

# Robust Anisotropic Gaussian Fitting for Volumetric Characterization of Pulmonary Nodules in Multislice CT

Kazunori Okada\*, *Member, IEEE*, Dorin Comaniciu, *Senior Member, IEEE*, and Arun Krishnan, *Member, IEEE*

**Abstract**—This paper proposes a robust statistical estimation and verification framework for characterizing the ellipsoidal (anisotropic) geometrical structure of pulmonary nodules in the Multislice X-ray computed tomography (CT) images. Given a marker indicating a rough location of a target, the proposed solution estimates the target's center location, ellipsoidal boundary approximation, volume, maximum/average diameters, and isotropy by robustly and efficiently fitting an anisotropic Gaussian intensity model. We propose a novel multiscale joint segmentation and model fitting solution which extends the robust mean shift-based analysis to the linear scale-space theory. The design is motivated for enhancing the robustness against margin-truncation induced by neighboring structures, data with large deviations from the chosen model, and marker location variability. A chi-square-based statistical verification and analytical volumetric measurement solutions are also proposed to complement this estimation framework. Experiments with synthetic one-dimensional and two-dimensional data clearly demonstrate the advantage of our solution in comparison with the  $\gamma$ -normalized Laplacian approach (Linderberg, 1998) and the standard sample estimation approach (Matei, 2001). A quasi-real-time three-dimensional nodule characterization system is developed using this framework and validated with two clinical data sets of thin-section chest CT images. Our experiments with 1310 nodules resulted in 1) robustness against intraoperator and interoperator variability due to varying marker locations, 2) 81% correct estimation rate, 3) 3% false acceptance and 5% false rejection rates, and 4) correct characterization of clinically significant nonsolid ground-glass opacity nodules. This system processes each 33-voxel volume-of-interest by an average of 2 s with a 2.4-GHz Intel CPU. Our solution is generic and can be applied for the analysis of blob-like structures in various other applications.

**Index Terms**—Anisotropic scale-space, Chi-square verification, covariance estimation, Gaussian model fitting, mean shift, multiscale analysis, multislice X-ray CT image analysis, part- and non-solid nodules, pulmonary nodule characterization and segmentation, robust estimation.

## I. INTRODUCTION

**L**UNG cancer is the most common cause of cancer death in the U.S. for both sexes [3]. This makes the analysis of pulmonary nodules as one of the major issues in the com-

puter-aided diagnosis (CAD) studies. In general, such CAD systems aim to realize 1) cancer therapy monitoring and surgical follow-up examination by quantifying the volumetric change of the pathological lesions between the preoperative and postoperative scans and 2) classification of malignancy/benignity of the detected pulmonary nodules. The advent of these technologies are sought for reducing the mortality rate and improving the quality of the cancer care management.

X-ray computed tomography (CT) is the most sensitive imaging domain for the pulmonary nodule analysis among others [4]. The multislice and helical CT scanners, the recent technological advances, also greatly improved image resolution and scanning time, making the analysis of small nodules (< 10 mm in diameter) feasible. Study of such small nodules is clinically important because the small tumors can still be malignant and early detection of such malignancy can drastically increase the chance of patient survival [5]. The improved image resolution indeed helps radiologists to detect nodules more accurately [6], however, it also costs them more burden increasing the amount of data they need to interpret. Thus, automation of the analysis with computer-assisted systems is much needed for reducing this burden and also improving the diagnostic accuracy especially for the small nodules.

The main goal of our investigation is to solve the problem of how to best represent the nodules numerically for various analysis tasks. We refer to this problem by *nodule characterization problem*. In past decades, the technical advances in the field of computer-assisted analysis of pulmonary nodules [7], [8] have facilitated the emergence of a number of research subdomains, such as automatic nodule detection [9]–[12], nodule segmentation [13], [14], volume quantification [15], [16], and malignancy classification [17], [18]. The above fundamental problem cannot be avoided for realizing a solution for any of the above topics. And the solution to this problem should serve as one of the important building blocks for developing the general CAD solutions.

Within this context, this paper focuses on geometrical and volumetric characterization of pulmonary nodules. We propose a comprehensive and generic computational framework based on robust multiscale Gaussian intensity model fitting. Exploiting the model's analytical advantages, our solution provides nodule characterizations in terms of 1) nodule center, 2) ellipsoidal boundary [three-dimensional (3-D) segmentation approximation], 3) nodule volume, 4) maximum diameter, 5) average diameter, and 6) isotropy. Throughout this study, it is assumed that an observer provides a marker indicating rough location of a target lesion. This allows us to focus on

Manuscript received September 23, 2004; revised December 13, 2004. The Associate Editor responsible for coordinating the review of this paper and recommending its publication was B. van Ginneken. *Asterisk indicates corresponding author.*

\*K. Okada is with the Real-Time Vision and Modeling Department, Siemens Corporate Research, 755 College Road East, Princeton, NJ 08540 USA (e-mail: Kazunori.okada@siemens.com).

D. Comaniciu is with the Integrated Data Systems Department, Siemens Corporate Research, Princeton, NJ 08540 USA.

A. Krishnan is with the Computer Aided Diagnosis Group, Siemens Medical Solutions, Malvern, PA 19355 USA.

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TMI.2004.843172




Fig. 1. An illustration of pulmonary nodule examples with typical data noises captured in 3-D CT images. From left to right; (a) nodule attached to pleural surface in 2-D dissection; (b) 1-D horizontal profile of (a) through the nodule center; (c) nonsolid vascularized nodule; and (d) 1-D vertical profile of (c). The voxel-intensities in (b,d) indicate the Hounsfield unit with an offset 1024. “+” denotes markers used as initialization points provided by expert radiologists. The estimated nodule center and anisotropic spread are shown by “x” and 35% confidence ellipses, respectively.

the semi-automatic characterization rather than the automatic detection problem. The extension of the proposed framework to the automatic nodule detection problem is out of this paper’s scope but will be briefly discussed in Section VII.

#### A. Previous Work on Nodule Analysis

Automatic nodule detection is by far the most studied topic within the field of computer-assisted nodule analysis [9]–[12], [19]. In these studies, the nodules were often characterized as spherical shapes of various size [10], [11]. However, this spherical assumption is not adequate for describing general geometry of the lesions. This is because their shape can be irregular and nonspherical due to the spiculation or the attachments to the pleural surface (i.e., juxtapleural and peripheral) and to the vessels (i.e., vascularized) [14].

For characterizing nodules in 3-D CT data, the *tumor size or volume* is most intuitive and the well-established method [4], [7]. Such underlining scales of lesions provide important clinical information, enabling to measure the *tumor growth* that correlates highly with probability of malignancy. The recent approaches for the tumor size estimation can be roughly categorized into segmentation- and model-based methods. The segmentation-based methods are based on delineation of the voxels belonging to the nodules by using voxel intensity thresholding. For instance, in their study for quantifying growth-rate of nodules, Kostis *et al.* [14] characterized different types of nodules by segmenting them based on the intensity thresholding followed by the morphological operations. On the other hand, the model-based methods describes nodules by fitting geometrical or intensity models to the data. For the pulmonary nodules, the model describing voxel intensity distribution in the 3-D data space is preferred to the one representing geometry of 3-D tumor boundary (e.g., deformable contour model [20]), because the intensity distribution conveys more information than the tumor boundary which may be ill-defined for a certain type of nodules [21]. The most common approach for the model-based methods is the template matching of isotropic Gaussian intensity templates [10], [11]. For instance, Lee *et al.* [10] developed a system for automatic nodule detection by using four different sizes of spherical nodule templates in their genetic algorithm-based template matching technique.

For volume quantification, the segmentation-based approaches have often been employed due to their capability to

handle irregular geometry. In practice, however, it is difficult to achieve high volume estimation accuracy due to the intrinsic uncertainty of the voxel values caused by different scanner settings as well as the nonsolid opacities of the tumor boundary. On the other hand, the model-based approaches may be more rigid but they can also incorporate a variety of statistical methods for improving the estimation accuracy (e.g., Markov random field [11], nonparametric density analysis [12]).

#### B. Our Approach

Robustness is one of the key issues addressed in this paper. We seek a nodule characterization solution that is robust against the characteristics of the real CT data with noise which is intrinsic to the measurement process and also the pathology and anatomy of our interest. For example, a recent clinical study suggested that the part- and nonsolid or ground-glass opacity nodules, whose intensity distribution is largely irregular, are more likely to be malignant than solid ones [21]. Despite this clinical demand, to our best knowledge, no comprehensive solutions for detecting, segmenting, and/or characterizing these difficult cases have been proposed. Fig. 1 illustrates examples of such difficult cases. The figure shows two-dimensional (2-D) dissections and one-dimensional (1-D) profiles of the two lesions for the juxtapleural [14] and nonsolid nodules. In developing an algorithm to describe them, our solution must be robust against:

- 1) influences from surrounding structures such as the pleural surface and vessels [i.e., margin-truncation: Fig. 1(a) and (b)];
- 2) deviation of the signal from a Gaussian intensity model of our choice [i.e., non-Gaussianity: Fig. 1(c) and (d)];
- 3) uncertainty in the marker location + given by system users [i.e., initialization: Fig. 1(a) and (c)].

In another words, we seek a method that estimates the nodule boundary (shown by the solid-line ellipses around the center  $x$  in the figure) and its volumetric measurements even with the presence of these problems.

