
Abstract

Despite the success of deep learning approaches when applied to many neuroimaging tasks, there remain many barriers to their clinical translation. Here, we explore the main challenges and the approaches which have been explored to overcome them. We focus on issues relating to data availability, interpretability, evaluation and logistical challenges, and propose the challenges we believe are still to be overcome to enable the full success of big data deep learning approaches to be experienced outside of the research field.

Keywords:

1. Introduction

Across neuroimaging, the majority of datasets have been limited to small scale collections, focusing on a clinical population of interest. Recently, however, large scale ‘big data’ collections have begun to be collated. The largest of these is the UK Biobank (?), which has a goal of collecting brain imaging data from 100,000 volunteers, including 6 MRI modalities, to study structure, function and connectivity. The UK Biobank also contains large quantities of lifestyle and health factors, which allow us to create models of population ageing and how different factors interplay with this process. For instance, the atrophy of the hippocampus is a well validated biomarker for Alzheimer’s disease, and so, using the UK Biobank, a nomogram of volume with normal ageing can be created (?), illustrating the progression with age and percentiles of expected volume across the population.

Due to the growth in size of the datasets, deep learning models are now an option for neuroimaging analysis. Applications of deep learning techniques to neuroimaging data have been explored in a research setting, with increasing numbers of novel methods proposed year on year. Powered by their ability to learn complex, non-linear relationships and patterns from data, deep learning methods have been applied to a wide range of applications and have found success in previously unsolved problems. They have, for instance, been applied to the UK Biobank data to create models of healthy ageing, with the results following observations from across the ageing literature (?).

For our models to have impact they need to be *translatable* – that is, they need to have genuine clinical impact beyond the research field. Having created our model of healthy ageing, when a patient arrives in the clinic we wish to be able to acquire their MRI scan




Figure 1: An example network architecture for a convolutional neural network (CNN) for a classification or regression task.

and compare their scan to the population trends. This would then allow us to identify if the patient was ageing differently to the population average, and potentially identify the need for intervention. Unfortunately, comparing a scan to the normative model is not as simple as merely acquiring a scan and making that comparison. First, research data differs from clinical data in terms of quality, acquisition and purpose and, further, MRI data acquired on different scanners or with different protocols may be sufficiently different in characteristics that the model is no longer valid. Second, the populations may differ so far that the clinical patient falls outside of the population modelled and we do not know if the models will extrapolate. Third, logistical challenges make the deployment of the models hard in a clinical setting, potentially to the point where it is not currently possible for them to be used outside of the research world.

These challenges limit the impact that big datasets such as the UK Biobank are currently able to have on patient care and work must be undertaken to allow our models to extend beyond the research domain. Recent developments in deep learning have begun to tackle the problems faced, but further developments are needed. Here, we will discuss the challenges being faced and current approaches being used to mitigate them. We will also identify and explore the barriers we believe still need to be overcome.

1.1. Deep Learning Background

To understand the challenges for clinical translatability of deep learning methods, we first require an overview of how these methods approach problems – for a more detailed introduction see, for example, (?). We will only consider convolutional neural networks (CNNs), which form the vast majority of deep learning methods currently applied in medical imaging, an example architecture of which is shown in Fig. 1. The majority are *supervised* approaches (?), meaning that to explore the research question, we need access to a dataset of images, \mathbf{X} , and the set of labels, \mathbf{y} , for the task we wish to explore. This requires an understanding of the information that we expect to be encoded within the images and an understanding of which questions are of interest, defined as *domain knowledge*. Examples for the \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{y} data could be a structural scan with an associated segmentation mask, or multiple modality data for \mathbf{X} , with the label being a prognosis.

Having curated and appropriately preprocessed the data (for instance, skull stripping, bias field correction, see e.g. (?)) the task is then to design a neural network architecture which we expect to be able to map from \mathbf{X} to \mathbf{y} through learning a highly non-linear mapping function $f(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}; \mathbf{W})$, where \mathbf{W} are the trainable weights of the neural network. The choice of architecture is highly influenced by a variety of factors: the task being explored, the quantity of data available, and the computational power available, and is again highly influenced by domain knowledge.

Nevertheless, most networks are formed through the same basic building blocks. The first are *convolutional filters*, which learn features of interest from the data, encoding spatial relationships between pixels by learning the image features from small patches of the input data, determined by the filter’s *kernel size*. These layers, then, complete *feature extraction*. They contain the weights and biases which need to be learned during the optimisation process, $\mathbf{W} = \{\mathbf{w}, b\}$, and stacks of these layers are placed at different spatial resolutions in order for a range of different features to be extracted at each level of abstraction, allowing us to create a rich understanding of the input data. During the forward pass of the *back propagation* training procedure (?), each filter is convolved across the width and height of the input volume, and the dot product between the filter and the input is calculated. This means that the network learns filters which activate when specific features are detected, and the exact nature of the features is learned through a network optimisation procedure that updates the filter weights.

The next components are the *activation functions* which play a fundamental role in the model training. The activation functions apply a non-linear transformation to the data,




Figure 2: Example extracted features, \mathbf{z}_l , for brain age prediction (see (?)) at different network depths and spatial resolutions. It can be seen that several different features are extracted and some features are repeated, showing redundancy in filters.

after it has been weighted by the convolutional layers. This non-linearity provides a distinct edge to the CNNs, allowing them to learn the complex non-linear relationships (or mapping) between the input and the output. Without the non-linear activation functions, CNNs would be rendered as only linear models despite the flexibility to learn the weights and sequential nature. Commonly used activation functions include rectified linear units (ReLU) (?) and sigmoid. Therefore, the features, \mathbf{z}_l , at layer depth l are given by $\mathbf{z}_l = \text{ReLU}(\mathbf{z}_{(l-1)} * \mathbf{w}_l + b_l)$ and we can see that, due to the CNN’s sequential data flow, the features at a given depth are a non-linear combination of the previous features and the weights and biases. Therefore, despite the sequential nature of CNNs, without the activation functions we would only be able to train linear models. Example extracted features, \mathbf{z}_l , after the activation function, can be seen in Fig. 2.

The networks then learn features at different spatial resolutions through the inclusion of *pooling blocks*, which reduce the input over a certain region to a single value, thus subsampling the data and condensing information. Pooling condenses the intensity-based information, which also provides a basic invariance to rotations and translations, and has been demonstrated to improve the object detection capability of convolutional networks. Learning features at different resolutions allows the network to create a rich understanding of the input image, aiding the mapping between the input data, \mathbf{X} , and the output label, \mathbf{y} .

The final key component of neural networks are *fully connected layers*, which are essential to many classification or regression architectures. They are normally placed at the end of a network, after the convolutional layers have extracted features from the data, and then the fully connected layers learn how to classify these features. The activation map from the final layer of the feature extraction is reshaped into a long vector instead of a volume *tensor*. In fully connected layers, all nodes in one layer are connected to all the nodes in the next, meaning that they are much more computationally expensive than convolutional layers.

By feeding the data through the network, we are able to create an output prediction. To make these predictions meaningful, the weights of the network must be optimised using a process called *back propagation* (?), and normalisation techniques such as *batch normalisation* are added to minimise the impact of outliers and help result generalisation (i.e. performance on new or unseen datasets)(?). To this end, we evaluate a *loss* or *cost function* which determines the error in the network prediction by comparing the prediction ($\hat{\mathbf{y}}$) and the true label (\mathbf{y}). The choice of the loss function is task-dependent, and plays a crucial role in the final network performance. The optimisation algorithm is often stochastic gradient decent or a similar algorithm, which updates the weights such that we reach a *minimum*




Figure 3: In classification tasks, there is likely to be a continuum between the classes and the decision boundary chooses where one class begins and another ends. For subjects on or close to this decision boundary it becomes critical as it determines the classification given.

in the *loss space*: that is, a model which minimises the loss. The aim is to find the *global minimum* of the loss space, which is the place in the loss space which most minimises the loss function. However, the optimisation can get stuck in *local minima* which are spots of low loss due to the non-convex nature of the loss function and so the *learning rate* (the step size taken during the optimisation process) must be chosen to best help the model find the global minimum.

Therefore, we have an optimisation problem, the performance of which is highly dependent on two factors: first, the design decisions made about the network architecture and the loss functions; second, the data available to train the network. This optimisation process determines the location of the *decision boundary*, that is which locations in the feature space will be allocated to which class and so which data points are allocated to each class, as illustrated in Fig. 3.

In computer vision, where most of the deep learning techniques have been developed, very large datasets are available, with datasets commonly consisting of many millions of data points and being relatively easy to curate, for instance, by scraping the internet for images. In neuroimaging in general, data has to be labelled by a domain expert rather than mechanically produced. This is one of many differences between working in medical imaging

and computer vision field, and therefore, although many of the methods used were developed in vision related fields, there are challenges specific to working in the medical imaging or neuroimaging domain.

2. Data Availability

For clinical translatability of deep learning techniques, data availability is a major limitation. Despite the growth in the size of available datasets, the largest are still only of the order of tens of thousands of imaging subjects, with a thousand images being commonly regarded as a large dataset. For many specific tasks, datasets exist only in the order of hundreds of subjects, due to many factors such as the monetary and time cost of acquiring data, the difficulties in sharing and/or pooling data across sites, and the fact that, for some conditions, there are insufficient patients to create a dataset of any great size (?). For instance, the frequently explored Brain Tumour Segmentation (BraTS) dataset (?) only has data from 369 subjects¹ available for training, which is in stark contrast to the popular datasets from computer vision such as ImageNet (?) (1,281,167 training examples), CIFAR-10 (?) (50,000 training examples) and MNIST (?) (60,000 training examples) where many of the methods are being developed. By simply looking at dataset sizes, it is clear that we are likely to be underpowered for training neural networks. Highly parameterised, deep neural networks are very dependent on the amount of available training data (??), with performance generally improving as the number of data points is increased, and they are far more affected by the amount of available training data than classical machine learning techniques, due to the need to learn the useful features as well as the decision boundary (?).

2.1. Maximising the impact of available data

There has, therefore, been an increasing focus on developing techniques to facilitate the most effective use of the data available. A commonly used technique from computer vision is the use of large natural image datasets (???), with ImageNet (?) being the most popular (?), to *pre-train* the network. Pre-training involves training the weights on a related task with more available data, such that the optimisation starts from an informed place, rather than a random initialisation. We can see why this might be useful by considering the information learned by the network at the different stages (?): the early layers learn features such as edges and simple textures, largely resembling Gabor filters – see Fig. 2 –

¹Training Data for 2020 challenge

and are therefore very general and applicable across different images, regardless of the target tasks (?). The deeper convolutional layers then tend to learn features such as more complex textures and object parts, and the final layers learn feature which are far more task- and dataset-specific (e.g. fully connected layers learn discriminative features for a classification task). Therefore, we can take a network pre-trained on the large, canonical dataset, and either use the network to extract features which we then pass to a classifier, requiring only the classifier to be trained, or, more commonly, we can fine-tune the deeper layers to the specific task. This requires less data, as not only are we starting the optimisation process from an informed point in the *parameter space*, but also the earlier layers can often be frozen (kept at their value and not updated during training) greatly reducing the number of weights in the model that need to be optimised. This process is referred to as *transfer learning* and is a step frequently used to allow networks to be trained with lower amounts of training data. Transfer learning can be performed across data domain (dataset), task, or both, depending on the datasets available for pre-training.

The standard practice is to use the very large datasets of natural images for the pre-training. However, natural images have very different characteristics from medical images and thus, the features learned are not necessarily the most appropriate for the tasks we need to consider (?). For instance, natural images are often stored as RGB images, whereas MR images are encoded as greyscale. Similarly, in medical images the location of structures could be informative, which is rarely true in natural images. Creating pre-trained networks for medical images has therefore been a focus, with Model Genesis (?) creating a flexible architecture trained to complete multiple tasks, to create features which aim to generalise across medical imaging tasks. Similarly, some works pre-train on large datasets such as the UK Biobank for tasks such as age prediction or sex prediction, where obtaining labels is relatively trivial (?) or on datasets for the same task with a dataset where more labels are available (??????). Here again, the aim is to learn features from the prediction task which are useful for the task we are interested in: that is, features that generalise across tasks.

