurate. To address this issue, we utilize an uncertainty

calibration method based on the quantile regression [13]. Given a pre-trained evidential estimator, F^{-1} : $[0,1] \rightarrow \hat{y}_j$ is the learned quantile function. We trained an auxiliary isotonic regression model R: $[0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]$, which can perfect the match between the empirical and the predicted CDFs, yielding a calibrated forecaster and output calibrated quantiles as demonstrated in Fig. 1-(c). Then the AU and EU can be calibrated via the calibrated quantiles:

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{y}_j] = \int_0^1 Q(p) dp \approx \sum_{n=1}^N Q(p_n) \Delta p_n, \ \mathbb{E}[\hat{y}_j^2] = \int_0^1 Q^2(p) dp \approx \sum_{n=1}^N Q^2(p_n) \Delta p_n$$
(6)

where $Q(\cdot) = F^{-1} \circ R(\cdot)$. Then we obtain calibrated uncertainties as $\mathrm{EU}' = Var[\hat{y}_j] = \mathbb{E}[\hat{y}_j^2] - (\mathbb{E}[\hat{y}_j])^2$ and $\mathrm{AU}' = \eta_j \mathrm{EU}'$.

2.4 Overall Framework and Training

This section shows the network architecture in our framework and explains the training strategy. From Bayesian probability theory, the regression is simplified to model a mapping estimating NIG distribution parameters, *i.e.*, $f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) = \{\gamma, \eta, \alpha, \beta\}$. We modify an alias-free GAN [11,23] as an evidential estimator f_{θ} . The estimator additionally has four output target maps corresponding to each evidential parameter in $\{\gamma, \eta, \alpha, \beta\}$, respectively. A softplus activation function is applied for the channels representing positive parameters $\{\eta, \alpha, \beta\}$ where the elements of α are additionally incremented by 1 as they are constrained to be greater than 1.

The proposed framework is trained by a two-stage training strategy. In stage I, we train an evidential estimator to obtain local predictions from each source modality. For an input image $\mathbf{x}_{[m]}$ of *m*-th modality, the local prediction follows $\operatorname{NIG}_m = \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{x}_{[m]}))$, where \mathcal{G} is the evidential generator and \mathcal{E} is the encoder. To achieve minimal information loss during translation, the overall loss is composed of an adversarial loss, NIG loss, and pixel-wise target reconstruction loss for each translation $\mathbf{x}_{[m]} \to \mathbf{y}$, as well as a self-reconstruction loss $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{x}_{[m]} \to \mathbf{x}_{[m]}}^{\operatorname{Pix}}$ to force the encoder learned effective representations of each source modality:

$$\mathcal{L}^{\text{Local}} = \sum_{m=1}^{M} (\mathcal{L}^{\text{Syn}}_{\mathbf{x}_{[m]} \to \mathbf{y}} + \lambda_{\text{Pix}} \mathcal{L}^{\text{Pix}}_{\mathbf{x}_{[m]} \to \mathbf{x}_{[m]}}),$$
(7)

where $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{x}_{[m]} \to \mathbf{y}}^{\text{Syn}} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{x}_{[m]} \to \mathbf{y}}^{\text{Adv}} + \lambda_{\text{Pix}} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{x}_{[m]} \to \mathbf{y}}^{\text{Pix}} + \lambda_{\text{NIG}} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{x}_{[m]} \to \mathbf{y}}^{\text{NIG}}$, and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{x}_{[m]} \to \mathbf{y}}^{\text{Pix}} = \|\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{[m]} - \cdot\|_{1}$. The adversarial loss and the discriminator are preserved from [23]. The balancing weights λ_{Pix} and λ_{NIG} are set to 100 and 0.5 in our experiments.

Stage II is shown in Fig. 1-(b). We notate the multi-level representations of modality m as $\boldsymbol{F}_{[m]} = \{F_{[m]}^{(1)}, \cdots, F_{[m]}^{(n)}\}$, where $F_{[m]}^{(i)}$ represents feature from *i*-th encoder layer. $\boldsymbol{F}_{[m]}$ is extracted by \mathcal{E} and local prediction NIG_m is generated by \mathcal{G} pre-trained in stage I. Then the parameters of NIG_m are encoded using the same



Fig. 2. Visualizations of T1Gd images synthesized from T1, T2, and Flair using various methods. The first five columns of each "Error" row display intensity discrepancies. The last column shows our method's AU and EU maps.

architecture as \mathcal{E} to guide multi-level dynamic fusion based on MoNIG, leading to fused feature \mathbf{F} . Finally, we obtain the global prediction by $\text{NIG}_{global} = \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{F})$.

