

BrainMorph: A Foundational Keypoint Model for Robust and Flexible Brain MRI Registration

Alan Q. Wang^{a,*}, Rachit Saluja^{a,b}, Heejong Kim^b, Xinzi He^b, Adrian Dalca^{c,d}, Mert R. Sabuncu^{a,b}

^aSchool of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Cornell University and Cornell Tech, New York, NY 10044, USA

^bDepartment of Radiology, Weill Cornell Medical School, New York, NY 10065, USA

^cComputer Science and Artificial Intelligence Lab at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA

^dA.A. Martinos Center for Biomedical Imaging at the Massachusetts General Hospital, Charlestown, MA 02129, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 24 May 2024

Communicated by S. Sarkar

Keywords: Image registration, Multi-modal, Keypoint detection, Foundation model, Brain MRI

ABSTRACT

We present a keypoint-based foundation model for general purpose brain MRI registration, based on the recently-proposed KeyMorph framework. Our model, called BrainMorph, serves as a tool that supports multi-modal, pairwise, and scalable groupwise registration. BrainMorph is trained on a massive dataset of over 100,000 3D volumes, skull-stripped and non-skull-stripped, from nearly 16,000 unique healthy and diseased subjects. BrainMorph is robust to large misalignments, interpretable via interrogating automatically-extracted keypoints, and enables rapid and controllable generation of many plausible transformations with different alignment types and different degrees of nonlinearity at test-time. We demonstrate the superiority of BrainMorph in solving 3D rigid, affine, and nonlinear registration on a variety of multi-modal brain MRI scans of healthy and diseased subjects, in both the pairwise and groupwise setting. In particular, we show registration accuracy and speeds that surpass current state-of-the-art methods, especially in the context of large initial misalignments and large group settings. All code and models are available at <https://github.com/alanqrwang/brainmorph>.
© 2024 Elsevier B. V. All rights reserved.

Table 1: Summary of registration capabilities of BrainMorph compared to baselines.

Support for..	ITK-Elastix	ANTs	SynthMorph	BrainMorph
pairwise?	✓	✓	✓	✓
groupwise?	✓	✗	✗	✓
multi-modal?	✓	✓	✓	✓
rigid?	✓	✓	✗	✓
affine?	✓	✓	✗	✓
nonlinear?	✓	✓	✓	✓
lesions?	✗	✗	✗	✓
non-skullstripped?	✗	✗	✓	✓

*Corresponding author:

e-mail: aw847@cornell.edu (Alan Q. Wang)

1. Introduction

Registration is a fundamental problem in biomedical imaging tasks. Multiple images, often reflecting a variety of contrasts, modalities, subjects, and underlying pathologies, are commonly acquired in many applications (Uludağ and Roebroeck, 2014). Registration seeks to spatially align these images in order to facilitate downstream analyses, like tracking longitudinal changes, studying disease progression, or analyzing population-level variability.

Registration can be broken down into different types. It may




Fig. 1: The framework of BrainMorph. Fixed and moving 3D brain images are passed through the same keypoint detection network, which predicts N keypoints useful for registration. The transformation parameters are then computed as a function of the keypoints, which are in turn used to resample the moving image. Keypoint colors denote depth (see Fig. 2).

be performed within the same modality (unimodal) or across different modalities (multimodal). Pairwise registration performs registration on an image pair, while groupwise registration performs registration on multiple images at once (Guyader et al., 2018). To perform the registration, various families of spatial transformations can be used, including rigid, affine, and nonlinear transformations.

Different lines of research have been explored to solve the registration task. “Classical” (i.e. non-learning-based) registration methods solve an iterative optimization of a similarity metric over a space of transformations, with additional regularization terms that restrict the space of plausible transformations (Oliveira and Tavares, 2014; Sotiras et al., 2013). Much research is dedicated to developing good transformations, similarity metrics, and optimization strategies. While performant, these approaches are known to suffer from long run times, often requiring upwards of several minutes to register a pair of images. In addition, these approaches are known to perform poorly when the initial misalignment between images is large (e.g. 90 degrees of rotational misalignment).

Another line of work decomposes the registration problem into two steps. First, salient features (e.g. keypoints or contours) are extracted from images, and correspondences are established between the features of the image pair. Second, the

transformation is derived which aligns these features and correspondences. In this work, we refer to methods that extract keypoints as salient features as “keypoint-based” registration. Largely, keypoint-based registration is advantageous in that the registration is relatively robust to initial misalignments, given good correspondences. In addition, these methods enjoy superior interpretability, because the user can interrogate the correspondences which are driving the registration. However, finding keypoints and establishing correspondences is a difficult task and is a subject of much research (Lowe, 2004; Tang et al., 2023, 2019).

More recently, deep learning-based strategies have emerged which leverage large datasets of images to train a neural network to perform the registration task. These strategies use convolutional neural network (CNN) or transformer-based architectures (Ma et al., 2022; Chen et al., 2021; Khan et al., 2021) that either output transformation parameters (e.g. rigid, affine or spline) (Lee et al., 2019b; de Vos et al., 2019) or a dense deformation field (Balakrishnan et al., 2019; Hoffmann et al., 2022) which aligns an image pair. These strategies are effective and are able to perform fast inference via efficient feed-forward passes. However, like classical methods, they often fail when the initial misalignment is large.

Recently, the KeyMorph framework proposed to combine the




Fig. 2: Moving, fixed, and aligned images in axial, sagittal, and coronal mid-slices. Keypoints extracted by BrainMorph are overlaid. For Aligned, aligned keypoints are dots and fixed keypoints are crosses. Color of the keypoint corresponds to depth. Note that keypoint weights are not visualized.

benefits of keypoint-based registration with deep learning using neural networks to automatically detect corresponding keypoints (Yu et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2023). Corresponding keypoints can then be used to compute the optimal transformation in closed-form, where the keypoints themselves are learned by a neural network. Thus, KeyMorph may be seen as possessing all the benefits of keypoint-based registration, including robustness to large misalignments and better interpretability, while retaining the fast inference times of deep learning-based methods. In addition, different transformation can be used according to user specifications, thereby enabling human controllability of the registration process.

In this work, we extend the KeyMorph framework into a general-purpose tool for brain MRI registration. Although the literature on deep-learning-based registration methods has been widely explored and many tools exist with support for brain MRIs (Avants et al., 2008a; Konstantinos Ntatsis et al., 2023; Hoffmann et al., 2022), most works focus on cross-subject pairwise registration on healthy subjects with skull-stripped images. Groupwise registration and support for non-skull-stripped and diseased subjects is often ignored, or is prohibitively slow or memory-intensive (Konstantinos Ntatsis et al., 2023). Often,

the tools that do exist require time-consuming preprocessing steps like skullstripping and pre-affine registration (Balakrishnan et al., 2019; Hoffmann et al., 2022). In short, there is a lack of software tools for brain MRIs which is capable of supporting registration across a wide swath of use cases, including healthy and diseased subjects, pairwise/longitudinal/groupwise registration, and minimal assumptions on preprocessing (like skullstripping).

Table 1 summarizes the capabilities of our tool, which we call BrainMorph. Our tool supports rigid, affine, and nonlinear registration. It is trained, and thus works “out-of-the-box”, on both skull-stripped and non-skull-stripped data of diseased and normal subjects in a variety of MRI modalities. In addition to pairwise registration, we introduce a novel and memory-efficient approach to groupwise registration and demonstrate the superiority and scalability of our approach in population-level and longitudinal settings. All code and models are available at <https://github.com/alanqrwang/brainmorph>.

2. Background

Classical Methods. Pairwise iterative, optimization-based approaches have been extensively studied in medical image reg-

istration (Hill et al., 2001; Oliveira and Tavares, 2014). These methods employ a variety of similarity functions, types of deformation, transformation constraints or regularization strategies, and optimization techniques. Intensity-based similarity criteria are most often used, such as mean-squared error (MSE) or normalized cross correlation for registering images of the same modality (Avants et al., 2009, 2008b; Hermsillo et al., 2002). For registering image pairs from different modalities, statistical measures like mutual information or contrast-invariant features like MIND are popular (Heinrich et al., 2012; Hermsillo et al., 2002; Hoffmann et al., 2021; Mattes et al., 2003; Viola and Wells III, 1997).

Keypoint-based Methods. Another registration paradigm first detects features or keypoints in the images, and then establishes their correspondence. This approach often involves handcrafted features (Tuytelaars and Mikolajczyk, 2008), features extracted from curvature of contours (Rosenfeld and Thurston, 1971), image intensity (Förstner and Gülch, 1987; Harris et al., 1988), color information (Montesinos et al., 1998; Van de Weijer et al., 2005), or segmented regions (Matas et al., 2004; Wachinger et al., 2018). Features can be also obtained so that they are invariant to viewpoints (Bay et al., 2006; Brown et al., 2005; Lowe, 2004; Toews et al., 2013). These algorithms then optimize similarity functions based on these features over the space of transformations (Chui and Rangarajan, 2003; Hill et al., 2001). This strategy is sensitive to the quality of the keypoints and often suffer in the presence of substantial contrast and/or color variation (Verdie et al., 2015).

Deep Learning-based Methods. In learning-based image registration, supervision can be provided through ground-truth transformations, either synthesized or computed by classical methods (Cao et al., 2018; Dosovitskiy et al., 2015; Eppenhof and Pluim, 2018; Lee et al., 2019a; Uzunova et al., 2017; Yang et al., 2017). Unsupervised strategies use loss functions similar to those employed in classical methods (Balakrishnan et al., 2019; Dalca et al., 2019; de Vos et al., 2019; Fan et al., 2018; Krebs et al., 2019; Qin et al., 2019; Wu et al., 2015; Hoopes

et al., 2021). Weakly supervised models employ (additional) landmarks or labels to guide training (Balakrishnan et al., 2019; Fan et al., 2019; Hu et al., 2018a,b).