Other studies utilise self-supervised approaches, such as *contrastive representation learning*, where general features of a dataset are learned, without labels, by teaching the model which data points are similar or different. These then act as the starting point for model training on the smaller target dataset, rather than pre-training the model on a different dataset. An example approach is presented in (?), where the data has been *augmented* (small transformations applied to increase the size of the dataset, discussed below) and then the network is trained to encode the original image and the augmented image into the same




Figure 4: Example augmentations that might be applied to a MRI image. Standard augmentations, those that come directly from computer vision approaches, and domain specific augmentations for neuroimaging which focus on variation that would be likely to be seen within MR images.

location in the feature space, using a contrastive loss function (?), that learns features describing the similarity between images. Different self-supervised methods and contrastive loss approaches have been developed (??), and have begun to be applied for medical imaging applications (????), including for segmentation of MRI scans of the brain (??), increasing the performance on tasks where a small amount of data is available.

2.2. Data Augmentation

Convolutional neural networks, however, still ultimately require a reasonable amount of data (100s or 1000s) in the target data domain, as at least some of the network parameters must be fine-tuned to optimise the network for the specific dataset and task. Even though the amount of data required is likely to be reduced (the degree to which it is reduced will be determined by the similarity between the proxy task and target task (??)) the amount still required may remain greater than is available for the task we are exploring. In this circumstance, data augmentation is normally applied (??), artificially increasing the size and diversity of the training dataset through applying transformations, creating slightly perturbed versions of the data.

These augmentations can take the form of basic transformations such as flips and rotations (??) as standardly applied in computer vision tasks, to more extreme examples such as mixup (?), or generative networks such as conditional Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) to generate simulated data (?), example segmentations can be seen in Fig. 4. While the vast majority of deep learning studies apply data augmentation during training, some

studies explore this for neuroimaging specifically, and its effect on model performance. For instance augmentation can be achieved through GANs being used to generate additional meaningful datapoints (?????) or registration to templates (???), which generate biologically plausible transformations of the data. Similarly, they can be produced by identifying augmentations which are plausible across sites and scanners (??), such as applying bias field.

Existing literature suggests that performing augmentations, even those which transform the images beyond realistic shape and appearance (?), helps the network to generalise better to unseen data at test time. Data augmentation must be handled with caution, however, so that the transformations applied do not change the label associated with the image. Consider, for instance, when trying to classify Alzheimer’s disease from structural MRI: the key indicator would be the atrophy of the hippocampus and so, if any transformations are applied during the augmentation process that affect this region (e.g. local elastic deformations), care must be taken to ensure that the perceived level of atrophy is not affected and, thus, the true label changed. Ensuring this requires high levels of specific domain knowledge and therefore, for certain scenarios, limits the augmentations which can be applied. Their application also requires domain knowledge, so that they encompass the expected variation of any test data sets.

Other approaches to solving the shortage of available data focus on breaking the input data down into patches e.g. (??) or slices (where 3D data is available) with many studies treating MRI data as 2D inputs e.g. (???). This approach can vastly increase the amount of available data and can be especially effective for segmentation tasks where we have voxelwise labels. However, by fragmenting the image, these approaches lead to the loss of global information. Although this can be compensated for to some degree using optical flow (?) or conditional random fields (?), patch-wise or slice-wise approaches cannot necessarily be applied to classification tasks, where a single label is provided for the whole image (which may not be valid for all slices) on a given patch or slice of the image (?). When these approaches can be applied, say for a segmentation task, care must be taken when combining the patches at the output to reconstruct a single output image, so that we do not suffer from artefacts at boundaries. Fully 3D networks have been found in most cases to provide better results when they can be implemented (?).

2.3. Differences between datasets or data domain shift

Having sufficient data to train the model, however, is only the first difficulty being faced by clinical application of these methods. Deep learning methods have a very high degree of freedom which enables them to learn very complicated and highly non-linear mappings




Figure 5: To demonstrate the effect of the difference between domain datasets or domain shift, we completed tissue segmentation on data from three sites collected as part of the ABIDE (?) multisite dataset. Although the data was collected as part of the same study, there are differences between the data collected at different sites due to being collected on different scanners. The architecture used was a 3D UNet (?) with T1 as the input image, and only images from one site were used during training. The predictions can be seen for example images for three sites, the one seen during training and two unseen. It is clear that the segmentation for the site seen during training is good but suffers significant degradation when applied to the unseen sites, despite them being collected for the same study and having similar (normalised) voxel intensities, demonstrating the potential difficulties caused by domain shift.

between the input images and the labels, but this same high degree of flexibility comes at a cost: deep learning methods are prone to *overfitting* to the training data (?). Furthermore, while, a well-trained model should interpolate well to data which falls within the same distribution as that seen during training, the performance degrades quickly once it has to extrapolate to out-of-distribution data, and even perturbations which are not noticeable by the human eye can cause the network performance to collapse (?). Considerable research effort within computer vision has focused on generalisability from the dataset seen during training to the dataset only seen during testing, where both datasets are drawn from the same distribution. For clinical translatability, we would need generalisability from the training set to all other reasonable datasets, including those which have not yet been collected.

If, for instance, we consider multisite datasets, such as from the ABIDE study (?), where attempts have been made to harmonise acquisition protocols and to use identical phantoms across imaging sites, there is still an increase in non-biological variance when we pool the data across the sites and scanners (?). A demonstration of this variance leading to performance degradation for a segmentation task is shown in Fig. 5. Multiple studies have confirmed this variation, identifying causes (batch effects) from scanner and acquisition differences, including scanner manufacturer (??), scanner upgrade (?), scanner drift (?), scanner strength (?), and gradient non-linearities (?).

The removal of this scanner-induced variance is therefore vital for many neuroimaging studies. The majority of deep learning approaches try either to produce harmonised images (????), or to remove the scanner related information from the features used to produce the predictions (?). Both approaches aiming for any results obtained for use downstream to be invariant to the acquisition scanner and protocol. These methods succeed in removing the scanner effects from the predictions, but hold no guarantees for scanners not seen during training, and, as the results are very hard to verify without ‘travelling heads datasets’ (images from the same subjects acquired on the scanners to be harmonised) the results obtained from the generated harmonised images are hard to validate (?).

The domain shift experienced when we have multisite data is much less than might be expected when we move between research data and clinical data, or even just two datasets collected independently. The domain shift here can come from two clear sources: the scanner and acquisition, and the demographics of the studies. Firstly, MRI scans collected for research are often at a higher resolution – 7T or 3T – with smaller spacing. On the other hand, clinical scans are designed to be much more time efficient – both in terms of acquisition time and in time required for visual inspection – and are often collected at a lower

277 resolution, for instance at 1.5T. Research scans frequently also have isotropic voxel sizes,
278 whereas anisotropic voxels are still the norm in the clinic and are present in the vast major-
279 ity of legacy data (?). Additionally, the majority of deep learning approaches also expect a
280 specific acquisition protocol. Unfortunately, due to the lack of data already discussed, we
281 are unlikely to be able to train the model directly on the clinical data.

282 Therefore, methods are being developed that consider this domain shift (one such in-
283 stance being the shift between clinical and research data), which, similarly to the harmon-
284 isation problem, focus either on domain adaptation approaches to create shared feature
285 representations for the different datasets, or in synthesising data to enable us to use the
286 clinical domain. Unlike the harmonisation paradigm, they do not wish to allow us to com-
287 bine the datasets, but simply to be able to harness the shared information from one domain
288 to the other. Domain adaptation techniques normally consider the situation where we have
289 a large source dataset – say a research dataset such as the UK Biobank (?) – and a much
290 smaller target dataset – say the clinical dataset that we are actually interested in (??).
291 Domain adaptation then asks the question: *can a shared embedding be found which is dis-*
292 *criminative for the task of interest, while invariant to the domain of the data?* This can take
293 the form of a fully supervised problem, where task labels are available for both datasets,
294 semi-supervised (?), where only a small number of labels are available for the target dataset,
295 or unsupervised (??), where no labels are available for the target dataset. The vast majority
296 of approaches perform domain adaptation across domains only; however, some also consider
297 adaptation across related tasks (?) and have been applied for segmentation (????) and
298 classification problems (?). These methods are clearly closely related to transfer learning
299 from a large dataset, but a single feature representation is found for both source and target
300 dataset, rather than creating a new one for the target dataset. These methods perform well
301 on the target data, but further work is required to enable them to adapt reliably to higher
302 numbers of datasets simultaneously.

303 Domain adaptation methods, at the extreme, essentially have the end goal that the
304 network would work regardless of the acquisition, which is an active area of research (???).
305 The other approach which has been explored is to use generative methods to convert the
306 data from one domain to the other (?), such that the transformed data can be used in
307 the existing model. Any generated images must be carefully validated to ensure that they
308 convey the same information as the original and that the outcomes are the same.

309 Finally, research data is generally cleaner than clinical data. For instance, many de-
310 veloped algorithms require multiple input modalities and therefore, cannot be applied to a

311 subject if they do not have all the scanning modalities available (?). Missing modalities,
312 different fields of view, and incidental findings would all potentially lead to the performance
313 of the model being significantly degraded or the model simply not being applicable. Ap-
314 proaches to deal with missing modalities exist (?), but generally still result in a significant
315 degradation in performance, compared to when all modalities are present. Similarly, models
316 are likely to suffer performance degradation or exhibit unexpected behaviour when presented
317 with unexpected pathologies that were not present in the training set (?). Due to the inclu-
318 sion criteria involved in research studies, incidental findings and co-morbidities occur more
319 in clinical data.

320 *2.4. Data Composition and Algorithmic Biases*

321 Finally, and potentially most concerning, is the consideration that the demographics of
322 study data frequently do not fully represent the population as a whole, and so a domain
323 shift is experienced when we attempt to move from the research domain to the clinical
324 domain. Research data is usually acquired with a certain study question in mind and
325 therefore subjects are selected so as to try to allow targeted exploration of that question.
326 Therefore, research datasets rarely contain subjects with co-morbidities and subjects with
327 incidental findings would possibly be excluded from the study. An example being that
328 patients with advanced Alzheimer’s disease are unlikely to be recruited for an imaging study,
329 due to the ethical implications (?), such as the inability to consent and the potential trauma
330 of being scanned.

331 In addition, there exists a strong selection bias, both in relation to the people who
332 volunteer for studies and those who see the study through to the end, with studies having
333 demonstrated associations to age, education, ancestry, geographic location, and health status
334 (??). Furthermore, people with family connections to a given condition are more likely to
335 volunteer for a study as a healthy control, leading to certain genetic markers being more
336 prevalent in a study dataset than in the population as a whole (?). Therefore, associations
337 learned when considering research data may not generalise, and care must be taken in
338 extrapolating any model trained on these datasets to clinical populations.

339 Therefore, any trained model will suffer from algorithmic bias: that is, the outcomes
340 of the model will potentially be systematically less favourable to, or have systematically
341 lower performance on, individuals within a particular group, where there is no relevant
342 difference between groups that justifies such harms (?). Erroneous or unsuitable outcomes
343 will likely be produced for the groups who are less likely to be represented in the training
344 data. Algorithmic bias is therefore a function of the creator and the creation process, and

fundamentally, of the data which drove the model training. When considering bias, there are two issues that must be considered: first, *does the algorithm have different accuracy rates for different demographic groups?* Second, *does the algorithm make vastly different decisions when applied to different populations?* As networks simply learn the patterns in the data, any bias, such as racial bias (?), in the data will be learnt and encoded into the models.

Inevitably, when considering complicated questions with extremely heterogeneous populations, the datasets used to train the deep learning methods will be incomplete and insufficient in terms of spanning all the possible modes of variability (?). For instance, pathologies will occur against a background of normal ageing, with differences being present between individuals due to both processes. Sufficiently encompassing all this variation is infeasible, not only due to the number of subjects which would be required, but also to the difficulty in recruiting subjects from some specific groups. There is, therefore, often inadequate data from minorities, and consequently any model found through the optimisation process (which is usually selected as the model which performs best on the average subject in the validation dataset) will probably be inadequate for these groups, especially for conditions with higher rates in these groups (?). When models are developed for clinical translation, therefore, the limitations of the models must be understood: wherever groups are under-represented, the appropriateness of the application of the model must be considered, and any limitations identified. Where these limitations mean that minorities will receive a lower standard of care, the models are inappropriate.