The proposed framework consists of three successive stages: 1) model estimation; 2) model verification; and 3) volumetric measurements. As our solution to the model estimation problem, this paper presents a novel statistical framework for robust multiscale joint segmentation and model fitting. Addressing the issues discussed in the previous section, our solution utilizes the model-based approach. The anisotropic

(nonspherical) Gaussian function is chosen as our intensity model. Such anisotropic Gaussian captures the 3-D nodule center by its mean location and the 3-D anisotropic spread (i.e., shape and orientation of an ellipsoid) by its fully parameterized covariance matrix, making our model more flexible than the spherical one.

Our multiscale analysis is driven by Gaussian scale-space [22], [23] over a set of discrete analysis scales given *a priori*. For each scale, we estimate the Gaussian mean and covariance that fits best to the corresponding scale-space image, resulting in a set of the mean and covariance estimates. In order to choose the best fit among this set, a stability test is performed by evaluating Jensen-Shannon divergence over the analysis scales. The estimate with the minimum divergence corresponds to the most stable estimate and serves as the best fit.

At a specific scale, the mean and covariance are estimated by using a novel mean shift-based analysis. This paper presents a formal extension of the mean shift analysis to the Gaussian scale-space by unifying the robust statistical methods for density gradient estimation [24] and continuous linear scale-space theory [1], [22], [23]. By likening the arbitrary positive function describing an image signal to the probability density function, the density mean shift-based analysis is extended toward the Gaussian model fitting in the continuous function domain. The resulting scale-space mean shift defines a convergent gradient-ascent in the Gaussian scale-space image, as well as the basin of attraction of a target tumor. Using this scale-space mean shift, the mean is estimated by the convergence of majority of initial points sampled around the marker location. The covariance is estimated by solving a set of linear equations constructed with mean shift vectors convergent to the estimated mean. We present a closed-form analytical solution to this least-squares problem with the symmetric positive definite constraint. The joint segmentation and model fitting is achieved for the mean and covariance estimations by using only convergent mean shift vectors, ignoring the nonconvergent mean shifts as outliers and exploiting inlier statistics only from the basin of attraction of the target tumor.

The robustness of this framework is facilitated by a number of factors. The stability criterion used for scale (bandwidth) selection facilitates the robustness against the non-Gaussianity because it does not depend on specific error measures of ill-fitting. This should enable our solution to handle part- and nonsolid nodule cases with high non-Gaussianity. The joint segmentation and model fitting approach facilitates the robustness against the margin-truncation because information from the nontarget neighboring structures can be ignored by treating them as outliers. This should help to fit the model correctly with the cases surrounded by vessels or pleural surfaces. The scale-space mean shift-based covariance estimation also mitigates the initialization variation because a set of inliers used for the least-squares do not depend on specific initializations, leading to low intraoperator and interoperator variability with varying marker locations.

For the model verification problem, a statistical verification method based on chi-square analysis is also proposed to complement the robust estimation framework. One of the advantages of our statistical approach is the availability of such goodness-of-fit

measures that provide information of how well the resulting statistical estimates and the specific model function fit to the data. In practice, such measures are of extreme importance, enabling to reject accidental ill-estimates.

Once the model estimation and verification stages are performed, the approximation of the 3-D nodule boundary segmentation is provided as the confidence ellipsoid of the fitted Gaussian with a specific limit of probability mass, forming a 3-D equal-probability contour. Such an ellipsoid can be used an intuitive visualization of the 3-D nodule shapes. Consequently, the volumetric measurements of the target nodule are derived from the volumetry of the confidence ellipsoid. We propose closed-form analytical solutions for measuring the volume, maximum and average diameter, and isotropy in a physical unit as a function of eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the estimated covariance matrix. The proposed solutions inherit the robustness of the Gaussian fitting process, facilitating low intraoperator and interoperator variability. On the other hand, we have recently developed a nonparametric 3-D tumor segmentation solution which employs the Gaussian model fitted by the proposed method as a prior [25]. Such a solution enables more accurate volume measurement than the proposed ellipsoidal approach, however, the analytical nature of the presented solution provides the type of measurement, such as average diameter and isotropy, that are difficult to obtain by using the conventional segmentation or manual methods.

### C. Related Work

There are a number of techniques in the literature that are related to our proposed method. In general, Gaussian model fitting is a well-studied standard technique [26, ch.2]. It is, however, not trivial to fit such a model to data with outliers and margin-truncation induced by neighboring structures. For example, minimum volume ellipsoid covariance estimator [27] addresses the robustness to the outliers, however, its effectiveness is limited regarding the truncation issue.

Bahalerao and Wilson [28] proposed an intensity model fitting method applied for visualizing 3-D vascular structures in MR images. They utilized anisotropic model similar to ours, however, their method does not exploit the robust statistics and involves an expensive EM algorithm-based iterative solution for the model fitting. Our proposed method exploits a closed form algebraic solution, making it more efficient.

Despite the seminal work by Perona and Malik [29], the extension of the Gaussian scale-scale theory to the anisotropic analysis kernel has not been thoroughly studied for its application toward nonedge feature extraction. Manmatha and Srimal [30] developed a hand writing segmentation system utilizing an anisotropic scale-space-based blob detection technique. However, they considered anisotropy only up to a diagonal covariance matrix. The extension to the full anisotropy along arbitrary axis is provided by our solution. Robust anisotropic diffusion proposed by Black *et al.* [31] addresses the exploitation of the robust statistics within the anisotropic diffusion paradigm. Although we share the same motivation toward the robust estimation, the resulting method is not directly related to ours and not applicable to our problem. Finally, to our knowledge, there are no pulmonary tumor analysis systems reported in the literature,

which employ the robust estimation methods for describing the ellipsoidal tumor structure and for deriving volumetric measurements from the fitted ellipsoid.

#### D. Organization

This paper is organized as follows. The proposed methods are described in Sections II–IV. Sections II–IV formally describe the proposed model fitting, model verification, and volumetric measurement methods, respectively. An overview of the proposed algorithm is given in Section V. Section VI provides the results of our experiments. The robustness of the proposed methods is empirically studied with synthetic data and the results are described in Section VI-A. The nodule analysis system based on the proposed framework is evaluated in Section VI-B. This paper is concluded by discussing our findings and future work in Section VII.

## II. ROBUST MULTI-SCALE GAUSSIAN MODEL FITTING

This section presents the robust parameter estimation for the multiscale Gaussian-based model fitting as a solution for characterizing 3-D nodule boundary. In the following, the terms *mean* and *covariance* are used interchangeably with *spatial local maximum* and *spread*, respectively.

#### A. Gaussian-Based Intensity Model

The pulmonary nodule in a chest CT image typically appears as a local concentration of high CT values surrounded by very low CT values of lung parenchyma as background. One of the most common model functions for describing the characteristics of such bounded signals is the Gaussian function.

We treat the volumetric CT image as the discretization of a  $d(=3)$ -dimensional continuous nonnegative signal  $f(\mathbf{x})$  over a 3-D regular lattice. The nonpositiveness is assured by using the offset with 1024 to the CT values in Hounsfield unit. The symbol  $\mathbf{u}$  is used for describing the location of a spatial local maximum of  $f$  (or a mode in the sense of density estimation). Suppose that the local region of  $f$  around  $\mathbf{u}$  can be approximated by a product of a  $d$ -variate Gaussian function and a positive multiplicative parameter

$$f(\mathbf{x}) \simeq \alpha \times [\Phi(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}, \Sigma)]_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \quad (1)$$

$$\Phi(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}, \Sigma) = (2\pi)^{-d/2} |\Sigma|^{-1/2} \times \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{u})^t \Sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{u})\right) \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathcal{S}$  is a set of data points in the neighborhood of  $\mathbf{u}$ , belonging to the basin of attraction of  $\mathbf{u}$ . An alternative is to consider a model with a DC component  $\beta \geq 0$  so that  $f \simeq \alpha \times \Phi + \beta$ . It is, however, straightforward to locally offset the DC component. Thus, we will not consider it within our estimation framework favoring a simpler form. Later, we will revisit this extended model for the statistical verification of the resulting estimates. The problem of our interest can now be understood as the parametric model fitting and the estimation of the model parameters: mean  $\mathbf{u}$ , covariance  $\Sigma$ , and amplitude  $\alpha$ . The *mean* and *covariance* of  $\Phi$  describe the *spatial local maximum* and *spread* of the local structure, respectively. The anisotropy of such structure can be specified only by a fully parameterized covariance.

#### B. Anisotropic Scale-Space Representation

The scale-space theory [1], [22], [23] states that, given any  $d$ -dimensional continuous signal  $f: \mathcal{R}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ , the scale-space representation  $F: \mathcal{R}^d \times \mathcal{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$  of  $f$  is defined to be the solution of the diffusion equation,  $\partial_h F = 1/2 \nabla^2 F$ , or equivalently the convolution of the signal with Gaussian kernels  $\Phi(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{H})$  of various bandwidths (or scales)  $\mathbf{H} \in \mathcal{R}^{d \times d}$

$$F(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{H}) = f(\mathbf{x}) * \Phi(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{H}). \quad (3)$$

When  $\mathbf{H} = h\mathbf{I}$  ( $h > 0$ ),  $F$  represents the solution of the isotropic diffusion process [1] and also the Tikhonov regularized solution of a functional minimization problem, assuming that scale invariance and semi-group constraints are satisfied [32]. When  $\mathbf{H}$  is allowed to be a fully parameterized symmetric positive definite matrix,  $F$  represents *anisotropic scale-space*<sup>1</sup> that is the solution to a partial differential equation:  $\partial_{\mathbf{H}} F = 1/2 \nabla \nabla^t F$ .