Recent learning-based methods compute image features or keypoints (Ma et al., 2021; Moyer et al., 2021) that can be used for image recognition, retrieval, tracking, or registration. Learning useful features or keypoints can be done with supervision (Verdie et al., 2015; Yi et al., 2016, 2018), self-supervision (DeTone et al., 2018; Liu et al., 2021) or without supervision (Barroso-Laguna et al., 2019; Lenc and Vedaldi, 2016; Ono et al., 2018). Finding correspondences between pairs of images usually involves identifying the learned features which are most similar between the pair. In contrast, our method uses a network which extract/generates keypoints directly from the image. The keypoints between the moving and fixed image are corresponding (i.e., matched) by construction, and we optimize these corresponding keypoints directly for the registration task (and not using any intermediate keypoint supervision).

Learning-based methods for multi-modal registration are of great practical utility and often-studied in the literature. Most works require, in addition to the moving and fixed image, a corresponding image in a standard space which can be compared and which drives the alignment, usually in the form of segmentations. (Zhang et al., 2022) address multi-modal retinal images and handle multi-modality by transforming each image to a standard grayscale image via vessel segmentation. A standard feature detection and description procedure is used to find correspondences from these standard images. Other works (Song et al., 2022) rely on segmentations from ultrasound and magnetic resonance images to align them. Obtaining these segmentations may be costly, add additional computational complexity to the registration procedure, or be specific to the anatomies/modalities in question. In contrast, our method can be applied generally to any registration problem. In addition, we present a variant of our model which only relies on the images themselves during training. In our experiments, we find that this variant outperforms state-of-the-art baselines

<i>Model</i>	<i>CPU Time, pre-processed</i>	<i>GPU Time, pre-processed</i>	<i>CPU Time, raw</i>	<i>GPU Time, raw</i>
ANTs, Rigid	101.38±2.33	-	143.38±2.33	-
ANTs, Affine	110.45±2.94	-	142.45±2.94	-
ANTs, Syn	216.03±3.14	-	248.03±3.14	-
BrainMorph, Rigid	109.84±1.80	1.05±0.29	108.27±1.82	1.05±0.25
BrainMorph, Affine	109.63±1.84	1.04±0.36	110.31±1.90	1.05±0.32
BrainMorph, TPS	180.14±1.99	1.24±0.30	180.40±1.91	1.25±0.31

Table 2: Average computation time in seconds for pairwise registration across different models. We separate between times when performing registration with pre-processed data and raw data. For ANTs, pre-processing requires skull-stripping with HD-BET, which adds an additional 32 seconds (Isensee et al., 2019). For SynthMorph, pre-processing requires an initial robust affine registration into a reference space. KeyMorph timings are based on KeyMorph-L.

while also performing comparably to a variant of our model which leverages segmentations.

3. BrainMorph

Our tool, BrainMorph, is based on the previously published KeyMorph framework and we refer the reader to prior papers for more details (Yu et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2023). Let $(\mathbf{x}_m, \mathbf{x}_f)$ be a moving (source) and fixed (target) image¹ pair, possibly of different contrasts or modalities. Additionally, we denote by \mathcal{T}_θ a parametric coordinate transformation with parameters θ , such as those discussed in Appendix A. The goal is to find the optimal transformation \mathcal{T}_{θ^*} such that the registered image $\mathbf{x}_r = \mathbf{x}_m \circ \mathcal{T}_{\theta^*}$ aligns with some fixed image \mathbf{x}_f , where \circ denotes the spatial transformation of an image.

BrainMorph works by detecting N keypoints $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times N}$ from any given image. In this work, $D = 3$. The keypoints are detected by a neural network f_w . Since f_w detects keypoints for any image, the keypoints for any arbitrary image pair are guaranteed to be in correspondence by construction. Given corresponding keypoint sets \mathbf{P} and \mathbf{Q} , the optimal transformation can be derived using a keypoint solver, which outputs the optimal transformation parameters as a function of the keypoints: $\theta^*(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q})$. Optionally, a vector of weights \mathbf{w} can weight the correspondences, such that lower weights lead to a lower contribution to the overall alignment: $\theta^*(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{w})$.

Fig. 1 depicts a graphical overview of BrainMorph. Note this formulation unlocks the benefits of keypoint-based registration, including robustness to large misalignments and interpretability

¹Although we consider 3D volumes in this work, BrainMorph is agnostic to the number of dimensions. The terms “image” and “volume” are used interchangeably.

(as compared to other learning-based methods) via visualizing the keypoints. Moreover, this formulation enables controllability in the sense that different transformations can be used to align the keypoints. In particular, during training, this allows for heterogeneity in training, such that the model can be robust to a wide variety of transformation types. At test-time, one can generate a dense set of registrations; the controllable nature of this framework enables the user to select the preferred registration.

3.1. Keypoint Detection Network

BrainMorph can leverage any deep learning-based keypoint detector (Ma et al., 2021; DeTone et al., 2018; Barroso-Laguna et al., 2019). In this work, we are interested in preserving translation equivariance; to this end, we leverage a center-of-mass (CoM) layer (Ma et al., 2020; Sofka et al., 2017) as the final layer, which computes the center-of-mass for each of the N activation maps. This specialized layer is (approximately) translationally-equivariant and enables precise localization. Since the CoM layer expects positive values at every grid location, we insert a ReLU activation before the CoM layer.

3.2. Training

Training BrainMorph involves optimizing the learnable parameters within the CNN f_w for pairwise registration. During training, we randomly sample pairs of moving and fixed images, and the general objective is:

$$\arg \max_{\mathbf{w}} \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}_m, \mathbf{x}_f)} \mathcal{L}_{sim}(\mathbf{x}_m \circ \mathcal{T}_{\theta^*}, \mathbf{x}_f) \quad (1)$$

where $\theta^* = \theta^*(f_w(\mathbf{x}_f), f_w(\mathbf{x}_m), \mathbf{w})$

where $\mathcal{L}_{sim}(\cdot, \cdot)$ measures image similarity between its two inputs. Weights \mathbf{w} for keypoints correspondences are found as

follows. First, we compute the energy (i.e. the aggregated sum) of each of the N activation maps for both the fixed and moving image. Then, we multiply the corresponding energies, and compute the softmax of the N energies to arrive at normalized weights (Moyer et al., 2021).

In this work, we choose transformations whose optimal parameters can be solved in a closed-form and differentiable manner so that f_w can be trained in an end-to-end fashion. Thus, the neural network is incentivized to detect N anatomically-consistent keypoints from a given image, such that a good registration can be achieved. Note that we do not rely on any ground truth keypoints as supervision.

The BrainMorph framework enables flexibility in training depending on the choice of the loss function and the transformation used. \mathcal{L}_{sim} can be any similarity function and can vary during training depending on the image pairs. In this work, we use MSE or Dice loss, depending on the current image pair. The closed-form optimal solution θ^* can depend on a hyperparameter λ , such as in TPS, which can be set to a constant or sampled from a distribution $\lambda \sim p(\lambda)$ during training. More details on the training details we used in this work are presented in Section 4.2. Once the model is trained, it can be used for both pairwise and groupwise registration during inference time, as described below.

3.3. Pairwise Registration

Pairwise follows straightforwardly from the training setup. Given a fixed image \mathbf{x}_f and moving image \mathbf{x}_m , BrainMorph performs pairwise registration as follows:

$$\mathbf{x}_r = \mathbf{x}_m \circ \mathcal{T}_{\theta^*} \text{ where } \theta^* = \theta^*(f_w(\mathbf{x}_f), f_w(\mathbf{x}_m)) \quad (2)$$

Note that at test time, we can use any transformation \mathcal{T}_θ (e.g, rigid, affine or TPS with any hyperparameter value), which would yield a different alignment based on the same keypoints.

3.4. Groupwise Registration

Groupwise registration methods try to mitigate uncertainties associated with any one image by simultaneously registering all images in a population. This incorporates all image information

in the registration process and eliminates bias towards a chosen reference frame.

We propose a novel algorithm for groupwise registration based on detected keypoints. In the groupwise setting, we have N subjects to align; thus we are solving for the optimal transformation as well as the optimal average space simultaneously. To achieve this with $\{\mathbf{P}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ keypoints, we optimize for the average space and the optimal transformations in an iterative, coordinate-ascent strategy by alternating the following two steps:

1. Given points \mathbf{P}_k at the current iteration k , compute the average keypoints $\bar{\mathbf{P}}_{k+1}$
2. Compute new points \mathbf{P}_{k+1} by registering all points \mathbf{P}_k to $\bar{\mathbf{P}}_{k+1}$

After K iterations, the algorithm converges to the average space $\bar{\mathbf{P}}_K$, and the final registration for the i 'th image is found by transforming the image according to the transformation that aligns points \mathbf{P}_0 to \mathbf{P}_K .

Note that this algorithm only relies on keypoints. Thus, it is computationally efficient since keypoints can be precomputed and done serially, whereas other works must fit all images in memory at once. In our experiments, we demonstrate the scalability of our approach by registering more than 100 volumes simultaneously.

4. Materials and Methods

4.1. Dataset

We train BrainMorph on a massive dataset of over 100,000 images from nearly 16,000 unique subjects. All datasets are gathered from publicly-available brain studies, datasets, and challenges. The full list of datasets is given in the Appendix. Our tool requires the following two pre-processing steps for all image inputs: resampling to 1mm isotropic and cropping/padding to 256x256x256. Min-max rescaling to [0, 1] is performed as the first layer in the network, and thus we do not consider it a pre-processing step.

Table 3: Summary of BrainMorph training.

