

# DENTEX: An Abnormal Tooth Detection with Dental Enumeration and Diagnosis Benchmark for Panoramic X-rays

Ibrahim Ethem Hamamci<sup>1\*</sup>, Sezgin Er<sup>2</sup>, Enis Simsar<sup>3</sup>, Atif Emre Yuksel<sup>4</sup>, Sadullah Gultekin<sup>4</sup>, Serife Damla Ozdemir<sup>5</sup>, Kaiyuan Yang<sup>1</sup>, Hongwei Bran Li<sup>1</sup>, Sarthak Pati<sup>6</sup>, Bernd Stadlinger<sup>7</sup>, Albert Mehl<sup>7</sup>, Mustafa Gundogar<sup>5</sup>, and Bjoern Menze<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Quantitative Biomedicine, University of Zurich, Switzerland

<sup>2</sup> International School of Medicine, Istanbul Medipol University, Turkey

<sup>3</sup> Department of Computer Science, ETH Zurich, Switzerland

<sup>4</sup> Department of Computer Engineering, Bogazici University, Turkey

<sup>5</sup> Department of Endodontics, Istanbul Medipol University, Turkey

<sup>6</sup> Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, USA

<sup>7</sup> Center of Dental Medicine, University of Zurich, Switzerland

\* Corresponding author: {ibrahim.hamamci@uzh.ch}

**Abstract.** Panoramic X-rays are frequently used in dentistry for treatment planning, but their interpretation can be both time-consuming and prone to error. Artificial intelligence (AI) has the potential to aid in the analysis of these X-rays, thereby improving the accuracy of dental diagnoses and treatment plans. Nevertheless, designing automated algorithms for this purpose poses significant challenges, mainly due to the scarcity of annotated data and variations in anatomical structure. To address these issues, the Dental Enumeration and Diagnosis on Panoramic X-rays Challenge (DENTEX) has been organized in association with the International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention (MICCAI) in 2023. This challenge aims to promote the development of algorithms for multi-label detection of abnormal teeth, using three types of hierarchically annotated data: partially annotated quadrant data, partially annotated quadrant-enumeration data, and fully annotated quadrant-enumeration-diagnosis data, inclusive of four different diagnoses. In this paper, we present the results of evaluating participant algorithms on the fully annotated data, additionally investigating performance variation for quadrant, enumeration, and diagnosis labels in the detection of abnormal teeth. The provision of this annotated dataset, alongside the results of this challenge, may lay the groundwork for the creation of AI-powered tools that can offer more precise and efficient diagnosis and treatment planning in the field of dentistry. The evaluation code and datasets can be accessed at <https://github.com/ibrahimethemhamamci/DENTEX>.

**Keywords:** DENTEX, challenge, tooth, dental enumeration, diagnosis, panoramic X-ray, object detection, machine learning

## 1 Introduction

Oral health is an integral part of overall well-being, and precise diagnosis and treatment are vital for the maintenance of healthy teeth and gums [1]. Panoramic X-rays are extensively used in dentistry to provide an inclusive view of the oral cavity, thus aiding in treatment planning for various dental conditions [2]. Nonetheless, interpreting these images can be a laborious task, often diverting clinicians from vital clinical activities [3]. Furthermore, the risk of misdiagnosis is substantial as general practitioners might lack specialized training in radiology, and communication errors due to work exhaustion can exacerbate this [4].

Recent advancements in artificial intelligence (AI) have opened the door to automated dental radiology analysis [5]. Yet, creating automated algorithms for panoramic X-ray analysis is challenging due to anatomical variations [6] and the shortage of publicly accessible annotated data [7]. Despite these hurdles, the potential benefits of incorporating AI in dental radiology analysis are substantial, promising improved treatment outcomes and patient satisfaction [8]. As a result, there is an escalating demand for research in this area to explore and develop effective AI algorithms for dental radiology analysis.

To address this gap, we introduce the Dental Enumeration and Diagnosis on Panoramic X-rays Challenge (DENTEX) held in collaboration with the International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention (MICCAI) in 2023. The primary objective of this challenge is to facilitate the development and evaluation of algorithms capable of detecting abnormal teeth accurately, including dental enumeration and associated diagnosis. This not only aids precise treatment planning but also enables practitioners to perform procedures with minimal errors [9].




