

Integration of operator-validated contours in deformable image registration for dose accumulation in radiotherapy

Lando Bosma, Mario Ries, Baudouin Denis de Senneville, Bas Raaymakers,

Cornel Zachiu

► To cite this version:

Lando Bosma, Mario Ries, Baudouin Denis de Senneville, Bas Raaymakers, Cornel Zachiu. Integration of operator-validated contours in deformable image registration for dose accumulation in radiotherapy. Physics and Imaging in Radiation Oncology, 2023, 27, pp.100483. 10.1016/j.phro.2023.100483 . hal-04268748

HAL Id: hal-04268748 https://hal.science/hal-04268748

Submitted on 2 Nov 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

¹ Integration of operator-validated contours in

- ² deformable image registration for dose accumulation
- ³ in radiotherapy

4	Lando S Bosma ¹ , Mario Ries ³ , Baudouin Denis de Senneville ^{1,2} ,
5	Bas W Raaymakers ¹ , Cornel Zachiu ¹
6	¹ Department of Radiotherapy, UMC Utrecht, Heidelberglaan 100, 3508 GA Utrecht,
7	The Netherlands
8	2 Institut de Mathématiques de Bordeaux (IMB), UMR 5251 CNRS/University of
9	Bordeaux, F-33400 Talence, France
10	3 Imaging Division, UMC Utrecht, Heidelberglaan 100, 3508 GA Utrecht, The
11	Netherlands

- E-mail: L.S.Bosma@umcutrecht.nl
- 13 6 July 2023

Abstract. Background and purpose. Deformable image registration (DIR) is a core element of adaptive radiotherapy workflows, integrating daily contour propagation and/or dose accumulation in their design. Propagated contours are usually manually validated and may be edited, thereby locally invalidating the registration result. This means the registration cannot be used for dose accumulation. We present and validated a novel multi-modal DIR algorithm that incorporates contour information to guide the registration. This ensures that the estimated deformation vector field and warped dose are in accordance with operator-validated contours.

Materials and methods. The proposed algorithm minimizes both a normalized gradient field-based data-fidelity term on the images and an optical flow data-fidelity term on the contours. The Helmholtz-Hodge decomposition was incorporated to ensure anatomically plausible deformations. The algorithm was validated for same- and cross-contrast Magnetic Resonance (MR) image registrations, Computed Tomography (CT) registrations, and CT-to-MR registrations for different anatomics, all based on challenging clinical situations. The contour-correspondence, anatomical fidelity, registration error, and dose warping error were evaluated.

Results. The proposed contour-guided algorithm considerably and significantly increased contour overlap, decreasing the mean distance to agreement by a factor of 1.3 to 13.7, compared to the best algorithm without contour-guidance. Importantly, the registration error and dose warping error decreased significantly, by a factor of 1.2 to 2.0.

Conclusion. Our contour-guided algorithm ensures that the deformation vector field and warped quantitative information are consistent with the operator-validated warped contours. This presents a feasible semi-automatic strategy for spatially correct warping of quantitative information even in difficult and artefacted cases.

2

Keywords: Contour Guidance, Deformable Image Registration, Deformable Dose
 Warping, Adaptive Radiotherapy, Constrained Motion Estimation, Preconditioning

42 1. Introduction

Deformable image registration (DIR) plays an important role in image-guided adaptive 43 radiotherapy. Currently, it is widely used for contour propagation, warping the planning 44 contours to the anatomy of the day. The application of DIR for warping and/or 45 accumulating quantitative information such as radiation dose or Hounsfield units is 46 increasing [1–3]. In clinical workflows, the contours generated by DIR undergo visual 47 inspection by an operator and may be adjusted. Thereby the underlying estimated 48 deformation becomes locally invalid and in turn, the warping of quantitative information 49 is inconsistent. A key challenge in incorporating automatic DIR into clinical workflows 50 that involve warping quantitative information is to provide a suitable hands-on repair 51 strategy for this scenario. Indeed, recent surveys of radiotherapy centers found that an 52 important barrier to the clinical adoption and use of DIR was to determine what to do 53 when a registration is unsatisfactory [4, 5]. On the other hand, due to this workflow, 54 every daily image-guided adaptive radiotherapy treatment fraction has these operator-55 approved contours available. 56