#### C. Mean Shift Procedure for Continuous Scale-Space Signal

In this section, we extend the fixed-bandwidth mean shift [33], introduced previously for the nonparametric point density estimation, toward the analysis of continuous signal evaluated in the linear scale-space.

The gradient of the scale-space representation  $F(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{H})$  can be written as convolution of  $f$  with the Gaussian derivative kernel  $\nabla \Phi$ , since the gradient operator commutes across the convolution operation. Some algebra reveals that  $\nabla F$  can be expressed as a function of a vector whose form resembles the density mean shift

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla F(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{H}) &= f(\mathbf{x}) * \nabla \Phi(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{H}) \\ &= \int f(\mathbf{x}') \Phi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'; \mathbf{H}) \mathbf{H}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}' \\ &= \mathbf{H}^{-1} \int \mathbf{x}' \Phi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'; \mathbf{H}) f(\mathbf{x}') d\mathbf{x}' \\ &\quad - \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{x} \int \Phi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'; \mathbf{H}) f(\mathbf{x}') d\mathbf{x}' \\ &= \mathbf{H}^{-1} F(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{H}) \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{H}) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

$$\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{H}) \equiv \frac{\int \mathbf{x}' \Phi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'; \mathbf{H}) f(\mathbf{x}') d\mathbf{x}'}{\int \Phi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'; \mathbf{H}) f(\mathbf{x}') d\mathbf{x}'} - \mathbf{x}. \quad (5)$$

Equation (5) defines the extended fixed-bandwidth mean shift vector for  $f$ . Setting  $f(\mathbf{x}') = 1$  in (5) results in the same form as the density mean shift vector. Note, however, that  $\mathbf{x}$  in (5) is an ordinal variable while a random variable was considered in [33]. Equation (5) can be seen as introducing a weight variable  $w \equiv f(\mathbf{x}')$  to the kernel  $K(\mathbf{x}') \equiv \Phi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')$ . Therefore, an arithmetic mean of  $\mathbf{x}'$  in our formulation of mean shift is not weighted by the Gaussian kernel but by its product with the signal  $K'(\mathbf{x}') \equiv \Phi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}') f(\mathbf{x}')$ .

The mean shift procedure [24] is defined as iterative updates of a data point  $\mathbf{x}_i$  until its convergence at  $\mathbf{y}_i^m$

$$\mathbf{y}_{j+1} = \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{y}_j; \mathbf{H}) + \mathbf{y}_j; \mathbf{y}_0 = \mathbf{x}_i. \quad (6)$$

<sup>1</sup>This is different from the well-known anisotropic diffusion [29] that is with the inhomogeneous, thus spatially dependent, bandwidth  $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x})$ .

Such iteration gives a robust and efficient algorithm of gradient-ascent, since  $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{H})$  can be interpreted as a normalized gradient by rewriting (4);  $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{H}) = \mathbf{H}\nabla F(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{H})/F(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{H})$ .  $F$  is strictly nonnegative valued since  $f$  is assumed to be non-negative. Therefore, the direction of the mean shift vector aligns with the exact gradient direction when  $\mathbf{H}$  is isotropic with a positive scale.

#### D. Robust Spatial Local Maxima Estimation

We assume that the data is given with information of where the target structure is roughly located but we do not have explicit knowledge of its spread. The marker point  $\mathbf{x}_p$  indicates such location information. We allow  $\mathbf{x}_p$  to be placed anywhere within the basin of attraction  $\mathcal{S}$  of the target structure. To increase the robustness of this approach, we run  $N_1$  mean shift procedures initialized by sampling the neighborhood of  $\mathbf{x}_p$  uniformly. The majority of the procedure's convergence at the same location indicates the location of the maximum. The point proximity is defined by using the Mahalanobis distance with  $\mathbf{H}$ . This approach is efficient because it does not require the time-consuming explicit construction of  $F(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{H})$  from  $f(\mathbf{x})$ .

#### E. Robust Anisotropic Covariance Estimation by Constrained Least-Squares in the Basin of Attraction

In the sequel we estimate the fully parameterized covariance matrix  $\Sigma$  in (1), characterizing the  $d$ -dimensional anisotropic spread and orientation of the signal  $f$  around the local maximum  $\mathbf{u}$ . Classical scale-space approaches relying on the  $\gamma$ -normalized Laplacian [1] are limited to the isotropic case, thus, not applicable to this problem. Another approach is the standard sample estimation of  $\Sigma$  by treating  $f$  as a density function [2, p. 179]. However, this approach becomes suboptimal in the presence of the margin-truncations. Addressing this issue, we present a constrained least-squares framework for the estimation of the anisotropic fully parameterized covariance of interest based on the mean shift vectors collected within the basin of attraction of  $\mathbf{u}$ .

With the signal model of (1), the definition of the mean shift vector of (5) can be rewritten as a function of  $\Sigma$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{y}_j; \mathbf{H}) &= \mathbf{H} \frac{\nabla F(\mathbf{y}_j; \mathbf{H})}{F(\mathbf{y}_j; \mathbf{H})} \\ &\simeq \mathbf{H} \frac{\alpha \Phi(\mathbf{y}_j; \mathbf{u}, \Sigma + \mathbf{H})(\Sigma + \mathbf{H})^{-1}(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{y}_j)}{\alpha \Phi(\mathbf{y}_j; \mathbf{u}, \Sigma + \mathbf{H})} \\ &= \mathbf{H}(\Sigma + \mathbf{H})^{-1}(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{y}_j). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Further rewriting (7) results in a linear matrix equation of unknown  $\Sigma$

$$\Sigma \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{m}_j = \mathbf{b}_j \quad (8)$$

where  $\mathbf{m}_j \equiv \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{y}_j; \mathbf{H})$  and  $\mathbf{b}_j \equiv \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{y}_j - \mathbf{m}_j$ .

An over-complete set of the linear equations can be formed by using all the trajectory points  $\{\mathbf{y}_j | j = 1, \dots, t_u\}$  located within the basin of attraction  $\mathcal{S}$ . For efficiently collecting a sufficient number of samples  $\{(\mathbf{y}_j, \mathbf{m}_j)\}$ , we run  $N_2$  mean shift

procedures initialized by sampling the neighborhood of  $\mathbf{u}$  uniformly. This results in  $t_u$  samples ( $t_u = \sum_{i=1}^{N_2} t_i$ ), where  $t_i$  denotes the number of points on the convergent trajectory starting from  $\mathbf{x}_i$ . The system described in (8) is solved by considering the following constrained least-squares problem [34], [35]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}\Sigma &= \mathbf{B} \\ \Sigma &\in \mathcal{SPD} \\ \mathbf{A} &= (\mathbf{m}_1, \dots, \mathbf{m}_{t_u})^t \mathbf{H}^{-t} \\ \mathbf{B} &= (\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_{t_u})^t \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where  $\mathcal{SPD}$  denotes a set of symmetric positive definite matrices in  $\mathcal{R}^{d \times d}$ .

Following [36], the unique solution  $\Sigma^{**}$  of (9) is expressed by

$$\Sigma^{**} = \mathbf{U}_P \Sigma_P^{-1} \mathbf{U}_{\tilde{Q}} \tilde{\Sigma}_{\tilde{Q}} \mathbf{U}_{\tilde{Q}}^t \Sigma_P^{-1} \mathbf{U}_P^t \quad (10)$$

which involves symmetric Schur decompositions [35, p. 393] of the matrices  $\mathbf{P} \equiv \mathbf{A}^t \mathbf{A}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}} \equiv \Sigma_P \mathbf{U}_P^t \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{U}_P \Sigma_P$  given  $\mathbf{Q} \equiv \mathbf{B}^t \mathbf{B}$ , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} &= \mathbf{U}_P \Sigma_P^2 \mathbf{U}_P^t \\ \tilde{\mathbf{Q}} &= \mathbf{U}_{\tilde{Q}} \tilde{\Sigma}_{\tilde{Q}}^2 \mathbf{U}_{\tilde{Q}}^t. \end{aligned}$$

The solution  $\Sigma^{**}$  is derived from finding  $\mathbf{Y}^{**}$  in the Cholesky factorization of  $\Sigma = \mathbf{Y}\mathbf{Y}^t$ . It can be shown that  $\Sigma^{**}$  uniquely minimizes an area criterion  $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{Y}^{-t}\|_F^2$  where  $\|\cdot\|_F$  denotes the Frobenius norm. This area criterion is related to the total least-squares [37] since errors in both  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  are considered for the minimization.

#### F. Scale Selection Criterion

The multiscale analysis treats  $\mathbf{H}$  as a variable parameter. It is supposed that a set of analysis bandwidths  $\{\mathbf{H}_k | k = 1, \dots, K\}$  is given *a priori*. Our scale selection criterion is based on the stability test [33]. Given a set of estimates  $\{(\mathbf{u}_k, \Sigma_k)\}$  for a series of the successive analysis bandwidths, a form of the Jensen-Shannon divergence is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} JS(k) &= \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{\left| \frac{1}{2a+1} \sum_{i=k-a}^{k+a} \Sigma_i \right|}{\sqrt{\prod_{i=k-a}^{k+a} |\Sigma_i|}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=k-a}^{k+a} (\mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{u})^t \left( \sum_{i=k-a}^{k+a} \Sigma_i \right)^{-1} (\mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{u}) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where  $\mathbf{u} = (1/(2a+1)) \sum_{i=k-a}^{k+a} \mathbf{u}_i$  and  $a$  define the neighborhood width of the divergence computation. The most stable estimate across the analysis bandwidths provides a local minimum of the divergence profile. We treat this result as the final estimation of our multiscale analysis  $(\mathbf{u}^*, \Sigma^*)$ .