Fig. 1: The hierarchical organization of the annotated data used in the DENTEX. The data is structured into three levels: (a) quadrant-only for quadrant detection, (b) quadrant-enumeration for tooth detection, and (c) quadrant-enumeration-diagnosis for abnormal tooth detection.

This challenge presents three categories of hierarchically annotated data along with supplemental unlabeled X-rays for potential pre-training, all annotated according to the Fédération Dentaire Internationale (FDI) system [10], as illustrated in Fig.1. The first dataset, partially labeled, encompasses anatomical quadrants. The second, also partially labeled, extends this to include the enumeration and localization of all visible teeth. The third dataset, fully labeled, provides a comprehensive perspective, detailing quadrants, enumerations, and diagnoses for each abnormal tooth, thereby defining the localization and classification tasks of the benchmark. Ultimately, the data—divided into these three subsets—directs the development of participant algorithms, which will be evaluated based on their proficiency in deciphering the complete spectrum of labels in the third dataset, culminating in the detection of abnormal teeth marked with three labels, as showcased in Fig.2.

In this paper, we present the results of the DENTEX evaluation and examine the performance variation for quadrant, enumeration, and diagnosis labels in abnormal tooth detection. Our challenge aims to provide insights into the efficacy of AI in dental radiology and its potential to enhance dental practice.

## 2 Materials & Methods

### 2.1 Data

The DENTEX dataset includes panoramic dental X-rays acquired from three distinct institutions. These images were captured under standard clinical conditions, yet they vary in terms of equipment used and imaging protocols followed. This leads to a diversity in image quality, reflecting the heterogeneity of clinical practice. The X-rays are taken from patients aged 12 years and above, randomly chosen from the hospital’s database to preserve patient privacy and confidentiality.

The dataset is structured hierarchically to facilitate the effective use of the FDI system. As shown in Fig. 1, it consists of three types of data: (a) 693 X-rays labeled only for quadrant detection, (b) 634 X-rays labeled for tooth detection with quadrant and tooth enumeration classifications, and (c) 1005 X-rays fully labeled for abnormal tooth detection with quadrant, tooth enumeration, and diagnosis classifications. The diagnosis class includes four categories: caries, deep caries, periapical lesions, and impacted teeth. An additional dataset of 1571 unlabeled X-rays is also available for pre-training purposes. All the necessary permissions have been obtained from the ethics committee, and the data is released publicly under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) license.

**2.1.1 Annotation Protocol.** DENTEX provides three hierarchically annotated datasets that facilitate various dental detection tasks: (0) plain images without annotations for optional pretraining, (1) quadrant-only annotations for quadrant detection, (2) quadrant-enumeration annotations for tooth detection, and (3) quadrant-enumeration-diagnosis annotations for abnormal tooth detection. While it may seem redundant to provide a quadrant detection dataset, it is crucial for utilizing the FDI Numbering System [10]. The FDI system is a globally used system that assigns each quadrant of the mouth a number from 1 through 4: the top right is 1, the top left is 2, the bottom left is 3, and the bottom right is 4 [11].

Then, each tooth and molar are numbered from 1 through 8, with 1 starting at the front middle tooth and the numbers increasing as we go farther back. For example, the back tooth on the lower left side would be 48 according to FDI notation, signifying quadrant 4, tooth number 8. Therefore, the quadrant segmentation dataset can significantly simplify the dental enumeration task, even though evaluations will be made only on the fully annotated third data.

All annotations in the DENTEX dataset are meticulously crafted by a team of dental experts. Specifically, each image is annotated by a final-year dental student, and these annotations are further verified and corrected by one of three expert dentists with over 15 years of experience. As a result, the annotated data in DENTEX is of the highest quality and accuracy, making it a valuable resource for dental research.

**2.1.2 Data Split for Evaluation and Training.** The DENTEX dataset consists of three types of annotated data: (1) partially annotated quadrant data, (2) partially annotated quadrant-enumeration data, and (3) fully annotated quadrant-enumeration-diagnosis data. The first two data types are intended for training and development purposes, while the third type is used for both training and evaluations.