Contours have been previously used to guide image registration. Gu and colleagues 57 proposed a contour-guided adaption of the image intensity-based demons algorithm[6]. 58 An additional term in the demons cost function matches the intensities of modified 59 images constructed by incorporating one or multiple contour pair(s) onto the original 60 images. This method has a high memory demand as it requires a new set of images 61 for every contour used for guidance, and it is sensitive to the tuning of multiple free 62 parameters. This algorithm is also focused on mono-modal image registrations. Multi-63 modal image registration is important for image-guided radiotherapy as it allows to 64 combine modality-specific information from Computed Tomography (CT) and multi-65 contrast Magnetic Resonance (MR) images in the same reference frame. Multi-modal 66 deformable image registration remains a particularly challenging task for state-of-the-art 67 DIR algorithms. Recently, contours were used to segment part of the images to consider 68 for registration, resulting in a transformation per organ that was validated for dose 69 warping [7]. Alam and colleagues used an algorithm that optimizes both image similarity 70 and structure guidance [8]. The algorithm is shown to improve contour overlap compared 71 to rigid registration and subsequently applied to dose accumulation. In other work, a 72 multi-modal contour-guided algorithm was shown to improve contour-propagation [9]. 73 The algorithm is slower, at about 15 minutes per registration. A commercial registration 74 solution exists that can combine the matching of image similarities with a minimization 75 of contour surface distances [10]. 76

The adoption of deep learning segmentation in the clinic is increasing [11–13]. These automatically generated contours can also be used as input for registration methods (after manual validation). In that way, this information can be used for the contour-propagation of structures that are not segmented and for warping quantitative
 information in accordance with these structures.

We present a solution for integrating operator-validated or corrected contours into the registration for consistent dose warping and/or accumulation. Our proposed method is fast (Graphical Processing Unit (GPU) accelerated) and multi-modal. We validate our algorithm for multiple anatomies, deformation patterns and image modalities using multiple benchmarks relevant to adaptive image-guided radiotherapy. We explicitly tested its application to the warping of quantitative information such as dose or Hounsfield units.

⁸⁹ 2. Materials and methods

⁹⁰ 2.1. Proposed registration algorithm

To incorporate contour information in the deformable image registration process, we combined the image data fidelity term \mathcal{D} and regularization term \mathcal{R} of EVolution [14] with an optical flow data fidelity term on the binary masks of the contours [15]:

$$\mathcal{E}_{CG} = \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{D}_{\text{images}}(I_r, I_m, \vec{u}) + \beta \cdot \mathcal{D}_{\text{contours}}(C_r, C_m, \vec{u}) + \alpha \cdot \mathcal{R}_{\text{smoothness}}(\vec{u})$$

$$= \int_{\Omega} \exp\left(f(\vec{u}, I_r, I_m)\right) + \beta(\nabla C_m \cdot \vec{u} + C_m - C_r)^2 + \alpha \left(||\vec{\nabla}u_1||_2^2 + ||\vec{\nabla}u_2||_2^2 + ||\vec{\nabla}u_3||_2^2\right),$$

(1)

with

$$f(\vec{u}(\vec{r}), I_r, I_m)) = -\frac{\sum_{\vec{s} \in \Gamma(\vec{r})} \left| \vec{\nabla} I_r(\vec{s}) \cdot \vec{\nabla} I_m(\vec{s} + \vec{u}(\vec{s})) \right|}{\sum_{\vec{s} \in \Gamma(\vec{r})} \| \vec{\nabla} I_r(\vec{s}) \|_2 \| \vec{\nabla} I_m(\vec{s} + \vec{u}(\vec{s})) \|_2},$$
(2)

where **u** is the deformation vector field with components $u_{1,2,3}$, $I_{r,m}$ are the reference and moving images, $C_{r,m}$ the reference and moving contours, and $\Gamma(\vec{r})$ is a neighborhood around \vec{r} . There are two free parameters weighting the contour guidance (β) and regularization (α). The performance of the algorithm was investigated for $\alpha \in$ $[0.4, 1.2], \beta \in [0.5, 2.5]$ and $\alpha = 1.0$ and $\beta = 2.0$ were used for all experiments in this manuscript.

We used an iterative fixed-point scheme on the Euler-Lagrange equations derived 97 from equation 1. Their derivations are given in Supplementary Material A. The 98 registration was performed using a course-to-fine scheme, starting the iterations on 99 the 16-fold downsampled images and contours, and upsampling with factors of two. We 100 used iterative refinement, restarting the registration process 50 times at each resolution 101 level. Each iteration was stopped when the average variation of the motion magnitude 102 from one update to the next was smaller than 10^{-3} voxels. The deformations from the 103 previous refinement iteration were then used as a starting point [16]. 104

The algorithm was implemented using the Compute Unified Device Architecture (CUDA) and executed on a Nvidia Quadro RTX 5000 graphics card. Table 1: Overview of the test data used, with the experiment name indicating its relevance, the organ contour(s) used for guidance and evaluation of contour correspondence, the modalities and image types involved, and the evaluation criteria used. Evaluation criteria are the Hausdorff distance (HDD), Jacobian determinant (JD, evaluated on the indicated contour), target registration error (TRE), endpoint error (EE), and dose warping error (DE).