### III. STATISTICAL VERIFICATION

In this section, we present a goodness-of-fit measure for validating the resulting estimates. Such statistical verification gives

a principled means for rejecting accidental ill-estimates. We treat this problem as analysis of chi-square fitting residual errors. We employ a linear model with an additive parameter of the DC component;  $f \simeq \alpha \times \Phi + \beta$ . Recall that our estimation model in (1) is without the DC. The additional degree of freedom introduced serves as another goodness-of-fit indicator. Given the estimate pair  $(\mathbf{u}^*, \Sigma^*)$ , the following defines the signal response estimate  $\hat{f}$  with two unknowns

$$\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}^*, \Sigma^*; \alpha, \beta) = \alpha \times [\Phi(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}^*, \Sigma^*)]_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} + \beta \quad (12)$$

where  $\mathcal{S}$  is a set of data points in the neighborhood of  $\mathbf{u}$ , belonging to the basin of attraction of  $\mathbf{u}$ , as introduced in (1). The chi-square statistic indicates the residual error of the fitted model  $\hat{f}(\mathbf{x})$  [38, p. 660]

$$\begin{aligned} \chi^2 &\equiv \sum_{\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{S}'} \left( \frac{f(\mathbf{x}_i) - \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_i)}{\sigma_i} \right)^2 \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{S}'} \left( \frac{f(\mathbf{x}_i) - \alpha \Phi(\mathbf{x}_i) - \beta}{\sigma_i} \right)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where  $\sigma_i$  is local uncertainty of normally distributed error  $(f(\mathbf{x}_i) - \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_i))^2$  and  $\mathcal{S}'$  denotes an appropriate support of the data space, within which the verification process performs sampling. Note that this verification support  $\mathcal{S}'$  may be different from the model support  $\mathcal{S}$ , which will be discussed in Section VI-B [p. 19].

Parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are estimated by chi-square fitting. Since both are nonnegative, we introduce parameters  $a$  and  $b$  such that  $\alpha = a^2$  and  $\beta = b^2$ . The estimates  $\alpha^*$  and  $\beta^*$  are given by solving  $\partial \chi^2 / \partial a = 0$  and  $\partial \chi^2 / \partial b = 0$

$$(\alpha^*, \beta^*) = \begin{cases} (p, q), & \text{if } p > 0 \text{ and } q > 0 \\ \left( \frac{\sum f(\mathbf{x}_i) \Phi(\mathbf{x}_i)}{\sum \Phi(\mathbf{x}_i)^2}, 0 \right), & \text{if } p > 0 \text{ and } q \leq 0 \\ \left( 0, \frac{\sum f(\mathbf{x}_i)}{N_s} \right), & \text{if } p \leq 0 \text{ and } q > 0 \\ (0, 0), & \text{if } p \leq 0 \text{ and } q \leq 0 \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

where  $\sigma = \sigma_i$  for all  $i$

$$p = \frac{N_s \sum f(\mathbf{x}_i) \Phi(\mathbf{x}_i) - \sum f(\mathbf{x}_i) \sum \Phi(\mathbf{x}_i)}{N_s \sum \Phi(\mathbf{x}_i)^2 - (\sum \Phi(\mathbf{x}_i))^2} \quad (15)$$

$$q = \frac{\sum f(\mathbf{x}_i) \sum \Phi(\mathbf{x}_i)^2 - \sum \Phi(\mathbf{x}_i) \sum f(\mathbf{x}_i) \Phi(\mathbf{x}_i)}{N_s \sum \Phi(\mathbf{x}_i)^2 - (\sum \Phi(\mathbf{x}_i))^2} \quad (16)$$

and  $N_s$  is the number of samples in  $\mathcal{S}'$  and all the summations are over  $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{S}'$ .

Given the above parameter estimates,  $\chi^2$  is computed by using (13). Chi-square probability function  $Q$  [38, p. 221] is employed to indicate an ill-fit of our model to the given signal

$$Q(\chi^2 | \nu) = Q\left(\frac{N_s - M}{2}, \frac{\chi^2}{2}\right) = g\left(\frac{N_s - M}{2}, \frac{\chi^2}{2}\right). \quad (17)$$

In (17),  $g$  is the incomplete gamma function [38, ch.6.2] with the number of degrees of freedom  $\nu = (N - M)/2$ , and  $M$  is the number of parameters.

Finally, we obtain the following rejection criterion

$$\text{Reject } (\mathbf{u}^*, \Sigma^*), \text{ if } Q < th_1 \quad \text{or } \beta^* > th_2. \quad (18)$$

The threshold for  $Q$  is set conservatively to the common confidence level  $th_1 = 0.001$  [38, p. 664]. Having a large estimate for  $\beta$  also indicates an ill-fit with our estimation model without the DC. The threshold  $th_2$  for  $\beta$  can be learned from training samples for specific applications.

#### IV. VOLUMETRIC MEASUREMENTS

This section presents our solutions for deriving volumetric measurements of the target tumor from the Gaussian model fitted to the data. First, tumor boundary segmentation is approximated by a 3-D ellipsoid defined from the fitted model. We propose solutions for analytically deriving target tumor's 1) volume, 2) maximum diameter, 3) average diameter; and 4) isotropy, directly from the ellipsoidal segmentation result. An extension of these solutions toward arbitrary voxel dimensions will also be provided.

The multiscale Gaussian-based model fitting, described in Section II, results in the mean and covariance estimates  $(\mathbf{u}^*, \Sigma^*)$  of a Gaussian function that fits the given data best. Treating the fitted model as a normal probability distribution  $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}^*, \Sigma^*)$ , the tumor boundary segmentation can be approximated by a confidence ellipsoid forming a 3-D equal-probability contour. Such a confidence ellipsoid is defined by the following generic quadratic equation

$$(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{u}^*)^t \Sigma^{*-1} (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{u}^*) = \sigma^2 \quad (19)$$

where  $\sigma^2$  is a squared Mahalanobis distance, defining the confidence limit. A specific value of the confidence limit  $\sigma^2$  has to be chosen so that the equal-probability contour coincides well with the tumor boundary. Throughout this paper, we use an empirically determined value  $\sigma^2 = 1.6416$ , corresponding to the 35% confidence limit. Figs. 3 and 4 illustrate the segmentation results with this confidence limit.

Given  $\sigma^2$ , the volumetry of an ellipsoid can be determined as a function of three radii along its major and two minor orthogonal axes. The radii are denoted by  $r_i > 0$  ( $r_1 \geq r_2 \geq r_3$ ). The following derives  $r_i$  from the eigen decomposition of the covariance  $\Sigma^*$ . Such eigen decomposition can be expressed in a matrix equation:  $\Sigma^* \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{V} \Lambda$ .  $\mathbf{V}$  is a column matrix of the eigenvectors  $\mathbf{v}_i$  and  $\Lambda$  is a diagonal matrix of the corresponding eigenvalues  $\lambda_i^2$  ( $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \lambda_3$ ). Right-multiply the matrix equation with  $\mathbf{V}^t$  yields the symmetric Schur decomposition of  $\Sigma^*$ :  $\Sigma^* = \mathbf{V} \Lambda \mathbf{V}^t$ . Since  $\Sigma^{*-1} = \mathbf{V} \Lambda^{-1} \mathbf{V}^t$ , with a coordinate transform  $\mathbf{y} \equiv \mathbf{V}^t (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{u}^*)$ , (19) can be simplified to:  $\mathbf{y}^t \Lambda^{-1} \mathbf{y} = \sigma^2$ . Substituting three points,  $\mathbf{y} = (r_1, 0, 0)^t, (0, r_2, 0)^t, (0, 0, r_3)^t$ , which are known to lie on the ellipsoid surface, to the quadratic equation results in

$$r_i = \sigma \lambda_i. \quad (20)$$

As a result, the following volumetric measurement formulae can immediately be derived for the volume  $V = (4/3)\pi\sigma^3 \prod_i \lambda_i$ , the maximum diameter  $L = 2\sigma\lambda_1$ , the average diameter  $A = (2/3)\sigma \sum_i \lambda_i$ , and the isotropy  $R = ((\lambda_2 + \lambda_3)/2\lambda_1)$ , where  $V$ ,




Fig. 2. Comparison of our method (solid-line) with  $\gamma$ -normalized Laplacian (dashed-line) and standard sample estimate (dot-dashed-line) using 1-D synthetic data. The ground-truth  $u = D/2$  and  $\Sigma = \sigma = 1$  are denoted by dotted-line. Test data is generated by superimposing two Gaussians with a varying distance  $D$  for evaluating robustness of estimates against biases caused by neighboring structures. (a) Local maxima estimates, (b) scale estimates, (c) our method's break-point  $D = 0.8$ , below which estimations are subjected to the bias. (d)  $\gamma$ -normalized Laplacian's break-point  $D = 6.2$ .




Fig. 3. Examples with 2-D synthetic data. (a), (b) Ground-truth and our method's estimate for an anisotropic Gaussian  $\Sigma = [2 \ -2; \ -2 \ 5]$  with random additive noise. (c), (d) Those for two Gaussians with the noise. The center of the smaller Gaussian is deviated by 2 Mahalanobis distance away from the target Gaussian. "+" and dashed-ellipses indicate ground-truth local maximum and spread. "x" and solid-ellipses display those estimated by our 2-D algorithm.