<i>Image pair</i>	<i>Transform type</i>	<i>Loss</i>
Normal	TPS	Dice
Skullstripped, lesion	Affine	MSE
Skullstripped, longitudinal	Rigid	MSE

For purposes of training, we reorient all brains to MNI space² and perform skull-stripping with HD-BET (Isensee et al., 2019), a robust deep learning-based skull-stripping tool. For images without extreme lesions, we further generate segmentations with SynthSeg (Billot et al., 2020, 2023a), which produces parcellations of 33 brain regions. We do not perform segmentation on images with extreme lesions. See the Appendix for the full list of brain regions.

4.2. Training Details

We are interested in learning foundational keypoints for the end goal of general-purpose brain registration. Thus, the keypoints should be optimized such that they are robust to a variety of brain MRI modalities and transformation types (rigid, affine, and nonlinear). Note that, BrainMorph is amenable to a variety of training strategies (pairwise sampling, loss function, and transformation type). We would like the network to be able to handle uni-modal, multi-modal, and longitudinal image pairs, with transform types including rigid, affine, and TPS. To do so, we perform heterogeneous training with different tasks for a single foundation model, where the task is randomly sampled in each mini-batch.

During training, we use two loss types: Dice of segmentation labels and mean-squared-error (MSE) of pixel values. We use three transformation types: rigid, affine, and Thin-plate splines, or TPS (nonlinear). TPS has a hyperparameter λ which controls the degree of nonlinearity.

In general, we are constrained by the following rules.

1. To use MSE loss, we must sample skull-stripped same-modality pairs.

2. For Dice loss, we may sample pairs which have corresponding segmentations (this precludes brains with lesions, for which SynthSeg (Billot et al., 2020, 2023a) cannot reliably segment).
3. For longitudinal image pairs, we use rigid transformation to simulate realistic downstream usage.
4. For image pairs with lesions, we use a restrictive affine transformation, as TPS will not guarantee bijective correspondence between images.

Table 3 summarizes the training strategy used, which we choose according to the above constraints. At every training iteration, we sample uniformly across the three image pair types. Thus, the model is trained to optimize the registration performance across all three image tasks with equal weighting.

We experimented with $N = 128, 256,$ and 512 keypoints, and perform a thorough analysis of the relationship between number of keypoints and registration performance in Section 6.2.2. For TPS transformations, we sample λ during training from a log-uniform distribution $p(\lambda) = \text{LogUnif}(0, 10)$. In addition, during training, in each mini-batch, we compute TPS on 32 keypoints chosen uniformly at random (Donato and Belongie, 2002). This is because TPS has a high memory requirement due to computing pairwise distances between every keypoint and grid location. Note that at test-time, we compute TPS on the full set of keypoints, and compute pairwise distances in a chunk-wise, iterative fashion to bypass this memory requirement. When minimizing Dice loss, we sample 14 regions uniformly at random for computational purposes.

For all models, we used a batch size of 1 image pair and the Adam optimizer (Kingma and Ba, 2017) for training. We train for a total of 160K gradient steps. The following uniformly-sampled augmentations were applied to the moving image across all dimensions during training: rotations $[-180^\circ, +180^\circ]$, translations $[-30, 30]$ voxels, scaling factor $[0.8, 1.2]$, and shear $[-0.1, 0.1]$. All training and GPU testing was performed on a machine equipped with an AMD EPYC 7513 32-Core processor and an Nvidia A100 GPU. CPU testing was performed on a machine equipped with an Intel Xeon Gold 6330 CPU

²During training, we apply random affine transformations as an augmentation strategy.

Table 4: BrainMorph backbone variants.

	# parameters	# downsampling layers
BrainMorph-S	4M	4
BrainMorph-M	16M	5
BrainMorph-L	66M	6

@ 2.00GHz. All BrainMorph models are implemented in PyTorch.

4.3. Model Details

Our architecture backbone consists of a truncated UNet, which is identical to a standard UNet except all layers which operate at the original resolution (e.g. after the last upsampling layer) are removed (Ulyanov et al., 2016). All truncated UNets we use have two convolutional blocks at each resolution. Thus, the final center-of-mass layer extracts keypoints at half-resolution. This enables us to train deeper networks with a bottleneck operating on a very coarse grid, which we empirically find leads to better performance. In particular, we report results on three variants of the truncated UNet, which differ in the capacity as a function of the number of downsampling layers. We refer to them as BrainMorph-S, BrainMorph-M, and BrainMorph-L, and summarize them in Table 4. All references to BrainMorph are BrainMorph-L models, unless otherwise noted.

4.4. Self-supervised Pretraining

We employ the following self-supervised pre-training strategy to aid in keypoint detector initialization, essentially encouraging equivariance of the keypoint extractor with respect to affine image deformations. Note that past works have leveraged equivariant networks (Billot et al., 2023b); however, we find these networks unstable to train and lack the capacity to capture variability present in our large datasets. Using a single subject, we pick a random set of keypoints \mathbf{P}_0 by sampling uniformly over the image coordinate grid. During pre-training, we apply random affine transformations to the input image as well as \mathbf{P}_0 , and minimize the following keypoint loss:

$$\arg \min_w \sum_i \mathbb{E}_A \left\| A \mathbf{P}_0 - f_w(\mathbf{x}^{(i)} \circ A) \right\|_2^2. \quad (3)$$

Here, A is an affine transformation drawn from a uniform distribution over the parameter space.

We train for a total of 480K gradient steps. We use the same augmentation strategy as training, except that we linearly increase the degree of augmentation such that maximum augmentation is reached after 160K gradient steps. We use the same dataset for training and pretraining. Note that we assume that all the training data are in the same orientation and roughly in the center of the image in order for the sampled keypoints to apply well to all images in the dataset.

5. Experimental Setup

5.1. Evaluation Datasets

We use the following datasets for evaluation of all models. Note that these datasets are not included in training.

1. For healthy pairwise and cross-subject groupwise experiments, we evaluate on the IXI brain MRI dataset³. Each subject has T1, T2, and PD-weighted 3D MRI scans in spatial alignment, so we can use this dataset for both unimodal and multimodal registration experiments. We evaluate on 100 subjects.
2. For diseased subjects with lesions, we evaluate on the test split of the RSNA-ASNR-MICCAI BraTS dataset (to ensure no dataset contamination), which consists of adult brains with gliomas acquired with T1, T1gd, T2, and FLAIR sequences⁴. We also evaluate on a dataset of brains with multiple sclerosis (Muslim et al., 2022), which consists of 60 MS patients with T1, T2, and FLAIR sequences.
3. For longitudinal experiments, we evaluate on the OASIS2 dataset, which consists of longitudinal MRI brains in nondemented and demented older adults⁵. The number of timepoints per subject ranges between 2 and 10.

For all evaluation datasets, we perform resampling to 1mm isotropic and cropping/padding to 256^3 image size.

³<https://brain-development.org/ixi-dataset/>

⁴<https://www.rsna.org/rsnai/ai-image-challenge/brain-tumor-ai-challenge-2021>

⁵<https://www.oasis-brains.org/>




Fig. 3: Dice performance on pairwise registration. Higher is better. Unimodal/multimodal, skull-stripped/non-skull-stripped.




Fig. 4: HD performance on pairwise registration. Lower is better. Unimodal/multimodal, skull-stripped/non-skull-stripped.

5.2. Test-time Performance Evaluation

For pairwise experiments, we use each test subject as a moving volume x_m , paired with another random test subject treated as a fixed volume x_f . We simulate different degrees of misalignment by transforming x_m using rotation. Rotation is ap-

plied to all 3 axes at the specified degree. We use the predicted transformation to resample the moved segmentation labels on the fixed image grid. Unimodal/multimodal registration is an independent variable in our experiments. We experiment with rigid, affine, and nonlinear registration types for all models and




Fig. 5: Pairwise registration results for BrainMorph and selected baselines. In first row, a 90 degree rotation is applied. In second row, a 135 degree rotation is applied.




Fig. 6: Groupwise registration with group size of 4. For ITK-Elastix, B-spline registration is used. For BrainMorph, TPS with $\lambda = 0$ is used. The last column shows the average brain in the optimized template space.

baselines.

For longitudinal experiments, we perform groupwise registration on all available timepoints, and restrict to rigid transformations only. For cross-subject groupwise experiments, we sample different subject, same-modality images and experiment with varying group sizes in [4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128]. We restrict to nonlinear transformations only. Similar to pairwise experiments, we simulate different degrees of misalignment by transforming all images using rotation applied to all 3 axes at the specified degree.

5.3. Metrics

For all experiments, we quantify alignment quality and properties of the transformation using Dice overlap score and Hausdorff distance (HD).

5.4. Baselines

As the goal of this work is to develop a general-purpose tool for brain MRI registration, we wish to compare our proposed model against state-of-the-art and easily-accessible tools for this purpose. Our intended users are practitioners who desire




Fig. 7: Groupwise registration using BrainMorph and ITK-Elastix. For BrainMorph, the transformation used is TPS with $\lambda = 0$. For ITK-Elastix, the transformation is nonlinear b-spline. We observe significant improvement in groupwise registration capabilities of BrainMorph, at a time reduction of nearly 4 orders of magnitude.




Fig. 8: a) Registration performance on longitudinal registration. Rigid transformations for all models. b) Registration performance on subjects with lesions. Affine transformations for all models, except for SynthMorph which only supports dense.

a simple, easy-to-use tool that performs registration with minimal pre-processing or setup. Thus, we adhere to all instructions required by baselines (including intensity normalization, initial robust registration, etc.), and do not assume that data are pre-processed. Note that since skullstripping vs. non-skullstripping is an independent variable in our experiments, we do not perform any skullstripping as part of any baseline’s preprocessing requirements.