3. Interpretability

The performance degradation experienced with domain shift would be potentially less problematic were it not for another problem associated with deep learning methods: that is, models will output a prediction for any data fed, but that prediction may not necessarily be meaningful. Lacking a ‘do not know’ option, given any image of the correct input dimension, a neural network will output a prediction, even if that prediction is meaningless or the input is nonsensical. For instance, if a random noise image is fed into a network trained to predict brain age, the network will predict a valid age for the random noise (see Fig. 6). While in this example, identifying the blank image is trivial, were the network trained for a more complicated classification task, identifying erroneous results is more difficult and requires large amounts of clinical and domain knowledge. This therefore leads to the critical question, can the results be trusted?

Despite the assertion of Geoffery Hinton, head of GoogleBrain, that there is no need for




Figure 6: If we take a model trained to predict brain age (?) from T1 structural images and present the network with an image of random noise, as it is unable to output an unknown class, the network predicted the random noise to have an age of 65, around the average age of the subjects of the dataset. While we clearly can identify the random noise image, there are many situations where the model could be presented with an image outside of the distribution it was trained on, but would still output a result, which would be much harder for a user to identify.

AI to be interpretable, the majority would agree that, were deep learning and AI methods to be used to determine patient care, they need to be interpretable and interrogable. Interpretability is often defined as ‘*the ability to provide explanations in understandable terms to a human*’. The explanations should, therefore, be logical decision rules which lead to a given diagnosis or patient care being chosen, and the understandable terms need to be from the domain knowledge related to the task. This is especially important because neural networks have no semantic understanding of the problem. That is, they have no understanding of the problem they are being asked to solve. Rather, they are blunt tools which given \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{y} learn a mapping between the two. If there exists spurious information in \mathbf{X} which can aid in this mapping (or *confounders*), then this information will probably be used, misleading the predictive potential of the network. Consider for instance, the case where all subjects with a given pathology were collected on the same scanner. A network could then achieve 100% recall (correctly identify all examples) for this pathology by fitting to the scanner signal, rather than learning any information about the pathology (?). It would then, in all probability, identify a healthy control from the same scanner as having the same pathology.

The effect of confounders would not be observed without further probing of the behaviour of the trained model, and the probing of networks is non-trivial. This has led to neural networks being commonly described as ‘blackbox’ methods. There is therefore a need for interpretable networks, allowing both understanding and scrutiny of any decision made. Approaches have broadly focused on two main areas: visualisation and uncertainty.

3.1. Visualisation

Visualisation methods generally attempt to show which aspects of the input image led to the given classification, often by creating a ‘heat map’ of importance of the input image. Many of these methods are post-hoc, taking a pre-trained model and trying to understand how the decision was made. Most commonly, these methods analyse the gradients or activations of the network for a given input image, such as saliency maps (?), GradCAM (?), integrated gradients (?), and layerwise relevance propagation (?). They have been applied in a range of MRI analysis tasks to explain decision-making, such as in Alzheimer’s disease classification (?), brain age prediction (?), and brain tumour detection and segmentation (??). Other methods are occlusion- (or perturbation-) based, where parts of the image are removed or altered in the input image, then heat maps are generated which evaluate the effect of this perturbation on the network’s performance (??). Most of these methods, however, provide coarse and low resolution attribution maps and can be extremely computationally expensive (?), especially when working with 3D medical images.




Figure 7: Schematic of the limitation of using saliency: when identifying the presence of white matter hyper-intensities, the neural network might only need to focus on a few of them to make the prediction. This would lead to not all of the white matter hyper-intensities being indicated in the saliency map and so the prediction not matching the clinician’s expectation.

These posthoc methods do not require model training in addition to the original network, however, they have been shown to be, in some instances, unable to identify all of the salient regions of a class, especially in medical imaging applications (??). It has been shown that classifiers base their results on certain salient regions, rather than the object as a whole, and therefore, a classifier may ignore a region if the information there is redundant – i.e. if it can be provided by a different region of the image, which is sufficient to minimise the loss function. Therefore, the regions of interest highlighted by these methods may not fully match the expectations of a clinician (see Fig. 7). Generally, although many methods have been developed to produce saliency or ‘heatmaps’ from CNNs, limited effort has been focused on their evaluation with actual end-users (?). Furthermore, these methods, at their best, only highlight the important content of the image, rather than uncovering the underlying mechanisms of the model.

Attention gates aim to focus a CNN on the target region of the image (the salient regions) by suppressing irrelevant feature responses in feature maps. This focuses the attention of the network onto the information critical for the specific task, rather than learning non-useful information in the background or surrounding areas (?????). These methods provide the user with attention maps, which again highlight the regions of the input image driving the network predictions. However, these methods, similarly to saliency or gradient based methods, may not highlight all of the expected regions in the image. Attention gates have

been applied to a range of medical image analysis tasks, both for classification (???) and segmentation (???????). Other methods have been developed to allow the visualisation of the differences between classes directly, rather than analysing the model post-hoc (???). Other methods aim to increase their interpretability by breaking down the task into smaller, more understandable tasks, such as first segmenting a region known to be a biomarker for a given condition, and then classifying based on this region (?).

The methods discussed so far enable the visualisation of the regions of the input image which drive the predictions, but they do not provide insight into how the underlying filters of the network create decision boundaries. In addition, in brain imaging, the class phenotypes are typically heterogenous and any changes they cause probably occur simultaneously, with significant amounts of healthy and normal variation in shape and appearance, meaning that interpretation of feature attribution maps to understand network predictions is often difficult. Given the millions of parameters in many deep learning networks, despite our ability to visualise individual filters and weights helping us to understand the hierarchical image composition, it is very difficult to interrogate how decision boundaries are formed. Therefore, there is a need to create networks which complete their predictions in more understandable ways.

3.2. Uncertainty

The use of uncertainties, then, is an approach which aims to address the problem that, regardless of the input image, neural networks will always output a prediction, even when they are very unsure of the prediction. An example is when the data falls far away from the domain of data the network was trained on. Furthermore, the softmax values frequently outputted by a neural network are not true probabilities (?), and networks often output high, incorrect softmax values, especially when presented with noisy or ambiguous data, or when the data presented to them differs from the distribution of the training data. Therefore, the development of models aware of the uncertainty in their predictions is key for providing confidence and trust in systems – and this is not provided by traditional deep learning algorithms.

Uncertainties in deep learning can be split into two distinct groups (?): *aleatoric uncertainty*, the uncertainty due to the ambiguity and noise in the data, and *epistemic uncertainty*, which is due to the model parameters. The majority of methods in the literature focus on epistemic uncertainty, using Bayesian approaches to quantify the degree of uncertainty. The goal here is to estimate the posterior distribution of the model parameters. However, due to the very high dimensional parameter space, analytically computing the posterior directly




Figure 8: Methods which use Monte Carlo dropout have dropout applied at training and test time, where weights in the convolutional kernels are removed, which is approximated to represent the distribution of possible model architectures at test time. To demonstrate this we trained a standard 3D UNet to complete hippocampal segmentation, with a dropout value of 0.5 applied on all convolutional layers. The HarP dataset (?) was used in this experiment, preprocessed as in (?). For each subject, we obtained a mean prediction and a uncertainty map, indicating the regions where the predictions between models were the most varied and so approximated to be the least certain. It can be seen that the result is dependent on the number of iterations, and so it has to be chosen to be sufficiently high that the result converges.

is infeasible. Therefore, most methods use Monte Carlo dropout (?), demonstrated in Fig. 8, where dropout (?) is applied to each of the convolutional layers and kept at test time. Although other methods exist, in the majority of approaches for medical imaging, the uncertainty is then quantified through the variance of the predictive distribution, resulting from multiple iterations of the prediction stage with dropout present at test time, as demonstrated in Fig. 8. This approach can be simply applied to existing convolutional neural networks and in medical imaging has primarily been used for segmentation tasks (????), where the segmentation is predicted alongside an uncertainty map. Other works have studied disease prediction, where the uncertainty is associated with the predicted class (???) and image registration (?). However, care must be taken with choice of the hyperparameters (the dropout probability and the number of iterations that the variation is calculated over) to ensure that the model assumptions are reasonable.

Some methods focus on the aleatoric uncertainty instead, which is estimated by having augmentation at test time (??). Understanding of the uncertainty introduced by data varying from the training distribution is vital for clinical translation of deep learning techniques: with the degree of variation present in clinical data between sites and scanners, it is vital to understand what this variation adds to predictions, both to allow it to be mitigated against, and to provide users with confidence in the predictions. It has been found that there is a correlation between erroneous predictions and high uncertainties, and so, this could be used to improve the eventual predictions (???)

There is, however, need for further development of these methods to ensure that the uncertainties produced are meaningful in all the circumstances in which they could be deployed. For instance, further study is required to ensure that the uncertainty is meaningful for all possible dataset shifts and to provide a calibration for the uncertainty values so that they are comparable across methods (??). Furthermore, the uncertainty values are, also, only as good as the trained model, the assumptions behind the uncertainty model, and are only meaningful alongside a well-validated model which is sufficiently powerful to discriminate the class of interest.

3.3. Interrogating the Decision Boundary

For many applications in medical imaging, the output of the deep learning algorithm, if applied clinically, could potentially directly influence patient care, and therefore patient outcomes. Therefore, there is a clear need to be able to interrogate how decisions were made (?). For instance, if we reconsider Fig. 3, it is clear that the location of the decision boundary could impact highly on the care for the patient if the classification was the presence or absence of white matter hyper intensities. While visualisation methods allow inspection of which regions of the image influenced the prediction, and uncertainties grant us an insight to the confidence we should place in a given prediction, for many applications we need to know precisely which characteristics led to a given prediction. This is also important to help with the identification of algorithmic bias influencing the decision making.

A method of understanding the decision boundary is counterfactual analysis, which, given a supervised model where the desired prediction has not been achieved, shows what would have happened if the input to the model were altered slightly (?). In other words, it identifies what altered characteristics would have led to a different model prediction. However, applications to neuroimaging (?), and even medical imaging (??) more generally, are currently few and the utility across neuroimaging tasks needs to be explored.

4. Evaluation

4.1. Availability of Training Labels

The evaluation of metrics also requires labels – that is, a *ground truth* label created by a domain expert. In medical imaging, the ground truth is regarded as labels created by domain experts and these labels are key for training models, but do not necessarily form part of standard clinical practice. Firstly, the labels are required for evaluation of the model performance, and secondly, they are required to allow the training of supervised methods. This, therefore, exacerbates the problem of the shortage of data as we need not only large amounts of data, but we also need equal amounts of correct manual labels. These labels are expensive to obtain, requiring large allocation of expert time to curate and expert domain knowledge. Therefore, there is a need to develop methods which can work in data domains where low numbers of labelled data points are available.

Few- and zero-shot learning methods work in very low data regimes and are beginning to be applied to medical imaging problems (???). They are, however, very unlikely to generalise well to images from other sites and scanners, as the variation seen will not span the expected variation of the data. Unsupervised domain adaptation has been applied more widely, including for neuroimaging problems, to help cope with a lack of labels, with information from one dataset being leveraged to help us perform the same or a related task on another dataset (???)

Other methods to overcome the lack of available labels focus on working with approximations for labels, which are cheaper to acquire (?). For instance, many methods propose pre-training the network using auxiliary labels generated using automatic tools and then fine-tuning the model on the small number of manual labels (????), or registration of an atlas to propagate labels from the atlas to the subject space (?). Other approaches are weakly supervised, utilising quick annotations such as image level labels (?), bounding box annotations (?), scribbles (??) or point labels (?).

Other approaches to allow us to utilise deep learning when we have access to limited numbers of training labels include active learning and omnisupervised learning, both trying to make the most effective use of the limited number of labels available for a task. Active learning aims to minimise the quantity of labelled data required to train the network by prompting a human labeller only to produce additional manual labels where they might provide the greatest performance improvements. This minimises the total number of annotations that need to be provided, and provides better performance than randomly annotating the same number of samples (??). In omnisupervised learning (?) automatically generated

labels are created to improve predictions, starting from a small labelled training set. By combining data diversity through applying data augmentation, and model diversity through the use of multiple different models, a consensus of labels is produced, which can be used to train the final model. For both approaches, the labels used are chosen using various different approaches such as uncertainty (??).