$L$ , and  $A$  are in the voxel unit and the isotropy  $R$  ranges in  $[0, 1]$ , taking the value 1 when it becomes a sphere. The bias of these

volumetric measurements are caused solely by the segmentation error. Therefore, these formulae are exact, thus, free from




Fig. 4. Examples of the estimation results with 3-D HRCT data. The marker locations are indicated by “+”. The estimated local maxima are indicated by “x”. The estimated spread of the nodules are shown as 2-D intersections of 35% confidence ellipsoids. Cases (a) and (b) are nonsolid (GGO) nodules identified by experts. Cases (c)–(f) are vascularized nodules with irregular nonspherical shapes. Cases (g) and (h) illustrate nodules attached to pleural surface.

the partial volume effect when the tumor boundary is well-characterized by the ellipsoidal segmentation.

Given a voxel dimension in a physical unit, the volumetric measurement formulae above can be revised to produce the



measurements in the unit. This is a crucial step for any comparative and differential studies because the voxel dimension can vary across different scans. Suppose that a voxel dimension is given as  $(\Delta x, \Delta y, \Delta z)$  in millimeter or any other unit. After a coordinate transform, eigenvalues in the unit of millimeter,  $\lambda'_i$ , can be expressed as a function of the voxel dimensions and eigenvectors

$$\lambda'_i = \beta_i \lambda_i \quad (21)$$

$$\beta_i = \sqrt{(v_{xi}\Delta x)^2 + (v_{yi}\Delta y)^2 + (v_{zi}\Delta z)^2} \quad (22)$$

where the eigenvector is denoted by  $\mathbf{v}_i = (v_{xi}, v_{yi}, v_{zi})^t$ . This leads us to the following formulae which takes the voxel dimension into account

$$V' = \frac{4}{3}\pi\sigma^3 \prod_i \beta_i \lambda_i \quad (23)$$

$$L' = 2\sigma\lambda'_1 = 2\sigma \max_i \beta_i \lambda_i \quad (24)$$

$$A' = \frac{2}{3}\sigma \sum_i \beta_i \lambda_i \quad (25)$$

$$R' = \frac{\lambda'_2 + \lambda'_3}{2\lambda'_1} \quad (26)$$

where  $\lambda'_1 \geq \lambda'_2 \geq \lambda'_3$ . Note that  $\lambda'_i$  must be re-sorted from the original order given by the eigen decomposition because the coordinate transform may change such an order.

## V. ALGORITHM OVERVIEW

The proposed algorithm consists of three stages: 1) the anisotropic structure estimation; 2) the verification of the estimates; and 3) volumetric measurements. The first stage assumes that a marker indicating the rough location of the target nodule is given *a priori*. Such information can be provided by a user of a GUI-based system (see Section VI-C for example). The estimation algorithm is as follows.

**Problem** Given the 3-D input data  $f(\mathbf{x})$ , a marker point  $\mathbf{x}_p$ , a set of analysis scales  $\{\mathbf{H}_k | k = 1, \dots, K\}$ , estimate the 3-D anisotropic structure of a nodule  $(\mathbf{u}^*, \mathbf{\Sigma}^*)$ .

**Scale-specific estimation** For each  $k$ .

- 1) Perform uniform sampling centered at  $x_p$ , resulting in a set of  $N_1$  starting points.
- 2) Perform the mean shift procedure in (6) from each starting point.
- 3) Take the convergence point of the majority of the points as the location estimate  $\mathbf{u}_k$ .
- 4) Perform uniform sampling centered at  $\mathbf{u}_k$ , resulting in a set of  $N_2$  starting points.
- 5) Perform the mean shift procedure from each starting point.
- 6) Construct the system in (9) with the mean shift vectors  $\{\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{y}_j)\}$  along the converging trajectories.
- 7) Solve the system by (10), resulting in the covariance estimate  $\mathbf{\Sigma}_k$ .

**Scale selection** With  $K$  estimates  $\{(\mathbf{u}_k, \mathbf{\Sigma}_k)\}$ .

- 1) Compute the divergence  $\{JS(\mathbf{u}_k, \mathbf{\Sigma}_k)\}$  using (11) for  $k = 1 + a, \dots, K - a$ .
- 2) Find the most stable solution  $(\mathbf{u}^*, \mathbf{\Sigma}^*)$  by finding a local minimum of  $\{JS_k\} : \arg \min_k JS(\mathbf{u}_k, \mathbf{\Sigma}_k)$ .

The second stage provides the binary decision of acceptance or rejection of the estimates in the following algorithm.

**Problem** Given the 3-D input data  $f(\mathbf{x})$  and thresholds  $th_1$  and  $th_2$ , verify the estimate  $(\mathbf{u}^*, \mathbf{\Sigma}^*)$  for the acceptance or rejection decision.

**Statistical verification** With  $(\mathbf{u}^*, \mathbf{\Sigma}^*)$ .

- 1) Compute  $\alpha^*$  and  $\beta^*$  by the chi-square fitting of (14).
- 2) Compute  $\chi^2$  by (13).
- 3) Compute the Chi-square probability  $Q(\chi^2)$  by (17).
- 4) Apply (18) to  $Q$  and  $\beta^*$ . Reject  $(\mathbf{u}^*, \mathbf{\Sigma}^*)$  if (18) holds otherwise accept it.

The ellipsoidal segmentation of the accepted nodule estimate is given by the 35% confidence ellipsoid of the normal distribution  $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{u}^*, \mathbf{\Sigma}^*)$  in the form of (19) with  $\sigma^2 = 1.6416$ . The third stage provides a number of volumetric measurements of the accepted estimate,

**Problem** Given the accepted estimate  $(\mathbf{u}^*, \mathbf{\Sigma}^*)$  and the voxel dimension  $(\Delta x, \Delta y, \Delta z)$ , provide the volumetric measurements of the target nodule.

**Volumetric Measurements** With  $(\mathbf{u}^*, \mathbf{\Sigma}^*)$ ,  $\sigma^2$ , and  $i \in (1, 2, 3)$ .

- 1) Compute the eigen decomposition  $(\mathbf{v}_i, \lambda_i)$  of  $\mathbf{\Sigma}^*$ .
- 2) Compute  $\beta_i$  by (22).
- 3) Sort the transformed eigenvalues  $\lambda'_i$  in (21).
- 4) Derive the tumor volume  $V'$  by (23).
- 5) Derive the maximum diameter  $L'$  of the tumor by (24).
- 6) Derive the average diameter  $A'$  of the tumor by (25).
- 7) Derive the tumor isotropy  $R'$  by (26).

## VI. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

### A. Synthetic Data

The proposed framework is examined with 1-D and 2-D synthetic data with the presence of noise. Fig. 2 compares local maximum and scale estimates by a 1-D implementation of our algorithm with those by the  $\gamma$ -normalized Laplacian [1] and the standard sample estimation [2, p. 179]. The test data is generated at each location by taking the maximum of two superimposed 1-D Gaussians offset by a varying distance  $D$  between the two peaks. The one in right is treated as the target while the left one acts as a nontarget neighboring structure. Each Gaussian has the same variance  $\Sigma = 1$  and height  $\alpha = 1$ . Fig. 2(a) and (b) shows the estimated mean and variance of the target as a function of the varying distance  $D$ . The ground-truth mean and variance are  $(\mathbf{u} = D/2, \Sigma = \sigma = 1)$ . Fig. 2(c) and (d) shows the break-points by our and  $\gamma$ -normalized Laplacian methods, respectively. The break-point is defined as the distance of the two peaks, below which estimations are subjected

to the bias due to the margin-truncation effect described in the introduction. The 1-D system employs all the available data points ( $N_1 = N_2 = N_S$ ) and 40 analysis scales with 0.05 interval ( $h = (0.1^2, 0.15^2, \dots, 2^2)$ ) for  $\mathbf{H} = h\mathbf{I}$ . For the sample variance estimation, the densities  $p(x_i)$  are approximated by  $f(x_i)$  normalized by the probability mass within  $\pm 1\sigma$  around the true maximum. The results indicate much lower break-point of our method than of others. This suggests that our method can achieve robust and accurate estimations even with the presence of the severe margin-truncations, demonstrating the advantage of our framework. Fig. 3 shows examples with 2-D synthetic data. A 2-D implementation of our method are applied for two test data: 1) the 2-D target Gaussian with random noise [Fig. 3(a)] and 2) the same target with the same noise and a nontarget Gaussian Fig. 3(c)]. The ground-truth and their corresponding estimates by our method are shown as 35% confidence ellipses in Fig. 3(a)–(d), respectively. This 2-D implementation utilizes all available data points and 12 analysis scales ( $h = (0.5^2, 0.75^2, \dots, 3.25^2)$ ). The results are almost identical to the ground-truth despite the presence of the random noise and the neighboring structure, confirming the results of our 1-D experiment.

### B. Lung HRCT Data

A 3-D implementation of the proposed algorithm is evaluated with two clinical data sets of the thin-section (1.25 mm slice thickness) chest high-resolution computed tomography (HRCT) images including pathological lesions. The data is recorded by Multislice CT scanners (Somatom Volume Zoom and Somatom Sensation 16; Siemens) and anonymized. Each volumetric image consists of 12-bit positive values over an array of  $512 \times 512$  lattices. The number of slices in a CT volume and the dimensions of a voxel vary across volumes in our data set. The number of slices ranges between 217 and 616. The voxel dimensions range within  $[0.4609 - 0.8281, 0.4609 - 0.8281, 0.5 - 1]$  in millimeter.

