Effective Segmentation of Post-Treatment Gliomas Using Simple Approaches: Artificial Sequence Generation and Ensemble Models

Heejong Kim^{2*}, Leo Milecki^{2*}, Mina C Moghadam^{2*}, Fengbei Liu^{1*}, Minh Nguyen^{1*}, Eric Qiu^{1*}, Abhishek Thanki^{3*}, and Mert R Sabuncu^{1,2}

¹ School of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Cornell University and Cornell Tech, New York, USA

² Department of Radiology, Weill Cornell Medicine, New York, USA

³ Weill Cornell Graduate School of Medical Sciences, New York, USA

Abstract. Segmentation is a crucial task in the medical imaging field and is often an important primary step or even a prerequisite to the analysis of medical volumes. Yet treatments such as surgery complicate the accurate delineation of regions of interest. The BraTS Post-Treatment 2024 Challenge published the first public dataset for post-surgery glioma segmentation and addresses the aforementioned issue by fostering the development of automated segmentation tools for glioma in MRI data. In this effort, we propose two straightforward approaches to enhance the segmentation performances of deep learning-based methodologies. First, we incorporate an additional input based on a simple linear combination of the available MRI sequences input, which highlights enhancing tumors. Second, we employ various ensembling methods to weigh the contribution of a battery of models. Our results demonstrate that these approaches significantly improve segmentation performance compared to baseline models, underscoring the effectiveness of these simple approaches in improving medical image segmentation tasks.

Keywords: BraTS 2024 \cdot Glioma Post Treatment \cdot Ensemble \cdot Segmentation

1 Introduction

Gliomas, the most prevalent malignant primary brain tumors in adults, present significant clinical challenges due to their diffuse nature and variability in biological behavior. Among gliomas, diffuse gliomas are particularly problematic because of their infiltrative growth patterns within the central nervous system, which complicates treatment and monitoring [16] [13]. These tumors often exhibit a range of responses to therapy and have varied prognoses, necessitating a multi-modal approach to treatment that includes surgery, radiation therapy, and systemic therapies. Despite these efforts, effective management and outcome prediction remain challenging.

^{*} Equal contribution

2 H Kim et al.

Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) is the cornerstone of post-treatment imaging for diffuse gliomas. It provides essential insights into tumor size, location, and morphological changes over time, which are crucial for evaluating treatment response and guiding subsequent clinical decisions. Accurate segmentation of gliomas from MRI scans is therefore critical for assessing residual tumor volume, planning further interventions, and predicting patient outcomes.

Several research works have been focusing on tumor segmentation tasks to accurately detect and delineate brain tumors [14] [1]. While significant progress has been made in developing segmentation algorithms for gliomas, most existing works have focused on pre-treatment or general glioma segmentation [3] [12] [7] [9]. Few works were emphasizing the specific challenges associated with post-treatment imaging [12] [21] [20] [23]. This gap underscores the need for specialized approaches that address the unique characteristics of post-treatment MRI scans, where residual tumor and treatment effects can be difficult to distinguish.

The 2024 BraTS challenge focuses on post-treatment gliomas and the development of data-driven models for the semantic segmentation of different tumor regions [24]. The challenge's dataset includes post-treatment MRI data for diffuse gliomas, introducing a supplementary sub-region known as the 'resection cavity,' left as a result of surgery, a new feature compared to previous BraTS challenges. The main objective of the challenge is to monitor disease progression after surgery and to further help in guiding treatment decisions. Additionally, the dataset and algorithms provided in the challenge can serve as a foundational resource for future research aimed at differentiating treatment modifications from residual or recurrent tumors, forecasting outcomes, and assessing treatment responses.

In this work, we address the task of segmenting post-treatment gliomas using the BraTS 2024 challenge dataset. The challenge consists of effectively delineating tumor regions after surgery, which introduces complexities not present in pre-treatment imaging. We hypothesize that incorporating additional input modalities and applying ensemble techniques will enhance segmentation outcomes. To test this hypothesis, we explore straightforward methods such as generating new sequences like T1Gd-T1 to better highlight different tumor regions and employing ensemble models like STAPLE and weighted averaging of baseline model predictions. Our results reveal that these methods can significantly improve the segmentation of post-treatment gliomas, demonstrating their potential to advance the field of medical image analysis.