The difficulty in acquiring good quality manual labels, is of course, exacerbated by the variance caused when we pool data, as discussed above. This increase in variance limits the impact any produced labels can have, and so again, methods of pooling data across datasets without getting an increase in variance due to the scanner effects will be necessary.

The labels themselves, however, will provide another source of variance (?): when working with medical images, the labels are frequently complicated and ambiguous (?), often open to interpretation or with subjects having multiple labels that could be attributed due to co-morbidities (?) but despite this we usually assume them to be 100% accurate (?) – the ‘gold’ standard. If there is no objective answer, we cannot expect networks to provide an objective answer. Furthermore, this also leads to inter-*rater* variability between the people creating the labels, which leads to a degree of uncertainty in the produced ground truth. The effect that this variability has on the predictions of the network needs to be understood and mitigated against, with the challenge being that obtaining labels for multiple raters for datasets is deeply infeasible, and has been shown to limit the performance of algorithms (?). The uncertainty in the labels is also amplified by the lack of available data for rare conditions, which are therefore less represented in datasets, resulting in raters having less experience assessing them. This is especially problematic if trying to quantify longitudinal changes with different raters (?).

Approaches need to consider three factors (?): *agreement* – the degree to which raters agree on a given label; *confidence* – how certain a rater is in their label, and *competence* – how accurate a given rater is. Research directions into the effect of rater variance have largely focused on either quantifying the reliability of the labels (?), or quantifying its effect on network performance (?????). Before any algorithm is deployed in practice, the limitations due to the labels must be understood, and its consideration become a standard part of any deployment pipeline, remembering always the “*garbage in, garbage out*” principle, for instance by producing the range of segmentations that might be produced when training with multiple raters (?).

4.2. Choice of Loss Function

When training networks and evaluating the model performance, we have to choose a loss, or cost, function which the network aims to minimise. Although some works design bespoke, task-specific cost functions, the majority are based on standard functions, such as categorical cross entropy for classification and segmentation tasks, Dice (a measure of overlap between the predicted and true label) for segmentation, and mean square error (MSE) for regression-based tasks.

These metrics are normally chosen because of their well-understood and characterised behaviour (?), and, especially in the cases of segmentation, their ability to produce visibly acceptable predictions. For clinical translation of deep learning methods, however, we rather need to consider which measures are most important for the clinical application (???). Metrics only tell us part of the story and it is important that we ensure that all vital information for clinical assessment is provided by the reported metrics. For instance, in many cases, false negatives are more problematic than false positives, resulting in a patient failing to receive the necessary care. Similarly, when considering tasks such as tumour segmentation, the classification of the center of the tumour is trivial and the utility for a clinician would be identification of boundaries, where the classification is harder or ambiguous. Therefore, a metric such as the Dice overlap metric is not necessarily a good indicator of performance from a clinician’s point of view, with the boundary having little impact on the metric if the region of interest is large, while being potentially critical for patient care. Developing networks and loss functions with the specific application in mind is vital and has been explored for some applications, such as focusing segmentations to the boundary (???), but needs to be considered for each application in turn.

Furthermore, when training neural networks, we generally maximise the performance averaged over the batch (a subset of the training data). In practice, however, we are more likely to care about the performance on the hardest example being acceptable, than the performance on the easiest example being improved slightly (?). If we, for instance, consider a segmentation task, a given level of performance could be achieved by easier examples being perfectly segmented, and more difficult examples being completely missed. We would, however, probably prefer trading-off a small amount of performance on the easier examples in return for better performance on the harder examples, which may give the same average performance overall. Therefore, the standard practice of minimising the average performance may not be appropriate when the aim is clinical deployment, rather than the development of methods.

5. Logistical Challenges

5.1. Computational Power

The final category of challenges are far more logistical. Firstly, most deep learning models are developed using GPUs (graphical processing units), hardware that is rarely available in a clinical setting, and producing predictions on standard hardware often takes infeasible amounts of time or requires prohibitive amounts of computational power. Many of the most successful methods applied in imaging challenges involve large ensemble models such as (?), leading to a very large amount of parameters and therefore calculations that must be stored and computed.

Therefore, for clinical translatability, methods need to be developed with consideration of the computational limitations that will be present on deployment, and seeking to create solutions which work within these constraints. Student-teacher networks (??) and model distillation (??) aim to create smaller networks which are able to mimic the performance of the original large model, thus reducing the number of parameters in the final network which is deployed. Other approaches use separable convolutions which drastically reduce the number of parameters in the network. Model pruning (????) acknowledges that the parameters in neural networks are very sparse and, therefore, by removing those that are contributing the least to the final prediction, we can reduce the size of the model architecture whilst having limited impact on the final performance of the model.

5.2. Data Sharing and Data Privacy

Clearly from the above discussion of data and labels, if we want CNNs which work for patients in real clinical applications, we need to be able to train our models on medical data which is relevant, realistic, and representative. Many current approaches focus on pooling anonymised data from across sites and patient groups, and to be able to do this concentrate on removing identifiable features such as name, birth data and faces from the images. However, neural networks are still capable of extracting identifiable features from these anonymised images such as age and sex (?), which, in combination with other features such as hospital location and illness, could be identifying (?). As neural network research continues to develop, it is probable that their ability to extract information despite the best efforts at anonymisation will increase. Furthermore, a proportion of identification risk comes from the presence of other auxiliary information, for instance, in neuroimaging, the scanner used to acquire the image. This is known as *linkage attack*, and is increasingly difficult to protect against across fields using classic anonymisation techniques (???).




Figure 9: Illustration of a centralised federated learning framework. In the framework, the data for training the model is stored in local servers and not shared with the central server to ensure data security. On the other hand, while the global model is available in the central server, the model parameters are shared with the local nodes 1,2... N (indicated by blue arrows) where training and parameter updates happen. The updated weights are then received at the central server (indicated by yellow arrows), where the incoming updates are aggregated and applied to the global model. This learning and update happens in an iterative manner, and both up and down transfer of model parameters are encrypted for data security.

While de-identifying this data may just seem like an extra task for medical researchers, there are parties whose core business model is to de-anonymize medical data that has been sold for research and sell that information to insurance companies (?). De-anonymisation research is a rapidly advancing field: for instance, reconstructing the faces of defaced medical images (??). Therefore, in order to avoid data privacy problems in the future, approaches avoiding the aggregation of private medical information are vital.

Fortunately, medical research is not the only field to face difficulties regarding the handling of sensitive and personal information. For instance, banking and mobile phone companies have faced this problem before: *how can one extract only the desired answer, without also collecting information that could be used for harm?* Therefore, we can take advantage of the privacy-preserving data analysis techniques that have rapidly developed in recent years. The field of privacy-preserving data analysis consists of a collection of techniques that allow models to be trained without having direct access to the data, and that prevent these mod-

els from inadvertently storing sensitive information about the data. The most popular of these techniques are *federated learning*, *differential privacy*, and various forms of encrypted computation (??). Here we will focus on federated learning and differential privacy, as they currently show the most practical relevance in a neuroscience research setting (?); for a broader review see, for instance, (?).

Federated learning means training or testing your model (or performing your statistical query) on data that is stored on different devices or servers across the world, without having to centrally collect the data samples into one local aggregate dataset (??). Instead of moving the data to the model, copies of the global model are sent to where the data is located; the data remains on the hospital server. A model is sent to the device and trained on the local data, after which the newly improved model with its update is sent back to the main server to be aggregated with the main model. This preserves privacy in the sense that the data has not been moved from the device, and therefore is gaining popularity in various healthcare applications (?) – for instance (???). However, federated learning is limited by the fact that the content of the local data can sometimes be inferred from the weight updates or improvements in the models (?). In addition, deep neural networks are often over-parametrised, meaning that they can encode more information than is necessary for the prediction task, resulting in a model that can potentially, inadvertently memorize individual samples. Therefore, to prevent the possibility of inferring personal characteristics from the data, further techniques need to be employed, such as differential privacy (?).

Differential privacy techniques work by injecting a controlled amount of statistical noise to obscure the data contributions from individuals in the dataset (?). This is performed while ensuring that the model still gains insight into the overall population, and thus provides predictions that are accurate enough to be useful. Differential privacy is a mathematical framework, and thus enables the degree of privacy loss to be calculated and evaluated based on the concept of a privacy ‘budget’. Therefore, ultimately the use of differential privacy is a careful tradeoff between privacy preservation and model utility (???). Importantly, a critical aspect of differential privacy is its inherent robustness to linkage attack (?).

Developments have led to both of these approaches being developed into libraries focused on medical imaging and neuroimaging applications, such as (??). While both methods have limitations and costs when compared to local, non-differential private training – both in terms of the accuracy of the final model and the the computational overhead – for models to be useful in a clinical environment they will most likely need to be trained on clinical data.

691 Therefore, it is probable that these techniques will need to be applied to enable access to
692 that data with appropriate protection of individuals' data.

693 **6. Conclusion**

694 The code for the examples in this paper can be found at github.com/nkdinsdale/challenges_review.

References

- Abadi, M., Chu, A., Goodfellow, I., McMahan, H. B., Mironov, I., Talwar, K., & Zhang, L. (2016). Deep learning with differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS '16*, p. 308–318.
- Abraham, N. & Khan, N. M. (2019). A novel focal Tversky loss function with improved attention U-Net for lesion segmentation. In *2019 IEEE 16th International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging (ISBI 2019)*, pp. 683–687.
- Abramian, D. & Eklund, A. (2019). Refacing: Reconstructing anonymized facial features using GANS. In *2019 IEEE 16th International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging (ISBI 2019)*, pp. 1104–1108.
- Abrol, A., Bhattarai, M., Fedorov, A., Du, Y., Plis, S., & Calhoun, V. (2020). Deep residual learning for neuroimaging: An application to predict progression to Alzheimer’s disease. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods*, 339, 108701.
- Ackauy, A., Courty, N., Vallée, E., Commowick, O., Barillot, C., & Galassi, F. (2020). *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience*, 14, 19.
- Al-Rubaie, M. & Chang, J. M. (2019). Privacy-preserving machine learning: Threats and solutions. *IEEE Security Privacy*, 17, 49–58.
- Alqaraawi, A., Schuessler, M., Weiß, P., Costanza, E., & Bianchi-Berthouze, N. (2020). Evaluating saliency map explanations for convolutional neural networks: A user study. In *IUI '20: 25th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*, pp. 275–285.
- Ayhan, M. & Berens, P. (2018). Test-time data augmentation for estimation of heteroscedastic aleatoric uncertainty in deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of Medical Imaging with Deep Learning (2018)*.
- Bai, W., Chen, C., Tarroni, G., Duan, J., Guitton, F., Petersen, S. E., Guo, Y., Matthews, P. M., & Rueckert, D. (2019). Self-supervised learning for cardiac MR image segmentation by anatomical position prediction. In *Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention – MICCAI 2019*, pp. 541–549.
- Bashyam, V., Erus, G., Doshi, J., Habes, M., Nasrallah, I., Truelove-Hill, M., Srinivasan, D., Mamourian, L., Pomponio, R., Fan, Y., Launer, L., Masters, C., Maruff, P., Zhuo, C., Volzke, H., Johnson, S., Fripp, J., Koutsouleris, N., Satterthwaite, T., & Davatzikos, C. (2020). MRI signatures of brain age and disease over the lifespan based on a deep brain network and 14 468 individuals worldwide. *Brain : a journal of neurology*, 143.
- Bass, C., Silva, M., Sudre, C., Tudosiu, P., Smith, S., & Robinson, E. (2020). ICAM: Interpretable classification via disentangled representations and feature attribution mapping. In *34th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2020)*.
- Baumgartner, C. F., Koch, L. M., Tezcan, K. C., Ang, J. X., & Konukoglu, E. (2018). Visual feature attribution using wasserstein GANs. In *2018 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 8309–8319.
- Baumgartner, C. F., Tezcan, K. C., Chaitanya, K., Hötker, A. M., Muehlematter, U. J., Schawkat, K., Becker, A. S., Donati, O., & Konukoglu, E. (2019). PHISeg: Capturing uncertainty in medical image segmentation. In *Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention – MICCAI 2019*, pp. 119–127.
- Ben-David, S., Blitzer, J., Crammer, K., Kulesza, A., Pereira, F., & Vaughan, J. (2010). A theory of learning from different domains. *Machine Learning*, 79, 151–175.