A straightforward implementation of our algorithm without any 3-D specific adaptation provides the 3-D nodule analysis system. The marker locations are provided by trained radiologists. Our visual inspection with a 3-D renderer revealed, however, that most of the markers are noticeably off-centered, deviating from the (unknown) true nodule centers with a certain degree. A 33-voxel cubic volume-of-interest (VOI) is extracted for processing each nodule. The analysis bandwidths are given by 18 scales with 0.25 interval  $h = (0.50^2, 0.75^2, \dots, 4.75^2)$ . Uniform sampling in the 3-voxel neighborhood of the marker (i.e.,  $N_1 = 7$ ) is used for estimating local maximum. The 3-voxel size is determined empirically. The same strategy is employed for initializing the mean shift trajectories around the local maximum (i.e.,  $N_2 = 7$ ). The neighborhood width of the divergence computation is set to  $a = 1$  (considering only three adjacent scales). For the verification, all data points that lie within the 90% confidence ellipsoid of  $(\mathbf{u}^*, \Sigma^*)$  are used as the support  $S'$ . This includes data points that may not converge to the estimated nodule center. For parameter estimation, it is natural to exclude such samples in order to realize a robust algorithm. For verification, however, such nonconvergence of samples also provide valid information of the model being ill-fit, thus, should be kept

for improving the rejection-acceptance margin. The rest of parameters are set as follows. The degrees of freedom in (17) are given by  $M = 3 + 6 + 2 = 11$ . The  $\beta$  threshold in Criterion (18) is set to  $th_2 = 400$ . The global uncertainty  $\sigma$  in (13) is estimated from the sample variance of 77 lesions, resulting in  $\sigma = 356$ .

The first data set consists of HRCT images of 14 patients including the total of 77 pulmonary nodules. All of the nodules are small ( $< 10$  mm). The data is recorded by a Siemens Somatom volume zoom scanner. Due to the lack of ground-truth for nodule center and segmentation, the classification of the correct or failure estimation is given manually by eye-appraisal of experts using a 3-D render view and its corresponding 3 orthogonal slice views (Fig. 6 shows an example of such views). The results of performance evaluations with this data set are given as follows. 63 cases (81.8%), including all the solitary nodules, resulted in correct estimation. All the 14 failures were successfully rejected by the verification process without false rejection and false acceptance. Most of the failures were due to very small nodules ( $< 5$  mm) that are heavily embedded into pleural surface. Given an off-centered marker, this can cause a nearby rib to be falsely estimated as nodule center (e.g., Fig. 5). The data includes six cases of the part- and nonsolid or ground-glass opacity (GGO) nodules[21], [see Figs. 1(c) and (d) and 4(a) and (b)] classified by the radiologists. All the GGO nodules were successfully estimated and accepted.

Fig. 4 shows examples of the resulting center and spread estimates. It illustrates cases with the irregular, nonsolid (GGO), and juxtaleural nodules whose geometrical shapes and/or intensity distributions are largely deviated from the Gaussian structure. The correct estimations for these difficult cases demonstrate the robustness and effectiveness of our framework. Fig. 5 shows the results of the statistical verification and examples of the rejected cases. For evaluating the generalization capability, we apply the same verification process to the data of 3 patients who are different from the ones used for deriving the parameters  $\sigma$  and  $th_2$ . This experiment resulted in 96% correct verification rate (4 false acceptances among 100 trials), similar to the results shown in Fig. 5.

The second data set is much larger than the first set, consisting of HRCT images of 39 patients with the total of 1310 pulmonary nodules. Moreover, the data is recorded by multiple scanners (Somatom volume zoom and Somatom Sensation 16; Siemens), and the data includes much wider range of nodule sizes (3–30 mm). Thus evaluation with this data set provides more realistic performance benchmark of our method in the clinical settings. The same system, including the parameter values for both estimation and verification, is used for this evaluation.

Table I summarized the results. 1064 cases (81.2%) resulted in successful estimation confirmed by the same visual inspection used for the small data set. This correct estimation rate was almost identical to the one for the first smaller data set, confirming the scalability of our algorithm. Similar to the first data set, most failures were caused by small juxtaleural nodules. Note that our method resulted in correct estimation for many juxtaleural cases as shown in Fig. 4(g)–(h). When a juxtaleural nodule is very small and deeply embedded into the surface, however, our method tends to provide biased estimates




Fig. 5. Experimental results for the verification process. The top plot illustrates the  $Q$  probability (solid-line) and  $\beta$  estimate (dashed-line) for each test case. The symbols “+” and “x” indicate correct and failure cases, respectively. The correct symbol “+” placed above zero also indicate nonsolid (GGO) nodule cases.  $\beta$  values are normalized to fit within the range of this plot. A horizontal dashed-line indicates the  $\beta$ -threshold  $th_{\beta} = 400$ . The bottom images show examples of correct failures. Legend of these images are the same as Fig. 4. Cases (a) and (c) satisfied the rejection conditions of both  $Q$  and  $\beta$  while Case (b) met only the  $Q$  condition and Cases (d) and (e) met only the  $\beta$  condition.

since the tumor center may not correspond to spatial maximum for such cases. For verification, small percentage of cases resulted in false acceptance (false positive (FP): 3%) and false rejection (false negative (FN): 5%), similar to the results of the generalization experiment with 100 trials. The most false positive cases occurred when a marker was placed outside of the attraction basin of the target nodule, causing the characterization of a nearby nonpathological structure (e.g., rib bones and vessels) which was accidentally Gaussian-like. On the other hand, the false negative cases were mostly caused by heavily vascularized or wall-embedded nodules that were correctly characterized by our robust algorithm but classified as nonnodule due to large chi-square fitting error. Except for these special cases, the majority of both correct and incorrect estimates are successfully accepted and rejected, respectively.

Another important question is the *stability* or *robustness* of our system against the initial localization of the markers. Such stability is a key factor for realizing low intraoperator and interoperator variability and high reproducibility. First, we study the characterization performance with additional duplicate markers. The second data set contained 150 additional duplicate markers provided by the radiologists, which are deviated from the other indicating the same nodule within 6 Euclidean voxel distance. Including these markers, the same performance evaluation for Table I is carried out with the total of 1469 markers. The results were almost identical to the ones without the duplicate markers; correct estimation: 81.3%, failed estimation: 18.7%, true positive: 76.3%, false negative: 5.0%, true negative: 15.4%, false positive: 3.3%.

TABLE I  
RESULTS OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF OUR METHOD WITH THE LARGE DATA SET. THE DATA SET CONSISTS OF 39 PATIENTS WITH 1310 NODULES WHOSE SIZE RANGES FROM 3 MM TO 30 MM. MULTIPLE SCANNERS ARE USED FOR DATA COLLECTION

Estimation	# Cases (%)	Verification	# Cases (%)
<b>Correct</b>	1064 (81.2)	<b>TP</b>	995 (76.0)
		<b>FN</b>	69 (5.2)
<b>Failure</b>	246 (18.8)	<b>TN</b>	205 (15.7)
		<b>FP</b>	41 (3.1)

TP: true positive, accepted correct estimates. FN: false negative, rejected correct estimates. TN: true negative, rejected false estimates. FP: false positive, accepted false estimates.

TABLE II  
THE STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE VARIOUS ESTIMATES INDUCED BY RANDOM PERTURBATION OF INITIAL MARKER LOCATIONS WITHIN THREE SAMPLING RANGES,  $\sqrt{1}$ ,  $\sqrt{2}$ , AND  $\sqrt{3}$  MAHALANOBIS DISTANCE, AROUND THE TUMOR CENTER ESTIMATED FROM THE MARKER GIVEN BY THE RADIOLOGISTS

Range	$\sigma_{\text{Mean}}$	$\sigma_{\text{Cov}}$	$\sigma_{\text{Vol}}$	$\sigma_{\text{MaxD}}$	$\sigma_{\text{AveD}}$	$\sigma_{\text{Iso}}$
$\sqrt{1}$	0.49	2.78	52.9	0.41	0.22	0.014
$\sqrt{2}$	0.58	2.49	44.1	0.46	0.28	0.018
$\sqrt{3}$	0.56	2.51	45.4	0.45	0.27	0.017

$\sigma_{\text{Mean}}$ : the average of standard deviations (SD) for single coordinate variables,  $\sigma_{\text{Cov}}$ : SD of the frobenius matrix norm,  $\sigma_{\text{Vol}}$ : SD of the 3-D volume in *voxel*<sup>3</sup> unit,  $\sigma_{\text{MaxD}}$ : SD of the maximum diameter in *voxel* unit,  $\sigma_{\text{AveD}}$ : SD OF THE average diameter in *voxel* unit, and  $\sigma_{\text{iso}}$ : SD of the isotropy parameter ranging within [0, 1].