2 Methods

2.1 Dataset

This retrospective study includes approximately 2,200 patients from seven academic clinical centers across the United States. The patients have been diagnosed with diffuse gliomas and have undergone various treatments, including surgery, radiation therapy, and additional therapeutic interventions [24]. The MRI scans provided by the BraTS challenge for these patients are available in NIfTI format and encompass multiple imaging modalities: 1) pre-contrast T1-weighted (T1), 2) post-contrast T1-weighted (T1Gd), 3) T2-weighted (T2), and 4) T2 Fluid Attenuated Inversion Recovery (FLAIR) volumes. The ground truth data was produced through pre-processing steps on expert annotations that included co-registering the images to a standard anatomical template, interpolating to a uniform resolution of $1mm^3$, and performing skull stripping. The sub-region labels are manually annotated by radiologists. The labels include enhancing tissue (ET), non-enhancing tumor core (NETC), surrounding non-enhancing FLAIR hyperintensity (SNFH), and resection cavity (RC). We used the dataset as provided in the original challenge's training dataset.

Additional Input Modality (T1Gd-T1) During the curation of the 2024 challenge dataset, annotators were provided with the T1 contrast subtraction (T1Gd-T1) image for segmentation [24]. Inspired by this, we used the T1Gd - T1 image as an additional input. In Figure 1, T1Gd-T1 highlights the ET.



Fig. 1. Four MR imaging modalities from the 2024 BraTS challenge dataset (A-D) and a calculated modality (T1Gd-T1, E). Tumor sub-region labels (F) include enhancing tissue (ET, blue), non-enhancing tumor core (NETC, red), surrounding non-enhancing FLAIR hyperintensity (SNFH, green), and resection cavity (RC, yellow).

2.2 Architecture

We based our models on mainly three different network architectures: 1) nnUNet - which is based on the original UNet architecture, 2) nnUNet ResEnc - which

4 H Kim et al.

is an extended version of nnUNet making use of the residual connections in the encoder, and 3) SegResNet - which is a CNN based encoder-decoder architecture incorporating a variational autoencoder technique [10] [15].

nnUNet: nnU-Net is a segmentation framework that configures and trains a U-Net model [10]. U-Net consists of an encoder-decoder network where the encoder preserves the semantic information whilst reducing the spatial dimensions and the decoder then reconstructs the segmentation map by upsampling the information obtained from the encoder as well as the corresponding spatial information received through the skip connections [19]. We trained the baseline nnUnet with the default configuration on the 3D full-resolution data. The network was trained using the nnU-Net framework with the following configuration: batch size set to 2, patch size set to (128, 160, 112), and the median image size in voxels set to (142, 175, 136).

nnUNet ResEnc: nnUNet ResEnc in the nnU-Net framework utilizes U-net with residual skip connections in the encoder part of the network [10]. We specifically used the newly introduced nnU-Net ResEnc presets which have the ability to adapt the batch and patch sizes depending on the VRAM budget. We trained the L and XL versions of the nnUNet ResEnc with the default configuration on 3D full-resolution data. In the case of L configuration, the batch size was 3, the patch size was (160, 192, 160), and the median image size in voxels was (142, 175, 136). In the case of XL configuration, the batch size was 5, the patch size was (160, 192, 160), and the median image size in voxels was (142, 175, 136).

SegResNet: SegResNet is based on an encoder-decoder architecture but extends it with an additional variational autoencoder (VAE) part [15]. The encoder part utilizes ResNet blocks along with group normalization instead of batch normalization [8]. The decoder part is similar to the encoder; however, it is based on a single block for each spatial level. The VAE part reduces the encoder output to a low-dimensional space, followed by sampling from a Gaussian distribution. The sampled data is then reconstructed into an image using a decoder-like model, with the key difference being the absence of inter-level skip connections from the encoder. The network was trained using the nnU-Net framework on 3D full-resolution data with the following configuration: batch size set to (128, 160, 112), and the median image size in voxels set to (142, 175, 136).