736 Bian, C., Yuan, C., Wang, J., Li, M., Yang, X., Yu, S., Ma, K., Yuan, J., & Zheng, Y. (2020). Uncertainty-
737 aware domain alignment for anatomical structure segmentation. *Medical Image Analysis*, 64, 101732.

738 Billot, B., Bocchetta, M., Todd, E., Dalca, A. V., Rohrer, J. D., & Iglesias, J. E. (2020a). Automated
739 segmentation of the hypothalamus and associated subunits in brain MRI. *NeuroImage*, 223, 117287.

740 Billot, B., Greve, D., Van Leemput, K., Fischl, B., Iglesias, J., & Dalca, A. (2020b). A learning strategy for
741 contrast-agnostic MRI segmentation. In *Proceedings of Machine Imaging with Deep Learning (MIDL)*
742 2020.

743 Billot, B., Robinson, E., Dalca, A. V., & Iglesias, J. E. (2020c). Partial volume segmentation of brain MRI
744 scans of any resolution and contrast. In *Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention*
745 – MICCAI 2020, pp. 177–187.

746 Binder, A., Lapuschkin, S., Montavon, G., Müller, K.-R., & Samek, W. (2016). Layer-wise relevance
747 propagation for deep neural network architectures. In *Information Science and Applications (ICISA)*
748 2016, pp. 913–922.

749 Bindschaedler, V., Grubbs, P., Cash, D., Ristenpart, T., & Shmatikov, V. (2018). The tao of inference in
750 privacy-protected databases. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 11, 1715–1728.

751 Bowles, C., Gunn, R. N., Hammers, A., & Rueckert, D. (2018). GANsfer learning: Combining labelled and
752 unlabelled data for GAN based data augmentation. *ArXiv*, abs/1811.10669.

753 Böhle, M., Eitel, F., Weygandt, M., & Ritter, K. (2019). Layer-wise relevance propagation for explaining deep
754 neural network decisions in MRI-based Alzheimer’s disease classification. *Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience*,
755 11, 194.

756 Cabitza, F., Campagner, A., Albano, D., Aliprandi, A., Bruno, A., Chianca, V., Corazza, A., Di Pietto, F.,
757 Gambino, A., Gitto, S., Messina, C., Orlandi, D., Pedone, L., Zappia, M., & Sconfienza, L. M. (2020).
758 The elephant in the machine: Proposing a new metric of data reliability and its application to a medical
759 case to assess classification reliability. *Applied Sciences*, 10.

760 Cabitza, F., Ciucci, D., & Rasoini, R. (2019). A giant with feet of clay: On the validity of the data that feed
761 machine learning in medicine. In *Organizing for the Digital World*, F. Cabitza, C. Batini, & M. Magni,
762 eds., pp. 121–136.

763 Cetin Karayumak, S., Bouix, S., Ning, L., James, A., Crow, T., Shenton, M., Kubicki, M., & Rath, Y.
764 (2019). Retrospective harmonization of multi-site diffusion MRI data acquired with different acquisition
765 parameters. *NeuroImage*, 184, 180–200.

766 Chaitanya, K., Erdil, E., Karani, N., & Konukoglu, E. (2020). Contrastive learning of global and local
767 features for medical image segmentation with limited annotations.

768 Chaitanya, K., Karani, N., Baumgartner, C. F., Becker, A., Donati, O., & Konukoglu, E. (2019). Semi-
769 supervised and task-driven data augmentation. In *Information Processing in Medical Imaging*, pp. 29–41.

770 Chapelle, O., Weston, J., Bottou, L., & Vapnik, V. (2001). Vicinal risk minimization. In *Advances in Neural*
771 *Information Processing Systems*, T. Leen, T. Dietterich, & V. Tresp, eds., vol. 13. (MIT Press).

772 Chen, H., Dou, Q., Yu, L., Qin, J., & Heng, P.-A. (2018). VoxResNet: Deep voxelwise residual networks for
773 brain segmentation from 3D MR images. *NeuroImage*, 170, 446–455.

774 Chen, L., Bentley, P., Mori, K., Misawa, K., Fujiwara, M., & Rueckert, D. (2019). Self-supervised learning
775 for medical image analysis using image context restoration. *Medical Image Analysis*, 58, 101539.

776 Chen, T., Kornblith, S., Norouzi, M., & Hinton, G. (2020). A simple framework for contrastive learning of

visual representations. ArXiv.

Cheng, B., Liu, M., Zhang, D., Munsell, B. C., & Shen, D. (2015). Domain transfer learning for MCI conversion prediction. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 62, 1805–1817.

Cheplygina, V., de Bruijne, M., & Pluim, J. P. (2019). Not-so-supervised: A survey of semi-supervised, multi-instance, and transfer learning in medical image analysis. *Medical Image Analysis*, 54, 280–296.

Cho, J., Lee, K., Shin, E., Choy, G., & Do, S. (2015). How much data is needed to train a medical image deep learning system to achieve necessary high accuracy. arXiv: Learning.

Cicek, O., Abdulkadir, A., Lienkamp, S. S., Brox, T., & Ronneberger, O. (2016). 3D U-Net: Learning dense volumetric segmentation from sparse annotation. In *Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention - MICCAI 2016*, pp. 424 – 432.

Clement, C., Selman, L., Kehoe, P., Howden, B., Lane, A., & Horwood, J. (2019). Challenges to and facilitators of recruitment to an Alzheimer’s disease clinical trial: A qualitative interview study. *Journal of Alzheimer’s Disease*, 69, 1–9.

Deng, J., Dong, W., Socher, R., Li, L., Kai Li, & Li Fei-Fei (2009). ImageNet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 248–255.

Dewey, B., Zhao, C., Reinhold, J., Carass, A., Fitzgerald, K., Sotirchos, E., Saidha, S., Oh, J., Pham, D., Calabresi, P., Zijl, P., & Prince, J. (2019). DeepHarmony: A deep learning approach to contrast harmonization across scanner changes. *Magnetic Resonance Imaging*, 64.

Di Martino, A., Yan, C.-G., Li, Q., Denio, E., Castellanos, F., Alaerts, K., Anderson, J., Assaf, M., Bookheimer, S., Dapretto, M., Deen, B., Delmonte, S., Dinstein, I., Birgit, E.-W., Fair, D., Gallagher, L., Kennedy, D., Keown, C., Keysers, C., & Milham, M. (2013). The Autism Brain Imaging Data Exchange: Towards large-scale evaluation of the intrinsic brain architecture in autism. *Molecular psychiatry*, 19.

Dinsdale, N. K., Bluemke, E., Smith, S., Arya, Z., Vidaurre, D., Jenkinson, M., & Namburete, A. I. (2021a). Learning patterns of the ageing brain in MRI using deep convolutional network. *Neuroimage*, 224.

Dinsdale, N. K., Jenkinson, M., & Namburete, A. I. (2021b). Deep learning-based unlearning of dataset bias for MRI harmonisation and confound removal. *NeuroImage*, 228, 117689.

Dinsdale, N. K., Jenkinson, M., & Namburete, A. I. L. (2019). Spatial warping network for 3D segmentation of the hippocampus in MR images. In *Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention – MICCAI 2019*, pp. 284–291.

Dorent, R., Joutard, S., Shapey, J., Bisdas, S., Kitchen, N., Bradford, R., Saeed, S., Modat, M., Ourselin, S., & Vercauteren, T. (2020). Scribble-based domain adaptation via co-segmentation. In *Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention – MICCAI 2020*, pp. 479–489.

Dwork, C. & Roth, A. (2014). The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy. *Found. Trends Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 9, 211–407.

Feng, X., Yang, J., Laine, A., & Angelini, E. (2017). Discriminative localization in CNNs for weakly-supervised segmentation of pulmonary nodules. vol. 10435, pp. 568–576.

Feyjie, A. R., Azad, R., Pedersoli, M., Kauffman, C., Ayed, I. B., & Dolz, J. (2020). Semi-supervised few-shot learning for medical image segmentation. arXiv.

Frisoni, G. & Jack, C. (2015). HarP: The EADC-ADNI harmonized protocol for manual hippocampal segmentation. a standard of reference from a global working group. *Alzheimer’s and Dementia*, 11.

Gal, Y. & Ghahramani, Z. (2016). Dropout as a bayesian approximation: Representing model uncertainty

in deep learning. In Proceedings of The 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning, vol. 48, pp. 1050–1059.

Gal, Y., Islam, R., & Ghahramani, Z. (2017). Deep Bayesian active learning with image data. In Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning, vol. 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 1183–1192.

Ganin, Y., Ustinova, E., Ajakan, H., Germain, P., Larochelle, H., Laviolette, F., Marchand, M., & Lempitsky, V. (2015). Domain-adversarial training of neural networks. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*.

Gass, T., Szekely, G., & Goksel, O. (2014). Auxiliary anatomical labels for joint segmentation and atlas registration. In *Medical Imaging 2014: Image Processing*, vol. 9034, pp. 985 – 992. (SPIE).

Gazula, H., Kelly, R., Romero, J., Verner, E., Baker, B., Silva, R., Imtiaz, H., Saha, d. k., Raja, R., Turner, J., Sarwate, A., Plis, S., & Calhoun, V. (2020). COINSTAC: Collaborative informatics and neuroimaging suite toolkit for anonymous computation. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 5, 2166.

Gentili, M., Hajian, S., & Castillo, C. (2017). A case study of anonymization of medical surveys. In Proceedings of the 2017 International Conference on Digital Health, DH '17, p. 77–81.

Ghafoorian, M., Teuwen, J., Manniesing, R., Leeuw, F.-E., Ginneken, B., Karssemeijer, N., & Platel, B. (2018). Student beats the teacher: Deep neural networks for lateral ventricles segmentation in brain MR. In Proceedings Volume 10574, *Medical Imaging 2018: Image Processing*; 105742U (2018).

Glorot, X., Bordes, A., & Bengio, Y. (2011). Deep sparse rectifier neural networks. In Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, G. Gordon, D. Dunson, & M. Dudík, eds., vol. 15 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 315–323.

Graber, M. L. (2013). The incidence of diagnostic error in medicine. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, 22, ii21–ii27.

Graham, M. S., Drobnjak, I., & Zhang, H. (2018). A supervised learning approach for diffusion MRI quality control with minimal training data. *NeuroImage*, 178, 668–676.

Grill, J.-B., Strub, F., Altché, F., Tallec, C., Richemond, P., Buchatskaya, E., Doersch, C., Avila Pires, B., Guo, Z., Gheshlaghi Azar, M., Piot, B., kavukcuoglu, k., Munos, R., & Valko, M. (2020). Bootstrap your own latent - a new approach to self-supervised learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. F. Balcan, & H. Lin, eds., vol. 33, pp. 21271–21284.

Guan, H., Yang, E., Yap, P.-T., Shen, D., & Liu, M. (2020). Attention-guided deep domain adaptation for brain dementia identification with multi-site neuroimaging data. In *Domain Adaptation and Representation Transfer, and Distributed and Collaborative Learning*, pp. 31–40.

Guha Roy, A., Conjeti, S., Navab, N., & Wachinger, C. (2018). QuickNAT: A fully convolutional network for quick and accurate segmentation of neuroanatomy. *NeuroImage*, 186.

Haarburger, C., Müller-Franzes, G., Weninger, L., Kuhl, C., Truhn, D., & Merhof, D. (2020). Radiomics feature reproducibility under inter-rater variability in segmentations of CT images. *Scientific Reports*, 10.

Hadsell, R., Chopra, S., & Lecun, Y. (2006). Dimensionality reduction by learning an invariant mapping. pp. 1735 – 1742.

Han, X., Jovicich, J., Salat, D., Kouwe, A., Quinn, B., Czanner, S., Busa, E., Pacheco, J., Albert, M., Killiany, R., Maguire, R., Rosas, H., Makris, N., Dale, A., Dickerson, B., & Fischl, B. (2006). Reliability of MRI-derived measurements of human cerebral cortical thickness: The effects of field strength, scanner upgrade and manufacturer. *NeuroImage*, 32, 180–94.