The fully annotated third dataset, composed of 1005 panoramic X-rays, is divided into training, validation, and testing subsets, comprising 705, 50, and 250 images respectively, in accordance with standard machine learning practices [12, 13]. Ground truth labels are provided only for the training data, while the validation data is offered without associated ground truth, and the testing data remains hidden from participants.

Participants are allowed to use additional public data for augmenting the provided DENTEX dataset or for pre-training models on such datasets to enhance performance. However, they must ensure that all the data they use is publicly available. Additionally, they must document the use of external data clearly in their final short paper submission, providing details on the dataset and its source.

## 2.2 Performance Evaluation

Participants in the DENTEX Challenge are encouraged to submit their results on the online evaluation platform for both the training and validation datasets. However, the test dataset remains undisclosed to the participants. Instead, they are required to upload their proposed methods in a containerized format for the final testing phase. To evaluate the performance of the participating teams, the DENTEX Challenge utilizes a comprehensive set of metrics, including  $AP_{50}$ ,  $AP_{75}$ ,  $AP$ , and  $AR$  [14]. These performance evaluation metrics are calculated based on the fully annotated testing dataset, which includes quadrant-enumeration-diagnosis data for the quadrant, enumeration, and diagnosis aspects of dental image analysis. This results in a total of 12 metrics, 4 for each of the three labels of abnormal teeth, used for evaluating the performance of the participating teams.

Following the VerSe challenge [15] and the Brain Tumor Segmentation (BraTS) challenge [16], we use a point-based ranking process. This ranking process for the DENTEX Challenge involves comparing every possible pair of teams for each metric using the Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test [17]. In each comparison, the team that performs statistically better (with a p-value  $< 0.001$ ) earns one point. After comparisons have been completed, each team has a total point count, which reflects the number of times it outperformed its counterparts. To further enhance the robustness and reliability of the ranking system, bootstrapping techniques [18] are incorporated by resampling 10% of the data and repeating the ranking process for the remaining x-ray images. This generates a total point count for each team for every excluded X-ray image. The total point counts are then combined to establish the final ranking for the DENTEX Challenge.

The final top three ranked participating teams, according to their evaluation on the testing data, will be invited to MICCAI 2023 to present their methods and results and to receive their awards.

## 2.3 Participation Timeline

The challenge commences with the release of the training dataset, which includes imaging data and the corresponding ground-truth labels. Participants begin by designing and training their methods using this training dataset. The validation data is released within three weeks after the training data, allowing participants to obtain preliminary results on unseen data. Participants can report these results in their submitted short papers, in addition to their cross-validated results on the training data. The ground truth of the validation data is not provided to the participants, but multiple submissions to the online evaluation platform are permitted.

Finally, all participants will be evaluated and ranked based on the same unseen testing data, which will not be made available to the participants. After uploading their containerized method to the evaluation platforms, the final top-ranked participating teams will be announced at the 2023 MICCAI Meeting.




Fig. 2: Desired output from the final model, illustrating well-defined bounding boxes for abnormal teeth. The corresponding quadrant (Q), enumeration (N), and diagnosis (D) labels are also displayed.

## 2.4 Baseline Method

Our baseline approach, HierarchicalDet, presents a framework for multi-label, hierarchically labeled tooth detection [19]. This method utilizes a diffusion-based model for hierarchical object detection, an approach that has seen promising applications in different medical fields, such as segmentation [20], classification [21], reconstruction [22], and image generation [23].

The baseline method comprises two primary components: an image encoder that extracts high-level features from input images, and a detection decoder that refines the initial noisy boxes using the features. The diffusion process in this method is similar to the one used in DiffusionDet [24], which perceives object detection as a denoising diffusion process that transitions from noisy boxes to object boxes.

To enhance the performance of the baseline model, we incorporate a hierarchical learning architecture that leverages hierarchically annotated data and an innovative noisy box manipulation technique. This architecture enables us to use previously inferred boxes for improved detection accuracy, while the innovative noisy box manipulation technique promotes efficient learning from partially annotated data.

Furthermore, our baseline method integrates multi-label object detection using a customized Detectron2 library [25], designed to handle partial annotations. We strategically freeze the classification heads corresponding to unlabeled classes, exploiting all available information to bolster our model’s ability to work with partially labeled data.