- **ITK-Elastix** is a widely-used software package which supports pairwise and groupwise registration (Konstantinos Ntatsis *et al.*, 2023). Rigid, affine, and bspline alignments are supported. For all registrations, we perform a multi-resolution pyramid strategy at 4 resolutions in order to improve the capture range and robustness of the registration. Note that amongst all baselines, ITK-Elastix is the only one to provide a groupwise registration method. The method uses a 4D (3D+time) free-form B-spline deforma-

tion model and a similarity metric that minimizes variance of intensities under the constraint that the average deformation over images is zero. This constraint defines a true mean frame of reference that lie in the center of the population without having to calculate it explicitly.⁶

- **Advanced Normalizing Tools (ANTs)** is a widely-used software package which is state-of-the-art for medical image registration (Avants *et al.*, 2009). We use the “Rigid” and “Affine” implementation for the rigid and affine model, respectively. The volumes are registered successively at three different resolutions: 0.25x, 0.5x and finally at full resolution. At 0.25x and 0.5x resolution, Gaussian smoothing with σ of two and one voxels is applied, respectively. For non-linear registration, we use

⁶<https://readthedocs.org/projects/simpleelastix/downloads/pdf/latest/>

“SynN”, which performs Symmetric Normalization (Avants et al., 2008a). Finally, we used mutual information as the similarity metric for all models, which is suitable for registering images with different contrasts.

- **SynthMorph** is a deep learning-based registration method which achieves agnosticism to modality/contrast by leveraging a generative strategy for synthesizing diverse images, thereby supporting multi-modal registration (Hoffmann et al., 2022). SynthMorph accepts as input the moving and fixed images and outputs a dense deformation field instead of global affine parameters, which is a common strategy in many well-performing registration models (Balakrishnan et al., 2019).

Note that an important pre-processing step required by SynthMorph is an affine-registration step to a pre-defined reference space (Reuter et al., 2010; Fischl, 2012). Thus, this limits the flexibility of SynthMorph in the sense that all registrations are performed in this reference space. In contrast, BrainMorph enables the user to define any arbitrary reference space via the fixed image. In addition, this requirement increases pre-processing time. In our experiments, we first affine register every image using ANTs (see above). SynthMorph models are implemented in Keras/Tensorflow.

6. Results

6.1. Main Results

6.1.1. Pairwise Registration

We analyze the performance of baselines and our proposed BrainMorph under conditions of large initial misalignments in terms of rotation. Figs. 3 and 4 plot overall Dice and HD across rotation angle of the moving image for baselines and BrainMorph. Each panel depicts rigid, affine, and nonlinear registrations, respectively. Each separate figure varies different combinations of unimodal vs. multimodal, skull-stripped and non-skull-stripped.

We find that all baseline models suffer substantially as the rotation angle increases, across all transformation types. Brain-

Morph performs well across all rotation angles, and is particularly strong for rigid and affine transformations. ANTs and SynthMorph yield excellent results when the initial misalignment is small (e.g. near 0 degrees of rotation) and when data is skull-stripped, particularly for nonlinear transformations. However, the accuracy drops substantially when the misalignment is not minimal.

We compare the computational time across different models in Table 2. Some representative examples for all models is provided in Fig. 5 for qualitative evaluation. Overall, BrainMorph outperforms other baselines at high degrees of initial misalignment, and furthermore performs comparably or often better (at large misalignments) than the state-of-the-art ANTs registration, while requiring substantially less runtime.

6.1.2. Groupwise Registration

Fig. 7 depicts groupwise performance and timings for BrainMorph vs. ITK-Elastix. We use B-spline for ITK-Elastix and TPS with $\lambda = 0$ for BrainMorph. We find that BrainMorph has much better and more stable performance across all group sizes we tested. Note that on our CPU, ITK-Elastix failed on 128 subjects. BrainMorph has an advantage in that keypoints can be precomputed in a serial fashion on a GPU, thus enabling much better scaling to large group sizes.

Fig. 6 depicts a representative example of groupwise registration with 4 subjects. The first row depicts the initial unaligned images, and the second and third row show the results of ITK-Elastix and BrainMorph, respectively. The last column depicts the average template brain for all 4 subjects. We find that BrainMorph groupwise registration to be substantially better, as evidenced by the sharp lines in the template brain. On a GPU, BrainMorph is also faster than ITK-Elastix by nearly 4 orders of magnitude.

6.1.3. Longitudinal Registration

Fig 8a shows boxplots for longitudinal registration performance across rotation angles for skull-stripped and non-skull-stripped, respectively. We find that across all rotation angles and with and without skullstripping, BrainMorph outperforms ITK-Elastix.

6.1.4. Registration with Lesions

Fig 8b shows a boxplot of performance of all models on lesion data. We observe that the weighted variant of BrainMorph outperforms all baselines across most rotation angles and is generally has more stable performance. In particular, weighted BrainMorph tends to outperform the unweighted variant of BrainMorph at 45 degrees of rotation and above.

Note that we use Dice performance as a proxy for registration quality, even though the SynthSeg-generated segmentations are not guaranteed to be robust to diseased patients.

6.2. Keypoint Analysis

6.2.1. Visualizing keypoints

In contrast to existing models that compute the transformation parameters using a “black-box” neural network, one can investigate the keypoints that BrainMorph learns to drive the alignment. Fig. 2 shows the keypoints for a moving and fixed subject pair via mid-slices for sagittal, axial, and coronal views. The first three columns depict keypoints extracted from skull-stripped images, and the last three columns depict keypoints extracted from non-skull-stripped images. The color of the keypoints represents depth with respect to the mid-slice. The “Aligned” slices show both warped (dots) and fixed (crosses) points.

Note that keypoint locations are trained end-to-end without explicit annotations. We observe that keypoint locations are generally in sub-cortical regions, where anatomical variability is relatively low across subjects as compared to cortical regions.

6.2.2. Number of Keypoints

As an ablation, we examine the effect of the number of keypoints used for alignment across different transformations. We trained BrainMorph model variants with 128, 256, and 512 keypoints. Fig. 9 illustrates that performance is not discernably correlated to increasing the number of keypoints. We hypothesize that as keypoints are generally in subcortical regions which are anatomically stable, increasing the number of correspondences does not provide further advantage beyond a certain point.




Fig. 9: Registration performance of variants of BrainMorph and varying the number of keypoints.

7. Discussion

The results demonstrate that BrainMorph is a robust and flexible tool for brain MRI registration. On pairwise registration, BrainMorph is generally superior to baselines across all degrees of initial misalignment, and is state-of-the-art for affine and rigid transformations. These results hold consistently for for unimodal and multimodal registration, as well as skull-stripped and non-skull-stripped data. In addition, BrainMorph does not require extensive pre-processing like skullstripping and pre-affine registration. On longitudinal and groupwise registration, BrainMorph is superior to baseline registration algorithms, while being much more memory efficient and nearly 4 orders of magnitude faster.

The main limitation of BrainMorph is nonlinear performance at low initial misalignment and skull-stripped data, for which ANTs and SynthMorph perform excellently. For this reason, users who require good nonlinear registrations may consider using BrainMorph as a robust initial alignment tool, and further performing nonlinear registration using a tool like ANTs.

8. Conclusion

We presented a robust and flexible registration tool based on the KeyMorph framework, called BrainMorph, which is a deep learning-based image registration method that uses corresponding keypoints to derive the optimal transformation that align the images. This formulation enables interpretability, robustness to large initial misalignments, and flexibility/controllability of

registrations at test-time. Training on a massive dataset of over 100,000 unique images from nearly 16,000 subjects enables our tool to work on raw data with minimal pre-processing. Empirically, we demonstrate fast, state-of-the-art performance across rigid, affine, nonlinear, and groupwise registration, particularly at large degrees of initial misalignment.

9. Acknowledgments

We thank Benjamin Billot and Juan Eugenio Iglesias for helpful discussions. Funding for this project was in part provided by the NIH grants R01AG053949, R01AG064027 and R01AG070988, and the NSF CAREER 1748377 grant.

Appendix A. Differentiable, Closed-Form Coordinate Transformations

Notation: In the following sections, column vectors are lower-case bolded and matrices are upper-case bolded. D -dimensional coordinates are represented as column vectors, i.e. $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^D$. D is typically 2 or 3. $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ denotes \mathbf{p} in homogeneous coordinates, i.e. $\tilde{\mathbf{p}} = [\mathbf{p}, 1]^T$. Superscripts in parentheses $\mathbf{p}^{(i)}$ index over separate instances of \mathbf{p} (e.g. in a dataset), whereas subscripts \mathbf{p}_i denotes the i 'th element of \mathbf{p} .

We summarize three parametric transformation families that can be derived in closed-form, from corresponding keypoint pairs. Suppose we have a set of N corresponding keypoint pairs $\{(\mathbf{p}^{(i)}, \mathbf{q}^{(i)})\}_{i=1}^N$, where $\mathbf{p}^{(i)}, \mathbf{q}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^D$ and $N > D$. For convenience, let $\mathbf{P} := [\mathbf{p}^{(1)} \ \dots \ \mathbf{p}^{(N)}] \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times N}$, and similarly for $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}$ and \mathbf{Q} . Define $\mathcal{T}_\theta : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^D$ as a family of coordinate transformations, where $\theta \in \Theta$ are parameters of the transformation. For all transformation families, we also consider weighted versions, where we have weights for each correspondence $\{w_i\}_{i=1}^N$. For convenience, let $\mathbf{W} = \text{diag}(w_1, \dots, w_N)$.

Appendix A.1. Rigid

Rigid transformations apply a rotation $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times D}$ and a translation $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times 1}$ to a coordinate:

$$\mathcal{T}_\theta(\mathbf{p}) = \mathbf{R}\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{t}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where the parameter set is the elements of the matrix and vector, $\theta = \{\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{t}\}$.