2.3 Training

All four models were trained on two groups of input data: 1) 4 input scans (T1, T1Gd, T2, and T2 FLAIR), and 2) 5 input scans (T1, T1Gd, T2, T2 FLAIR, and T1Gd-T1). We utilized an 80/20 split for training and validation from the entire dataset. Following the nnU-Net framework, a variety of data augmentation techniques were applied during training: rotations, scaling, Gaussian noise, Gaussian

blur, brightness, contrast, simulation of low resolution, gamma correction, and mirroring. All models were trained for 1000 epochs using the SGD optimizer with Nesterov momentum [22] ($\mu = 0.99$) with a starting learning rate of 0.01 following a polynomial schedule on a single NVIDIA GPU using Pytorch [17].

2.4 Test time augmentation

We utilized test-time augmentation to enhance the robustness of predictions by averaging results from various augmented versions of the input data. This approach helps to account for potential variations and uncertainties in unseen data. In this work, we employed the default nnUNet test-time augmentations [10] during inference. It includes mirroring (flipping) along different axes and applying Gaussian weighting of the predictions, helping to smooth the output and reduce boundary artifacts.

2.5 Ensemble

The ensembling of predictions can yield a significant boost in prediction performance and has been employed successfully by winners of previous editions of the BraTS challenges [27,6]. We explored two different ways of ensembling model predictions: STAPLE [18,25] and weighted average. STAPLE [18,25] constructs a weighted average of the predictions but does so without requiring held-out data. Instead, STAPLE estimates the weights assigned to each model using the model predictions themselves and the EM algorithm [4]. When held-out data are available, one could also output a weighted probabilities average where the weights are estimated by maximizing the ensemble performance on the held-out data. One advantage of this approach is that we can weight models for multi-labels separately.

3 Results

In this section, we show our results on the internal validation set (N = 280) and hold-out validation set (N = 188) with different baselines and ensembling approaches. We follow the provided metrics⁴ and calculate Lesion-wise Dice scores (LD) and Lesion-wise Hausdorff95 scores (LH95). For each label, the Dice and Hausdorff distance at the 95% percentile metrics are computed separately on unique lesions. The different lesions are detected using morphological operators and connected components analysis.

For the internal validation set, we show results for LD and LH95 scores in Table 1 and Table 2. For index #1-4, we calculate LD and LH95 for each baseline with 4 input scans. For index #5-9, we calculate LD and LH95 with 5 input scans, including the additional T1Gd-T1 input scan. Figure 2 presents qualitative segmentation results for one subject in the internal validation set for the baseline

⁴ https://github.com/rachitsaluja/BraTS-2024-Metrics.git



Fig. 2. Segmentation results visualization on one subject in the internal validation set on the different MR imaging input modalities (lines). The ground truth annotation (GT) is compared against our baseline models (columns #1 to #4) and our models with the T1Gd-T1 input (columns #5 to #8). Labels include enhancing tissue (ET, blue), non-enhancing tumor core (NETC, red), surrounding non-enhancing FLAIR hyperintensity (SNFH, green), and resection cavity (RC, yellow).

7



Fig. 3. Segmentation results visualization on one subject in the internal validation set on the different MR imaging input modalities (lines). The ground truth annotation (GT) is compared against our ensemble models using STAPLE (columns #9 to #11) and the proposed weighted approach (columns #12 to #14). Labels include enhancing tissue (ET, blue), non-enhancing tumor core (NETC, red), surrounding non-enhancing FLAIR hyperintensity (SNFH, green), and resection cavity (RC, yellow).