Experiment name	Contours	Modalities	Evaluation	
Large complex deformations	Prostate	3D T2w MRI	HDD, JD	
Large complex deformations	Lungs	3D CT	HDD, JD, TRE	
Signal dropout	Prostate	3D cine MRI	HDD, JD	
Signal dropout simulation	Prostate	3D cine MRI	HDD, JD, EE, DE	
Multi-modal	Liver, spleen, kidneys	3D CT & 3D T1w MRI	HDD, JD	
Cross-contrast simulation	Prostate	3D DIXON MRI	HDD, JD, EE	

107 2.2. Helmholtz-Hodge decomposition

Using contour-guidance may introduce the risk of over-constraining, leading to 108 anatomically implausible deformations. Therefore, we introduced the Helmholtz-Hodge 109 decomposition as an optional post-processing step [17-19]. This decomposes any vector 110 field into three components: a curl-free component, a divergence-free component, and 111 a harmonic remainder that is both curl-free and divergence-free. The details of its 112 derivation and computation are presented in Supplementary Material B. The Helmholtz-113 Hodge decomposition thus provides local control over the registration result, allowing 114 to demand incompressible (i.e. divergence-free) deformations in incompressible regions, 115 to potentially resolve the risk of over-fitting. 116

117 2.3. Test data and evaluation methods

We tested our algorithm on experiments representing misregistrations of different 118 origins: large and complex deformations; a signal dropout; and cross-contrast or multi-119 modal registrations. These experiments are discussed in detail below. An overview 120 of the anatomies, modalities, and evaluation criteria used for the experiments can be 121 found in Table 1. For all datasets, we evaluated the contour correspondence using 122 the mean distance to agreement and the Hausdorff distance [20] and the anatomical 123 plausibility using the range of the Jacobian determinant on incompressible organs. For 124 the simulated datasets, we evaluated the voxelwise endpoint error [21], i.e. the Euclidean 125 distance between the benchmark and estimated vector for each voxel, and dose warping 126 error. Additional details of the evaluation criteria and acquisition parameters used are 127 provided in Supplementary Material C and D. 128

¹²⁹ Our proposed contour-guidance algorithm was compared to the original EVolution

implementation ‡ and to the mutual-information B-spline algorithm from the openly
 available Elastix toolbox [22, 23]. Details on the parameters used are given in Supple mentary Material E. We compared the results both with and without the Helmholtz Hodge decomposition. We performed statistical testing using the paired t-test.

134

Large and complex deformations datasets. Using cone-beam CT linac systems [24] or 135 the MR-linac [25-27], treatment plans can be updated to the anatomy of the day. Im-136 age registration can be used to propagate the contours to the new anatomy, and to 137 perform dose accumulation. This can be challenging when large day-to-day anatomical 138 variations occur. We used pretreatment (T2w) MR and daily MR scans for 20 prostate 139 cancer patients (5x7.25Gy) with delineations of the bladder, prostate and rectum on 140 both image sets made by experienced radiation oncologists. Ethical approval for use of 141 all internally acquired patient data was provided by the Ethics Board of the University 142 Medical Center Utrecht. 143

Registration of thoracic inhale to exhale images represents a challenge for image registration due to the large magnitude of the deformations as well as their complex nature at the lung-liver interface and the sliding motion between the lungs and the ribs. We tested our algorithm on twenty thoracic 4DCT image pairs from the DIR-lab and COPD-gene datasets§ [28, 29]. For images of full inhale and full exhale, 300 manually annotated anatomical landmarks are available to quantify the target registration error. An experienced staff member delineated the lung contours on both image sets.

Signal dropout datasets. With the MR-linac, the patient's anatomy can be imaged during treatment. This can be used to track the tumor and to reconstruct the delivered dose. Typically, this is done with bSSFP-sequences that offer sufficient anatomical detail for organ tracking combined with low acquisition and reconstruction times. The problem is that these sequences are prone to susceptibility artefacts, caused e.g. by gas pockets in the rectum. These artefacts may impact the registration accuracy, demanding manual corrections.

We tested the algorithm on a 4D cine-MR series acquired during treatment of a prostate cancer patient on the 1.5T MR-Linac Unity system (Elekta AB, Stockholm, Sweden) installed at the UMC Utrecht, The Netherlands. During imaging, a signal dropout appears due to a gas bubble passing through the rectum, see Figure S1 in the Supplementary Material.

