Deformable registration of X-ray and MRI for post-implant dosimetry in low-dose-rate prostate brachytherapy

William T. Hrinivich¹, Seyoun Park², Yi Le³, Daniel Y. Song¹, Junghoon Lee¹*

1. Department of Radiation Oncology and Molecular Radiation Sciences, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore MD, 21287, USA
2. Department of Radiology, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore MD, 21287, USA
3. Department of Radiation Oncology, Indiana University, Indianapolis, IN, 46202, USA

Version typeset June 17, 2019

*corresponding author
email: junghoon@jhu.edu
address: Department of Radiation Oncology and Molecular Radiation Sciences
401 N Broadway
Baltimore, MD, 21287

This is the author’s manuscript of the article published in final edited form as:

Abstract

**Purpose:** Dosimetric assessment following permanent prostate brachytherapy (PPB) commonly involves seed localization using CT and prostate delineation using co-registered MRI. However, pelvic CT leads to additional imaging dose and requires significant resources to acquire and process both CT and MRI. In this study, we propose an automatic post-implant dosimetry approach that retains MRI for soft-tissue contouring, but eliminates the need for CT and reduces imaging dose while overcoming the inconsistent appearance of seeds on MRI with three projection X-rays acquired using a mobile C-arm.

**Methods:** Implanted seeds are reconstructed using X-rays by solving a combinatorial optimization problem and deformably registered to MRI. Candidate seeds are located in MR images using local hypo-intensity identification. X-ray based seeds are registered to these candidate seeds in three steps: 1) rigid registration using a stochastic evolutionary optimizer, 2) affine registration using an iterative closest point optimizer, and 3) deformable registration using a local feature point search and non-rigid coherent point drift. The algorithm was evaluated using 20 PPB patients with X-rays acquired immediately post-implant and T2 weighted MR images acquired the next day at 1.5 T with mean 0.8×0.8×3.0 mm³ voxel dimensions. Target registration error (TRE) was computed based on the distance from algorithm results to manually identified seed locations using co-registered CT acquired the same day as the MRI. Dosimetric accuracy was determined by comparing prostate D90 determined using the algorithm and the ground truth CT-based seed locations.

**Results:** The mean±standard deviation TREs across 20 patients including 1774 seeds were 2.23 ± 0.52 mm (rigid), 1.99 ± 0.49 mm (rigid+affine), and 1.76 ± 0.43 mm (rigid+affine+deformable). The corresponding mean±standard deviation D90 errors were 5.8±4.8%, 3.4±3.4%, and 2.3±1.9%, respectively. The mean computation time of the registration algorithm was 6.1 s.

**Conclusion:** The registration algorithm accuracy and computation time are sufficient for clinical PPB post-implant dosimetry.
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1. Introduction

Permanent prostate brachytherapy (PPB) is a standard treatment option for localized prostate cancer\(^1\) and favorable results from recent clinical trials suggest that PPB utilization will increase.\(^2,3,4\) Safe delivery of a therapeutic dose using PPB depends critically on the final implanted seed locations, which must be localized in the imaging coordinate system for dose calculation and evaluation of dose delivered to the prostate and nearby organs at risk (OARs). During the implant, seed locations are typically verified using transrectal ultrasound (TRUS) due to its non-invasive real-time imaging capabilities.\(^5\) However, seeds can be difficult to localize using TRUS due to artifacts caused by tissue interfaces and the seeds themselves. Furthermore, intra-operative dose metrics are impacted by edema caused by the implant, which dissipates over time as the dose is deposited.\(^6\) For these reasons, a post-implant dosimetric assessment is considered mandatory, involving the localization of seeds, prostate boundaries, and organs at risk between 0 and 42 days after the implant.\(^7,8,9\)

Post-implant dosimetry is conventionally performed using CT due to its widespread availability and high contrast produced by metallic seeds.\(^7\) However, soft tissue contrast in CT is limited, leading to prostate contouring uncertainty, which propagates to uncertainty in the final dose metrics.\(^10\) To overcome this limitation, a multi-modality approach has been recommended taking advantage of the unparalleled soft tissue contrast of MRI.\(^11\) This approach makes use of co-registered CT and MRI to localize the seeds and organs, respectively. This approach has demonstrated reduced dosimetric variability compared to CT-only post-implant dosimetry\(^11,12\) and has been adopted by many clinics.

While the combined MRI and CT approach improves dosimetric accuracy compared to a CT-only approach, it is resource intensive and still subject to limitations. The approach requires transporting the patient between the MRI and CT suites, creating the potential for prostate deformations due to changes in position, bladder and rectum filling. CT slice thickness on the order of 1-3 mm limits seed localization accuracy,\(^12\) and registration between CT and MRI may be subject to errors. Advanced MRI-to-CT registration techniques have been developed to mitigate error,\(^13\) however, workflows eliminating the need for both CT and MRI are desirable to reduce resource requirements, reduce imaging dose, limit motion, and improve accuracy further.
Two primary techniques have been proposed to overcome limitations of current MRI and CT-based dosimetry. The first is MRI-based seed localization. Metallic seeds do not generate signal intensity using conventional pulse sequences, so appear as signal voids leading to some non-seed features identified as seeds (false positives) and some missing seeds (false negatives).\(^{14,15}\) Seeds designed to generate positive contrast have been demonstrated, but are not typically integrated with isotopes used for therapy.\(^{16}\) Balanced steady-state free precession (bSSFP) pulse sequences can improve MRI quality for seed identification\(^{17}\) and susceptibility-based pulse sequences have been developed to provide positive contrast with conventional seeds.\(^{18,19}\) Susceptibility-based pulse sequences have recently been combined with machine learning-based automatic seed localization enabling all implanted seeds to be localized within 0.7 mm error in phantoms.\(^{20}\) Preliminary evidence suggests that this performance may translate to patients;\(^{21}\) however, to the authors’ knowledge, robust MRI-only seed localization has not been validated in patients and may require hardware and software upgrades for implementation in many clinics. The second technique involves the combination of projection X-rays and MRI for seed localization acquired sequentially using a custom imaging facility (XMR).\(^{22,23}\) By mechanically linking the X-ray and MRI systems, the images are inherently registered enabling reliable seed and soft tissue localization. However, this system is not widely available, limiting its utility for most clinics.