TABLE III  
THE STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE VOLUMETRIC ESTIMATES SHOWN AS A FUNCTION OF FIVE DIFFERENT TUMOR SIZE RANGES. THE RANGES ARE DESCRIBED IN BOTH VOLUME (VOL) AND AVERAGE DIAMETER (AVE D) IN *voxel*<sup>3</sup> AND *voxel* UNITS, RESPECTIVELY. THE LARGEST SAMPLING RANGE,  $\sqrt{3}$ , IS USED FOR THIS EXPERIMENT

Range (Vol,AveD)	<(150,6.7)	<(525,10)	<(1250,13.3)	<(2425,16.7)	<(4190,20)
$\sigma$ Vol	4.00	15.9	21.0	39.6	45.4
$\sigma$ AveD	0.13	0.25	0.25	0.27	0.27
$\sigma$ MaxD	0.23	0.42	0.42	0.44	0.45

Second, the robustness is evaluated by numerical stability analysis of estimation variances induced by random perturbation of initial marker locations. For this experiment, we randomly select 550 nodules from the second database which are correctly estimated and verified (confirmed by our eye appraisal) and are of size between 3 and 20 voxels in the average diameter. For each selected nodule, its mean and covariance are estimated by our method from the marker given by the radiologists. A set of 10 test markers are randomly sampled around the estimated mean within  $\sqrt{3}$  Mahalanobis distance range for each nodule. The variance of estimates with the 5500 test markers are studied for center (mean), spread (covariance), volume, maximum/average diameter, and isotropy.

Tables II and III summarize the results shown as a function of sampling ranges and tumor sizes, respectively. The spread variance  $\sigma$ Cov is quantified by the standard deviation of the Frobenius norm of the covariance matrix. While the isotropy parameter is nondimensional, the variance for the center, volume, maximum/average diameters are expressed by the standard deviation of the estimates in *voxel* unit. Since the voxel dimension of our data is bounded by a 1 mm cube and roughly isotropic, these volumetric estimate variances in *voxel* unit can be treated as an upper-bound of the variances in *millimeter* unit for the measurements by using (23)–(26). The results in Table II show that the various estimation variances do not change largely by using the different sampling ranges from  $\sqrt{1}$  to  $\sqrt{3}$  Mahalanobis distances, indicating the insensitivity against the marker perturbation. The absolute values for the mean location and spread variances are also very small, showing the robustness of our estimation process. Table III shows that the absolute value of the estimation variances correlates better to the estimated tumor sizes. For the given range of the tumor sizes, the standard deviations with the  $\sqrt{3}$  Mahalanobis distance perturbation were small with respect to the corresponding tumor sizes, ranging between 1–3% of the estimated measurement values. The overall results of the above stability analyses suggest the insensitivity of our solution against the initialization or intraoperator and interoperator variability. Due to the lack of the ground-truth, the error analysis of the estimation bias was not possible. However, the eye appraisal of the results using the visualization in the form of Figs. 4 and 6 indicated at least reasonable accuracy of the mean location and maximum diameter estimates.

### C. System Implementation

The above-described 3-D nodule analysis system is implemented in C language and processes each 33-voxel VOI by an average of 2 s using an off-the-shelf PC with a 2.4-GHz Intel CPU. A quasi-real-time nodule characterization and visualization software is developed by using this system. The C-implemented system is packaged as the matlab's mex library which is

used as a computational module of a volume visualization tool built on the matlab's GUIDE (GUI development environment). Fig. 6 illustrates screen-snapshots of the nodule characterization and visualization process.

## VII. DISCUSSIONS

This paper proposed a comprehensive robust framework for characterizing the 3-D anisotropic pulmonary nodules. The nodule's geometric structure is specified by a 3-D ellipsoid that is provided by robustly fitting the anisotropic Gaussian-based intensity model to the volume data. The new estimation framework unifies the mean shift-based robust statistical analysis and the linear scale-space-based multiscale analysis. The unification is realized by formally extending the density mean shift toward the continuous positive function representing the volume data. The proposed verification algorithm also complements the estimation framework, providing an effective goodness-of-fit measure for rejecting accidental ill-estimates. The analytical volumetric measurement solutions are also proposed for efficiently approximating the nodule volume, maximum/average diameter, and isotropy directly from the fitted ellipsoid.

The nodule characterization system is validated by two sets of the large number of nodules as well as 1-D and 2-D synthetic data. The experimental results with the clinical chest HRCT data demonstrated a successful application of volumetric nodule characterization, providing robust estimation of 3-D location and anisotropic spread, as well as the stable volumetric measurements, of the nonspherical pulmonary nodules. The quasi-real-time system developed in this study also provides an efficient tumor visualization that can aid the tasks of radiologists. Such application for visualization is possible due to the ellipsoidal nature of our tumor characterization unlike other promising features such as fractal dimension analysis [17], [18].

As discussed in the introduction, the importance of accurately diagnosing the small and part- or nonsolid (GGO) nodules has been revealed by recent clinical studies. Such clinical demands pose technical challenges since much higher characterization accuracy in both shape and volume is required for detecting the malignancy and for quantifying the related tumor growth-rate. Moreover, the voxel intensity distribution of the subsolid nodules are much more irregular than the typical nodules targeted by the previous studies. Our experimental results suggest that the proposed model-based approach is a promising technique for segmenting and quantifying the volume of the nonsolid nodules, with which the intensity thresholding-based segmentation may fail. More GGO cases, especially the part-solid nodules, should be further evaluated in future for deriving more clinically conclusive result.




Fig. 6. Quasi-real-time nodule characterization and visualization. Three slices of the volume data read from dicom files can be viewed in 2-D (top) and 3-D (bottom) layouts. A mouse-click in the root view (top-left) initiates the nodule characterization process. After an average of 2 s, the process is completed and results in a zoom-up view of the nodule in the 2-D (top-right) and 3-D (bottom-right) layouts, as well as its volumetric measurements. The estimated nodule spread is visualized by yellow ellipses in the top-right figure and a red opaque ellipsoid in the bottom-right figure.

One of the contributions of this work is the proposed estimation solution for the fully anisotropic Gaussian intensity model. The importance of considering the anisotropic covariance in the scale-space was also suggested by Lillholm *et al.* [6].

[39] in their image reconstruction analyses with various local features defined as combinations of the first and second order scale-space derivatives. Their results have direct implications to our problem since the second order derivatives (or Hessian

matrix) are explicitly related to the covariance matrix [2, p. 178], [40].

The main technical strengths of our solution is its robustness against the effects of the margin-truncation (i.e., attachment to vessels and pleural surfaces) and the non-Gaussianity (i.e., part- and nonsolid nodules) that are common in the pulmonary CT data or clinically significant. Such robustness is due to the nature of our framework consisting of 1) the multiscale joint Gaussian fitting and segmentation using only samples within the basin of attraction, 2) the divergence-based scale selection, and 3) the constraint least-squares covariance estimation. The robustness against the non-Gaussianity also supports our choice of the Gaussian intensity model. While such model is appropriate for small nodules due to the partial volume effect, it may not serve as an accurate model for large nodules whose intensity profile tends to resemble a constant plateau or a step function. The scale-space approach used in our solution helps to fit a Gaussian function to such data by regularizing a step function into more Gaussian-like uni-modal signal. Moreover, the stability-based scale selection algorithm helps to absorb the modeling error by choosing the best fit regardless of such errors.

The proposed solutions provide volumetric measurements of target nodules which can be used for the differential diagnosis in the CAD application context. The advantage of our approach is three-folds. First, our solution inherits the robustness of our model estimation solution, resulting in a low intraoperator and interoperator variability of the measurements. Second, the ellipsoidal formulation provides the type of measurements such as the average diameter and isotropy that are difficult to measure by conventional methods. Third, the robust solution for measuring the maximum nodule diameter can be related to the clinical RECIST scheme. The main issue of our approach is a bias due to the ellipsoidal approximation. The ellipsoidal segmentation is limited to an approximation of true tumor boundary. When the target tumor possesses irregular surface, the volumetric measurements by our method can be biased from the absolute value of the (unknown) ground-truth volume. While this issue can be well addressed by the previous segmentation-based approaches that explicitly account for the irregular surface structures and the boundary between the nodule and other structures (e.g., Kostis *et al.* [14]), the robustness of such approach has not been fully investigated. The proposed solution emphasizes the robustness over the ability to describe fine surface structure. In the context of the differential diagnosis, this may be a reasonable trade-off when, due to the robustness, the bias is unique to specific data, because such bias can be then canceled by differentiating a pair of volumes.

Our experimental results also indicated that most of the biased estimations were due to the small nodules with pleural attachments. In the nodule taxonomy introduced by Kostis *et al.* [14], our system performed well on the well-circumscribed, vascularized, and pleural tail nodules. Although many juxtapleural cases were also characterized correctly by our robust method, most of the failures were due to this type of nodules when they are small and heavily embedded into the surface. In such situation, the nodule center may become an unstable spatial local maximum, forcing the center/mean estimate to be drifted to a nearby nontarget peak such as rib bones. This is an open issue

of the proposed approach. Further improvement of the system performance on such case is clinically important since such peripheral nodules are found frequently in practice.

The issue of the estimation bias due to the ellipsoidal approximation can be solved by combining the proposed model-based approach with an additional nonparametric segmentation-based approach. The ellipsoidal approximation derived from the Gaussian fitted by our method can be used as the initial prior state, from which the finer boundary segmentation can be nonparametrically derived. Moreover, the intensity statistics can be sampled only within the ellipsoidally segmented nodule area, reducing the estimation bias. We have recently proposed such a nonparametric segmentation solution using 4D joint domain density mean shift analysis where the analysis bandwidth is directly derived from the fitted Gaussian [25]. Another natural continuation of this study is the extension of our framework for the automatic nodule detection problem. The most simple approach is to apply our nodule characterization solution from a set of markers distributed over the entire lung volume. This requires an intelligent sampling scheme and voting mechanism for realizing an efficient automatic detection solution, which remains as our future work.

