# **DeepBrainPrint: A Novel Contrastive Framework for Brain MRI Re-Identification** Lemuel Puglisi, Frederik Barkhof, Daniel C. Alexander, Joffrey Parker, Arman Eshaghi, Daniele Ravì

# **BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATIONS**

Re-identification is the process of locating previous scans of the same patient within a large dataset

- This process is crucial for several reasons, including:
- access and compare historical medical information
- monitoring patient progress over time
- treatment planning



# **EXISTING APPROCHES**

| Reference                | Description   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Wachinger et<br>al, 2015 | Study of the geometry of the brain using Laplace-Beltrami operator                      |
| Valizadeh et<br>al, 2018 | Characterization of the brain through quantitative measurements of its anato structures |
| Chauvin et al,<br>2020   | Image feature extraction through the 3D<br>Rank algorithm                               |

# MAIN LIMITATIONS

- $\succ$  Reliance on computationally intensive processes using manually engineered features
- Struggle with achieving robust generalization across diverse modalities









**DeepBrainPrint** generates a fingerprint from **brain MRI** scans, utilizing **deep metric learning** based on two distinct loss functions:

1. a fully-supervised:  $L_c = -\log \frac{\exp(sim\left(e_a^{(i)}, e_p^{(i)}\right)/\tau)}{\exp(sim\left(e_a^{(i)}, e_p^{(i)}\right)/\tau) + \exp(sim\left(e_a^{(i)}, e_n^{(i)}\right)/\tau)}$ 

2. a self-supervised:  $L_{BT} = \sum_{i} (1 - c_{ii})^2 + \lambda \sum_{i} \sum_{i \neq i} c_{ij}^2$ 

The final loss  $L_{DBP}$  is determined by a weighting function  $\beta(t)$  that combines the individual losses  $L_c$  and  $L_{BT}$ 

$$L_{DBP} = \beta(t) L_{BT} + (1 - \beta(t))L_C \qquad where \ \beta(t) = 1 - \frac{t}{H}$$

#### The workflow of DeepBrainPrint is divided into two main branches



#### Proposed transformations used for image distortion during training

| Transformation        | Type             | $\mathbf{p_i}$ |
|-----------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Negative of the image | Intensity-based  | 40%            |
| Intensity shifts      | Intensity-based  | 40%            |
| Bias field            | Intensity-based  | 30%            |
| Rotations             | Structural-based | 100%           |
| Random black patches  | Structural-based | 40%            |
| Elastic deformation   | Structural-based | 30%            |







ig the

omical

D SIFT-





#### Take a picture to download the full paper

### RESULTS

|  |                         | ettin                   | gs                      | ADNI   |       | SYNT-CONTR |       |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------|-------|------------|-------|
| Method                                     | $\widehat{\mathbf{FS}}$ | $\widehat{\mathbf{SS}}$ | $\widehat{\mathbf{DT}}$ | R@3    | mAP@3 | <b>R@3</b> | mAP@3 |
| SIM-based (Wang et al., 2004)              |                         | No training             |                         | 96.89  | 90.21 | 76.68      | 48.86 |
| 3D SIFT-Rank (Chauvin et al., 2020)        | No training             |                         | 100.00                  | 100.00 | 81.77 | 63.71      |       |
| Barlow Twins (Zbontar et al., 2021)        |                         | $\checkmark$            |                         | 73.06  | 45.35 | 48.70      | 25.52 |
| Barlow Twins with our transformations      |                         | $\checkmark$            | $\checkmark$            | 97.41  | 90.47 | 92.23      | 79.62 |
| SimCLR (Chen et al., 2020)                 |                         | $\checkmark$            |                         | 68.39  | 38.47 | 51.30      | 24.55 |
| SimCLR with our transformations            |                         | $\checkmark$            | $\checkmark$            | 87.05  | 67.63 | 70.98      | 39.94 |
| NCA (Goldberger et al., 2004)              | $\checkmark$            |                         | $\checkmark$            | 96.89  | 90.34 | 72.02      | 48.10 |
| MLKR (Weinberger and Tesauro, 2007)        | $\checkmark$            |                         | $\checkmark$            | 96.37  | 90.03 | 72.02      | 48.07 |
| SoftTriple (Qian et al., 2019)             | $\checkmark$            |                         | $\checkmark$            | 98.45  | 91.97 | 96.89      | 87.64 |
| Proxy-NCA (Movshovitz-Attias et al., 2017) |                         |                         | $\checkmark$            | 98.45  | 90.80 | 94.82      | 84.86 |
| InfoNCE (Oord et al., 2018)                | $\checkmark$            |                         | $\checkmark$            | 96.89  | 94.04 | 95.34      | 86.95 |
| DeepBrainPrint (Proposed)                  | $\checkmark$            | $\checkmark$            | $\checkmark$            | 99.48  | 95.54 | 98.96      | 91.00 |

## **EXAMPLES OF WRONG RETRIEVALS**



Query scan

### CONCLUSIONS

**DeepBrainPrint** has potential for various clinical applications:  $\succ$  searching for scans with similar brain shapes, lesions, or atrophy Support diagnostic decisions on new patients  $\succ$  suggest effective treatments for similar disease subtypes/stages

#### We tested **DeepBrainPrint** on 2 different datasets: 1. a large dataset of 795 T1-weighted brain MRIs from (ADNI) 2. a synthetic dataset designed to evaluate retrieval performance with different image modalities (SYNT-CONTR)

**SALIENCY MAPS** 

Correct retrieval 📕 Wrong retrieval