Our group has previously developed a multi-modality imaging approach for intra-operative PPB dosimetry combining X-ray projection images and TRUS,\(^{24,25}\) taking advantage of reliable seed localization using X-rays similar to the XMR system. However, our automatic seed reconstruction algorithm is unique in its ability to use a limited set of images acquired using a commonly available mobile C-arm while providing improved seed reconstruction accuracy relative to CT, with errors \(\leq 0.5\) mm.\(^{24,26}\) A similar approach combining X-rays and MRI is desirable for post-implant dosimetry, which would eliminate the need for CT, thereby decreasing radiation dose from imaging and improving seed localization accuracy without requiring specialized hardware. Specifically, this approach would involve X-ray imaging for seed reconstruction followed by MR imaging for prostate and OAR contouring, and registration of the two modalities for post-implant dose calculation and plan evaluation in the MRI coordinate system. However, unlike intra-operative TRUS, X-rays and MRI cannot be acquired without moving the patient, even if the distance is small when using a mobile C-arm, creating the potential for local deformations which our previous intra-operative
algorithm did not account for.\textsuperscript{25}

Multiple rigid, affine, and non-rigid algorithms have been proposed for three-dimensional point set registration in the presence of noise and missing data, as reviewed by Tam et al.\textsuperscript{27} Deformable registration techniques include minimizing the mean squared distance between the moving and fixed point sets using gradient descent optimization while regularizing the point translations using a deformation model such as a thin-plate spline.\textsuperscript{28} Coherent point drift (CPD) is an iterative non-rigid registration technique in which the moving point set is represented as a Gaussian mixture model (GMM), and the fixed point set is represented as observations of the model.\textsuperscript{29} The centroids of the GMM are updated using an expectation maximization approach, and translations are regularized to maintain point topology using motion coherence theory.\textsuperscript{30} CPD may be less subject to local minima than gradient descent-based registration, but still may result in sub-optimal solutions in the presence of large initial translations or rotations.\textsuperscript{31} Robust rigid initialization has been proposed using stochastic methods such as random sample consensus (RANSAC) or 4-points congruent sets (4PCS).\textsuperscript{32} Combining these approaches may provide robust deformable registration of X-ray and MRI as required clinically.

In this study, we propose a deformable registration approach to align X-ray-based seeds and MRI using non-rigid CPD and initialized using stochastic minimization of mean squared distances between X-ray-based seeds and MRI-based candidate seeds. This algorithm is initialized using an existing X-ray-based seed reconstruction approach.\textsuperscript{24,33} Our group previously presented a preliminary gradient descent-based deformable X-ray to MRI registration algorithm for post-implant dosimetry that was evaluated in a subset of implanted seeds.\textsuperscript{34} To our knowledge, this is the only existing intensity-based registration method evaluated for this purpose. In the present study, CPD registration algorithm accuracy is evaluated in terms of target registration error (TRE) and dosimetry by comparing all implanted seed locations and resultant dose distributions with those determined using the standard MRI and CT approach. We also analyze the impact of variations in candidate seed localization on algorithm accuracy, propose optimal candidate seed localization parameters, and compare the CPD registration approach to the previous gradient descent-based approach.\textsuperscript{34}
II. Methods

II.A. Image Acquisition

Twenty prostate cancer patients treated with TRUS-guided PPB using Theragenics model 200 $^{103}$Pd seeds (Theragenics Corp., Buford GA) at Johns Hopkins Hospital were included in this study, including 1777 implanted seeds. Three X-rays were taken immediately following seed implantation using an OEC 9800 mobile C-arm (GE Healthcare, Chicago IL) as part of an IRB-approved protocol for intra-operative dosimetry, and were acquired within a 20° angle around the anterior-posterior axis between the patient’s legs, e.g. approximately -10°, 0° (anterior-posterior), and 10°. Resultant X-ray images had pixel dimensions of 0.4×0.4 mm$^2$.

MRI and CT scans were performed one day after seed implantation for routine clinical post-implant dosimetry using a 1.5 T Magnetom Espree MRI scanner (Siemens Medical Systems, Erlangen, Germany) and Brilliance Big Bore CT scanner (Philips, Andover MA). MR images were acquired with a body coil (no endorectal coil was used) using a two-dimensional T2 weighted spin echo pulse sequence with 8690 ms repetition time (TR), 104 ms echo time (TE), and 150° degree flip angle. Resultant images had 3 mm slice thickness and mean (range) in-plane voxel dimensions of 0.8 (0.5-1.3) mm. CT images had mean (range) slice thicknesses of 3.0 (2.9-4.0) mm and in-plane voxel dimensions of 0.5 (0.4-0.6) mm. A physician contoured the prostate on all MR images.

We identified twenty clinical cases with MRI and CT that could be aligned well rigidly, making the cases well-suited for registration algorithm validation. Note that in the datasets used for algorithm validation in this study, X-rays were acquired immediately following implantation while MRI and CT were acquired the next day as required clinically. In this workflow, seed migration may occur, and the patient position is changed from lithotomy for X-ray to supine for MRI and CT. Therefore, the images used in this study represent more challenging registration problem than the expected clinical scenario where X-ray and MRI scans will take place on the same day.