8 H Kim et al.

	Additional	Ensemble	Method	ET	NETC	RC	SNFH	TC	WT
	channel input								
#1			nnUNet	0.7717	0.8386	0.7697	0.8365	0.7747	0.8330
#2	×	×	SegResNet	0.7887	0.8265	0.7799	0.8252	0.7856	0.8254
#3			nnUNet + ResEncUNetL	0.8047	0.8248	0.7777	0.8273	0.8027	0.8289
#4			nnUNet + ResEncUNetXL	0.8032	0.8431	0.8019	0.8393	0.8035	0.8392
#5			nnUNet	0.7985	0.8426	0.7779	0.8276	0.7979	0.8295
#6	1		SegResNet	0.7869	0.8303	0.7798	0.8199	0.7900	0.8179
#7			nnUNet + ResEncUNetL	0.8038	0.8435	0.7784	0.8244	0.8024	0.8238
#8			nnUNet + ResEncUNetXL	0.8136	0.8409	0.7781	0.8331	0.8161	0.8349
#9	×		Ensemble $\#1-4$	0.8106	0.8398	0.8076	0.8348	0.8051	0.8320
#10	 ✓ 	STAPLE	Ensemble $\#5-9$	0.8095	0.8512	0.7917	0.8314	0.8128	0.8316
#11	 ✓ 		Ensemble $\#1-9$	0.8036	0.8466	0.7999	0.8377	0.8090	0.8341
#12	×		Ensemble $\#1-4$	0.8100	0.8423	0.8076	0.8422	0.8077	0.8436
#13	 ✓ 	Weighted	Ensemble $\#5-9$	0.8104	0.8427	0.8016	0.8421	0.8081	0.8435
#14	 Image: A state of the state of		Ensemble #1-9	0.8071	0.8470	0.8024	0.8427	0.8093	0.8420

Table 1. LD scores for internal validation set with different baselines. Additional channel input indicates the usage of T1Gd-T1. **Red** is the best performing result and green is the second best. Result is the higher the better.

models with (columns #1-4) and without (columns #5-8) including the additional T1Gd-T1 input scan against the ground truth annotations (GT). While both groups of models depict similar predictions for the SNFH label (green), we observe more accurate contours for the ET (blue) using the proposed additional input. For indices #9-11 and #12-14, we calculate STAPLE/weighted ensemble results with respect to the aforementioned baselines. We observe that for single baseline results, incorporating additional channel input generally improves LD scores. We also observe better LD and LH95 scores with larger baseline models (ResEncUNetL to ResEncUNetXL). For ensemble approaches, STAPLE and weighted average generally improve performance compared with single baselines. In Figure 3, we visualize qualitative segmentation results for one subject in the internal validation set for ensemble models using STABLE (columns #9-11) and the proposed weighted approach (columns #12-14) against the ground truth annotations (GT). For the selected subject, the STABLE ensemble models provide a better detection of the RC (vellow) while the proposed weighted ensemble models focus on accurate segmentation of the NETC (red).

For the hold-out validation set, we show results in Table 3 and Table 4. We submit only the ensemble approaches as they generally outperform single models in the internal validation set. On the hold-out validation set, we observe that the weighted average generally performs better than STAPLE on LD scores. We also observe that without T1Gd-T1 (Ensemble #1-4) and with T1Gd-T1 (Ensemble #5-9) perform similarly in both LD and LH95. However, ensembling them (Ensemble #1-9) provides significant improvement in RC and WT classes, with 1% LD improvement and 3-4% LH95 reduction. This validates our argument that additional input modalities and ensemble techniques can lead to improve segmentation outcomes.