To quantify the accuracy of the resulting deformation vector field, we also simulated a cine-MR with a synthetic signal dropout for a prostate cancer patient. First, we simulated a clinically observed and anatomically plausible rectal filling organ movement [30] using the biomechanical modeling software FEBio [31]. Thereafter an artificial signal dropout was created on the moving image. The resulting image is shown in Figure S1

 $[\]ddagger$ http://bsenneville.free.fr/RealTITracker/

 $[\]$ https://med.emory.edu/departments/radiation-oncology/research-laboratories/deformable-image-registration/index.html

in the Supplementary Material. The mean planned dose on the prostate for this patientwas 62.6 Gy.

171

Multi-modal and cross-contrast datasets. CT-to-MR registration is needed in radio-172 therapy to combine information from both of these modalities. Especially for adaptive 173 radiotherapy on the MR-linac, it is essential to warp the electron density or planned 174 dose distribution from the planning CT to the MR of the anatomy of the day. In the 175 lower abdomen, a lot of anatomical changes can happen that make for a challenging 176 registration task that in turn may lead to corrections in the propagated contours. We 177 used abdominal CT and MR scans for 8 patients from the Learn2Reg challenge [32]. 178 The data is modified from The Cancer Imaging Archive project [33–36] and manual seg-179 mentations of the liver, spleen, right kidney and left kidney are added by the organizers. 180 We have cropped the images for a matching field of view. 181

To quantify the accuracy of the resulting deformation vector field, we also simulated 182 a cross-contrast experiment using a set of DIXON images of a prostate cancer patient. 183 These images are acquired in the same anatomical state, allowing the simulation of the 184 deformation of one of the images with a known benchmark. A typically observed prostate 185 deformation was simulated using biomechanical modeling software FEBio, resulting in 186 the prostate moving in the anterior and caudal direction. The in-phase image was 187 deformed to create the moving image and the water-only image was used as the reference 188 image. 189

190 3. Results

A visual comparison of a thorax CT-to-CT registration with and without contourguidance shows that in particular the caudal boundary of the lungs matched better when using contour-guidance, see Figure 1. Also for MR-to-MR and MR-to-CT registrations, an improved contour and image overlap is visible, see Figures S2 and S3 in the Supplementary Material. For all three experiments, the case with results closest to the mean of the dataset is shown.

¹⁹⁷ The proposed algorithm was relatively stable with respect to the free parameters ¹⁹⁸ α and β , see Figures S6, S7, and S8 in the Supplementary Material. The difference in ¹⁹⁹ error between the used configuration and the optimal one was low at 6 to 8%.

The GPU-accelerated EVolution and GPU-accelerated contour-guided EVolution were considerable faster than Elastix, see Table S3 in the Supplementary Material. Using contour-guidance decreased the registration time for the prostate and abdomen anatomies, but increased the time for the thorax anatomies.

²⁰⁴ 3.1. Contour correspondence and anatomical plausibility

|| https://learn2reg.grand-challenge.org/Learn2Reg2021/

Table 2: Mean distance to agreement in mm for the different experiments when using no registration, Elastix, EVolution without contour-guidance, the proposed algorithm with contour-guidance, and the proposed algorithm with contour-guidance and the Helmholtz-Hodge decomposition (HHD). For the experiments with multiple registrations the mean (standard deviation) is shown. Contour-guidance reduces the distance by a factor of 7.0 on average (range 1.3-13.7), compared to the best algorithm without guidance. This was statistically significant for all experiments (p < 0.01). The contour overlap after the HHD is still significantly (p < 0.03) improved. The mean distance to agreement split per organ for the abdomen experiment is shown in Table S2 in the Supplementary Material.

Experiment	No DIR	Elastix	EVolution	Contour-guided	With HHD
Large complex deformations prostate	9.8 (12.1)	1.1 (1.1)	0.83 (0.96)	0.13 (0.21)	0.15(0.20)
Large complex deformations thorax	2.0(2.2)	0.05(0.03)	0.12(0.13)	$0.01 \ (0.01)$	0.08(0.02)
Signal dropout prostate	0.98	0.70	0.41	0.03	0.10
Signal dropout simulation prostate	0.60	0.08	0.10	0.06	0.05
Multi-modal abdomen	13.3(12.0)	6.0(12.5)	4.6(9.3)	0.7(2.4)	1.8(2.9)
Dixon cross-contrast simulation prostate	7.9	0.61	0.44	0.05	0.11

The mean distance to agreement decreased by a factor of 1.9 on average by using contourguidance, see Table 2. After the Helmholtz-Hodge decomposition the contour overlap was still considerably improved. For the Hausdorff distance, qualitatively similar results were found, see Table S1 in the Supplementary Material.