II.B. Registration Algorithm

Fig. 1 provides a flow chart outlining major steps of the algorithm, indicating the two deformable registration methods investigated in this study. Implanted seeds are reconstructed...
from three X-rays by solving a combinatorial optimization problem and registered to MR images using an intensity-based points-to-volume registration method. As a pre-processing step, MR images are filtered to identify candidate seed locations, which are converted to a smooth distance map. The X-ray-based seed locations are then rigidly registered to the distance map using a stochastic evolutionary optimizer. The rigid registration is refined using an iterative closest point (ICP) algorithm that estimates an optimal affine transformation using singular value decomposition (SVD) at each iteration. The results of the affine registration are used to refine the candidate seed locations and distance map. While the ICP algorithm can also be implemented for rigid registration, the iterative approach is highly susceptible to local minima. For this reason, we chose to initialize the algorithm using the stochastic optimizer, thereby improving algorithm robustness to changes in pose.

Finally, a deformable registration step is used to account for local tissue deformations and seed migration. We compare two deformable registration methods 1) an iterative non-rigid CPD algorithm regularized using motion coherence theory and 2) gradient descent optimization of seed translations regularized by imposing forces between adjacent seeds based on a spring model. The output of these algorithms is a set of seed locations in the MRI coordinate system enabling computation of the radiation dose delivered to the prostate and nearby organs at risk. The details of each algorithm step are described as follows.

II.B.1. Seed reconstruction from X-rays

Seeds are reconstructed from X-rays using an algorithm previously developed by our group. APC-REDMAPS (REduced-Dimensionality Matching Algorithm for Prostate Seed reconstruction with Automatic Pose Correction) simultaneously corrects X-ray image pose errors and reconstructs seeds as a three-dimensional point cloud and is briefly described as follows. Three X-ray images are taken at different angles (poses) using an imaging system such as a mobile C-arm or kilo-voltage imaging system commonly available on linear accelerators. Image poses are tracked using an X-ray tracking fiducial that consists of a set of radio-opaque beads. The seeds and the fiducials are automatically segmented, discriminated from one another, and used to detect image pose. The three-dimensional seed cloud is then reconstructed by determining the unique correspondences of all the seeds among the images in the presence of partial seed occlusion using binary combinatorial optimization.
II.B.2. MRI Pre-Processing

Permanent brachytherapy seeds do not generate MR signal and typically appear as dark voids in T2 weighted MR images as shown in Fig. 1. We implemented pre-processing steps to identify candidate seed locations using MRI based on local hypo-intensities. First, the MRI was resampled using linear interpolation to have isotropic 0.8×0.8×0.8 mm$^3$ voxels to minimize directional bias in the algorithm. Next, background intensity variations in the MRI were mitigated using a filter described by

$$I'_{i,j,k} = (I \ast K)_{i,j,k} - I_{i,j,k}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)$$

where $I'_{i,j,k}$ is a filtered image voxel, $I_{i,j,k}$ is a raw image voxel, $\ast$ represents a two-dimensional convolution, and $K$ is a uniform two-dimensional circular kernel with 5 mm radius oriented in the axial plane. Due to the 3 mm slice thickness, convolution in the out-of-plane direction was not found to influence results so was omitted to decrease computation time. This operation produced the filtered image in Fig. 1, in which candidate seed locations appeared as hyper-intensities.

Candidate seed locations were isolated from the filtered image using a local peak identification algorithm, which exhaustively searched the spherical neighborhood around each voxel within the prostate contour to find the local maximum intensity. The radius of this neighborhood was set as 4 mm. The resultant candidate seeds were sorted in descending order based on the associated filtered image signal intensity. Candidate seeds were retained with filtered image intensity ≥10% of the maximum, including a maximum of 1.3N candidate seeds where $N$ is equal to the number of seeds in the X-ray based seed cloud. Since the MRI pre-processing step identifies all local hypo-intensities, including some non-seed features such as needle tracks, the threshold of 1.3N provided a sufficient number of true positive candidate seed locations for robust registration. This threshold selection is described further in Section II.C.3.

The final set of candidate seeds was then converted to a Danielsson distance map with...
isotropic 0.5×0.5×0.5 mm³ voxel dimensions. The distance map can be described using

\[ D(\vec{p}) = \min_n \|\vec{p} - \vec{c}_n\| \]  

where \( D(\vec{p}) \) is the value of the distance map at a voxel location \( \vec{p} \), and \( \vec{c}_n \) is the coordinates of an MRI-based candidate seed.

### II.B.3. Rigid Registration

The X-ray based seed cloud was initially registered to the distance map by finding the rigid transformation that minimized the mean squared distance between the X-ray-based seeds and the MRI-based candidate seed locations using

\[ \hat{R} = \arg \min_R \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} D(R\vec{s}_i)^2 \]  

where \( R \) is a rigid transformation matrix, and \( \vec{s}_i \) is the coordinates of a seed in the X-ray based seed cloud containing a total of \( N \) seeds. The six degree-of-freedom rigid transformation \( R \) was parameterized for optimization using three Euler angles and a three-dimensional translation vector. Equation 3 was minimized using a stochastic evolutionary optimizer. The transformation parameters were initialized assuming zero rotation and a translation vector that aligned the centers of mass of the X-ray-based seeds and the MRI-based candidate seeds. The optimization search space was initialized using parameter scale factors of 10 radians\(^{-1} \) (0.17 degrees\(^{-1} \)) and 1 mm\(^{-1} \), initial search radius of 3 mm, growth factor of 1.1, shrink factor of 0.96, and stopping criterion of the Frobenius norm of the covariance matrix < \( 1 \times 10^{-9} \).