The optimal translation is estimated by subtracting the weighted centroids of the moving and fixed point clouds:

$$\mathbf{t}^* = \bar{\mathbf{p}} - \bar{\mathbf{q}}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{p}} = \sum_i \mathbf{p}^{(i)}$ for non-weighted and $\bar{\mathbf{p}} = \sum_i w_i \mathbf{p}^{(i)}$ for weighted, and similarly for $\bar{\mathbf{q}}$.

The optimal rotation is well-studied and is known as the orthogonal Procrustes problem (Viklands, 2006). First, denote by $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}$ the centered version of \mathbf{P} where each column is subtracted by the centroid $\bar{\mathbf{p}}$, and similarly for $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$. Next, compute the SVD of the weighted cross-correlation matrix $\text{SVD}(\Sigma) = \text{SVD}(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}) = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}^T$. For weighted, $\Sigma = \tilde{\mathbf{P}}^T \mathbf{W} \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$. Then, $\mathbf{R}^* = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{U}^T$.

Appendix A.2. Affine

Affine transformations are represented as a matrix multiplication of $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times (D+1)}$ with a coordinate in homogeneous form:

$$\mathcal{T}_\theta(\mathbf{p}) = \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{p}}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where the parameter set is the elements of the matrix, $\theta = \{\mathbf{A}\}$.

Given N corresponding keypoint pairs, there exists a differentiable, closed-form expression for an affine transformation that aligns the keypoints:

$$\theta^*(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}) := \arg \min_{\theta} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{p}}^{(i)} - \mathbf{q}^{(i)})^2 \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$= \mathbf{Q}\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^T (\tilde{\mathbf{P}}\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^T)^{-1}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

To derive this solution, rewrite the objective in matrix form:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &= \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{p}}^{(i)} - \mathbf{q}^{(i)})^2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{P}} - \mathbf{Q}\|_F, \end{aligned}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_F$ denotes the Frobenius norm. Taking the derivative with respect to \mathbf{A} and setting the result to zero, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \mathbf{A}} &= (\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{P}} - \mathbf{Q})\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^T = \mathbf{0} \\ &\implies \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{P}}\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^T = \mathbf{Q}\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^T \\ &\implies \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^T (\tilde{\mathbf{P}}\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^T)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

The extension to incorporate weightings for the correspondences is straightforward:

$$\theta^*(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{W}) := \arg \min_{\theta} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i (\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{p}}^{(i)} - \mathbf{q}^{(i)})^2 \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$= \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{W}\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^T (\tilde{\mathbf{P}}\mathbf{W}\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^T)^{-1}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Note that solving for the affine transformation is the least-squares solution to an overdetermined system, and thus in practice the points will not be exactly matched due to the restrictive nature of the affine transformation. This restrictiveness may be alleviated or removed by choosing a transformation family with additional degrees of freedom, as we detail next.

Appendix A.3. Thin-Plate Spline

The application of the thin-plate spline (TPS) interpolant to modeling coordinate transformations yields a parametric, non-rigid deformation model which admits a closed-form expression for the solution that interpolates a set of corresponding

keypoints (Bookstein, 1989; Donato and Belongie, 2002; Rohr et al., 2001). This provides additional degrees of freedom over the affine family of transformations, while also subsuming it as a special case.

For the d 'th dimension, the TPS interpolant $\mathcal{T}_{\theta_d} : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ takes the following form:

$$\mathcal{T}_{\theta_d}(\mathbf{p}) = (\mathbf{a}_d)^T \tilde{\mathbf{p}} + \sum_{i=1}^N v_{i,d} U(\|\mathbf{p}^{(i)} - \mathbf{p}\|_2), \quad (\text{A.8})$$

where $\mathbf{a}_d \in \mathbb{R}^{D+1}$ and $\{v_{i,d}\}$ constitute the transformation parameters θ_d and $U(r) = r^2 \ln(r)$. We define $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{(D+1) \times D}$ and $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times D}$ as the collection of all the parameters for $d = 1, \dots, D$. Then, the parameter set is $\theta = \{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{V}\}$.

This form of \mathcal{T} minimizes the *bending energy*:

$$I_{\mathcal{T}} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^D} \|\nabla^2 \mathcal{T}\|_F^2 d\mathbf{p}_1 \dots d\mathbf{p}_D, \quad (\text{A.9})$$

where $\|\cdot\|_F$ is the Frobenius norm and $\nabla^2 \mathcal{T}$ is the matrix of second-order partial derivatives of \mathcal{T} . For each θ_d , we impose interpolation conditions $\mathcal{T}_{\theta_d}(\mathbf{p}^{(i)}) = \mathbf{q}_d^{(i)}$ and enforce \mathcal{T} to have square-integrable second derivatives:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N v_{i,d} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^N v_{i,d} \mathbf{p}_d = 0 \quad \forall d \in \{1, \dots, D\}. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Given these conditions, the following system of linear equations solves for θ :

$$\Psi \theta := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{K} & \mathbf{L} \\ \mathbf{L}^T & \mathbf{O} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{A} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{Q}^T \\ \mathbf{O} \end{bmatrix} := \mathbf{Z}. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Here, $\mathbf{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ where $\mathbf{K}_{ij} = U(\|\mathbf{p}^{(i)} - \mathbf{p}^{(j)}\|_2)$, $\mathbf{L} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times (D+1)}$ where the i 'th row is $(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}^{(i)})^T$, and \mathbf{O} is a matrix of zeros with appropriate dimensions. Thus,

$$\theta^*(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}) := \Psi^{-1} \mathbf{Z}. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Solving for θ^* is a differentiable operation.

The interpolation conditions can be relaxed (e.g. under the presence of noise) by introducing a regularization term:

$$\arg \min_{\theta_d} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathcal{T}_{\theta_d}(\mathbf{p}^{(i)}) - \mathbf{q}_d^{(i)})^2 + \lambda I_{\mathcal{T}} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is a hyperparameter that controls the strength of regularization. As λ approaches ∞ , the optimal \mathcal{T} approaches

the affine case (i.e. zero bending energy). This formulation can be solved exactly by replacing \mathbf{K} with $\mathbf{K} + \lambda \mathbf{I}$ in Eq. (A.11). Importantly, θ and the optimal $\theta^*(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q})$ exhibits a dependence on λ . Finally, weights can be incorporated by replacing \mathbf{K} with $\mathbf{K} + \lambda \mathbf{W}^{-1}$ (Rohr et al., 2001).

Appendix B. List of Datasets

A full list of datasets used for training and evaluation is shown in Table B.5.

Dataset	Description	Train/Eval	No. Subjects	No. Modalities	Modalities Info	No. Images	Longitudinal?	Lesion?
BraTS-SSA-2023	African Glioms	Train	60	4	T1 T1gd T2 FLAIR	240	X	✓
BraTS-MEN-2023	Meningiomas	Train	1000	4	T1 T1gd T2 FLAIR	4000	X	✓
BraTS-MET-2023	Metastases	Train	165	4	T1 T1gd T2 FLAIR	660	X	✓
BraTS-MET-NYU-2023	Metastases	Train	164	4	T1 T1gd T2 FLAIR	656	X	✓
BraTS-PED-2023	Pediatric Glioblastomas	Train	99	4	T1 T1gd T2 FLAIR	396	X	✓
BraTS-MET-UCSF-2023	Metastases	Train	324	4	T1 T1gd T2 FLAIR	1296	X	✓
BraTS-2016	Tumor	Train	1104	1	T1	1104	X	✓
UCSF-BMSR	Metastases	Train	459	4	FLAIR T1post T1pre subtraction	1836	X	✓
MSSEG2	Multiple Sclerosis	Train	40	1	FLAIR	80	✓	✓
Shifts-challenge-part1MSSEG	Multiple Sclerosis	Train	15	5	FLAIR T1 T2 GADO DP	75	X	✓
Shifts-challenge-part2Ljubljana	Multiple Sclerosis	Train	25	4	FLAIR T1 T2 T1ce	100	X	✓
Shifts-challenge-part2Best	Multiple Sclerosis	Train	21	4	FLAIR T1 T2 PD	84	X	✓
Brain Development	Adult and Neonatal Brain Atlases	Train	33	1	T1	33	X	X
EPISURG	Epileptic	Train	133	1	T1	133	X	X
WMH	White Matter Hyperintensity	Train	120	1	T1	120	X	X
ISLES-2022	Ischemic Stroke Lesion	Train	250	2	DWI ADC	500	X	✓
MedicalDecathlon-BrainTumour	Tumor	Train	484	4	FLAIR T1 T1gd T2	1936	X	✓
UCSF-ALPTDG	Post Treatment Gliomas	Train	298	5	FLAIR T1 T1ce T2 T1sub	1490	✓	✓
StanfordMETShare	Metastases	Train	105	4	T1 FLAIR T1gd T1pre	420	X	✓
PPMI	Parkinson's Disease	Train	1382	1	T1	1382	✓	✓
ADNI	Alzheimer's Disease	Train	2027	3	T1 T2 FLAIR	18645	✓	X
PAC 2019	Normal Aging	Train	2640	1	T1	2640	X	X
AIBL	Alzheimer's Disease	Train	708	1	T1	708	X	X
OASIS1	Normal Aging and Dementia	Train	348	1	T1	1350	✓	X
OASIS3	Normal Aging and Alzheimer's Disease	Train	2270	6	T1 T2 T2star FLASH FLAIR angio	10299	✓	X
IXI	Normal	Eval	151	3	T1 T2 PD	453	X	X
OASIS2	Dementia	Eval	298	1	T1	1095	✓	X
BraTS-GLI-2023 (test)	Glioblastomas	Eval	876	4	T1 T1gd T2 FLAIR	3504	X	✓
MS-60	Multiple sclerosis	Eval	60	3	T1 T2 FLAIR	180	X	✓
Total			15659	13 (unique)		55415 ($\times 2$)		

Table B.5: Dataset details. Total images is 55415 (possibly non-unique due to overlap). $\times 2 = 110836$ to include with and without skullstripping. All citations in top-bottom row order: (Kazerooni et al., 2024), (Kazerooni et al., 2024), (Kazerooni et al., 2024), (Kazerooni et al., 2024), (Kazerooni et al., 2024), (Rudie et al., 2024), (Menze et al., 2015), (Menze et al., 2024), (Commowick et al., 2018), (Malinin et al., 2022), (Rudie et al., 2024), (Rudie et al., 2024), (Gousias et al., 2012), (Pérez-García et al., 2020), (Kuijff et al., 2019), (Hernandez Petzsche et al., 2022), (Antonelli et al., 2022), (Rudie et al., 2022), (Grøvik et al., 2020), (Marek et al., 2011), (Peterson et al., 2010), (Fowler et al., 2021), (Fisch et al., 2021), (Marcus et al., 2007), (LaMontagne et al., 2019), <https://brain-development.org/ixi-dataset/>, (Marcus et al., 2010), (Kazerooni et al., 2024), (Muslim et al., 2022).