The Helmholtz-Hodge decomposition decreased the non-outlier range of the Jacobian determinant by a factor of 2.0 on average, see Table S3 in the Supplementary Material. It also brought the values closer to the benchmark ranges for the biomechanical simulations. The decomposition furthermore resolved any undesired negative (outlier) values that indicate the estimation of tissue folding.

214 3.2. Registration errors and dose warping errors

For the manually annotated 4DCT, the mean target registration error over the 20 cases was 15.9 mm before registration, see Figure 2. Using Elastix and EVolution this became 4.3 and 5.6 mm. Including contour-guidance decreased the error by a factor of 1.3 and 1.8, to 3.2 mm. Applying the Helmholtz-Hodge decomposition kept the mean error at 3.2 mm.

For the simulated cross-contrast prostate experiment, the mean endpoint error on the prostate plus its vicinity of 2 mm before registration was 25.7 mm, see Figure 3. Using Elastix this became 10.6 mm, and using EVolution this became 5.9 mm. Including contour-guidance, the mean error is reduced by an additional factor of 2.2, to 2.8 mm. After the Helmholtz-Hodge decomposition, the mean error slightly increased to 3.0 mm. When considering a larger area of the prostate and the surrounding 10 mm of tissue, contour-guidance reduced the mean error by a factor of 1.7 to 2.9 mm, indicating that it does not lead to unrealistic deformations outside the guiding contour.

For the simulated signal dropout, the mean endpoint error on the prostate plus its 228 vicinity of 2 mm before registration was 4.8 mm, see Figure S4 in the Supplementary 229 This became 1.3 mm after using Elastix or EVolution. Using contour-Material. 230 guidance, the mean endpoint error decreased with an additional factor of 1.5 to 0.88 231 mm. After performing the Helmholtz-Hodge decomposition, this was further lowered 232 to 0.76 mm. The voxel-by-voxel dose error on the prostate plus vicinity decreased 233 from 2.36 Gy (3.8%) of the planned dose) to 0.47 Gy and 0.40 Gy, when using Elastix 234 and EVolution, see Figure 4. Including contour-guidance decreased the mean dose 235 error with an additional factor of 1.2, to 0.32 Gy. When applying the Helmholtz-236 Hodge decomposition, the mean dose error slightly decreased further and the maximum 237 error decreased with a factor of 1.2. Also for the dose error on the rectal wall, using 238 contour-guidance on the prostate decreased both the mean and maximum dose errors 239 on this nearby organ-at-risk by a factor of 1.2, compared to the best algorithm without 240 guidance, see Figure S5 in the Supplementary Material. Including the Helmholtz-Hodge 241 decomposition decreased the error with a factor of 1.3. 242

243 4. Discussion

Using contour-guidance significantly increased contour overlap. Importantly, it significantly decreased the registration error and the dose warping error, compared to the algorithms without contour-guidance. These errors were evaluated on the contour used for guidance and its vicinity, ensuring no errors arise due to over-fitting or boundary inconsistencies.

Our results confirm that the proposed algorithm can integrate operator-validated contours into the dose warping and accumulation process by matching deformation vector fields to these contours. Future work should focus on validating the algorithm for additional anatomies such as the abdomen. Including contour-guidance corrects the functional and the numerical scheme, aiding the convergence of the variational algorithm, resulting in a decrease in computation times for most data sets.

The main difference between this work and previous studies is that we specifically 255 design and validate the algorithm for its application to dose accumulation (as well as 256 warping e.g. Hounsfield units). To our knowledge, this is the first study testing a 257 contour-guided registration method on a voxel-by-voxel basis for its registration and 258 dose warping performance. Additionally, our method is designed for and validated for 259 multi-modal registrations (like [9]) while also GPU-accelerated and converging within 260 a few seconds (like [10]. Furthermore/Compared to [7], we explicitly incorporate and 261 integrate the contour information and generate a single transformation which makes our 262 method well-suited for dose accumulation. Finally/Compared to [6], the algorithm is 263 very stable with respect to the (additional) free parameter on a wide range of modalities 264 and anatomies. We use the same configuration for all experiments, in contrast to the 265

REFERENCES

²⁶⁶ algorithms without contour-guidance.

The Helmholtz-Hodge decomposition post-processing step [17–19] decreased the (non-outlier) range of the Jacobian determinant by about a factor of two and resolved unwanted negative values. For incompressible tissues, like the prostrate on intra-fraction timescales, this brought the Jacobian determinants closer to the simulated benchmark and improved the registration, decreasing the mean and maximum errors.