Ļ	Additional channel input	Ensemble	Method	ET	NETC	\mathbf{RC}	SNFH	TC	WT
#1			nnUNet	51.1324	27.1954	41.0131	37.1673	50.1382	41.2318
#2	×	×	SegResNet	47.3470	28.4743	33.7970	37.7961	47.4018	39.2164
#3			nnUNet + ResEncUNetL	40.3632	30.7466	37.7362	35.1327	41.8607	37.1744
#4			nnUNet + ResEncUNetXL	46.2630	23.3088	33.5624	30.6463	45.7200	34.0185
#5			nnUNet	42.6100	23.4603	37.8478	37.1878	43.9434	37.1065
#6	~		SegResNet	44.4186	24.7710	33.1014	41.7299	46.1129	46.0196
#7			nnUNet + ResEncUNetL	41.3596	23.2999	35.8579	36.2353	44.3718	39.7798
#8			nnUNet + ResEncUNetXL	40.4495	22.4659	34.6625	37.7991	40.9828	38.4813
#9	X		Ensemble #1-4	41.1699	27.5377	28.8558	34.8404	43.9045	38.1087
#10	 ✓ 	STAPLE	Ensemble $\#5-9$	41.8326	20.7410	32.1034	36.5352	41.5172	36.8008
#11	 ✓ 		Ensemble #1-9	40.9159	22.8680	31.0782	30.6314	42.0808	33.6783
#12	×		Ensemble $\#1-4$	40.6045	25.7191	29.4378	35.2625	41.2713	37.1799
#13	-	Weighted	Ensemble $\#5-9$	39.4369	25.7088	31.9253	35.2629	41.2662	37.1792
#14	l 🖌		Ensemble #1-9	42.3202	23.2703	29.6432	31.9311	42.8091	33.9768

Table 2. LH95 scores for internal validation set with different baselines. Additional channel input indicates the usage of T1Gd-T1. **Red** is the best performing result and **green** is the second best. The metric is the lower, the better.

\uparrow	Ensemble	Method	ET	NETC	RC	SNFH	TC	WT
#15		Ensemble $\#1-4$	0.7292	0.7855	0.7014	0.8478	0.7200	0.8500
#16	STAPLE	Ensemble $\#5-9$	0.7193	0.7836	0.6843	0.8486	0.7008	0.8465
#17		Ensemble #1-9	0.7277	0.7868	0.6994	0.8454	0.7154	0.8446
#18		Ensemble $\#1-4$	0.7332	0.7866	0.7009	0.8594	0.7173	0.8601
#19	Weighted	Ensemble $\#5-9$	0.7334	0.7824	0.6956	0.8594	0.7166	0.8600
#20		Ensemble $\#1-9$	0.7332	0.7861	0.6948	0.8682	0.7120	0.8704

Table 3. LD scores for hold-out validation set with ensemble methods. **Red** is the best performing result and green is the second best.

4 Discussion

In this work, we proposed a simple yet effective approach for the BraTS 2024 Segmentation Challenge - Adult Glioma Post Treatment. We demonstrate that simple approaches, such as artificially generating new sequences like T1Gd-T1 to enhance different tumor regions and utilizing ensemble models like STAPLE and weighted averaging, can effectively improve segmentation performance in the post-treatment glioma dataset.

Several papers have previously reported the usefulness of subtraction images for segmentation tasks [5,11], as well as integrating multiple MRI modalities for diverse medical imaging-based tasks [2]. However, there is a lack of studies on using subtraction images for deep learning models. Our analysis of the synthesized T1Gd-T1 input image demonstrated the potential utility of subtraction images for glioma sub-region segmentation tasks.

Aggregating predictions from multiple models can significantly boost performance, as well as demonstrate its relevance for more robust and generalizable capabilities [26]. In addition to STAPLE, a long-established method, we demonstrated that a label-wise weighted averaging technique can outperform STAPLE.

\downarrow	Ensemble	Method	ET	NETC	RC	SNFH	TC	WT		
#15		Ensemble $\#1-4$	43.3998	44.4383	54.3403	31.4488	42.9108	32.3994		
#16	STAPLE	Ensemble $\#5-9$	52.9701	45.9666	60.3439	31.3575	56.8107	33.1450		
#17		Ensemble $\#1-9$	46.0162	45.6417	53.7277	33.7174	51.5435	34.9169		
#18		Ensemble $\#1-4$	42.6223	44.2384	54.7714	28.7516	46.7207	29.9510		
#19	Weighted	Ensemble $\#5-9$	42.6185	44.2957	56.5904	28.7519	46.6246	29.9491		
#20)	Ensemble $\#1-9$	44.4066	46.0825	56.1886	25.4669	50.3338	25.6896		
Table 4. LH95 scores for hold-out validation set with ensemble methods. Red is the										
best	best performing result and green is the second best.									