### II.B.4. Affine Registration

To account for potential changes in scale, an affine registration was performed following the rigid registration. We employed an affine ICP algorithm for this purpose with stringent criteria for point correspondences (distance <3 mm) to mitigate the impact of false positive seeds. The ICP algorithm estimates the affine transformation mapping the X-ray-based seeds to the candidate seed locations using the method described by Umeyama, which
uses SVD of the covariance matrix of point positions to estimate a seven degree-of-freedom
affine transformation incorporating rotation, translation, and isotropic scaling while avoiding
reflections. Point correspondences are estimated at each iteration using a Kd-tree search
constrained to a 3 mm radius. The stopping criterion was defined as the change in mean
squared residuals < $1 \times 10^{-8}$ between iterations.

II.B.5. Candidate Seed Location Refinement

The candidate seed locations were refined using the affine registration results by exhaustively
searching the spherical neighborhood of each registered seed location for the local maximum
in filtered signal intensity. A spherical neighborhood radius of 3 mm was used to identify
seeds locally, while mitigating the possibility of identifying an incorrect adjacent seed. This
search radius selection is discussed further in Section II.C.3. Refined candidate seed locations
were again retained if the associated signal intensity was $\geq 10\%$ of the maximum filtered
image intensity.

II.B.6. Deformable Registration

In this study, we investigate the use of two deformable registration techniques to account for
local tissue deformation between the X-ray and MRI acquisitions. The two techniques are
a CPD approach, optimized using iterative expectation maximization, and a spring-model
approach, optimized using gradient descent. Both approaches use the results of the affine
registration as the moving point set, and the refined candidate seed locations as the fixed
point set. Both approaches also find a transformation function $\nu$ that minimizes the distance
between the moving point set and the fixed point set using an external energy term $U_E(\nu)$
while maintaining point cloud topology and deformation smoothness using an internal energy
(regularization) term $U_I(\nu)$. The general deformable registration cost function is

$$f(\nu) = U_E(\nu) + \frac{\lambda}{2} U_I(\nu)$$

where $\lambda$ defines the trade-off between goodness of fit and regularization.
**Coherent Point Drift (CPD):** Non-rigid CPD involves a maximum likelihood estimation of GMM centroid locations (moving point set) translated by a displacement function $\nu_{\text{CPD}}$ relative to a set of GMM observations (fixed point set). The displacement function $\nu_{\text{CPD}}$ is a set of weights of Gaussian basis functions defining translations in each direction for each seed in the moving point set. The external energy term is a negative log-likelihood function

$$U_E(\nu_{\text{CPD}}) = -\sum_{i=1}^{M} \log \left[ \omega \frac{1}{M} + (1 - \omega) \frac{1}{N} p(\vec{c}_i|j,\nu_{\text{CPD}}) \right]$$

where $\omega$ defines the weight of a uniform distribution term corresponding to the expected fraction of outliers in the fixed point set. $N$ and $M$ are the numbers of seeds in the moving and fixed point sets, respectively. The term $p(\vec{c}_i|j,\nu_{\text{CPD}})$ is a normalized Gaussian function of the Euclidean distance between the fixed point $\vec{c}_i$ and the transformed moving point $T(\vec{s}_j,\nu_{\text{CPD}})$. The internal energy term represents a high-pass filter of the displacement function

$$U_I(\nu_{\text{CPD}}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{|\tilde{\nu}(k)|}{G(k,\beta)} dk$$

where $G(k,\beta)$ is a Gaussian function with variance $\beta$, $\sim$ represents the Fourier transform, and $k$ is the spatial frequency parameter. This regularization enforces motion coherence by limiting high frequency displacement components, causing nearby points have similar displacements as described by motion coherence theory.$^{29,30}$ The external and internal energy terms were combined according to Eq. 4. In this study, $\omega$ was set to 0.05, $\beta$ and $\lambda$ were set to 3, which have been shown to result in robust non-rigid registration results.$^{29}$ This cost function was minimized using an iterative expectation maximization approach with stopping criterion of covariance of the GMM $< 1 \times 10^{-5}$. Further details regarding the formulation of the expectation and maximization steps are provided by Myronenko and Song.$^{29}$

**Spring Model:** A gradient-descent based optimization approach regularized using a spring model was employed, extended from the method proposed by Park et al.,$^{34}$ which was previously validated on a subset of implanted seeds. Briefly, the refined candidate seed locations were converted to a Danielsson distance map,$^{42}$ which was truncated at 3 mm to mitigate the influence of distant candidate seeds. This distance map was used to define an
external energy term $U_E(\nu_{spring})$, where $\nu_{spring}$ is a set of translation components for each seed in the moving point set. An internal energy term $U_I(\nu_{spring})$ was defined based on a spring model, penalizing changes in distance between nearby groups of seeds. The external and internal energy terms were combined according to Eq. 4 with a $\lambda$ value of 40. The cost function was minimized using a limited memory bounded quasi-newton BFGS optimizer. The seed translation components were bounded within [-3, 3] mm and optimizer stopping criterion of change in cost function value $< 1 \times 10^{-9}$ between iterations. Further details of the non-linear spring model and derivation of the cost function are provided in the Appendix.

II.C. Algorithm Validation

The registration algorithm was implemented in C++ using the Insight Segmentation and Registration Toolkit (ITK) (Kitware, Clifton Park NY), Point Cloud Library (PCL), and the CPD library developed by Gadomski (http://www.gadomski/cpd) and run on a laptop PC with a 2.6 GHz dual core Intel Core i5-7300U CPU and 16 GB of memory.