In many clinical radiotherapy situations where DIR is employed, operator-validated 272 contours are available. Examples include daily plan adaption where contours are 273 propagated to or re-segmented on the anatomy of the day. All adapt-to-shape plan 274 adaption workflows on the MR-linac have validated contours available. With our 275 proposed algorithm, it becomes possible to accumulate the dose for these workflows. 276 An additional application is some inter-fraction registration problems where tissues are 277 not conserved, and a voxel reclassification is needed for registration [37]. We expect that 278 contour-guidance might prove useful in these cases as well, paying the way for additional 279 instances where the warping of quantitative information can be applied. Finally, deep 280 learning may be used for the automatic segmentation of contours to use for guidance. 281 With our method, these contours can be used for warping the dose and CT, for plan 282 comparison, and for treatment response assessment. Additionally, this can improve 283 contour propagation for contours that are not automatically segmented. This may be 284 useful as automatic segmentation can be slow and including additional structures for 285 deep learning segmentation may require retraining. We are currently implementing the 286 algorithm presented here in our clinical workflow to allow these operations. 287

We introduce a solution for integrating (manually edited) contours in dose warping, 288 matching the deformation vector field with operator-validated contours, and improving 289 the registration performance. The multi-modal algorithm is fast and robust and 290 ensures substantial contour overlap while improving the registration result as well as 291 the warped dose. Importantly, no over-constraining errors are created by the contour-292 guidance. The algorithm can thus be used to warp doses and other quantitative 293 information in accordance with operator-validated contours, providing a solution for 294 adaptive radiotherapy workflows. 295

296 Acknowledgments

²⁹⁷ The collaboration project is co-funded by the PPP Allowance made available by ²⁹⁸ Health~Holland, Top Sector Life Sciences & Health, to stimulate public-private ²⁹⁹ partnerships.

300 References

1. Chetty IJ and Rosu-Bubulac M. Deformable registration for dose accumulation.

302 Seminars in radiation oncology. Vol. 29. 3. Elsevier. 2019 :198–208

- Lowther NJ, Marsh SH, and Louwe RJ. Dose accumulation to assess the validity
 of treatment plans with reduced margins in radiotherapy of head and neck cancer.
 Physics and imaging in radiation oncology 2020; 14:53–60
- 306 3. Murr M, Brock KK, Fusella M, Hardcastle N, Hussein M, Jameson MG, et
 al. Applicability and usage of dose mapping/accumulation in radiotherapy.
 308 Radiotherapy and Oncology 2023; 182:109527
- 4. Hussein M, Akintonde A, McClelland J, Speight R, and Clark CH. Clinical use, challenges, and barriers to implementation of deformable image registration in radiotherapy-the need for guidance and QA tools. The British Journal of Radiology 2021; 94:20210001
- 5. Yuen J, Barber J, Ralston A, Gray A, Walker A, Hardcastle N, et al. An international survey on the clinical use of rigid and deformable image registration in radiotherapy. Journal of Applied Clinical Medical Physics 2020; 21:10–24
- Gu X, Dong B, Wang J, Yordy J, Mell L, Jia X, et al. A contour-guided deformable
 image registration algorithm for adaptive radiotherapy. Physics in Medicine &
 Biology 2013; 58:1889
- Bohoudi O, Lagerwaard FJ, Bruynzeel AM, Niebuhr NI, Johnen W, Senan S, et
 al. End-to-end empirical validation of dose accumulation in MRI-guided adaptive
 radiotherapy for prostate cancer using an anthropomorphic deformable pelvis
 phantom. Radiotherapy and Oncology 2019; 141:200–7
- 8. Alam S, Veeraraghavan H, Tringale K, Amoateng E, Subashi E, Wu AJ, et al.
 Inter-and intrafraction motion assessment and accumulated dose quantification of
 upper gastrointestinal organs during magnetic resonance-guided ablative radiation
 therapy of pancreas patients. Physics and Imaging in Radiation Oncology 2022;
 21:54-61
- 9. Rivest-Hénault D, Greer P, Fripp J, and Dowling J. Structure-guided nonrigid registration of CT-MR pelvis scans with large deformations in MR-based image guided radiation therapy. *Clinical Image-Based Procedures. Translational Research in Medical Imaging: Second International Workshop, CLIP 2013, Held in Conjunction with MICCAI 2013, Nagoya, Japan, September 22, 2013, Revised Selected Papers 2.* Springer. 2014:65-73
- Weistrand O and Svensson S. The ANACONDA algorithm for deformable image
 registration in radiotherapy. Medical physics 2015; 42:40–53
- Wang R, Lei T, Cui R, Zhang B, Meng H, and Nandi AK. Medical image
 segmentation using deep learning: A survey. IET Image Processing 2022; 16:1243–
 67
- 12. Savenije MH, Maspero M, Sikkes GG, Voort van Zyp JR van der, TJ Kotte AN, Bol
 GH, et al. Clinical implementation of MRI-based organs-at-risk auto-segmentation
- ³⁴¹ with convolutional networks for prostate radiotherapy. Radiation oncology 2020;
- 342 15:1–12