These findings suggest that integrating diverse data sources and leveraging ensemble techniques can significantly improve the accuracy and reliability of glioma segmentation models. Future work will focus on exploring additional input channels and ensembling strategies, as well as investigating the potential of these methods in other segmentation tasks and medical imaging applications.

References

- Bakas, S., Reyes, M., Jakab, A., Bauer, S., Rempfler, M., Crimi, A., Shinohara, R.T., Berger, C., Ha, S.M., Rozycki, M., 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)
- Calhoun, V.D., Sui, J.: Multimodal fusion of brain imaging data: A key to finding the missing link(s) in complex mental illness. Biol. Psychiatry Cogn. Neurosci. Neuroimaging 1(3), 230–244 (May 2016)
- Chang, K., Beers, A.L., Bai, H.X., Brown, J.M., Ly, K.I., Li, X., Senders, J.T., Kavouridis, V.K., Boaro, A., Su, C., et al.: Automatic assessment of glioma burden: a deep learning algorithm for fully automated volumetric and bidimensional measurement. Neuro-oncology 21(11), 1412–1422 (2019)
- Dempster, A.P., Laird, N.M., Rubin, D.B.: Maximum likelihood from incomplete data via the em algorithm. Journal of the royal statistical society: series B (methodological) 39(1), 1–22 (1977)
- Duan, Y., Hildenbrand, P., Sampat, M., Tate, D., Csapo, I., Moraal, B., Bakshi, R., Barkhof, F., Meier, D., Guttmann, C.: Segmentation of subtraction images for the measurement of lesion change in multiple sclerosis. American Journal of Neuroradiology 29(2), 340–346 (2008)
- Ferreira, A., Solak, N., Li, J., Dammann, P., Kleesiek, J., Alves, V., Egger, J.: How we won brats 2023 adult glioma challenge? just faking it! enhanced synthetic data augmentation and model ensemble for brain tumour segmentation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17317 (2024)
- Gooya, A., Pohl, K.M., Bilello, M., Cirillo, L., Biros, G., Melhem, E.R., Davatzikos, C.: Glistr: glioma image segmentation and registration. IEEE transactions on medical imaging **31**(10), 1941–1954 (2012)
- He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., Sun, J.: Identity mappings in deep residual networks. In: Computer Vision–ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11–14, 2016, Proceedings, Part IV 14. pp. 630–645. Springer (2016)