Overall, our solution is generic and does not depend on semantics of the absolute CT values in the Hounsfield unit. The robustness, flexibility, and efficiency of the proposed framework, therefore, facilitates not only the pulmonary nodule applications in CT sought in this paper but also various other applications in different imaging domains (e.g., PET scans) and different pathological and anatomical structures (e.g., polyps), involving with the analysis of blob-like geometrical structures. We plan to explore such other applications of our method in near future.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors wish to thank V. Ramesh from Siemens Corporate Research for stimulating discussions, A. Gupta from CAD group, Siemens Medical Solutions, for his support and encouragement, and J. Stoeckel from CAD group, Siemens Medical Solutions, for providing us the volume visualization tool and for his valuable technical supports. They also thank anonymous reviewers of this manuscript for their thorough and insightful comments.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] T. Lindeberg, "Feature detection with automatic scale selection," *Int. J. Comput. Vis.*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 79–116, 1998.
- [2] B. Matei, "Heteroscedastic errors-in-variables models in computer vision," Ph.D. dissertation, Rutgers Univ., New Brunswick, NJ, 2001.
- [3] H. K. Weir *et al.*, "Annual report to the nation on the status of cancer, 1975–2000," *J. Nat. Cancer Inst.*, vol. 95, no. 17, pp. 1276–1299, 2003.
- [4] J. P. Ko and D. P. Naidich, "Lung nodule detection and characterization with multislice CT," *Radiol. Clin. N. Am.*, vol. 41, pp. 575–597, 2003.
- [5] T. Ohtsuka, H. Nomori, H. Horio, T. Naruke, and K. Suemasu, "Radiological examination for peripheral lung cancers and benign nodules less than 10 mm," *Lung Cancer*, vol. 42, pp. 291–296, 2003.
- [6] F. Fischback, F. Knollmann, V. Griesshaber, T. Freund, E. Akkol, and R. Felix, "Detection of pulmonary nodules by multislice computed tomography: Improved detection rate with reduced slice thickness," *Eur. Radiol.*, vol. 13, pp. 2378–2383, 2003.
- [7] A. P. Reeves and W. J. Kostis, "Computer-aided diagnosis of small pulmonary nodules," in *Sem. Ultrasound, CT, MRI*, vol. 21, 2000, pp. 116–128.

- [8] B. van Ginneken, B. M. ter Haar Romeny, and M. A. Viergever, "Computer-aided diagnosis in chest radiography: A survey," *IEEE Trans. Med. Imag.*, vol. 20, no. 12, pp. 1228–1241, Dec. 2001.
- [9] M. S. Brown, M. F. McNitt-Gray, J. G. Goldin, R. D. Suh, J. W. Sayre, and D. R. Aberle, "Patient-specific models for lung nodule detection and surveillance in CT images," *IEEE Trans. Med. Imag.*, vol. 20, no. 12, pp. 1242–1250, Dec. 2001.
- [10] Y. Lee, T. Hara, H. Fujita, S. Itoh, and T. Ishigaki, "Automated detection of pulmonary nodules in helical CT images based on an improved template-matching technique," *IEEE Trans. Med. Imag.*, vol. 20, no. 7, pp. 595–604, Jul. 2001.
- [11] H. Takizawa, S. Yamamoto, T. Matsumoto, Y. Tateno, T. Inuma, and M. Matsumoto, "Recognition of lung nodules from X-ray CT images using 3D Markov random field models," presented at the Int. Conf. Pattern Recog., Quebec City, QC, Canada, 2002.
- [12] B. Zhao, G. Gamsu, M. S. Ginsberg, L. Jian, and L. H. Schwartz, "Automatic detection of small lung nodules on CT utilizing a local density maximum algorithm," *J. Appl. Clin. Med. Phys.*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 248–260, 2003.
- [13] B. Zhao, D. Yankelevitz, A. Reeves, and C. Henschke, "Two-dimensional multicriterion segmentation of pulmonary nodules on helical CT images," *IEEE Trans. Med. Imag.*, vol. 22, no. 10, pp. 1259–1274, Oct. 2003.
- [14] W. J. Kostis, A. P. Reeves, D. F. Yankelevitz, and C. I. Henschke, "Three-dimensional segmentation and growth-rate estimation of small pulmonary nodules in helical CT images," *IEEE Trans. Med. Imag.*, vol. 22, no. 10, pp. 1259–1274, Oct. 2003.
- [15] D. Wormanns, G. Kohl, E. Kotz, A. Marheine, F. Beyer, W. Heindel, and S. Diederich, "Volumetric measurements of pulmonary nodules at multi-row detector CT: *In vivo* reproducibility," *Eur. Radiol.*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 86–92, 2004.
- [16] J. P. Ko, H. Rusinek, E. L. Jacobs, J. S. Babb, M. Betke, G. McGuinness, and D. P. Naidich, "Small pulmonary nodules: Volume measurement at chest CT—Phantom study," *Radiology*, vol. 228, no. 3, pp. 864–870, 2003.
- [17] Y. Kawata, N. Niki, H. Ohmatsu, M. Kusumoto, R. Kakinuma, K. Mori, H. Nishiyama, K. Eguchi, M. Kaneko, and N. Moriyama, "Computerized analysis of pulmonary nodules in topological and histogram feature spaces," presented at the Int. Conf. Pattern Recognition, Barcelona, Spain, 2000.
- [18] S. Kido, K. Kuriyama, M. Higashiyama, T. Kasugai, and C. Kuroda, "Fractal analysis of internal and peripheral textures of small peripheral bronchogenic carcinomas in thin-section computed tomography: Comparison of bronchioloalveolar cell carcinomas with nonbronchioloalveolar cell carcinomas," *J. Comput. Assist. Tomogr.*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 56–61, 2003.
- [19] D. Wormanns, M. Fiebich, M. Saidi, S. Diederich, and W. Heindel, "Automatic detection of pulmonary nodules at spiral CT: Clinical application of a computer-aided diagnosis system," *Chest*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 1052–1057, 2002.
- [20] M. Kass, A. Witkin, and D. Terzopoulos, "Snakes: Active contour models," *Int. J. Comput. Vis.*, vol. 1, pp. 321–331, 1987.
- [21] C. I. Henschke, D. F. Yankelevitz, R. Mirtcheva, G. McGuinness, D. McCauley, and O. S. Miettinen, "CT screening for lung cancer: Frequency and significance of part-solid and nonsolid nodules," *AJR Am. J. Roentgenol.*, vol. 178, no. 5, pp. 1053–1057, 2002.
- [22] A. Witkin, "Scale-space filtering," in *Int. Joint. Conf. Artif. Intell.*, Karlsruhe, Germany, 1983, pp. 1019–1021.
- [23] J. J. Koenderink, "The structure of images," *Biol. Cybern.*, vol. 50, pp. 363–370, 1984.
- [24] D. Comaniciu and P. Meer, "Mean shift: A robust approach toward feature space analysis," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Machine Intell.*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 603–619, May 2002.
- [25] K. Okada, D. Comaniciu, and A. Krishnan, "Robust 3D segmentation of pulmonary nodules in multislice CT images," in *Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention* Saint Malo, France, 2004.
- [26] K. Fukunaga, *Statistical Pattern Recognition*. San Diego: Academic, 1990.
- [27] P. J. Rousseeuw and A. M. Leroy, *Robust Regression and Outlier Detection*. New York: Wiley, 1987.
- [28] A. Bhalerao and R. Wilson, "Estimating local and global structure using a Gaussian intensity model," presented at the Medical Image Understanding and Analysis, Birmingham, U.K., 2001.
- [29] P. Perona and J. Malik, "Scale-space and edge detection using anisotropic diffusion," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Machine Intell.*, vol. 12, no. 7, pp. 629–639, Jul. 1990.
- [30] R. Manmatha and N. Srima, "Scale space technique for word segmentation in handwritten documents," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Scale-Space Theories in Computer Vision*, 1999, pp. 22–33.
- [31] M. J. Black, G. Sapiro, D. Marimont, and D. Heeger, "Robust anisotropic diffusion," *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, vol. 7, pp. 421–432, Jul. 1998.
- [32] M. Nielsen, L. Florack, and R. Deriche, "Regularization, scale space, and edge detection filters," *J. Math. Imag. Vis.*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 291–307, 1997.
- [33] D. Comaniciu, "An algorithm for data-driven bandwidth selection," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Machine Intell.*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 281–288, Feb. 2003.
- [34] H. Hu, "Positive definite constrained least-squares estimation of matrices," *Linear Algebra and Its Applications*, vol. 229, pp. 167–174, 1995.
- [35] G. H. Golub and C. F. van Loan, *Matrix Computations*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1996.
- [36] Y. Chen and J. E. McInroy, "Estimating symmetric, positive definite matrices in robotic control," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and Automation*, Washington, DC, 2002, pp. 4269–4274.
- [37] S. van Huffel and J. Vandewalle, *The Total Least Squares Problem Computational Aspects and Analysis*. Philadelphia, PA: SIAM, 1991.
- [38] W. H. Press, S. A. Teukolsky, W. T. Vetterling, and B. P. Flannery, *Numerical Recipes in C*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992.
- [39] M. Lillholm, M. Nielsen, and L. D. Griffin, "Feature-based image analysis," *Int. J. Comput. Vis.*, vol. 52, no. 2/3, pp. 73–95, 2003.
- [40] Y. Kanazawa and K. Kanatani, "Do we really have to consider covariance matrices for image features?," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Computer Vision*, Vancouver, BC, Canada, 2001, pp. 586–591.