The to. al loss of stage II is defined as

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}^{\text{Comb}} + \mathcal{L}^{\text{Global}},\tag{8}$$

where $\mathcal{L}^{\text{Comb}}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\text{Global}}$ represents the losses for combining local and global predictions as well as global prediction solely, respectively, implemented in a similar way as $\mathcal{L}^{\text{Syn}}_{\mathbf{x}_{[m]} \to \mathbf{y}}$.

3 Experiments

3.1 Dataset and Implementation

Dataset We used brain MRI images from 285 subjects in the publicly available BraTS2018 dataset [2, 3, 19]. The data for each subject comprised four aligned volumes of modalities T1WI, T2WI, Flair, and T1-weighted Gadolinium-enhanced MRI (T1Gd) respectively. These subjects were randomly divided into training (228 subjects), validation (28 subjects), and testing (29 subjects) subsets. For preprocessing, each image was truncated at the 99th percentile of its maximum value. We then performed intensity normalization using the z-score method. We also removed altogether 60 slices from the superior and inferior without brain structures.

Table 1. Comparison of different methods in synthesizing T1Gd image by T1WI and T2WI (T1+T2 \rightarrow T1Gd), T1WI and Flair (T1+Flair \rightarrow T1Gd), T2WI and Flair (T2+Flair \rightarrow T1Gd), and altogether three modalities (T1+T2+Flair \rightarrow T1Gd). The results are in the "mean \pm standard deviation" format.

Method	$T1+T2 \rightarrow T1Gd$		$\rm T1{+}Flair{\rightarrow}~T1Gd$		$\rm T2{+}Flair{\rightarrow}~T1Gd$		$\rm T1{+}T2{+}Flair{\rightarrow}~T1Gd$	
	$PSNR\uparrow$	$SSIM\uparrow$	$PSNR\uparrow$	$SSIM\uparrow$	$PSNR\uparrow$	$SSIM\uparrow$	$PSNR\uparrow$	$SSIM\uparrow$
Pix2pix [10]	$25.60 \pm$	$0.893 \pm$	$25.49~\pm$	$0.891 \pm$	$24.72~\pm$	$0.882 \pm$	$25.69~\pm$	$0.894 \pm$
	2.67	0.033	2.64	0.035	0.036	0.034	2.58	0.033
MM-GAN [22]	$26.70~\pm$	$\textbf{0.909} \pm$	$26.30~\pm$	$0.898 \pm$	$25.20 \pm$	$\textbf{0.886} \pm$	$26.79~\pm$	$0.907 \pm$
	2.74	0.029	2.66	0.033	2.75	0.040	3.04	0.030
ResViT [5]	$26.53 \pm$	$0.902 \pm$	$26.06~\pm$	$0.896 \pm$	$25.01 \pm$	$0.883 \pm$	$26.42~\pm$	$0.903 \pm$
	2.34	0.031	2.24	0.032	2.02	0.038	2.74	0.032
Our TrustI2I	$\textbf{27.43} \pm$	$0.908 \pm$	$\textbf{26.98} \pm$	$\textbf{0.900} \pm$	$\textbf{25.46} \pm$	$0.879~\pm$	$\textbf{27.46} \pm$	$\textbf{0.909} \pm$
	2.22	0.034	2.39	0.039	2.11	0.043	2.25	0.035

Evaluation Metrics We used the peak signal-to-noise ratio (PSNR) and the structural similarity index (SSIM) to evaluate the quality of the generated images. Additionally, we assessed the reliability of our uncertainty estimation by calculating the expected uncertainty calibration error (UCE) [14], which was the weighted L_1 -norm between the uncertainty and error map.