II.C.1. Target Registration Error

Target registration errors (TREs) were calculated following each major step of the registration algorithm to demonstrate and compare the improvements in accuracy attributed to affine and deformable registration methods. Manual CT/MRI-based seed locations were used as the ground truth for TRE calculation. We selected twenty patient data sets for which the CT and MR images exhibited little deformation leading to an accurate rigid registration, and CT seeds were automatically segmented using Variseed treatment planning software (Varian Medical Systems, Palo Alto CA) followed by an expert medical physicist’s manual adjustment on the CT image. The CT was rigidly registered to the MRI using a manual landmark approach, where seeds appearing in both images were used as fiducials to align the images. This approach was intended to minimize the registration error of the CT-based seed cloud to the MRI.

TREs were calculated for each seed following each registration method using one-to-one correspondences between the registered X-ray-based seeds and ground truth seeds. A single set of X-ray to ground truth correspondences was determined for each patient using the results of the deformable spring-model registration. This set of correspondences was used to
calculate the TREs for each registration approach, and was determined using an iterative correspondence estimation algorithm in PCL, CorrespondenceEstimationBackProjection. The TREs were then calculated as the three-dimensional Euclidean distances between the ground truth and X-ray-based seed locations following each registration method.

The mean, standard deviation (SD), and maximum TRE were calculated for each step of the registration algorithm for each patient. Due to the difference between the axial (in-plane) and superior-inferior (out-of-plane) spatial resolution of the MRI and CT, statistics were also calculated in terms of the in-plane and out-of-plane TRE components. Mean and maximum TREs were compared between the two deformable registration approaches in R using paired t-tests.

II.C.2. Dosimetric Analysis

Dose distributions were calculated following each registration approach using the TG-43 formalism and Theragenics model 200 $^{103}$Pd point source parameters. The clinical source strengths were used to calculate dose distributions for each patient in the MRI coordinate system with isotropic 2 mm dose grids. The post-implant dose distribution calculated based on the clinical CT and MRI registration approach and was used as the ground truth for comparison. The metric of interest was the minimum dose delivered to 90% of the prostate (D90), which was calculated for each patient based on the clinical prostate contour using SlicerRT. The error in prostate D90 was calculated for each patient and registration approach.

II.C.3. Sensitivity Analysis

Simulations were performed to assess the sensitivity of the rigid and deformable registration results to variations in the hyper-parameters used to identify the candidate seed locations. Since multiple factors may cause MR image quality to vary, robustness to variations in candidate seed identification is important for clinical applicability. Hyper-parameters were systematically varied and the algorithm was re-applied to all 20 patients. TREs were recomputed as described in Section II.C.1. In all simulations, the X-ray-to-ground truth seed correspondences were kept constant based on the deformable registration results obtained in Section II.C.1. to mitigate the impact of seed correspondences on the sensitivity analysis.
results.

**Rigid Registration:** Two parameters impacting the initial candidate seed localization method used for rigid registration are 1) the search radius of the local peak identification step and 2) the constraint on the maximum number of candidate seeds as described in Section II.B.2. The search radius of the local peak identification step was varied from 2 mm to 5 mm in 1 mm increments, and the constraint on the maximum number of candidate seeds was varied from 0.5N to 2N in 0.1N increments, where N is the number of seeds implanted. We investigated the impact of these two parameters on the number of candidate seeds actually identified, and on the resultant mean TRE following rigid registration.

**Deformable Registration:** The parameter impacting the refined candidate seed localization method used for deformable registration is the local search radius described in Section II.B.5., applied following affine registration. This local search radius was varied from 1 mm to 6 mm in 1 mm increments. The resultant mean and maximum TREs were calculated following deformable registration using the CPD and spring model approaches for each local search radius value.

### III. Results

#### III.A. Target Registration Error

Of the 1777 seeds implanted, one seed unidentified on CT for one patient due to potential migration, and two seeds identified >1 cm outside of the prostate in a second patient were excluded resulting in 1774 seeds for validation. Fig. 2 shows example MR images from two patients with seed locations identified at each step of the registration algorithm. The final column contains corresponding images from co-registered CT with manually identified seed locations that were used as the ground truth in this study. Seeds located within 3 mm of the selected slice were displayed in each image, leading to some seeds appearing or disappearing between images.

Fig. 3 contains histograms of TREs of all 1774 seeds following each component of the registration algorithm, showing incremental reductions in TRE with each step. Table 1
summarizes statistics of total TREs for all 1774 seeds, along with the in-plane (axial) and out-of-plane (superior-inferior) TRE components. The patient-specific mean TREs (mean ± SD) for the deformable-spring and deformable-CPD approaches were 1.81±0.48 mm and 1.76±0.43 mm, respectively (p = 0.21), and patient-specific maximum TREs were 5.37±1.25 mm and 5.07±1.38 mm, respectively (p = 0.009). The in-plane TRE component was larger than the out-of-plane component following the rigid and affine registrations, but was smaller than the out-of-plane component following deformable registration.

Fig. 4 contains boxplots of TREs for each individual patient following each step of the registration algorithm. In general, TREs decreased with each step of the algorithm for each patient. The affine and deformable registration led to incremental improvements in accuracy for each individual patient. Specifically, patients with the largest TREs following the rigid registration tended to have the largest TREs following affine and deformable registration as well. The deformable-CPD approach led to smaller mean TREs than the deformable-spring approach in 13 patients and smaller maximum TREs in 15 patients.

For the CPD approach, 1225 (69.0%), 1599 (90.1%), and 1751 (98.7%) of seeds had TREs within 2 mm, 3 mm, and 5 mm, respectively. Visual inspection of the 23 (1.3%) seeds with TREs >5 mm showed that 7 were outside of the prostate boundary, 4 were in the seminal vesicles, 3 were in the apex, and 1 was in the base. The remaining 8 cases appeared to be the result of sub-optimal one-to-one correspondences with the CT-based seeds used for TRE calculation. These seeds appeared near groups of other seeds, leading to unclear one-to-one correspondences with the CT-based seeds with at least one X-ray-based seed assigned to a distant CT-based seed. Since deformations near the prostate periphery appeared to contribute to these sub-optimal correspondences, the resultant TREs were not excluded from analysis.

