
Automated Classification of Aortic Valve Morphology from Phase-Contrast Cardiac MRI Using an Augmented CNN

Anonymous Author(s)

Affiliation

Address

email

Abstract

1 Bicuspid aortic valve (BAV) is most common congenital malformation of the heart
2 occurring in 1-2% of all individuals, and is associated with a variety of poor health
3 outcomes. Exploring BAV in large unlabeled imaging datasets such as the UK
4 Biobank is complicated by the absence of functional models for classification of
5 aortic valve morphology. Fully automated identification of BAV from MRI images
6 was not previously studied in the medical literature. In this paper, we show that
7 with an extremely limited set of 112 samples, subjected to simple pre-processing
8 steps along with data augmentation, we can train a CNN classification model which
9 achieves an AUC of 0.76, a 0.14 lift from non-augmented data, thus establishing a
10 baseline for automatic BAV identification from cardiac MRIs.

11 1 Introduction

12 Bicuspid aortic valve (BAV) is a highly prevalent cardiac malformation present in 1-2% of individuals.
13 As it may go undiagnosed even in adulthood [1], its early detection can help pinpoint other conditions
14 such as congenital aortic stenosis, hypoplastic left heart, and coarctation of the aorta [2, 3]. In
15 2006-2010, the UK Biobank (UKBB) recruited 502,638 participants aged 37-73 years and made
16 publicly available comprehensive health-related data including genome-wide data, and medical
17 imaging data in the form of cardiac MRI [4]. The availability of large unstructured medical imaging
18 datasets allows the possibility of performing a variety of genetic and epidemiological studies related
19 to anatomical features within the dataset. However there are no extant software tools for unsupervised
20 classification of anatomical structures from cardiac MRI data. Here we describe a computer vision
21 approach incorporating a small labeled training dataset and data augmentation to classify individual
22 participants with bicuspid aortic valve (BAV) within the cardiac MRI data in the UK Biobank.

23 2 Methods

24 The data consists of dicom files of cardiac MRI sequences [5] including eight sets of cardiac images
25 – coronal and transverse scout imaging, cine-images from 2-chamber, 3-chamber, 4-chamber, left-
26 ventricular-outflow tract, short axis at 9 separate planes, aortic valve phase-contrast imaging, and
27 measures of regional wall motion and diastolic function. Phase-contrast images processed for
28 magnitude of flow across the aortic valve taken in the short axis plane were selected for analysis of
29 aortic valve morphology [6]. Individual images consisted of 30 frames of 192 by 192 pixels. Training
30 data was imbalanced, reflecting the prevalence of BAV within the general population, at 100 healthy
31 subjects and 12 with bicuspid aortic valves. As frame brightness is proportional to the magnitude of
32 flow through the aortic valve, we selected a sequence of the six brightest frames from each series.

33 The primary model included base CNN layers of the VGG 16 model [7], added with 5-layer feed-
 34 forward deep neural network model with one node in the output layer. Stacked convolutional neural
 35 network layers can capture high level concepts such as edge detection, so we employed pre-trained
 36 CNN layers to extract features from gray scale cardiac MRI data. The FNN layers of VGG 16 model
 37 were constructed for classification of 1000 common objects, therefore we employed a separate FNN
 38 top model for classification of aortic valve morphology. For the input of 192 x 192 pixel cardiac
 39 MRI data used in this project, the CNN layers of the VGG 16 model output 512 layers of feature
 40 images with the size of 6 x 6 pixels. The feature image size gets smaller, in concordance with the size
 41 reduction of the input image, but the number of feature image layers (512) will stay the same.

42 Due to the small number of MRI samples, the CNN layers may easily overfit when using a complex
 43 FNN model. Preliminary experiments suggested a relatively simple FNN structure; 5 feed-forward
 44 layers with the number of each layer being 128, 64, 32, 16, 1. We used binary cross entropy as the
 45 loss function and the ADAM optimizer. Finally, to deal with the training data imbalance, and to
 46 penalize false negatives more than false positives, we introduced class weights in the loss function.

47 Basic pre-processing of the images to eliminate extraneous information led to increased performance
 48 of the deep learning model. A black border surrounding the frames due to acquisition or processing
 49 artifact differed between patients and contained no relevant information or features. Therefore we
 50 eliminated the 14 pixels on the periphery of each image yielding a borderless image of 164x164
 51 pixels. Additionally the range of pixel intensity values varied from patient to patient, and thus were
 52 normalized to give a pixel value range of 0-255 per frame using the Pillow-4.3.0 package PIL.Image
 53 module. After normalization, we performed Gamma-correction [8] (Gray Level Transformation) to
 54 enhance contrast of high intensities ($f(x) = cx^r$, $r=2$) ($255.0 \times (\text{pixels}/255.0)^2$).

55 We tested two different augmentations: translations of 2-4 pixels yielding 36 to 49 additional images,
 56 and shearing/stretching of up to 20% of the image size yielding 495 additional augmented images.