859 Hatamizadeh, A., Terzopoulos, D., & Myronenko, A. (2019). End-to-End Boundary Aware Networks for
860 Medical Image Segmentation, pp. 187–194.

861 He, K., Girshick, R., & Dollar, P. (2019). Rethinking ImageNet pre-training. In 2019 IEEE/CVF Interna-
862 tional Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV), pp. 4917–4926.

863 He, T., Kong, R., Holmes, A. J., Nguyen, M., Sabuncu, M. R., Eickhoff, S. B., Bzdok, D., Feng, J., & Yeo,
864 B. T. (2020). Deep neural networks and kernel regression achieve comparable accuracies for functional
865 connectivity prediction of behavior and demographics. *NeuroImage*, 206, 116276.

866 He, Y., Zhang, X., & Sun, J. (2017). Channel pruning for accelerating very deep neural networks. In 2017
867 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV), pp. 1398–1406.

868 Henaff, O. (2020). Data-efficient image recognition with contrastive predictive coding. In Proceedings of
869 the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning, vol. 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning*
870 *Research*, pp. 4182–4192.

871 Henschel, L., Conjeti, S., Estrada, S., Diers, K., Fischl, B., & Reuter, M. (2020). FastSurfer - a fast and
872 accurate deep learning based neuroimaging pipeline. *NeuroImage*, 219, 117012.

873 Herzog, L., Murina, E., Dürr, O., Wegener, S., & Sick, B. (2020). Integrating uncertainty in deep neural
874 networks for MRI based stroke analysis. *Medical Image Analysis*, 65, 101790.

875 Hinton, G., Vinyals, O., & Dean, J. (2015). Distilling the knowledge in a neural network. *ArXiv*.

876 Hoffer, E. & Ailon, N. (2015). Deep metric learning using triplet network. In *Similarity-Based Pattern*
877 *Recognition*, pp. 84–92.

878 Hostage, C., Choudhury, K., Doraiswamy, P., & Petrella, J. (2013). Dissecting the gene dose-effects of the
879 APOE $\eta 4$ and $\eta 2$ alleles on hippocampal volumes in aging and alzheimer’s disease. *PloS one*, 8, e54483.

880 Hu, J., Shen, L., & Sun, G. (2018). Squeeze-and-excitation networks. In 2018 IEEE/CVF Conference on
881 Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pp. 7132–7141.

882 Huang, L., Shea, A. L., Qian, H., Masurkar, A., Deng, H., & Liu, D. (2019). Patient clustering improves
883 efficiency of federated machine learning to predict mortality and hospital stay time using distributed
884 electronic medical records. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 99, 103291.

885 Iglesias, J., Billot, B., Balbastre, Y., Tabari, A., Conklin, J., Alexander, D., Golland, P., Edlow, B., & Fischl,
886 B. (2020a). Joint super-resolution and synthesis of 1 mm isotropic MP-RAGE volumes from clinical MRI
887 exams with scans of different orientation, resolution and contrast. *ArXiv*.

888 Iglesias, J., Billot, B., Balbastre, Y., Tabari, A., Conklin, J., Alexander, D., Golland, P., Edlow, B., & Fischl,
889 B. (2020b). Joint super-resolution and synthesis of 1 mm isotropic MP-RAGE volumes from clinical MRI
890 exams with scans of different orientation, resolution and contrast. *ArXiv*.

891 Ioffe, S. & Szegedy, C. (2015). Batch normalization: Accelerating deep network training by reducing internal
892 covariate shift. In Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning, vol. 37 of
893 *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 448–456. (PMLR).

894 Isensee, F., Jaeger, P., Kohl, S., Petersen, J., & Maier-Hein, K. (2021). nnU-Net: a self-configuring method
895 for deep learning-based biomedical image segmentation. *Nature Methods*, 18, 1–9.

896 Jetley, S., Lord, N., Lee, N., & Torr, P. (2018). Learn to pay attention. In Proceedings on the International
897 Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR).

898 Jonsson, B., Bjornsdottir, G., Thorgeirsson, T., Ellingsen, L., Walters, G., Guobjartsson, D., Stefansson,
899 H., Stefansson, K., & Ulfarsson, M. (2019). Brain age prediction using deep learning uncovers associated

sequence variants. *Nature Communications*, 10.

Jovicich, J., Czanner, S., Greve, D., Haley, E., Kowalewski, A., Gollub, R., Kennedy, D., Schmitt, F., Brown, G., Macfall, J., Fischl, B., & Dale, A. (2006). Reliability in multi-site structural MRI studies: Effects of gradient non-linearity correction on phantom and human data. *NeuroImage*, 30, 436–43.

Jungo, A., McKinley, R., Meier, R., Knecht, U., Vera, L., Pérez-Beteta, J., Molina-García, D., Pérez-García, V. M., Wiest, R., & Reyes, M. (2018a). Towards uncertainty-assisted brain tumor segmentation and survival prediction. pp. 474–485.

Jungo, A., Meier, R., Ermis, E., Blatti-Moreno, M., Herrmann, E., Wiest, R., & Reyes, M. (2018b). On the effect of inter-observer variability for a reliable estimation of uncertainty of medical image segmentation. In *Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention – MICCAI 2018*, pp. 682–690. (Cham: Springer International Publishing).

Kaissis, G., Ziller, A., Passerat-Palmbach, J., Ryffel, T., Usynin, D., Trask, A., Lima, I., Mancuso, J., Jungmann, F., Steinborn, M.-M., Saleh, A., Makowski, M., Rueckert, D., & Braren, R. (2021). End-to-end privacy preserving deep learning on multi-institutional medical imaging. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, pp. 1–12.

Kamnitsas, K., Baumgartner, C., Ledig, C., Newcombe, V., Simpson, J., Kane, A., Menon, D., Nori, A., Criminisi, A., Rueckert, D., & Glocker, B. (2017a). Unsupervised domain adaptation in brain lesion segmentation with adversarial networks. In *Information Processing in Medical Imaging*, pp. 597–609.

Kamnitsas, K., Ledig, C., Newcombe, V. F., Simpson, J. P., Kane, A. D., Menon, D. K., Rueckert, D., & Glocker, B. (2017b). Efficient multi-scale 3D CNN with fully connected CRF for accurate brain lesion segmentation. *Medical Image Analysis*, 36, 61–78.

Karlawish, J., Cary, M. S., Rubright, J., & TenHave, T. (2008). How redesigning AD clinical trials might increase study partners’ willingness to participate. *Neurology*, 71, 1883–1888.

Keane, P. & Topol, E. (2018). With an eye to AI and autonomous diagnosis. *npj Digital Medicine*, 1.

Kendall, A. & Gal, Y. (2017). What uncertainties do we need in bayesian deep learning for computer vision? In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, p. 5580–5590.

Khagi, B., Lee, C. G., & Kwon, G.-R. (2018). Alzheimer’s disease classification from brain MRI based on transfer learning from CNN. In *2018 11th Biomedical Engineering International Conference (BMEiCON)*, pp. 1–4.

Khosla, M., Jamison, K., Kuceyeski, A., & Sabuncu, M. R. (2019). Ensemble learning with 3D convolutional neural networks for functional connectome-based prediction. *NeuroImage*, 199, 651–662.

Koch, G., Zemel, R., & Salakhutdinov, R. (2015). Siamese neural networks for one-shot image recognition. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning*.

Kornblith, S., Shlens, J., & Le, Q. V. (2019). Do better ImageNet models transfer better? In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*.

Krizhevsky, A., Nair, V., & Hinton, G. (2009). CIFAR-10 (Canadian institute for advanced research). Technical Report.

Krizhevsky, A., Sutskever, I., & Hinton, G. E. (2012). ImageNet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, F. Pereira, C. J. C. Burges, L. Bottou, & K. Q. Weinberger, eds., vol. 25.

941 Kushibar, K., Valverde, S., González-Villà, S., Bernal, J., Cabezas, M., Oliver, A., & Llado, X. (2019).
942 Supervised domain adaptation for automatic sub-cortical brain structure segmentation with minimal
943 user interaction. *Scientific Reports*, 9.

944 Kwon, Y., Won, J., Kim, B., & Paik, M. (2020). Uncertainty quantification using bayesian neural networks
945 in classification: Application to biomedical image segmentation. *Computational Statistics and Data
946 Analysis*, 142.

947 Laves, M.-H., Ihler, S., Fast, J. F., Kahrs, L. A., & Ortmaier, T. (2020). Well-calibrated regression uncer-
948 tainty in medical imaging with deep learning. In *Medical Imaging with Deep Learning*.

949 LeCun, Y., Bengio, Y., & Hinton, G. (2015). Deep learning. *Nature*, 521, 436–44.

950 LeCun, Y., Boser, B., Denker, J., Henderson, D., Howard, R., Hubbard, W., & Jackel, L. (1990a). Hand-
951 written digit recognition with a back-propagation network. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing
952 Systems*, D. Touretzky, ed., vol. 2.

953 Lecun, Y., Bottou, L., Bengio, Y., & Haffner, P. (1998). Gradient-based learning applied to document
954 recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 86, 2278–2324.

955 LeCun, Y., Denker, J. S., & Solla, S. A. (1990b). Optimal brain damage. In *Advances in Neural Information
956 Processing Systems 2*, p. 598–605. (San Francisco, CA, USA: Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.).

957 Lee, B., Yamanakkanavar, N., & Choi, J. Y. (2020a). Automatic segmentation of brain MRI using a novel
958 patch-wise U-Net deep architecture. *PLOS ONE*, 15, 1–20.

959 Lee, H.-Y., Tseng, H.-Y., Mao, Q., Huang, J.-B., Lu, Y.-D., Singh, M., & Yang, M.-H. (2020b). DRIT++:
960 Diverse image-to-image translation via disentangled representations. *International Journal of Computer
961 Vision*, 128.

962 Leibig, C., Allken, V., Ayhan, M. S., Berens, P., & Wahl, S. (2017). Leveraging uncertainty information
963 from deep neural networks for disease detection. *Scientific Reports*, 7.

964 Li, H., Kadav, A., Durdanovic, I., Samet, H., & Graf, H. (2017). Pruning filters for efficient ConvNets. In
965 *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

966 Li, T., Sahu, A. K., Talwalkar, A., & Smith, V. (2020). Federated learning: Challenges, methods, and future
967 directions. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 37, 50–60.

968 Li, W., Milletari, F., Xu, D., Rieke, N., Hancox, J., Zhu, W., Baust, M., Cheng, Y., Ourselin, S., Cardoso,
969 M. J., & Feng, A. (2019). Privacy-preserving federated brain tumour segmentation. In *Machine Learning
970 in Medical Imaging*, pp. 133–141.

971 Liu, M., Li, F., Yan, H., Wang, K., Ma, Y., Shen, L., & Xu, M. (2020). A multi-model deep convolu-
972 tional neural network for automatic hippocampus segmentation and classification in Alzheimer’s disease.
973 *NeuroImage*, 208, 116459.

974 Livne, M., Rieger, J., Aydin, O. U., Taha, A. A., Akay, E. M., Kossen, T., Sobesky, J., Kelleher, J. D.,
975 Hildebrand, K., Frey, D., & Madai, V. I. (2019). A U-Net deep learning framework for high performance
976 vessel segmentation in patients with cerebrovascular disease. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 13.

977 Lu, B., Li, H.-X., Chang, Z.-K., Li, L., Chen, N.-X., Zhu, Z.-C., Zhou, H.-X., Li, X.-Y., Wang, Y.-W., Cui,
978 S.-X., Deng, Z.-Y., Fan, Z., Yang, H., Chen, X., Thompson, P. M., Castellanos, F. X., & Yan, C.-G.
979 (2021). A practical Alzheimer disease classifier via brain imaging-based deep learning on 85,721 samples.
980 *ArXiv*.

981 Luo, X., Wang, G., Song, T., Zhang, J., Aertsen, M., Deprest, J., Ourselin, S., Vercauteren, T., & Zhang,

982 S. (2021). MIDeepSeg: Minimally interactive segmentation of unseen objects from medical images using
983 deep learning. *Medical Image Analysis*, p. 102102.

984 Lyu, I., Bao, S., Hao, L., Yao, J., Miller, J. A., Voorhies, W., Taylor, W. D., Bunge, S. A., Weiner,
985 K. S., & Landman, B. A. (2021). Labeling lateral prefrontal sulci using spherical data augmentation and
986 context-aware training. *NeuroImage*, 229, 117758.