Implementation Details Our model was trained using the Adam optimizer, with an initial learning rate of 2×10^{-3} and 2×10^{-4} for stage I and II, respectively, which was decayed following the cosine annealing warm restarting learning rate scheduler [16]. The two stages were trained with 2×10^5 and 5×10^4 iterations, respectively. The balancing coefficient $\lambda_{\rm R}$ in (3) was set to increase linearly from 0 to 1 during training. In Stage II, we froze the encoder \mathcal{E} and fine-tuned the pre-trained generator \mathcal{G} and discriminator. The framework was implemented using Pytorch and was run on a single NVIDIA RTX 3090 GPU.

3.2 Results

Comparison with multi-modality medical image translation methods. To evaluate the image translation quality delivered by our proposed TrustI2I model, we compared it with three medical image translation methods, including Pix2pix [10], MM-GAN [22], and ResViT [5].

We employed various combinations of the T1WI, T2WI, and Flair modalities to synthesize the T1Gd images.

As shown in Table 1, our method outperformed others on different combinations of source modalities, indicating the proposed method could integrate information more effectively from multiple modalities. Fig. 2 shows that our TrustI2I could restore high-frequency details, especially in the tumor region, which is demonstrated by the lowest error map between the synthesized and target T1Gd images. It proves that our method was able to capture both the global and local information, and the uncertainty-aware mixture rule could be more robust than the methods with implicit fusion strategies. Moreover, the uncertainty maps generated by our model could reflect the prediction error to some extent, indicating the reliability of uncertainty estimates. We found that AU rose J Liu et al.

Table 2. Ablation study of the proposed framework among estimations (a,b,c) using local prediction from single source modality (1-T1WI, 2-T2WI, 3-Flair), (d) mixture of NIG from the local predictions, (e) global predictions solely, (f) mixture of NIG from the local and global predictions without uncertainty calibration, and (our) with uncertainty calibration.

Model	PSNR↑	$SSIM\uparrow$	$UCE(aleatoric)\downarrow$	$UCE(epistemic)\downarrow$
(a) TrustI2I local-1	26.68 ± 2.29	$0.895 {\pm} 0.041$	1.93×10^{-3}	1.71×10^{-3}
(b) TrustI2I local-2	$25.46 \pm \ 2.08$	$0.883 {\pm} 0.043$	3.38×10^{-3}	2.95×10^{-3}
(c) TrustI2I local-3	$25.18 \pm \ 2.07$	$0.866 {\pm} 0.053$	4.40×10^{-3}	4.13×10^{-3}
(d) TrustI2I w/o global	27.28 ± 2.20	$0.908 {\pm} 0.030$	2.22×10^{-3}	2.21×10^{-3}
(e) TrustI2I w/o local	27.17 ± 2.24	$0.904 {\pm} 0.036$	2.45×10^{-3}	2.31×10^{-3}
(f) TrustI2I w/o calib	27.46 ± 2.25	0.909 ± 0.035	1.98×10^{-3}	1.96×10^{-3}
(ours) TrustI2I	27.46 ± 2.25	0.909 ± 0.035	$1.36\times\mathbf{10^{-3}}$	$1.47\times\mathbf{10^{-3}}$



Fig. 3. T1Gd, AU, and EU from two random examples during the synthesis of T1Gd. We visualized the real T1Gd image and highlighted the contrast-enhanced tumor region with a red mask.

at the edge region due to pixel misalignment among source and target images. EU occurred in parts of the image that were previously unseen by the model, such as the contrast-enhanced tumor regions marked by the red rectangles. This phenomenon is consistent with the theoretical definitions of AU and EU and will be further discussed later.

Ablation study An ablation study of the proposed method was conducted to examine the performance of the local and global predictions, as well as the contribution of these predictions. Table 2 shows that compared with (a)-(c), (d) presented better results, demonstrating that the late fusion of multiple local predictions was effective. Besides, (f) and (ours) achieved better performance than (d) and (e), which means that using both intermediate fusion and late fusion could integrate complementary information more effectively. After uncertainty calibration, our method achieved the best prediction quality and lowest UCE and resulted in the best consistency between the uncertainties and overall results, which made our system more reliable.