The mean computation times of the APC-REDMAPS X-ray seed reconstruction (including X-ray image segmentation, image pose computation, and seed reconstruction) was 30 s. The mean computation times of the deformable-spring and deformable-CPD X-ray to MRI registration algorithms (including rigid and affine steps) were 9.6 s and 6.1 s, respectively.
III.B. Dosimetric Analysis

Example MRI and dose distributions calculated using each registration approach are shown in Fig. 5, along with the ground truth dose distributions derived from the clinical CT-to-MRI registration approach in Fig. 5c). Qualitatively, the dose distribution calculated based on the CPD approach appeared similar to the CT-based dose distribution, particularly near the urethra. Boxplots of the prostate D90 error for each registration approach are shown in Fig. 5a). The mean±SD magnitude of error for the rigid, affine, spring, and CPD approaches was 5.8±4.8%, 3.4±3.4%, 2.7±2.8%, and 2.3±1.9%, respectively. With the CPD approach, 18 (90%) of the patients had prostate D90 error within 5%, and the largest error was -6.8%.

III.C. Sensitivity Analysis

III.C.1. Rigid Registration

Plots of the number of candidate seeds identified versus the constraint on the maximum number of candidate seeds are shown in Fig. 6a). Increases in the constraint led to proportional increases in the number of candidate seeds identified up to a plateau value, beyond which the number of candidate seed locations identified remained approximately constant. This plateau value depended on the local peak search radius, where larger radii had lower plateau values. For a 4 mm search radius, the plateau value was approximately 1.25. Corresponding plots of the mean rigid TRE versus the constraint on the maximum number of candidate seeds is shown in Fig. 6b). Mean TREs tended to decrease with increasing constraint value up to a constraint of 1.0, beyond which the mean TRE change depended on the local peak search radius. The 4 mm search radius resulted in low and stable TREs for constraint values between 1.1 and 1.6. A local peak search radius of 4 mm and a constraint on the maximum number of candidate seeds of 1.3N were selected as default values.

III.C.2. Deformable Registration

Plots of the mean and maximum deformable TREs versus the refined candidate seed search radius are shown in Fig. 6c) and d), respectively. The CPD approach provided decreased mean TREs compared to the spring approach for search radii <4 mm, with a minimum value with a search radius of 3 mm. Similarly, the CPD approach provided decreased maximum...
TREs for search radii <6 mm, with a minimum value with a search radius of 3 mm. Both
deformable registration approaches demonstrated increases in TRE with search radii >3
mm. A refined candidate seed search radius of 3 mm was selected as the default value.

IV. Discussion

We have presented an algorithm for deformable registration of X-ray images and MRI for
PPB post-implant dosimetry. This algorithm enables a clinical workflow where soft tissue
contouring can by performed using MRI, and dose can be calculated in the MRI coordinate
system without the need for CT. By saving seed locations in DICOM-RT format, it would
be possible to use commercially available treatment planning systems for dose calculation.
Replacing the CT scan with three projection X-rays for seed localization reduces the effective
imaging dose by a factor of \(\sim 10\) and reduces clinical resource requirements. The TRE
distributions following the deformable-CPD registration approach resulted in mean±SD error
in prostate D90 of 2.3±1.9%. This dosimetric error resulting from the TRE distribution
with mean of 1.76 mm coincide with the simulation results of Su et al., which indicated
that normally-distributed seed localization errors with 2 mm standard deviation lead to
prostate D90 errors within 5%. Prostate D90 has previously been correlated with clinical
outcomes, and an uncertainty in D90 of 5% has been suggested to be clinically reasonable
in the context of other sources of uncertainty, such as contouring.

In this study, we compared two general approaches for deformable point cloud registra-
tion, and found that the CPD approach resulted in decreased TRE and computation time
when compared to the spring model-based gradient descent approach. To our knowledge,
the spring model approach is the only other algorithm previously investigated for this ap-
plication. The comparison showed that the CPD approach led to a statistically significant
decrease in the maximum TREs. The results of the sensitivity analysis suggest that spring
model-based regularization may limit seed translations to a greater degree than the CPD
approach, where the spring model provides smaller TREs than the CPD approach for refined
candidate search radii >4 mm. Decreasing the coefficient of the regularization term of the
spring model cost function may lead to small improvements in accuracy; however, the CPD
algorithm led to improved registration accuracy for the data in this study. Furthermore, the
accuracy of both deformable registration approaches appeared to be limited by the quality
of the candidate seeds identified from MRI, which is limited by image quality. The results of the sensitivity analysis suggest optimal parameters for candidate seed localization and refinement using clinical T2 weighted MRI using either deformable registration approach.

A limitation of the images analyzed in this study was the spatial resolution of the clinical T2 weighted MRI, which had mean voxel dimensions of $0.8 \times 0.8 \times 3.0 \text{ mm}^3$. The rigid and affine registration steps led to TREs with smaller out-of-plane than in-plane components, potentially attributed to the 0.4 mm superior-inferior spatial resolution of the X-rays used for initial seed reconstruction. Deformable registration using the spring-model or CPD approach led to TREs with smaller in-plane than out-of-plane components, suggesting that improved deformable registration accuracy can be achieved through improved MRI spatial resolution.