## 3 Results

This section will be written in thorough detail after the challenge.

## 4 Discussion

In this paper, we present the design of the Dental Enumeration and Diagnosis on Panoramic X-Rays (DENTEX) Challenge, organized at MICCAI 2023.

### 4.1 Algorithm Design

In this section, we will discuss the design of the submitted approaches. This section will be elaborated in detail following the completion of the challenge.

## 4.2 Limitations of the Study

This study has several significant limitations worth discussing. First, the hierarchical labeling structure of our data results in partially annotated datasets for both the quadrant and quadrant-enumeration categories. This partial annotation may potentially impede the performance of the algorithms by providing limited information during the model training process.

Moreover, our dataset is limited in terms of the quantity of labeled and unlabeled panoramic X-Rays, thereby restricting the potential for both supervised training and self-supervised pretraining approaches. The fact that our data originates exclusively from three institutes, instead of being collected from a variety of cohorts, could also limit the generalizability of our findings.

With regard to data annotation, our dataset is labeled by dentistry students, with experienced dentists verifying these annotations. Despite the meticulousness of this approach in an attempt to minimize labeling bias, discrepancies may still exist due to variations in the expertise levels among students and dentists. Such inconsistencies could negatively impact the performance of the trained models and the reliability of the evaluation metrics.

Lastly, it is critical to acknowledge that the Average Precision (AP) and Average Recall (AR) metrics, widely used to evaluate object detection, have notable limitations. These include sensitivity to class imbalance, lack of specificity, insensitivity to false positives, challenges associated with threshold selection, inaccuracies arising from interpolation, susceptibility to the number of samples, limited applicability to specific tasks, and limited interpretability. These potential issues could result in misleading performance scores, complicating the accurate assessment of a model's true performance.

## Acknowledgments

We are grateful to all the data contributors, annotators, and participants for their time and efforts.

## References

1. M. S. Tonetti, P. Bottenberg, G. Conrads, P. Eickholz, P. Heasman, M.-C. Huysmans, R. López, P. Madianos, F. Müller, I. Needleman, *et al.*, “Dental caries and periodontal diseases in the ageing population: call to action to protect and enhance oral health and well-being as an essential component of healthy ageing—consensus report of group 4 of the joint efp/orca workshop on the boundaries between caries and periodontal diseases,” *Journal of clinical periodontology*, vol. 44, pp. S135–S144, 2017.
2. J.-J. Hwang, Y.-H. Jung, B.-H. Cho, and M.-S. Heo, “An overview of deep learning in the field of dentistry,” *Imaging science in dentistry*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 1–7, 2019.
3. A. Kumar, H. S. Bhadauria, and A. Singh, “Descriptive analysis of dental x-ray images using various practical methods: A review,” *PeerJ Computer Science*, vol. 7, p. e620, 2021.
4. M. A. Bruno, E. A. Walker, and H. H. Abujudeh, “Understanding and confronting our mistakes: the epidemiology of error in radiology and strategies for error reduction,” *Radiographics*, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 1668–1676, 2015.
5. S. AbuSalim, N. Zakaria, M. R. Islam, G. Kumar, N. Mokhtar, and S. J. Abdulkadir, “Analysis of deep learning techniques for dental informatics: A systematic literature review,” in *Healthcare*, vol. 10, p. 1892, MDPI, 2022.
6. A. E. Yüksel, S. Gültekin, E. Simsar, Ş. D. Özdemir, M. Gündoğar, S. B. Tokgöz, and İ. E. Hamamcı, “Dental enumeration and multiple treatment detection on panoramic x-rays using deep learning,” *Scientific reports*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 1–10, 2021.
7. N. A. El Joudi, M. B. Othmani, F. Bourzgui, O. Mahboub, and M. Lazaar, “Review of the role of artificial intelligence in dentistry: Current applications and trends,” *Procedia Computer Science*, vol. 210, pp. 173–180, 2022.
8. R. Pauwels, “A brief introduction to concepts and applications of artificial intelligence in dental imaging,” *Oral Radiology*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 153–160, 2021.
9. F. De Angelis, N. Pranno, A. Franchina, S. Di Carlo, E. Brauner, A. Ferri, G. Pellegrino, E. Grecchi, F. Goker, and L. V. Stefanelli, “Artificial intelligence: A new diagnostic software in dentistry: A preliminary performance diagnostic study,” *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, vol. 19, no. 3, p. 1728, 2022.
10. D. V. Tuzoff, L. N. Tuzova, M. M. Bornstein, A. S. Krasnov, M. A. Kharchenko, S. I. Nikolenko, M. M. Sveshnikov, and G. B. Bednenko, “Tooth detection and numbering in panoramic radiographs using convolutional neural networks,” *Dentomaxillofacial Radiology*, vol. 48, no. 4, p. 20180051, 2019.
11. A. J. Van Wijk and S. P. Tan, “A numeric code for identifying patterns of human tooth agenesis: a new approach,” *European journal of oral sciences*, vol. 114, no. 2, pp. 97–101, 2006.