57 3 Results

58 We tested the model using 4-fold cross validation, where, within each fold, 50% of the data was used
 59 for training, 25% for tuning and the remaining 25% for testing. Table 1 shows the performance of the
 60 models obtained through each transformation. We report the area under the precision-recall curve
 61 (AUC), accuracy (acc), weighted accuracy (w-acc), negative weighted binary cross entropy (neg_ce),
 62 the F3 measure (f3), precision (prec), recall (rec), and the confusion matrix.

Table 1: Performance metrics for each of the tested augmentations. Original – model uses untrans-
 formed data. OTA – translation augmentation of original data. B – border removal. BTA – border
 removal and translation. GC – gamma correction. GCTA – gamma correction with translation
 augmentation. GCSA – gamma correction with stretch augmentation.

	auc	acc	w-acc	neg_ce	f3	prec	rec	tp	tn	fp	fn
O	0.62	0.90	0.3275	-11.04	0.26	0.5	0.25	0.75	24.5	0.5	2.25
OTA	0.58	0.89	0.255	-12.23	0.17	0.33	0.17	0.5	24.5	0.5	2.5
B	0.61	0.90	0.3275	-11.04	0.26	0.38	0.25	0.75	24.5	0.5	2.25
BTA	0.65	0.89	0.3975	-10.13	0.35	0.69	0.33	1	24	1	2
GC	0.70	0.92	0.4775	-8.65	0.43	0.58	0.42	1.25	24.5	0.5	1.75
GCTA	0.75	0.88	0.6175	-7.11	0.56	0.48	0.58	1.75	23	2	1.25
GCSA	0.76	0.89	0.62	-6.97	0.58	0.613	0.58	1.75	23.25	1.75	1.25

63 We described a method to classify BAV from phase contrast images from MRI, using a small training
 64 dataset and applying simple methods of augmentation to improve the predictive capabilities of the
 65 classifier. Pre-processing steps reduced inter-subject variability (border removal and normalization)
 66 and trimmed information irrelevant to the classification task (border removal and gamma correction).
 67 The VGG16/FNN model on the original data displayed a modest performance (AUC=0.6175). Pre-
 68 processing steps alone improved performance (AUC=0.70), suggesting that low-level intuitive steps
 69 to clean the input data are key to optimizing performance in medical imaging classification. When
 70 translation and stretch augmentations were applied to pre-processed data, the model characteristics
 71 were additionally improved (AUC=0.76), obtaining a baseline for automated BAV classification.
 72 Interestingly, improvements to the predictive characteristics of the VGG16/FNN model by both
 73 translation and stretching augmentation tasks appeared to be dependent on simple pre-processing.

74 **References**

- 75 [1] William C Roberts and Jong M Ko. Frequency by decades of unicuspid, bicuspid, and tricuspid
76 aortic valves in adults having isolated aortic valve replacement for aortic stenosis, with or without
77 associated aortic regurgitation. *Circulation*, 111(7):920–925, 2005.
- 78 [2] Ilenia Foffa, Lamia Ait Ali, Paola Panesi, Massimiliano Mariani, Pierluigi Festa, Nicoletta Botto,
79 Cecilia Vecoli, and Maria Grazia Andreassi. Sequencing of notch1, gata5, tgfr1 and tgfr2
80 genes in familial cases of bicuspid aortic valve. *BMC medical genetics*, 14(1):44, 2013.
- 81 [3] Marc-Phillip Hitz, Louis-Philippe Lemieux-Perreault, Christian Marshall, Yassamin Feroz-Zada,
82 Robbie Davies, Shi Wei Yang, Anath Christopher Lionel, Guylaine D’Amours, Emmanuelle
83 Lemyre, Rebecca Cullum, et al. Rare copy number variants contribute to congenital left-sided
84 heart disease. *PLoS genetics*, 8(9):e1002903, 2012.
- 85 [4] Naomi E Allen, Cathie Sudlow, Tim Peakman, Rory Collins, et al. Uk biobank data: come and
86 get it, 2014.
- 87 [5] Steffen E Petersen, Paul M Matthews, Fabian Bamberg, David A Bluemke, Jane M Francis,
88 Matthias G Friedrich, Paul Leeson, Eike Nagel, Sven Plein, Frank E Rademakers, et al. Imaging
89 in population science: cardiovascular magnetic resonance in 100,000 participants of uk biobank-
90 rationale, challenges and approaches. *Journal of Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance*, 15(1):46,
91 2013.
- 92 [6] Steffen E Petersen, Paul M Matthews, Jane M Francis, Matthew D Robson, Filip Zemrak, Redha
93 Boubertakh, Alistair A Young, Sarah Hudson, Peter Weale, Steve Garratt, et al. Uk biobank’s
94 cardiovascular magnetic resonance protocol. *Journal of cardiovascular magnetic resonance*,
95 18(1):8, 2016.
- 96 [7] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale
97 image recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556*, 2014.
- 98 [8] Jan Erik Solem. *Programming Computer Vision with Python: Tools and algorithms for analyzing*
99 *images*. " O’Reilly Media, Inc.", 2012.