REFERENCES

- ³⁴³ 13. Eppenhof KA, Maspero M, Savenije M, Boer J de, Voort van Zyp J van der, Raaymakers BW, et al. Fast contour propagation for MR-guided prostate
 ³⁴⁵ radiotherapy using convolutional neural networks. Medical physics 2020; 47:1238–
 ³⁴⁶ 48
- Denis de Senneville B, Zachiu C, Ries M, and Moonen C. EVolution: an edgebased variational method for non-rigid multi-modal image registration. Physics in Medicine and Biology 2016; 61:7377–96. DOI: 10.1088/0031-9155/61/20/7377.
 Available from: https://doi.org/10.1088%5C%2F0031-9155%5C%2F61%5C% 2F20%5C%2F7377
- Horn BK and Schunck BG. Determining optical flow. *Techniques and Applications of Image Understanding*. Vol. 281. International Society for Optics and Photonics.
 1981 :319-31
- Brox T, Bruhn A, Papenberg N, and Weickert J. High accuracy optical flow
 estimation based on a theory for warping. *European conference on computer vision*.
 Springer. 2004 :25–36
- Polthier K and Preuß E. Variational approach to vector field decomposition. Data
 Visualization 2000. Springer, 2000 :147–55
- ³⁶⁰ 18. Fu T, Fan J, Liu D, Song H, Zhang C, Ai D, et al. Divergence-Free Fitting-Based
 ³⁶¹ Incompressible Deformation Quantification of Liver. IEEE Journal of Biomedical
 ³⁶² and Health Informatics 2020; 25:720–36
- Reich W, Hlawitschka M, and Scheuermann G. Decomposition of vector fields
 beyond problems of first order and their applications. *Topological Methods in Data Analysis and Visualization*. Springer. 2015 :205–19
- ³⁶⁶ 20. Hausdorff F. Grundzüge der mengenlehre. Vol. 7. von Veit, 1914
- Baker S, Scharstein D, Lewis J, Roth S, Black MJ, and Szeliski R. A database and
 evaluation methodology for optical flow. International journal of computer vision
 2011; 92:1–31
- Klein S, Staring M, Murphy K, Viergever MA, and Pluim JP. Elastix: a toolbox for
 intensity-based medical image registration. IEEE transactions on medical imaging
 2009; 29:196–205
- Shamonin DP, Bron EE, Lelieveldt BP, Smits M, Klein S, Staring M, et al.
 Fast parallel image registration on CPU and GPU for diagnostic classification of Alzheimer's disease. Frontiers in neuroinformatics 2014; 7:50
- Posiewnik M and Piotrowski T. A review of cone-beam CT applications for
 adaptive radiotherapy of prostate cancer. Physica Medica 2019; 59:13–21
- Raaymakers B, Lagendijk J, Overweg J, Kok J, Raaijmakers A, Kerkhof E, et al.
 Integrating a 1.5 T MRI scanner with a 6 MV accelerator: proof of concept. Physics
 in Medicine & Biology 2009; 54:N229