12. S. Yadav and S. Shukla, "Analysis of k-fold cross-validation over hold-out validation on colossal datasets for quality classification," in *2016 IEEE 6th International conference on advanced computing (IACC)*, pp. 78–83, IEEE, 2016.
13. S. Pati, S. P. Thakur, I. E. Hamamci, U. Baid, B. Baheti, M. Bhalerao, O. Güley, S. Mouchtaris, D. Lang, S. Thermos, et al., "Gandlf: the generally nuanced deep learning framework for scalable end-to-end clinical workflows," *Communications Engineering*, vol. 2, no. 1, p. 23, 2023.
14. J. Redmon, S. Divvala, R. Girshick, and A. Farhadi, "You only look once: Unified, real-time object detection," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 779–788, 2016.
15. A. Sekuboyina, M. E. Husseini, A. Bayat, M. Löffler, H. Liebl, H. Li, G. Tetteh, J. Kukačka, C. Payer, D. Štern, et al., "Verse: A vertebrae labelling and segmentation benchmark for multi-detector ct images," *Medical image analysis*, vol. 73, p. 102166, 2021.
16. B. H. Menze, A. Jakab, S. Bauer, J. Kalpathy-Cramer, K. Farahani, J. Kirby, Y. Burren, N. Porz, J. Slotboom, R. Wiest, et al., "The multimodal brain tumor image segmentation benchmark (brats)," *IEEE transactions on medical imaging*, vol. 34, no. 10, pp. 1993–2024, 2014.
17. R. F. Woolson, "Wilcoxon signed-rank test," *Wiley encyclopedia of clinical trials*, pp. 1–3, 2007.
18. S. Abney, "Bootstrapping," in *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 360–367, 2002.
19. I. E. Hamamci, S. Er, E. Simsar, A. Sekuboyina, M. Gundogar, B. Stadlinger, A. Mehl, and B. Menze, "Diffusion-based hierarchical multi-label object detection to analyze panoramic dental x-rays," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.06500*, 2023.
20. B. Kim, Y. Oh, and J. C. Ye, "Diffusion adversarial representation learning for self-supervised vessel segmentation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.14566*, 2022.
21. Y. Yang, H. Fu, A. Aviles-Rivero, C.-B. Schönlieb, and L. Zhu, "Diffmic: Dual-guidance diffusion network for medical image classification," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.10610*, 2023.
22. Z.-X. Cui, C. Cao, S. Liu, Q. Zhu, J. Cheng, H. Wang, Y. Zhu, and D. Liang, "Self-score: Self-supervised learning on score-based models for mri reconstruction," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.00835*, 2022.
23. I. E. Hamamci, S. Er, E. Simsar, A. Tezcan, A. G. Simsek, F. Almas, S. N. Esirgun, H. Reynaud, S. Pati, C. Bluethgen, et al., "Generatect: Text-guided 3d chest ct generation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16037*, 2023.
24. S. Chen, P. Sun, Y. Song, and P. Luo, "Diffusiondet: Diffusion model for object detection," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09788*, 2022.
25. Y. Wu, A. Kirillov, F. Massa, W.-Y. Lo, and R. Girshick, "Detectron2," 2019.