References

- Antonelli, M., Reinke, A., Bakas, S., Farahani, K., Kopp-Schneider, A., Landman, B.A., Litjens, G., Menze, B., Ronneberger, O., Summers, R.M., van Ginneken, B., Bilello, M., Bilic, P., Christ, P.F., Do, R.K.G., Gollub, M.J., Heckers, S.H., Huisman, H., Jarnagin, W.R., McHugo, M.K., Napel, S., Pernicka, J.S.G., Rhode, K., Tobon-Gomez, C., Vorontsov, E., Meakin, J.A., Ourselin, S., Wiesenfarth, M., Arbeláez, P., Bae, B., Chen, S., Daza, L., Feng, J., He, B., Isensee, F., Ji, Y., Jia, F., Kim, I., Maier-Hein, K., Merhof, D., Pai, A., Park, B., Perslev, M., Rezaifar, R., Rippel, O., Sarasua, I., Shen, W., Son, J., Wachinger, C., Wang, L., Wang, Y., Xia, Y., Xu, D., Xu, Z., Zheng, Y., Simpson, A.L., Maier-Hein, L., Cardoso, M.J., 2022. The medical segmentation decathlon. *Nature Communications* 13, 4128.
- Avants, B.B., Epstein, C.L., Grossman, M., Gee, J.C., 2008a. Symmetric diffeomorphic image registration with cross-correlation: evaluating automated labeling of elderly and neurodegenerative brain. *Medical image analysis* 12, 26–41.
- Avants, B.B., Epstein, C.L., Grossman, M., Gee, J.C., 2008b. Symmetric diffeomorphic image registration with cross-correlation: evaluating automated labeling of elderly and neurodegenerative brain. *Medical image analysis* 12, 26–41.
- Avants, B.B., Tustison, N., Song, G., 2009. Advanced normalization tools (ants). *Insight j* 2, 1–35.
- Balakrishnan, G., Zhao, A., Sabuncu, M.R., Guttag, J., Dalca, A.V., 2019. Voxelmorph: A learning framework for deformable medical image registration. *IEEE TMI* 38, 1788–1800.
- Barroso-Laguna, A., Riba, E., Ponsa, D., Mikolajczyk, K., 2019. Key. net: Keypoint detection by handcrafted and learned cnn filters, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 5836–5844.
- Bay, H., Tuytelaars, T., Van Gool, L., 2006. Surf: Speeded up robust features, in: *European conference on computer vision*, Springer, pp. 404–417.
- Billot, B., Greve, D., Van Leemput, K., Fischl, B., Iglesias, J.E., Dalca, A.V., 2020. A learning strategy for contrast-agnostic mri segmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.01995*.
- Billot, B., Greve, D.N., Puonti, O., Thielscher, A., Van Leemput, K., Fischl, B., Dalca, A.V., Iglesias, J.E., 2023a. Synthseg: Segmentation of brain MRI scans of any contrast and resolution without retraining. *Medical Image Analysis* 86, 102789.
- Billot, B., Moyer, D., Dey, N., Hoffmann, M., Turk, E.A., Gagoski, B., Grant, E., Golland, P., 2023b. Se(3)-equivariant and noise-invariant 3d motion tracking in medical images. *arXiv:2312.13534*.
- Bookstein, F., 1989. Principal warps: thin-plate splines and the decomposition of deformations. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 11, 567–585.
- Brown, M., Szeliski, R., Winder, S., 2005. Multi-image matching using multi-scale oriented patches, in: *2005 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR'05)*, IEEE, pp. 510–517.
- Cao, X., Yang, J., Zhang, J., Wang, Q., Yap, P.T., Shen, D., 2018. Deformable image registration using a cue-aware deep regression network. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering* 65, 1900–1911.
- Chen, J., He, Y., Frey, E., Li, Y., Du, Y., 2021. Vit-v-net: Vision transformer for unsupervised volumetric medical image registration. *ArXiv abs/2104.06468*.
- Chui, H., Rangarajan, A., 2003. A new point matching algorithm for non-rigid registration. *Computer Vision and Image Understanding* 89, 114–141.
- Commowick, O., Istace, A., Kain, M., et al., 2018. Objective evaluation of multiple sclerosis lesion segmentation using a data management and processing infrastructure. *Scientific Reports* 8, 13650.
- Dalca, A.V., Balakrishnan, G., Guttag, J., Sabuncu, M.R., 2019. Unsupervised learning of probabilistic diffeomorphic registration for images and surfaces. *Medical image analysis* 57, 226–236.
- DeTone, D., Malisiewicz, T., Rabinovich, A., 2018. Superpoint: Self-supervised interest point detection and description, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*, pp. 224–236.
- Donato, G., Belongie, S., 2002. Approximate thin plate spline mappings, in: Heyden, A., Sparr, G., Nielsen, M., Johansen, P. (Eds.), *Computer Vision — ECCV 2002*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp. 21–31.
- Dosovitskiy, A., Fischer, P., Ilg, E., Hausser, P., Hazirbas, C., Golkov, V., Van Der Smagt, P., Cremers, D., Brox, T., 2015. FlowNet: Learning optical flow with convolutional networks, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pp. 2758–2766.
- Eppenhof, K.A., Pluim, J.P., 2018. Pulmonary ct registration through supervised learning with convolutional neural networks. *IEEE transactions on medical imaging* 38, 1097–1105.
- Fan, J., Cao, X., Xue, Z., Yap, P.T., Shen, D., 2018. Adversarial similarity network for evaluating image alignment in deep learning based registration, in: *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*, Springer, pp. 739–746.
- Fan, J., Cao, X., Yap, P.T., Shen, D., 2019. Birnet: Brain image registration using dual-supervised fully convolutional networks. *Medical image analysis* 54, 193–206.
- Fisch, L., Leenings, R., Winter, N.R., Dannlowski, U., Gaser, C., Cole, J.H., Hahn, T., 2021. Editorial: Predicting chronological age from structural neuroimaging: The predictive analytics competition 2019. *Frontiers in Psychiatry* 12.
- Fischl, B., 2012. Freesurfer. *NeuroImage* 62, 774–781.
- Förstner, W., Gülch, E., 1987. A fast operator for detection and precise location of distinct points, corners and centres of circular features, in: *Proc. ISPRS intercommission conference on fast processing of photogrammetric data*, Interlaken, pp. 281–305.
- Fowler, C., Rainey-Smith, S.R., Bird, S., Bomke, J., Bourgeat, P., Brown, B.M., Burnham, S.C., Bush, A.I., Chadunow, C., Collins, S., et al., 2021. Fifteen years of the australian imaging, biomarkers and lifestyle (aibl) study: Progress and observations from 2,359 older adults spanning the spectrum from cognitive normality to alzheimer’s disease. *Journal of Alzheimer’s Disease Reports* 5, 443–468. PMID: 34368630; PMCID: PMC8293663.
- Gousias, I.S., Edwards, A.D., Rutherford, M.A., Counsell, S.J., Hajnal, J.V., Rueckert, D., Hammers, A., 2012. Magnetic resonance imaging of the newborn brain: manual segmentation of labelled atlases in term-born and preterm infants. *Neuroimage* 62, 1499–1509. Epub 2012 Jun 17. PMID: 22713673.
- Grøvik, E., Yi, D., Iv, M., Tong, E., Rubin, D., Zaharchuk, G., 2020. Deep learning enables automatic detection and segmentation of brain metastases on multisequence mri. *Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging* 51, 175–182. Epub 2019 May 2. PMID: 31050074; PMCID: PMC7199496.
- Guyader, J., Huizinga, W., Poot, D., van Kranenburg, M., Uitterdijk, A., Niessen, W., Klein, S., 2018. Groupwise image registration based on a total correlation dissimilarity measure for quantitative mri and dynamic imaging data. *Scientific Reports* 8.
- Harris, C.G., Stephens, M., et al., 1988. A combined corner and edge detector., in: *Alvey vision conference*, Citeseer, pp. 10–5244.
- Heinrich, M.P., Jenkinson, M., Bhushan, M., Matin, T., Gleeson, F.V., Brady, M., Schnabel, J.A., 2012. Mind: Modality independent neighbourhood descriptor for multi-modal deformable registration. *Medical image analysis* 16, 1423–1435.
- Hermosillo, G., Chedf’Hotel, C., Faugeras, O., 2002. Variational methods for multimodal image matching. *International Journal of Computer Vision* 50, 329–343.
- Hernandez Petzsche, M.R., de la Rosa, E., Hanning, U., et al., 2022. Isles 2022: A multi-center magnetic resonance imaging stroke lesion segmentation dataset. *Scientific Data* 9, 762.
- Hill, D.L., Batchelor, P.G., Holden, M., Hawkes, D.J., 2001. Medical image registration. *Physics in medicine & biology* 46, R1.
- Hoffmann, M., Billot, B., Greve, D.N., Iglesias, J.E., Fischl, B., Dalca, A.V., 2021. Synthmorph: learning contrast-invariant registration without acquired images. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging* 41, 543–558.
- Hoffmann, M., Billot, B., Greve, D.N., Iglesias, J.E., Fischl, B., Dalca, A.V., 2022. SynthMorph: Learning contrast-invariant registration without acquired images. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging* 41, 543–558.
- Hoopes, A., Hoffmann, M., Fischl, B., Guttag, J., Dalca, A.V., 2021. Hypermorph: Amortized hyperparameter learning for image registration. *IPMI*.
- Hu, Y., Modat, M., Gibson, E., Ghavami, N., Bonmati, E., Moore, C.M., Emberton, M., Noble, J.A., Barratt, D.C., Vercauteren, T., 2018a. Label-driven weakly-supervised learning for multimodal deformable image registration, in: *2018 IEEE 15th International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging (ISBI 2018)*, IEEE, pp. 1070–1074.
- Hu, Y., Modat, M., Gibson, E., Li, W., Ghavami, N., Bonmati, E., Wang, G., Bandula, S., Moore, C.M., Emberton, M., et al., 2018b. Weakly-supervised convolutional neural networks for multimodal image registration. *Medical image analysis* 49, 1–13.
- Isensee, F., Schell, M., Pfleger, I., Brugnara, G., Bonekamp, D., Neuberger, U., Wick, A., Schlemmer, H.P., Heiland, S., Wick, W., Bendszus, M., Maier-