987 Maier-Hein, L., Eisenmann, M., Reinke, A., Onogur, S., Stankovic, M., Scholz, P., Arbel, T., Bogunović,
988 H., Bradley, A., Carass, A., Feldmann, C., Frangi, A., Full, P., Ginneken, B., Hanbury, A., Honauer, K.,
989 Kozubek, M., Landman, B., März, K., & Kopp-Schneider, A. (2018). Why rankings of biomedical image
990 analysis competitions should be interpreted with care. *Nature Communications*, 9.

991 Major, D., Lenis, D., Wimmer, M., Sluiter, G., Berg, A., & Bühler, K. (2020). Interpreting medical
992 image classifiers by optimization based counterfactual impact analysis. In *2020 IEEE 17th International
993 Symposium on Biomedical Imaging (ISBI)*, pp. 1096–1100.

994 Manjón, J. V. (2017). *MRI Preprocessing*, pp. 53–63. (Cham).

995 McEver, R. & Manjunath, B. (2020). PCAMs: Weakly supervised semantic segmentation using point
996 supervision. *ArXiv*.

997 Mehmood, A., Yang, S., Feng, Z., Wang, M., Ahmad, A. S., Khan, R., Maqsood, M., & Yaqub, M. (2021).
998 A transfer learning approach for early diagnosis of Alzheimer’s disease on MRI images. *Neuroscience*,
999 460, 43–52.

1000 Menze, B., Jakab, A., Bauer, S., Kalpathy-Cramer, J., Farahaniy, K., Kirby, J., Burren, Y., Porz, N.,
1001 Slotboom, J., Wiest, R., Lancziy, L., Gerstnery, E., Webery, M.-A., Arbel, T., Avants, B., Ayache, N.,
1002 Buendia, P., Collins, L., Cordier, N., & Van Leemput, K. (2014). The multimodal brain tumor image
1003 segmentation benchmark (BRATS). *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, 99.

1004 Mirza, M. & Osindero, S. (2014). Conditional generative adversarial nets. *ArXiv*.

1005 Mitra, S., Banerjee, S., & Hayashi, Y. (2017). Volumetric brain tumour detection from MRI using visual
1006 saliency. *PLOS ONE*, 12, 1–14.

1007 Molchanov, P., Tyree, S., Karras, T., Aila, T., & Kautz, J. (2016). Pruning convolutional neural networks
1008 for resource efficient transfer learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

1009 Morid, M. A., Borjali, A., & Del Fiol, G. (2021). A scoping review of transfer learning research on medical
1010 image analysis using ImageNet. *Computers in Biology and Medicine*, 128, 104115.

1011 Moyer, D., Ver Steeg, G., Tax, C., & Thompson, P. (2020). Scanner invariant representations for diffusion
1012 MRI harmonization. *Magnetic Resonance in Medicine*.

1013 Murugesan, B., Vijayarangan, S., Sarveswaran, K., Ram, K., & Sivaprakasam, M. (2020). KD-MRI: A
1014 knowledge distillation framework for image reconstruction and image restoration in mri workflow. In
1015 *Proceedings of the Third Conference on Medical Imaging with Deep Learning*, vol. 121 of *Proceedings of
1016 Machine Learning Research*, pp. 515–526. (PMLR).

1017 Nair, T., Precup, D., Arnold, D., & Arbel, T. (2018). Exploring uncertainty measures in deep networks
1018 for multiple sclerosis lesion detection and segmentation. In *Medical Image Computing and Computer
1019 Assisted Intervention – MICCAI 2018*. MICCAI 2018. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 11070.

1020 Nath, V., Yang, D., Landman, B. A., Xu, D., & Roth, H. R. (2021). Diminishing uncertainty within the
1021 training pool: Active learning for medical image segmentation. *ArXiv*.

1022 Nguyen, K. P., Fatt, C. C., Treacher, A., Mellema, C., Trivedi, M. H., & Montillo, A. (2020). Anatomically

- informed data augmentation for functional MRI with applications to deep learning. In *Medical Imaging 2020: Image Processing*, vol. 11313, pp. 172 – 177.
- Ning, L., Bonet-Carne, E., Grussu, F., Sepehrband, F., Kaden, E., Veraart, J., Blumberg, S. B., Khoo, C. S., Palombo, M., Kokkinos, I., Alexander, D. C., Coll-Font, J., Scherrer, B., Warfield, S. K., Karayumak, S. C., Rathi, Y., Koppers, S., Weninger, L., Ebert, J., Merhof, D., Moyer, D., Pietsch, M., Christiaens, D., Gomes Teixeira, R. A., Tournier, J.-D., Schilling, K. G., Huo, Y., Nath, V., Hansen, C., Blaber, J., Landman, B. A., Zhylyka, A., Pluim, J. P., Parker, G., Rudrapatna, U., Evans, J., Charron, C., Jones, D. K., & Tax, C. M. (2020). Cross-scanner and cross-protocol multi-shell diffusion MRI data harmonization: Algorithms and results. *NeuroImage*, 221, 117128.
- Nobis, L., Manohar, S. G., Smith, S. M., Alfaro-Almagro, F., Jenkinson, M., Mackay, C. E., & Husain, M. (2019). Hippocampal volume across age: Nomograms derived from over 19,700 people in UK Biobank. *NeuroImage: Clinical*, 23, 101904.
- Oh, K., Chung, Y.-C., Kim, K., Kim, W.-S., & Oh, I.-S. (2019). Classification and visualization of Alzheimer’s disease using volumetric convolutional neural network and transfer learning. *Scientific Reports*, 9.
- Olah, C., Satyanarayan, A., Johnson, I., Carter, S., Schubert, L., Ye, K., & Mordvintsev, A. (2018). The building blocks of interpretability. *Distill*.
- Ozdemir, O., Woodward, B., & Berlin, A. (2017). Propagating uncertainty in multi-stage bayesian convolutional neural networks with application to pulmonary nodule detection. In *NIPS Workshop on Bayesian Deep Learning*, 2017.
- Papernot, N., McDaniel, P., Goodfellow, I., Jha, S., Celik, Z. B., & Swami, A. (2017). Practical black-box attacks against machine learning. In *Association for Computing Machinery 2017*, pp. 506–519.
- Park, J., Woo, S., Lee, J.-Y., & Kweon, I. (2018). BAM: Bottleneck attention module. In *Proceedings of the British Machine Vision Conference (BMVC) 2018*.
- Paulus, J. & Kent, D. (2020). Predictably unequal: understanding and addressing concerns that algorithmic clinical prediction may increase health disparities. *npj Digital Medicine*, 3, 99.
- Pawlowski, N., Coelho de Castro, D., & Glocker, B. (2020). Deep structural causal models for tractable counterfactual inference. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. F. Balcan, & H. Lin, eds., vol. 33, pp. 857–869.
- Pawlowski, N. & Glocker, B. (2019). Is texture predictive for age and sex in brain {mri}? In *International Conference on Medical Imaging with Deep Learning – Extended Abstract Track*.
- Pérez-García, F., Sparks, R., & Ourselin, S. (2020). TorchIO: a Python library for efficient loading, preprocessing, augmentation and patch-based sampling of medical images in deep learning. *arXiv:2003.04696 [cs, eess, stat]*. *arXiv: 2003.04696*.
- Perone, C. S., Ballester, P., Barros, R. C., & Cohen-Adad, J. (2019). Unsupervised domain adaptation for medical imaging segmentation with self-ensembling. *NeuroImage*, 194, 1–11.
- Qi, K., Yang, H., Li, C., Liu, Z., Wang, M., Liu, Q., & Wang, S. (2019). X-Net: Brain stroke lesion segmentation based on depthwise separable convolution and long-range dependencies. In *Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention – MICCAI 2019*. *MICCAI 2019. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 11766.
- Radosavovic, I., Dollar, P., Girshick, R., Gkioxari, G., & He, K. (2018). Data distillation: Towards

- omni-supervised learning. In 2018 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), pp. 4119–4128.
- Raghu, M., Zhang, C., Kleinberg, J., & Bengio, S. (2019). Transfusion: Understanding transfer learning with applications to medical imaging. In 33rd Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2019).
- Rajchl, M., Lee, M. C. H., Oktay, O., Kamnitsas, K., Passerat-Palmbach, J., Bai, W., Damodaram, M., Rutherford, M. A., Hajnal, J. V., Kainz, B., & Rueckert, D. (2017). DeepCut: Object segmentation from bounding box annotations using convolutional neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, 36, 674–683.
- Ramprasaath, R. S., Cogswell, M., Vedantam, R., Parikh, D., & Batra, D. (2017). Grad-CAM: Visual explanations from deep networks via gradient-based localization. In 2017 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV), pp. 618–626.
- Rieke, N., Hancox, J., Milletari, F., Roth, H., Albarqouni, S., Bakas, S., Galtier, M., Landman, B., Maier-Hein, K., Ourselin, S., Sheller, M., Summers, R., Trask, A., Xu, D., Baust, M., & Cardoso, M. J. (2020). The future of digital health with federated learning. *npj Digital Medicine* volume.
- Roy, A. G., Conjeti, S., Navab, N., & Wachinger, C. (2018). Inherent brain segmentation quality control from fully ConvNet Monte Carlo sampling. In *Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention – MICCAI 2018*, A. F. Frangi, J. A. Schnabel, C. Davatzikos, C. Alberola-López, & G. Fichtinger, eds., pp. 664–672.
- Saito, T. & Rehmsmeier, M. (2015). The precision-recall plot is more informative than the ROC plot when evaluating binary classifiers on imbalanced datasets. *PloS one*, 10, e0118432.
- Schlemper, J., Oktay, O., Schaap, M., Heinrich, M., Kainz, B., Glocker, B., & Rueckert, D. (2019). Attention gated networks: Learning to leverage salient regions in medical images. *Medical Image Analysis*, 53.
- Shah, N. H., Milstein, A., & Bagley, PhD, S. C. (2019). Making Machine Learning Models Clinically Useful. *JAMA*, 322, 1351–1352.
- Sheller, M. J., Reina, G. A., Edwards, B., Martin, J., & Bakas, S. (2019). Multi-institutional deep learning modeling without sharing patient data: A feasibility study on brain tumor segmentation. In *Brainlesion: Glioma, Multiple Sclerosis, Stroke and Traumatic Brain Injuries*, pp. 92–104.
- Shin, H.-C., Tenenholtz, N. A., Rogers, J. K., Schwarz, C. G., Senjem, M. L., Gunter, J. L., Andriole, K. P., & Michalski, M. (2018). Medical image synthesis for data augmentation and anonymization using generative adversarial networks. In *Simulation and Synthesis in Medical Imaging*. (Cham: Springer International Publishing).
- Shokri, R. & Shmatikov, V. (2015). Privacy-preserving deep learning. In 2015 53rd Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton), pp. 909–910.
- Shu, M., Liu, C., Qiu, W., & Yuille, A. (2020). Identifying model weakness with adversarial examiner. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 34, 11998–12006.
- Shwartzman, O., Gazit, H., Shelef, I., & Riklin-Raviv, T. (2020). The worrisome impact of an inter-rater bias on neural network training. *ArXiv*.
- Simard, P., Lecun, Y., & Denker, J. (1998). Transformation invariance in pattern recognition tangent distance and tangent propagation. *Neural networks: tricks of the trade*.
- Simonyan, K., Vedaldi, A., & Zisserman, A. (2014). Deep inside convolutional networks: Visualising image

classification models and saliency maps. In Workshop at International Conference on Learning Representations.

Simonyan, K. & Zisserman, A. (2015). Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. In International Conference on Learning Representations.

Singla, S., Pollack, B., Wallace, S., & Batmanghelich, K. (2021). Explaining the black-box smoothly- a counterfactual approach. ArXiv.

Sinha, A. & Dolz, J. (2020). Multi-scale self-guided attention for medical image segmentation. IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics, PP, 1–1.

Srivastava, N., Hinton, G., Krizhevsky, A., Sutskever, I., & Salakhutdinov, R. (2014). Dropout: A simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting. Journal of Machine Learning Research, 15, 1929–1958.