- Hussain, S., Anwar, S.M., Majid, M.: Segmentation of glioma tumors in brain using deep convolutional neural network. Neurocomputing 282, 248–261 (2018)
- Isensee, F., Jaeger, P.F., Kohl, S.A., Petersen, J., Maier-Hein, K.H.: nnu-net: a self-configuring method for deep learning-based biomedical image segmentation. Nature methods 18(2), 203–211 (2021)
- Leung, D.A., Pelkonen, P., Hany, T.F., Zimmermann, G., Pfammatter, T., Debatin, J.F.: Value of image subtraction in 3d gadolinium-enhanced mr angiography of the renal arteries. Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging 8(3), 598–602 (1998)
- Lotan, E., Zhang, B., Dogra, S., Wang, W., Carbone, D., Fatterpekar, G., Oermann, E., Lui, Y.: Development and practical implementation of a deep learning–based pipeline for automated pre-and postoperative glioma segmentation. American Journal of Neuroradiology 43(1), 24–32 (2022)
- Louis, D.N., Perry, A., Wesseling, P., Brat, D.J., Cree, I.A., Figarella-Branger, D., Hawkins, C., Ng, H., Pfister, S.M., Reifenberger, G., et al.: The 2021 who classification of tumors of the central nervous system: a summary. Neuro-oncology 23(8), 1231–1251 (2021)
- Menze, B.H., Jakab, A., Bauer, S., Kalpathy-Cramer, J., Farahani, K., Kirby, J., Burren, Y., Porz, N., Slotboom, J., Wiest, R., et al.: The multimodal brain tumor image segmentation benchmark (brats). IEEE transactions on medical imaging 34(10), 1993–2024 (2014)
- Myronenko, A.: 3d mri brain tumor segmentation using autoencoder regularization. In: Brainlesion: Glioma, Multiple Sclerosis, Stroke and Traumatic Brain Injuries: 4th International Workshop, BrainLes 2018, Held in Conjunction with MICCAI 2018, Granada, Spain, September 16, 2018, Revised Selected Papers, Part II 4. pp. 311–320. Springer (2019)
- Ostrom, Q.T., Price, M., Neff, C., Cioffi, G., Waite, K.A., Kruchko, C., Barnholtz-Sloan, J.S.: Cbtrus statistical report: primary brain and other central nervous system tumors diagnosed in the united states in 2015–2019. Neuro-oncology 24(Supplement 5), v1–v95 (2022)
- 17. Paszke, A., Gross, S., Massa, F., Lerer, A., Bradbury, J., Chanan, G., Killeen, T., Lin, Z., Gimelshein, N., Antiga, L., Desmaison, A., Köpf, A., Yang, E., DeVito, Z., Raison, M., Tejani, A., Chilamkurthy, S., Steiner, B., Fang, L., Bai, J., Chintala, S.: Pytorch: an imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. In: Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems. Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA (2019)
- Rohlfing, T., Russakoff, D.B., Maurer, C.R.: Performance-based classifier combination in atlas-based image segmentation using expectation-maximization parameter estimation. IEEE transactions on medical imaging 23(8), 983–994 (2004)
- Ronneberger, O., Fischer, P., Brox, T.: U-net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation. In: Medical image computing and computer-assisted intervention-MICCAI 2015: 18th international conference, Munich, Germany, October 5-9, 2015, proceedings, part III 18. pp. 234–241. Springer (2015)
- Rudie, J.D., Calabrese, E., Saluja, R., Weiss, D., Colby, J.B., Cha, S., Hess, C.P., Rauschecker, A.M., Sugrue, L.P., Villanueva-Meyer, J.E.: Longitudinal assessment of posttreatment diffuse glioma tissue volumes with three-dimensional convolutional neural networks. Radiology: Artificial Intelligence 4(5), e210243 (2022)
- Sørensen, P.J., Carlsen, J.F., Larsen, V.A., Andersen, F.L., Ladefoged, C.N., Nielsen, M.B., Poulsen, H.S., Hansen, A.E.: Evaluation of the hd-glio deep learning algorithm for brain tumour segmentation on postoperative mri. Diagnostics 13(3), 363 (2023)

- 12 H Kim et al.
- 22. Sutskever, I., Martens, J., Dahl, G., Hinton, G.: On the importance of initialization and momentum in deep learning. In: Dasgupta, S., McAllester, D. (eds.) Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Machine Learning. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, vol. 28, pp. 1139–1147. PMLR, Atlanta, Georgia, USA (17–19 Jun 2013), https://proceedings.mlr.press/v28/sutskever13.html
- Tang, F., Liang, S., Zhong, T., Huang, X., Deng, X., Zhang, Y., Zhou, L.: Postoperative glioma segmentation in ct image using deep feature fusion model guided by multi-sequence mris. European Radiology 30, 823–832 (2020)
- 24. de Verdier, M.C., Saluja, R., Gagnon, L., LaBella, D., Baid, U., Tahon, N.H., Foltyn-Dumitru, M., Zhang, J., Alafif, M., Baig, S., et al.: The 2024 brain tumor segmentation (brats) challenge: Glioma segmentation on post-treatment mri. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.18368 (2024)
- Warfield, S.K., Zou, K.H., Wells, W.M.: Simultaneous truth and performance level estimation (staple): an algorithm for the validation of image segmentation. IEEE transactions on medical imaging 23(7), 903–921 (2004)
- Yang, Z., Li, L., Xu, X., Kailkhura, B., Xie, T., Li, B.: On the certified robustness for ensemble models and beyond. ICLR (2021)
- Zeineldin, R.A., Karar, M.E., Burgert, O., Mathis-Ullrich, F.: Multimodal cnn networks for brain tumor segmentation in mri: a brats 2022 challenge solution. In: International MICCAI Brainlesion Workshop. pp. 127–137. Springer (2022)