- Hein, K.H., Kickingereder, P., 2019. Automated brain extraction of multi-sequence mri using artificial neural networks. *Human Brain Mapping* 40, 4952–4964.
- Kazerouni, A.F., Khalili, N., Liu, X., Haldar, D., Jiang, Z., Anwar, S.M., Albrecht, J., Adewole, M., Anazodo, U., Anderson, H., Bagheri, S., Baid, U., Bergquist, T., Borja, A.J., Calabrese, E., Chung, V., Conte, G.M., Dako, F., Eddy, J., Ezhov, I., Familiar, A., Farahani, K., Haldar, S., Iglesias, J.E., Janas, A., Johansen, E., Jones, B.V., Kofler, F., LaBella, D., Lai, H.A., Leemput, K.V., Li, H.B., Maleki, N., McAllister, A.S., Meier, Z., Menze, B., Moawad, A.W., Nandolia, K.K., Pavaine, J., Piraud, M., Poussaint, T., Prabhu, S.P., Reitman, Z., Rodriguez, A., Ruddy, J.D., Sanchez-Montano, M., Shaikh, I.S., Shah, L.M., Sheth, N., Shinohara, R.T., Tu, W., Viswanathan, K., Wang, C., Ware, J.B., Wiestler, B., Wiggins, W., Zapaishchykova, A., Aboian, M., Bornhorst, M., de Blank, P., Deutsch, M., Fouladi, M., Hoffman, L., Kann, B., Lazow, M., Mikael, L., Nabavizadeh, A., Packer, R., Resnick, A., Rood, B., Vossough, A., Bakas, S., Linguraru, M.G., 2024. The brain tumor segmentation (brats) challenge 2023: Focus on pediatrics (cbtnc-connect-dipgr-asnr-miccai brats-peds). *arXiv:2305.17033*.
- Khan, S.H., Naseer, M., Hayat, M., Zamir, S.W., Khan, F., Shah, M., 2021. Transformers in vision: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 54, 1–41.
- Kingma, D.P., Ba, J., 2017. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980 arXiv:1412.6980*.
- Krebs, J., Delingette, H., Mailhé, B., Ayache, N., Mansi, T., 2019. Learning a probabilistic model for diffeomorphic registration. *IEEE transactions on medical imaging* 38, 2165–2176.
- Kuijff, H.J., Biesbroek, J.M., De Bresser, J., Heinen, R., Andermatt, S., Bento, M., Berseth, M., Belyaev, M., Cardoso, M.J., Casamitjana, A., et al., 2019. Standardized assessment of automatic segmentation of white matter hyperintensities and results of the wmh segmentation challenge. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging* 38, 2556–2568. Epub 2019 Mar 19. PMID: 30908194; PMCID: PMC7590957.
- LaMontagne, P.J., Benzinger, T.L., Morris, J.C., Keefe, S., Hornbeck, R., Xiong, C., Grant, E., Hassenstab, J., Moulder, K., Vlassenko, A.G., Raichle, M.E., Cruchaga, C., Marcus, D., 2019. Oasis-3: Longitudinal neuroimaging, clinical, and cognitive dataset for normal aging and alzheimer disease. *medRxiv*.
- Lee, M.C., Oktay, O., Schuh, A., Schaap, M., Glocker, B., 2019a. Image-and-spatial transformer networks for structure-guided image registration, in: *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*, Springer. pp. 337–345.
- Lee, M.C.H., Oktay, O., Schuh, A., Schaap, M., Glocker, B., 2019b. Image-and-spatial transformer networks for structure-guided image registration. *arXiv:1907.09200*.
- Lenc, K., Vedaldi, A., 2016. Learning covariant feature detectors, in: *European conference on computer vision*, Springer. pp. 100–117.
- Liu, F., Yan, K., Harrison, A., Guo, D., Lu, L., Yuille, A., Huang, L., Xie, G., Xiao, J., Ye, X., Jin, D., 2021. Same: Deformable image registration based on self-supervised anatomical embeddings. *arXiv:2109.11572*.
- Lowe, D.G., 2004. Distinctive image features from scale-invariant keypoints. *International journal of computer vision* 60, 91–110.
- Ma, J., Jiang, X., Fan, A., Jiang, J., Yan, J., 2021. Image matching from hand-crafted to deep features: A survey. *International Journal of Computer Vision* 129, 23–79.
- Ma, M., Song, L., Xu, Y., Liu, G.X., 2022. Symmetric transformer-based network for unsupervised image registration. *Knowl. Based Syst.* 257, 109959.
- Ma, T., Gupta, A., Sabuncu, M.R., 2020. Volumetric landmark detection with a multi-scale shift equivariant neural network. *International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging (ISBI)*, 981–985.
- Malinin, A., Athanasopoulos, A., Barakovic, M., Cuadra, M.B., Gales, M.J.F., Granziera, C., Graziani, M., Kartashev, N., Kyriakopoulos, K., Lu, P.J., Molchanova, N., Nikitakis, A., Raina, V., Rosa, F.L., Sivena, E., Tsarsitalidis, V., Tsompopoulou, E., Volf, E., 2022. Shifts 2.0: Extending the dataset of real distributional shifts. *arXiv:2206.15407*.
- Marcus, D.S., Fotenos, A.F., Csernansky, J.G., Morris, J.C., Buckner, R.L., 2010. Open Access Series of Imaging Studies: Longitudinal MRI Data in Nondemented and Demented Older Adults. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* 22, 2677–2684.
- Marcus, D.S., Wang, T.H., Parker, J., Csernansky, J.G., Morris, J.C., Buckner, R.L., 2007. Open Access Series of Imaging Studies (OASIS): Cross-sectional MRI Data in Young, Middle Aged, Nondemented, and Demented Older Adults. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* 19, 1498–1507.
- Marek, K., Jennings, D., Lasch, S., Siderowf, A., Tanner, C., Simuni, T., Coffey, C., Kiebertz, K., Flagg, E., Chowdhury, S., Poewe, W., Mollenhauer, B., Klinik, P.E., Sherer, T., Frasier, M., Meunier, C., Rudolph, A., Casaceli, C., Seibyl, J., Mendick, S., Schuff, N., Zhang, Y., Toga, A., Crawford, K., Ansbach, A., De Blasio, P., Piovella, M., Trojanowski, J., Shaw, L., Singleton, A., Hawkins, K., Eberling, J., Brooks, D., Russell, D., Leary, L., Factor, S., Sommerfeld, B., Hogarth, P., Pighetti, E., Williams, K., Standaert, D., Guthrie, S., Hauser, R., Delgado, H., Jankovic, J., Hunter, C., Stern, M., Tran, B., Leverenz, J., Baca, M., Frank, S., Thomas, C.A., Richard, I., DeDey, C., Rees, L., Sprenger, F., Lang, E., Shill, H., Obradov, S., Fernandez, H., Winters, A., Berg, D., Gauss, K., Galasko, D., Fontaine, D., Mari, Z., Gerstenhaber, M., Brooks, D., Malloy, S., Barone, P., Longo, K., Comery, T., Ravina, B., Grachev, I., Gallagher, K., Collins, M., Widnell, K.L., Ostrowizki, S., Fontoura, P., Ho, T., Luthman, J., van der Brug, M., Reith, A.D., Taylor, P., 2011. The parkinson progression marker initiative (ppmi). *Progress in Neurobiology* 95, 629–635. *Biological Markers for Neurodegenerative Diseases*.
- Matas, J., Chum, O., Urban, M., Pajdla, T., 2004. Robust wide-baseline stereo from maximally stable extremal regions. *Image and vision computing* 22, 761–767.
- Mattes, D., Haynor, D.R., Vesselle, H., Lewellen, T.K., Eubank, W., 2003. Pet-ct image registration in the chest using free-form deformations. *IEEE transactions on medical imaging* 22, 120–128.
- Menze, B.H., Jakab, A., Bauer, S., Kalpathy-Cramer, J., Farahani, K., Kirby, J., Burren, Y., Porz, N., Slotboom, J., Wiest, R., Lanczi, L., Gerstner, E., Weber, M.A., Arbel, T., Avants, B.B., Ayache, N., Buendia, P., Collins, D.L., Cordier, N., Corso, J.J., Criminisi, A., Das, T., Delingette, H., Demiralp, C., Durst, C.R., Dojat, M., Doyle, S., Festa, J., Forbes, F., Geremia, E., Glocker, B., Golland, P., Guo, X., Hamamci, A., Iftekharuddin, K.M., Jena, R., John, N.M., Konukoglu, E., Lashkari, D., Mariz, J.A., Meier, R., Pereira, S., Precup, D., Price, S.J., Raviv, T.R., Reza, S.M.S., Ryan, M., Sarikaya, D., Schwartz, L., Shin, H.C., Shotton, J., Silva, C.A., Sousa, N., Subbanna, N.K., Szekely, G., Taylor, T.J., Thomas, O.M., Tustison, N.J., Unal, G., Vasseur, F., Wintermark, M., Ye, D.H., Zhao, L., Zhou, B., Zikic, D., Prastawa, M., Reyes, M., Van Leemput, K., 2015. The multimodal brain tumor image segmentation benchmark (brats). *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging* 34, 1993–2024.
- Montesinos, P., Gouet, V., Deriche, R., 1998. Differential invariants for color images, in: *Proceedings. Fourteenth International Conference on Pattern Recognition (Cat. No. 98EX170)*, IEEE. pp. 838–840.
- Moyer, D., Abaci Turk, E., Grant, P.E., Wells, W.M., Golland, P., 2021. Equivariant filters for efficient tracking in 3d imaging, in: *Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention—MICCAI 2021: 24th International Conference, Strasbourg, France, September 27–October 1, 2021, Proceedings, Part IV 24*, Springer. pp. 193–202.
- Muslim, A., Mashohor, S., Gawwam, G., Mahmud, R., Hanafi, M., Alnuaimi, O., Josephine, R., Almutairi, A., 2022. Brain mri dataset of multiple sclerosis with consensus manual lesion segmentation and patient meta information. *Data Brief* 42, 108139.
- Konstantinos Ntatsis, Niels Dekker, Viktor van der Valk, Tom Birdsong, Dženan Zukić, Stefan Klein, Marius Staring, Matthew McCormick, 2023. itk-elastic: Medical image registration in Python, in: *Meghann Agarwal, Chris Calloway, Dillon Niederhut (Eds.), Proceedings of the 22nd Python in Science Conference*, pp. 101–105.
- Oliveira, F.P., Tavares, J.M.R., 2014. Medical image registration: a review. *Computer methods in biomechanics and biomedical engineering* 17, 73–93.
- Ono, Y., Trulls, E., Fua, P., Yi, K.M., 2018. Lf-net: Learning local features from images. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.09662*.
- Pérez-García, F., Rodionov, R., Alim-Marvasti, A., Sparks, R., Duncan, J.S., Ourselin, S., 2020. Simulation of brain resection for cavity segmentation using self-supervised and semi-supervised learning, in: *Martel, A.L., Abolmaesumi, P., Stoyanov, D., Mateus, D., Zuluaga, M.A., Zhou, S.K., Racoceanu, D., Joskowicz, L. (Eds.), Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention – MICCAI 2020*, Springer International Publishing, Cham. pp. 115–125.
- Petersen, R.C., Aisen, P.S., Beckett, L.A., Donohue, M.C., Gamst, A.C., Harvey, D.J., Jack, C.R.J., Jagust, W.J., Shaw, L.M., Toga, A.W., Trojanowski, J.Q., Weiner, M.W., 2010. Alzheimer’s disease neuroimaging initiative (adni): clinical characterization. *Neurology* 74, 201–209. Epub 2009 Dec 30. PMID: 20042704; PMCID: PMC2809036.
- Qin, C., Shi, B., Liao, R., Mansi, T., Rueckert, D., Kamen, A., 2019. Un-