Gd-enhanced tumor structure detection without T1Gd We also tested the ability of Our-of-Distribution (OOD) detection. As shown in Fig. 3, the highly uncertain regions in EU to some extent reflected the information discrepancy between T1Gd and other modalities which were challenging to synthesize through modality translation. Referring to further consideration of the impact on clinical diagnosis, the EU of the synthesized images could potentially predict the approximate contrast-enhanced tumor location based on contrast-free source modality images, reflecting the trustworthiness of predictions.

4 Conclusion

In this work, we have proposed a novel trustworthy method that reformulates multi-to-one medical image translation as a multimodal regression problem for brain CE-MRI synthesis. We have constructed an uncertainty-aware medical image translation framework based on deep evidential regression with uncertainty calibration and incorporated an explicit fusion of source modalities to enhance performance, reliability, and interpretability.

References

- Alexander Amini, Wilko Schwarting, Ava Soleimany, and Daniela Rus. Deep evidential regression. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 33:14927– 14937, 2020.
- Spyridon Bakas, Hamed Akbari, Aristeidis Sotiras, Michel Bilello, Martin Rozycki, Justin S Kirby, John B Freymann, Keyvan Farahani, and Christos Davatzikos. Advancing the cancer genome atlas glioma mri collections with expert segmentation labels and radiomic features. *Scientific data*, 4(1):1–13, 2017.
- 3. Spyridon Bakas, Mauricio Reyes, Andras Jakab, Stefan Bauer, Markus Rempfler, Alessandro Crimi, Russell Takeshi Shinohara, Christoph Berger, Sung Min Ha, Martin Rozycki, et al. Identifying the best machine learning algorithms for brain tumor segmentation, progression assessment, and overall survival prediction in the brats challenge. arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.02629, 2018.
- Laëtitia Buisson, Wilfried Thuiller, Nicolas Casajus, Sovan Lek, and Gael Grenouillet. Uncertainty in ensemble forecasting of species distribution. *Global Change Biology*, 16(4):1145–1157, 2010.
- Onat Dalmaz, Mahmut Yurt, and Tolga Çukur. Resvit: Residual vision transformers for multimodal medical image synthesis. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, 41(10):2598–2614, 2022.
- Erik Daxberger, Eric Nalisnick, James U Allingham, Javier Antorán, and José Miguel Hernández-Lobato. Bayesian deep learning via subnetwork inference. In International Conference on Machine Learning, pages 2510–2521. PMLR, 2021.
- Yarin Gal and Zoubin Ghahramani. Dropout as a bayesian approximation: Representing model uncertainty in deep learning. In *international conference on machine learning*, pages 1050–1059. PMLR, 2016.
- Zheyao Gao, Yuanye Liu, Fuping Wu, Nannan Shi, Yuxin Shi, and Xiahai Zhuang. A reliable and interpretable framework of multi-view learning for liver fibrosis staging. In Hayit Greenspan, Anant Madabhushi, Parvin Mousavi, Septimiu Salcudean, James Duncan, Tanveer Syeda-Mahmood, and Russell Taylor, editors, Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention – MICCAI 2023, pages 178–188, Cham, 2023. Springer Nature Switzerland.
- Luyi Han, Tianyu Zhang, Yunzhi Huang, Haoran Dou, Xin Wang, Yuan Gao, Chunyao Lu, Tao Tan, and Ritse Mann. An explainable deep framework: Towards task-specific fusion for multi-to-one mri synthesis. In *International Conference* on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention, pages 45–55. Springer, 2023.