St-Jean, S., Viergever, M., & Leemans, A. (2019). Harmonization of diffusion MRI datasets with adaptive dictionary learning. bioRxiv.

Sudlow, C., Gallacher, J., Allen, N., Beral, V., Burton, P., Danesh, J., Downey, P., Elliott, P., Green, J., Landray, M., Liu, B., Matthews, P., Ong, G., Pell, J., Silman, A., Young, A., Sprosen, T., Peakman, T., & Collins, R. (2015). UK biobank: An open access resource for identifying the causes of a wide range of complex diseases of middle and old age. 12, e1001779.

Sundararajan, M., Taly, A., & Yan, Q. (2017). Axiomatic attribution for deep networks. In Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning.

Sundaresan, V., Zamboni, G., Dinsdale, N. K., Rothwell, P. M., Griffanti, L., & Jenkinson, M. (2021). Comparison of domain adaptation techniques for white matter hyperintensity segmentation in brain MR images. bioRxiv.

Svensson, C., Hübner, R., & Figge, M. (2015). Automated classification of circulating tumor cells and the impact of interobserver variability on classifier training and performance. Journal of Immunology Research, 2015, 1–9.

Sweeney, L. (2002). K-anonymity: A model for protecting privacy. Int. J. Uncertain. Fuzziness Knowl.-Based Syst., 10, 557–570.

Tajbakhsh, N., Hu, Y., Cao, J., Yan, X., Xiao, Y., Lu, Y., Liang, J., Terzopoulos, D., & Ding, X. (2019). Surrogate supervision for medical image analysis: Effective deep learning from limited quantities of labeled data. In 2019 IEEE 16th International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging (ISBI 2019), pp. 1251–1255.

Tajbakhsh, N., Jeyaseelan, L., Li, Q., Chiang, J. N., Wu, Z., & Ding, X. (2020). Embracing imperfect datasets: A review of deep learning solutions for medical image segmentation. Medical Image Analysis, 63, 101693.

Takacs, P. & Manno-Kovacs, A. (2018). MRI brain tumor segmentation combining saliency and convolutional network features. In 2018 International Conference on Content-Based Multimedia Indexing (CBMI), pp. 1–6.

Takao, H., Hayashi, N., & Ohtomo, K. (2011). Effect of scanner in longitudinal studies of brain volume changes. Journal of magnetic resonance imaging : JMRI, 34, 438–44.

Takao, H., Hayashi, N., & Ohtomo, K. (2013). Effects of study design in multi-scanner voxel-based morphometry studies. NeuroImage, 84.

Talo, M., Baloglu, U., yildirim, O., & Acharya, U. R. (2018). Application of deep transfer learning for automated brain abnormality classification using MRimages. Cognitive Systems Research.

- Tanner, A. (2017). *Our Bodies, Our Data: How Companies Make Billions Selling Our Medical Records*. (Beacon Press).
- Thagaard, J., Hauberg, S., van der Vegt, B., Ebstrup, T., Hansen, J. D., & Dahl, A. B. (2020). Can you trust predictive uncertainty under real dataset shifts in digital pathology? In *Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention – MICCAI 2020*, pp. 824–833. Cham.
- Thakur, S., Doshi, J., Pati, S., Rathore, S., Sako, C., Bilello, M., Ha, S., Shukla, G., Flanders, A., Kotrotsou, A., Milchenko, M., Liem, S., Alexander, G., Lombardo, J., Palmer, J., LaMontagne, P., Nazeri, A., Talbar, S., Kulkarni, U., & Bakas, S. (2020). Brain extraction on MRI scans in presence of diffuse glioma: Multi-institutional performance evaluation of deep learning methods and robust modality-agnostic training. *NeuroImage*, 220, 117081.
- Tousignant, A., Lemaître, P., Precup, D., Arnold, D. L., & Arbel, T. (2019). Prediction of disease progression in multiple sclerosis patients using deep learning analysis of MRI data. In *Proceedings of The 2nd International Conference on Medical Imaging with Deep Learning*, vol. 102, pp. 483–492.
- Tzeng, E., Hoffman, J., Darrell, T., & Saenko, K. (2015). Simultaneous deep transfer across domains and tasks. In *2015 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pp. 4068–4076.
- Valverde, S., Salem, M., Cabezas, M., Pareto, D., Vilanova, J. C., Ramió-Torrentà, L., Àlex Rovira, Salvi, J., Oliver, A., & Lladó, X. (2019). One-shot domain adaptation in multiple sclerosis lesion segmentation using convolutional neural networks. *NeuroImage: Clinical*, 21, 101638.
- Vaze, S., Xie, W., & Namburete, A. I. L. (2020). Low-memory CNNs enabling real-time ultrasound segmentation towards mobile deployment. *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, 24, 1059–1069.
- Venturini, L., Papageorghiou, A. T., Noble, J. A., & Namburete, A. I. L. (2020). Uncertainty estimates as data selection criteria to boost omni-supervised learning. In *Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention – MICCAI 2020*, pp. 689–698.
- Verma, S., Dickerson, J., & Hines, K. (2020). Counterfactual explanations for machine learning: A review.
- Vidanage, A., Christen, P., Ranbaduge, T., & Schnell, R. (2020). A graph matching attack on privacy-preserving record linkage. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, p. 1485–1494.
- Visser, M., Müller, D., Duijn, R., Smits, M., Verburg, N., Hendriks, E., Nabuurs, R., Bot, J., Eijelaar, R., Witte, M., Herk, M., Barkhof, F., De Witt Hamer, P., & De Munck, J. (2019). Inter-rater agreement in glioma segmentations on longitudinal MRI. *NeuroImage: Clinical*, 22, 101727.
- Wachinger, C., Reuter, M. R., & Klein, T. (2018). DeepNAT: Deep convolutional neural network for segmenting neuroanatomy. *NeuroImage*, 170, 434–445.
- Wang, G., Li, W., Aertsen, M., Deprest, J., Ourselin, S., & Vercauteren, T. (2019). Aleatoric uncertainty estimation with test-time augmentation for medical image segmentation with convolutional neural networks. *Neurocomputing*, 338, 34–45.
- Wang, L., Guo, D., Wang, G., & Zhang, S. (2020). Annotation-efficient learning for medical image segmentation based on noisy pseudo labels and adversarial learning. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, p. 1–1.
- Wang, X., Girshick, R., Gupta, A., & He, K. (2018). Non-local neural networks. In *2018 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 7794–7803.
- Williams, D. R. & Wyatt, R. (2015). *Racial Bias in Health Care and Health: Challenges and Opportunities*.

- JAMA, 314, 555–556.
- Winkler, J. K., Fink, C., Toberer, F., Enk, A., Deinlein, T., Hofmann-Wellenhof, R., Thomas, L., Lallas, A., Blum, A., Stolz, W., & Haenssle, H. A. (2019). Association Between Surgical Skin Markings in Dermoscopic Images and Diagnostic Performance of a Deep Learning Convolutional Neural Network for Melanoma Recognition. *JAMA Dermatology*, 155, 1135–1141.
- Wong, W., Laveist, T., & Sharfstein, J. M. (2015). Achieving health equity by design. *JAMA*, 313.
- Woo, S., Park, J., Lee, J.-Y., & Kweon, I. S. (2018). CBAM: Convolutional block attention module. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pp. 3–19.
- Wu, W., Lu, Y., Mane, R., & Guan, C. (2020). Deep learning for neuroimaging segmentation with a novel data augmentation strategy. In *2020 42nd Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine Biology Society (EMBC)*, pp. 1516–1519.
- Xia, Y., Yang, D., Yu, Z., Liu, F., Cai, J., Yu, L., Zhu, Z., Xu, D., Yuille, A., & Roth, H. (2020). Uncertainty-aware multi-view co-training for semi-supervised medical image segmentation and domain adaptation. *Medical Image Analysis*, 65, 101766.
- Yang, L., Zhang, Y., Chen, J., Zhang, S., & Chen, D. Z. (2017). Suggestive annotation: A deep active learning framework for biomedical image segmentation. In *Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention – MICCAI 2017*, pp. 399–407.
- Yang, Q., Liu, Y., Chen, T., & Tong, Y. (2019). Federated machine learning: Concept and applications. *ACM Trans. Intell. Syst. Technol.*, 10.
- Yosinski, J., Clune, J., Bengio, Y., & Lipson, H. (2014). How transferable are features in deep neural networks? In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Z. Ghahramani, M. Welling, C. Cortes, N. Lawrence, & K. Q. Weinberger, eds., vol. 27. (Curran Associates, Inc.).
- Yu, M., Linn, K., Cook, P., Phillips, M., McInnis, M., Fava, M., Trivedi, M., Weissman, M., Shinohara, R., & Sheline, Y. (2018). Statistical harmonization corrects site effects in functional connectivity measurements from multisite fMRI data. *Human Brain Mapping*, 39.
- Zeiler, M. & Fergus, R. (2014). Visualizing and understanding convolutional neural networks. In *2014 IEEE European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, vol. 8689.
- Zhang, H., Cisse, M., Dauphin, Y., & Lopez-Paz, D. (2017). mixup: Beyond empirical risk minimization.
- Zhang, J., Jiang, Z., Dong, J., Hou, Y., & Liu, B. (2020). Attention gate resU-Net for automatic MRI brain tumor segmentation. *IEEE Access*, 8, 58533–58545.
- Zhang, J., Xie, Y., Xia, Y., & Shen, C. (2019). Attention residual learning for skin lesion classification. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, 38, 2092–2103.
- Zhang, Y., Jiang, H., Miura, Y., Manning, C., & Langlotz, C. (2020a). Contrastive learning of medical visual representations from paired images and text. *ArXiv*.
- Zhang, Y., Liu, B., Wang, Y., Gao, Z., Bai, X., & Zhou, F. (2020b). BDB-Net: Boundary-enhanced dual branch network for whole brain segmentation. In *Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention – MICCAI 2020*, pp. 188–197. Cham.
- Zhao, A., Balakrishnan, G., Durand, F., Guttag, J. V., & Dalca, A. V. (2019a). Data augmentation using learned transformations for one-shot medical image segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*.
- Zhao, F., Wu, Z., Wang, L., Lin, W., Xia, S., & Li, G. (2019b). Harmonization of infant cortical thickness

1228 using surface-to-surface cycle-consistent adversarial networks. *Medical Image Computing and Computer*
1229 *Assisted Intervention - Conference Proceedings*, pp. 475–483.

1230 Zhou, C., Chen, S., Ding, C., & Tao, D. (2019a). Learning contextual and attentive information for brain
1231 tumor segmentation. In *Brainlesion: Glioma, Multiple Sclerosis, Stroke and Traumatic Brain Injuries.*
1232 *BrainLes 2018.*, vol. 11384.

1233 Zhou, T., Canu, S., Vera, P., & Ruan, S. (2020). Brain tumor segmentation with missing modalities via
1234 latent multi-source correlation representation. In *Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted*
1235 *Intervention – MICCAI 2020*, pp. 533–541.

1236 Zhou, Z., Sodha, V., Rahman Siddiquee, M. M., Feng, R., Tajbakhsh, N., Gotway, M. B., & Liang, J.
1237 (2019b). Models genesis: Generic autodidactic models for 3D medical image analysis. In *Medical Image*
1238 *Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention – MICCAI 2019*, pp. 384–393.

1239 Zhu, H., Tang, Z., Cheng, H., Wu, Y., & Fan, Y. (2019). Multi-atlas label fusion with random local binary
1240 pattern features: Application to hippocampus segmentation. *Scientific Reports*, 9, 16839.

1241 Zhuang, P., Schwing, A. G., & Koyejo, O. (2019a). FMRI data augmentation via synthesis. In *2019 IEEE*
1242 *16th International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging (ISBI 2019)*, pp. 1783–1787.

1243 Zhuang, Z., Li, N., Joseph Raj, A. N., Mahesh, V., & Qiu, S. (2019b). An RDAU-NET model for lesion
1244 segmentation in breast ultrasound images. *PLOS ONE*, 14, e0221535.

1245 Zitnick, C., Jovic, N., & Kang, S. B. (2005). Consistent segmentation for optical flow estimation. In *Tenth*
1246 *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV’05) Volume 1*, vol. 2, pp. 1308–1315 Vol. 2.