- 26. Lagendijk JJ, Raaymakers BW, and Van Vulpen M. The magnetic resonance
 imaging-linac system. Seminars in radiation oncology. Vol. 24. 3. Elsevier. 2014
 :207-9
- ³⁸⁴ 27. Mutic S and Dempsey JF. The ViewRay system: magnetic resonance-guided and
 ³⁸⁵ controlled radiotherapy. *Seminars in radiation oncology*. Vol. 24. 3. Elsevier. 2014
 ³⁸⁶ :196-9
- 28. Castillo E, Castillo R, Martinez J, Shenoy M, and Guerrero T. Four-dimensional
 deformable image registration using trajectory modeling. Physics in Medicine &
 Biology 2009; 55:305
- ³⁹⁰ 29. Castillo R, Castillo E, Guerra R, Johnson VE, McPhail T, Garg AK, et al. A
 ³⁹¹ framework for evaluation of deformable image registration spatial accuracy using
 ³⁹² large landmark point sets. Physics in Medicine & Biology 2009; 54:1849
- ³⁹³ 30. Bosma L, Zachiu C, Ries MG, Senneville BD de, and Raaymakers BW.
 ³⁹⁴ Quantitative investigation of dose accumulation errors from intra-fraction motion
 ³⁹⁵ in MRgRT for prostate cancer. Physics in Medicine & Biology 2021
- 336 31. Maas SA, Ellis BJ, Ateshian GA, and Weiss JA. FEBio: finite elements for
 337 biomechanics. J Biomech Eng 2012; 134:011005
- 398 32. Hering A, Hansen L, Mok TC, Chung AC, Siebert H, Häger S, et al. Learn2Reg:
 comprehensive multi-task medical image registration challenge, dataset and
 evaluation in the era of deep learning. IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging
 2022
- 402 33. Clark K, Vendt B, Smith K, Freymann J, Kirby J, Koppel P, et al. The
 403 Cancer Imaging Archive (TCIA): maintaining and operating a public information
 404 repository. Journal of digital imaging 2013; 26:1045–57
- Akin O, Elnajjar P, Heller M, Jarosz R, Erickson BJ, Kirk S, et al. Radiology
 Data from The Cancer Genome Atlas Kidney Renal Clear Cell Carcinoma [TCGAKIRC] collection. 2016. DOI: 10.7937/K9/TCIA.2016.V6PBVTDR. Available from:
 https://wiki.cancerimagingarchive.net/x/woFY
- Linehan M, Gautam R, Kirk S, Lee Y, Roche C, Bonaccio E, et al. Radiology Data
 from The Cancer Genome Atlas Cervical Kidney renal papillary cell carcinoma
 [KIRP] collection. 2016. DOI: 10.7937/K9/TCIA.2016.ACWOGBEF. Available from:
 https://wiki.cancerimagingarchive.net/x/M4G0
- 413 36. Erickson BJ, Kirk S, Lee Y, Bathe O, Kearns M, Gerdes C, et al. Radiology Data
 414 from The Cancer Genome Atlas Liver Hepatocellular Carcinoma [TCGA-LIHC]
 415 collection. 2016. DOI: 10.7937/K9/TCIA.2016.IMMQW8UQ. Available from: https:
 416 //wiki.cancerimagingarchive.net/x/PBBp
- ⁴¹⁷ 37. Sonke JJ and Belderbos J. Adaptive radiotherapy for lung cancer. *Seminars in* ⁴¹⁸ *radiation oncology.* Vol. 20. Elsevier. 2010 :94–106

REFERENCES

419 5. Figures



Figure 1: An example case for the experiment on large complex deformations of the thorax with CT-to-CT registrations. A coronal slice of the full inhale and full exhale images is shown (TRE before registration 10.9 mm), as well as the exhale image registered to the inhale using Elastix (TRE 2.9 mm), the original EVolution (3.9), our proposed contour-guided algorithm (1.7), and this contour-guided algorithm with the Helmholtz-Hodge decomposition (HHD) on the body excluding the lungs (1.8). The lung contours used for guidance are shown in white and the registered contours are shown in red. In particular, the caudal side of the lungs is better aligned when using contour-guidance.



Figure 2: Box plot of the mean target registration error (TRE) for the large complex deformations of the thorax CT-to-CT when using no registration, Elastix, EVolution without contour-guidance, the proposed algorithm with contour-guidance, and the proposed algorithm with contour-guidance and the Helmholtz-Hodge decomposition (HHD). The 75th percentile and maximum for no registration are at 24 and 30 mm. Contour-guidance on the lungs significantly ($p < 10^{-4}$) decreases the mean error compared to registration without guidance for all cases, on average by a factor of 1.3 and 1.8. The error after performing a Helmholtz-Hodge decomposition (HHD) is very similar.



Figure 3: Box plot of the endpoint error on the prostate and its vicinity of 2 mm for the cross-contrast biomechanical simulation of a prostate MRI. Shown are the results without registration, using Elastix, using EVolution without contour-guidance, our algorithm with contour guidance, and the algorithm with contour-guidance combined with the Helmholtz-Hodge decomposition (HHD). The maximum for no registration is at 35 mm. Using contour-guidance significantly ($p < 10^{-5}$) decreases the error, reducing the mean error by a factor of 2.2, compared to EVolution. Including the HHD decreases the non-outlier maximum error by a factor of 1.1.



Figure 4: Box plot of the dose error on the prostate and its vicinity of 2 mm for the simulated signal dropout experiment. Shown are the results without registration, using Elastix, using EVolution without contour-guidance, our algorithm with contour guidance, and the algorithm with contour-guidance combined with the Helmholtz-Hodge decomposition (HHD). The 75th percentile of the error for no registration is 2.5 Gy. The (outlier) maxima are 33, 11, 5.0, 6.0, and 4.2 Gy, respectively. Using contour-guidance significantly ($p < 10^{-5}$) decreases the error, decreasing the mean with a factor of 1.2. The Helmholtz-Hodge decomposition (HHD) decreases the non-outlier maximum error with a factor of 1.1.