- 10 J Liu et al.
- Phillip Isola, Jun-Yan Zhu, Tinghui Zhou, and Alexei A Efros. Image-to-image translation with conditional adversarial networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE* conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pages 1125–1134, 2017.
- Tero Karras, Miika Aittala, Samuli Laine, Erik Härkönen, Janne Hellsten, Jaakko Lehtinen, and Timo Aila. Alias-free generative adversarial networks. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 34:852–863, 2021.
- Armen Der Kiureghian and Ove Ditlevsen. Aleatory or epistemic? does it matter? Structural Safety, page 105–112, Mar 2009.
- Volodymyr Kuleshov, Nathan Fenner, and Stefano Ermon. Accurate uncertainties for deep learning using calibrated regression. In *International conference on* machine learning, pages 2796–2804. PMLR, 2018.
- Max-Heinrich Laves, Sontje Ihler, Jacob F Fast, Lüder A Kahrs, and Tobias Ortmaier. Well-calibrated regression uncertainty in medical imaging with deep learning. In *Medical Imaging with Deep Learning*, pages 393–412. PMLR, 2020.
- 15. François Lersy, Gregoire Boulouis, Olivier Clément, Hubert Desal, René Anxionnat, Jérome Berge, Claire Boutet, Apolline Kazémi, Nadya Pyatigorskaya, Augustin Lecler, et al. Consensus guidelines of the french society of neuroradiology (sfnr) on the use of gadolinium-based contrast agents (gbcas) and related mri protocols in neuroradiology. Journal of Neuroradiology, 47(6):441–449, 2020.
- 16. Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Sgdr: Stochastic gradient descent with warm restarts. arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.03983, 2016.
- Huan Ma, Zongbo Han, Changqing Zhang, Huazhu Fu, Joey Tianyi Zhou, and Qinghua Hu. Trustworthy multimodal regression with mixture of normalinverse gamma distributions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:6881–6893, 2021.
- Wesley J Maddox, Pavel Izmailov, Timur Garipov, Dmitry P Vetrov, and Andrew Gordon Wilson. A simple baseline for bayesian uncertainty in deep learning. Advances in neural information processing systems, 32, 2019.
- Bjoern H Menze, Andras Jakab, Stefan Bauer, Jayashree Kalpathy-Cramer, Keyvan Farahani, Justin Kirby, Yuliya Burren, Nicole Porz, Johannes Slotboom, Roland Wiest, et al. The multimodal brain tumor image segmentation benchmark (brats). *IEEE transactions on medical imaging*, 34(10):1993–2024, 2014.
- 20. Chandrakanth Jayachandran Preetha, Hagen Meredig, Gianluca Brugnara, Mustafa A Mahmutoglu, Martha Foltyn, Fabian Isensee, Tobias Kessler, Irada Pflüger, Marianne Schell, Ulf Neuberger, et al. Deep-learning-based synthesis of post-contrast t1-weighted mri for tumour response assessment in neuro-oncology: a multicentre, retrospective cohort study. *The Lancet Digital Health*, 3(12):e784– e794, 2021.
- Murat Sensoy, Lance Kaplan, and Melih Kandemir. Evidential deep learning to quantify classification uncertainty. Advances in neural information processing systems, 31, 2018.
- Anmol Sharma and Ghassan Hamarneh. Missing mri pulse sequence synthesis using multi-modal generative adversarial network. *IEEE transactions on medical imaging*, 39(4):1170–1183, 2019.
- 23. Zhiyun Song, Xin Wang, Xiangyu Zhao, Sheng Wang, Zhenrong Shen, Zixu Zhuang, Mengjun Liu, Qian Wang, and Lichi Zhang. Alias-free co-modulated network for cross-modality synthesis and super-resolution of mr images. In International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention, pages 66–76. Springer, 2023.

11

- Uddeshya Upadhyay, Yanbei Chen, Tobias Hepp, Sergios Gatidis, and Zeynep Akata. Uncertainty-guided progressive gans for medical image translation. In Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention-MICCAI 2021: 24th International Conference, Strasbourg, France, September 27-October 1, 2021, Proceedings, Part III 24, pages 614-624. Springer, 2021.
- Bao Wang, Yongsheng Pan, Shangchen Xu, Yi Zhang, Yang Ming, Ligang Chen, Xuejun Liu, Chengwei Wang, Yingchao Liu, and Yong Xia. Quantitative cerebral blood volume image synthesis from standard mri using image-to-image translation for brain tumors. *Radiology*, 308(2):e222471, 2023.
- 26. Chenchu Xu, Dong Zhang, Jaron Chong, Bo Chen, and Shuo Li. Synthesis of gadolinium-enhanced liver tumors on nonenhanced liver mr images using pixellevel graph reinforcement learning. *Medical image analysis*, 69:101976, 2021.
- Tao Zhou, Huazhu Fu, Geng Chen, Jianbing Shen, and Ling Shao. Hi-net: hybridfusion network for multi-modal mr image synthesis. *IEEE transactions on medical imaging*, 39(9):2772–2781, 2020.