We did not directly evaluate the application of this algorithm to MR images acquired with different hardware or pulse sequences; however, the MRI pre-processing step involved signal intensity normalization within the prostate to limit sensitivity to changes in signal gain. Furthermore, we did not directly evaluate the application of this algorithm to different seed models; however, we expect that seed models leading to local hypo-intensities can be identified in the pre-processing step and used for deformable registration.

Limited spatial resolution of the CT likely also contributed to the measured TREs through non-zero target localization error from both the manual identification of seeds on CT and registration of the CT to MRI. Inter-observer variability in CT-based seed localization has been shown to be 1.1 mm. The CT and MRI registration accuracy may also have been influenced by the landmarks chosen for alignment, the CT and MRI acquisition parameters, or changes in patient position, bladder and rectum filling between the CT and MRI scans. Registration errors between CT and MRI would lead to systematic increases in measured TRE.

The image acquisition timeline used in this study was selected to provide test images (X-ray and MRI) and a reasonable ground truth (CT) for deformable registration while remaining clinically feasible. The timeline began with X-rays acquired immediately following the PPB implant followed by CT and MRI acquired the next day. In this scenario, we expect prostate deformations to occur between X-ray imaging and CT/MRI, thereby producing images that test the ability for the algorithm to perform deformable registration between X-rays and MRI in vivo. A limitation of this approach is the short time elapsing between CT and
MRI, during which further deformations may take place that would increase the measured TREs. We specifically selected patient cases for algorithm validation that displayed little or no visible deformation between CT and MRI to mitigate this effect. Another limitation of this timeline is that the changes in seed position observed between X-rays and MRI are likely larger than those that would be expected clinically, where we expect X-rays and MRI to be acquired on the same day, similar to the CT/MRI approach. A portion of the 1.3% of seeds with TREs >5 mm may have been caused by seed migration taking place in this one day interval.

In this study, we considered seeds implanted within the prostate and outside of the prostate within 1 cm of the prostate periphery, which commonly arise in peripherally loaded treatment plans. Seeds at the prostate periphery, particularly within the seminal vesicles, base, and apex may migrate following insertion. Visual inspection of the seeds with TREs >5 mm suggest that most of the apparent registration errors occurred in these regions prone to seed migration. For clinical post-implant dosimetry, X-rays used for seed reconstruction will typically be acquired on the same day as the MRI to mitigate potential seed migration and reduce the maximum TREs, similar to the CT/MRI approach. The deformable registration algorithm is currently limited to account for local deformations \( \leq 3 \) mm. Based on the results from this study, a 3 mm search neighborhood is sufficient to model most local prostate deformations while avoiding errors introduced by nearby seeds.

Finally, the X-ray and MRI-based post-implant dosimetry approach proposed in this study depends critically on the geometric accuracy of the MRI. This type of geometric error could lead to dosimetric errors when X-ray-based seeds are deformably registered to the MRI. The MR images analyzed in this study were acquired using the MRI simulator in our radiation oncology department, which corrects for geometric distortions using an algorithm available in the Siemens console workstation (Syngo). The MRI simulator also undergoes daily and monthly quality assurance using a phantom designed to detect geometric distortions.
V. Conclusions

We have proposed novel X-ray and MRI registration methods for PPB post-implant dosimetry. The proposed method requires only three X-rays acquired using a mobile C-arm imaging system for seed localization in the MRI coordinate system, potentially enabling reliable post-implant dosimetry without the need for CT. The total combined execution time of the X-ray based seed reconstruction and deformable registration is 36.1 s. The algorithm accuracy and computation time is sufficient for clinical PPB post-implant dosimetry.

Appendix

The derivation of the spring model-based cost function is described as follows, extended from the method proposed by Park et al. First, we define an external energy term $U_{E,i}$ for each seed $\mathbf{s}_i$ in the moving point set as

$$U_{E,i} = D(\mathbf{s}_i + \Delta \mathbf{s}_i)$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

where $D(\mathbf{p})$ is the distance from $\mathbf{p}$ to the nearest candidate seed location as defined in Eq. 2 and $\Delta \mathbf{s}_i$ is a set of local $[\Delta x_i, \Delta y_i, \Delta z_i]$ displacement components. We then define an internal energy term $U_{I,i}$ based on a non-linear spring model between adjacent seeds. Hooke’s law states that the restoring force $F$ exerted by a spring displaced by distance $\Delta L$ is given by $F = k \Delta L$ where $k$ is a spring constant. In an ideal spring, $k$ is inversely proportional to the original spring length $L$. To allow local deformations while preventing large translations that may change seed cloud topology, we define a non-linear spring constant for a pair of seeds $\mathbf{s}_i$ and $\mathbf{s}_j$ as

$$k_{i,j} = \frac{\lambda}{L_{i,j}^2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

where $\lambda$ is a constant defining the spring stiffness and

$$L_{i,j} = \| \mathbf{s}_i - \mathbf{s}_j \|$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)
The potential energy \( U_{I,i,j} \) associated with a displacement \( \Delta L_{i,j} \) is then

\[
U_{I,i,j} = \frac{\lambda}{2} \left( \frac{\Delta L_{i,j}}{L_{i,j}} \right)^2
\]  

(10)

The term \( \Delta L_{i,j} \) is approximated for two seeds \( \vec{s}_i \) and \( \vec{s}_j \) displaced by vectors \( \Delta \vec{s}_i \) and \( \Delta \vec{s}_j \), as

\[
\Delta L_{i,j} = \| (\vec{s}_i + \Delta \vec{s}_i) - (\vec{s}_j + \Delta \vec{s}_j) \| - \| \vec{s}_i - \vec{s}_j \| \\
\approx \| \Delta \vec{s}_i - \Delta \vec{s}_j \|
\]  

(11)