- supervised deformable registration for multi-modal images via disentangled representations. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science Information Processing in Medical Imaging*, 249–261.
- Reuter, M., Rosas, H.D., Fischl, B., 2010. Highly accurate inverse consistent registration: a robust approach. *Neuroimage* 53, 1181–1196. Epub 2010 Jul 14. PMID: 20637289; PMCID: PMC2946852.
- Rohr, K., Stiehl, H., Sprengel, R., Buzug, T., Weese, J., Kuhn, M., 2001. Landmark-based elastic registration using approximating thin-plate splines. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging* 20, 526–534.
- Rosenfeld, A., Thurston, M., 1971. Edge and curve detection for visual scene analysis. *IEEE Transactions on computers* 100, 562–569.
- Rudie, J.D., Calabrese, E., Saluja, R., Weiss, D., Colby, J.B., Cha, S., Hess, C.P., Rauschecker, A.M., Sugrue, L.P., Villanueva-Meyer, J.E., 2022. Longitudinal assessment of posttreatment diffuse glioma tissue volumes with three-dimensional convolutional neural networks. *Radiology: Artificial Intelligence* 4, e210243.
- Rudie, J.D., Saluja, R., Weiss, D.A., Nedelec, P., Calabrese, E., Colby, J.B., Laguna, B., Mongan, J., Braunstein, S., Hess, C.P., Rauschecker, A.M., Sugrue, L.P., Villanueva-Meyer, J.E., 2024. The university of california san francisco brain metastases stereotactic radiosurgery (ucsf-bmsr) mri dataset. *Radiology: Artificial Intelligence* 6, e230126.
- Sofka, M., Milletari, F., Jia, J., Rothberg, A., 2017. Fully convolutional regression network for accurate detection of measurement points, in: *Deep learning in medical image analysis and multimodal learning for clinical decision support*. Springer, pp. 258–266.
- Song, X., Chao, H., Xu, X., Guo, H., Xu, S., Turkbey, B., Wood, B.J., Sanford, T., Wang, G., Yan, P., 2022. Cross-modal attention for multi-modal image registration. *Medical Image Analysis* 82, 102612.
- Sotiras, A., Davatzikos, C., Paragios, N., 2013. Deformable medical image registration: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging* 32, 1153–1190.
- Tang, C., Li, Y., Du, S., Wang, G., Tian, Z., 2023. Hd2reg: Hierarchical descriptors and detectors for point cloud registration. *2023 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, 1–6.
- Tang, J., Kim, H., Guizilini, V., Pillai, S., Ambrus, R., 2019. Neural outlier rejection for self-supervised keypoint learning. *ArXiv abs/1912.10615*.
- Toews, M., Zöllei, L., Wells, W.M., 2013. Feature-based alignment of volumetric multi-modal images, in: *International Conference on Information Processing in Medical Imaging*, Springer. pp. 25–36.
- Tuytelaars, T., Mikolajczyk, K., 2008. *Local invariant feature detectors: a survey*. Now Publishers Inc.
- Uludağ, K., Roebroek, A., 2014. General overview on the merits of multi-modal neuroimaging data fusion. *Neuroimage* 102, 3–10.
- Ulyanov, D., Vedaldi, A., Lempitsky, V., 2016. Instance normalization: The missing ingredient for fast stylization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.08022*.
- Uzunova, H., Wilms, M., Handels, H., Ehrhardt, J., 2017. Training cnns for image registration from few samples with model-based data augmentation, in: *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*, Springer. pp. 223–231.
- Verdie, Y., Yi, K., Fua, P., Lepetit, V., 2015. Tilde: A temporally invariant learned detector, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 5279–5288.
- Viklands, T., 2006. Algorithms for the weighted orthogonal procrustes problem and other least squares problems.
- Viola, P., Wells III, W.M., 1997. Alignment by maximization of mutual information. *International journal of computer vision* 24, 137–154.
- de Vos, B.D., Berendsen, F.F., Viergever, M.A., Sokooti, H., Staring, M., Išgum, I., 2019. A deep learning framework for unsupervised affine and deformable image registration. *Medical image analysis* 52, 128–143.
- Wachinger, C., Toews, M., Langs, G., Wells, W., Golland, P., 2018. Keypoint transfer for fast whole-body segmentation. *IEEE transactions on medical imaging* 39, 273–282.
- Wang, A.Q., Yu, E.M., Dalca, A.V., Sabuncu, M.R., 2023. A robust and interpretable deep learning framework for multi-modal registration via keypoints. *Medical Image Analysis* 90, 102962.
- Van de Weijer, J., Gevers, T., Bagdanov, A.D., 2005. Boosting color saliency in image feature detection. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 28, 150–156.
- Wu, G., Kim, M., Wang, Q., Munsell, B.C., Shen, D., 2015. Scalable high-performance image registration framework by unsupervised deep feature representations learning. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering* 63, 1505–1516.
- Yang, X., Kwitt, R., Styner, M., Niethammer, M., 2017. Quicksilver: Fast predictive image registration—a deep learning approach. *NeuroImage* 158, 378–396.
- Yi, K.M., Trulls, E., Lepetit, V., Fua, P., 2016. Lift: Learned invariant feature transform, in: *European conference on computer vision*, Springer. pp. 467–483.
- Yi, K.M., Trulls, E., Ono, Y., Lepetit, V., Salzmann, M., Fua, P., 2018. Learning to find good correspondences. *arXiv:1711.05971*.
- Yu, E.M., Wang, A.Q., Dalca, A.V., Sabuncu, M.R., 2022. Keymorph: Robust multi-modal affine registration via unsupervised keypoint detection, in: *Medical Imaging with Deep Learning*.
- Zhang, J., Wang, Y., Dai, J., Cavichini, M., Bartsch, D.U.G., Freeman, W.R., Nguyen, T.Q., An, C., 2022. Two-step registration on multi-modal retinal images via deep neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* 31, 823–838.