The internal energy for seed \( \vec{s}_i \) surrounded by \( Q \) neighboring seeds is then

\[
U_{I,i} = \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{Q} \left( \frac{\| \Delta \vec{s}_i - \Delta \vec{s}_{P(i,j)} \|}{\| \vec{s}_i - \vec{s}_{P(i,j)} \|} \right)^2
\]  

(12)

where \( P \) is a two-dimensional array of indices in which element \( P(i,j) \) is the index of the \( j^{th} \)-nearest neighbor to \( \vec{s}_i \). The spring model cost function is then defined according to Eq. 4 where the external and internal energy terms are defined for the set of \( N \) seeds as

\[
U_E(\nu_{spring}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} D(\vec{s}_i + \Delta \vec{s}_i)
\]  

(13)

\[
\frac{\lambda}{2} U_I(\nu_{spring}) = \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{Q} \left( \frac{\| \Delta \vec{s}_i - \Delta \vec{s}_{P(i,j)} \|}{\| \vec{s}_i - \vec{s}_{P(i,j)} \|} \right)^2
\]  

(14)

where \( \lambda \) can be interpreted as the spring stiffness or degree of regularization, and \( \nu_{spring} \) is the set of local displacements \( \{ \Delta \vec{s}_1, \Delta \vec{s}_2, \ldots, \Delta \vec{s}_N \} \). Values of \( Q \) and \( \lambda \) of 5 and 40 were used in this study. \( P \) was populated prior to optimization using a Kd-tree nearest neighbors search algorithm.43 Using the spring model energy terms, Eq. 4 was minimized using gradient descent optimization based on the partial derivatives

\[
\frac{\partial f(\nu_{spring})}{\partial \Delta u_i} = \nabla D(\vec{s}_i + \Delta \vec{s}_i) u_i + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^{M} \frac{\Delta u_i - \Delta u_{P(i,j)}}{\| \vec{s}_i - \vec{s}_{P(i,j)} \|^2}
\]  

(15)

where \( u \) is \( x, y, \) or \( z \).
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Figure Captions

Figure 1. Flow chart outlining the proposed deformable X-ray and MRI registration algorithm.

Figure 2. Example MR images with registered X-ray-based seed locations from two patients.

Figure 3. Histograms of TREs following each registration step for 1774 seeds. Mean values are indicated by the dashed lines.

Figure 4. Boxplots of TREs for each step of the registration algorithm for each patient. Center-lines indicate medians, boxes indicate inter-quartile range, and dots indicate TREs for each seed.

Figure 5. a) Boxplots of the prostate D90 error relative to the CT and MRI-based post-implant dosimetry approach. Center-lines indicate medians, boxes indicate inter-quartile range, and dots indicate the error for each patient. b-g) Example MRI and corresponding dose distributions in the MRI coordinate system.

Figure 6. a) Plot of the number of candidate seeds locations identified versus the constraint on maximum number of candidate seeds, both normalized to the number of seeds implanted. b) Mean rigid TRE versus the constraint on the maximum number of candidate seeds. c) Mean deformable TRE versus the refined candidate seed search radius. d) Maximum deformable TRE versus the refined candidate seed search radius. In all plots, dots represent the mean value across patients and error bars represent standard error.
### Tables

Table 1: Mean±SD TRE metrics across patients (mm).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRE Component</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>2.23±0.52</td>
<td>1.04±0.27</td>
<td>5.86±1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Affine</td>
<td>1.99±0.49</td>
<td>1.00±0.23</td>
<td>5.59±1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deformable-Spring</td>
<td>1.81±0.48</td>
<td>0.99±0.24</td>
<td>5.37±1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deformable-CPD</td>
<td>1.76±0.43</td>
<td>0.93±0.23</td>
<td>5.07±1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-plane</td>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>1.56±0.48</td>
<td>0.90±0.25</td>
<td>5.14±1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affine</td>
<td>1.34±0.39</td>
<td>0.84±0.24</td>
<td>4.82±1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deformable-Spring</td>
<td>1.14±0.34</td>
<td>0.79±0.24</td>
<td>4.57±1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deformable-CPD</td>
<td>1.09±0.30</td>
<td>0.75±0.23</td>
<td>4.37±1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-plane</td>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>1.33±0.36</td>
<td>0.95±0.24</td>
<td>4.44±1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affine</td>
<td>1.24±0.36</td>
<td>0.91±0.19</td>
<td>4.16±1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deformable-Spring</td>
<td>1.21±0.35</td>
<td>0.91±0.19</td>
<td>4.18±1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deformable-CPD</td>
<td>1.19±0.31</td>
<td>0.87±0.19</td>
<td>3.97±1.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: Flow chart outlining the proposed deformable X-ray and MRI registration algorithm.
Figure 2: Example MR images with registered X-ray-based seed locations from two patients.

Figure 3: Histograms of TREs following each registration step for 1774 seeds. Mean values are indicated by the dashed lines.
Figure 4: Boxplots of TREs for each step of the registration algorithm for each patient. Center-lines indicate medians, boxes indicate inter-quartile range, and dots indicate TREs for each seed.

Figure 5: a) Boxplots of the prostate D90 error relative to the CT and MRI-based post-implant dosimetry approach. Center-lines indicate medians, boxes indicate inter-quartile range, and dots indicate the error for each patient. b-g) Example MRI and corresponding dose distributions in the MRI coordinate system.
Figure 6: a) Plot of the number of candidate seeds locations identified versus the constraint on maximum number of candidate seeds, both normalized to the number of seeds implanted. b) Mean rigid TRE versus the constraint on the maximum number of candidate seeds. c) Mean deformable TRE versus the refined candidate seed search radius. d) Maximum deformable TRE versus the refined candidate seed search radius. In all plots, dots represent the mean value across patients and error bars represent standard error.