
Concurrent 3D super resolution on intensity and segmentation maps improves detection of structural effects in neurodegenerative disease

Anonymous Author(s)

Affiliation

Address

email

Abstract

1 We propose a new perceptual super resolution (PSR) method for 3D neuroimaging
2 and evaluate its performance in detecting brain changes due to neurodegenerative
3 disease. The method, concurrent super resolution and segmentation (CSRS), is
4 trained on volumetric brain data to consistently upsample both an image intensity
5 channel and associated segmentation labels. The simultaneous nature of the method
6 improves not only the resolution of the images but also the resolution of associated
7 segmentations thereby making the approach directly applicable to existing labeled
8 datasets. One challenge to real world evaluation of SR methods such as CSRS
9 is the lack of high resolution ground truth in the target application data: clinical
10 neuroimages. We therefore evaluate CSRS effectiveness in an adjacent, clinically
11 relevant signal detection problem: quantifying cross-sectional and longitudinal
12 change across a set of phenotypically heterogeneous but related disorders that
13 exhibit known and differentiable patterns of brain atrophy. We contrast several 3D
14 PSR loss functions in this paradigm and show that CSRS consistently increases the
15 ability to detect regional atrophy both longitudinally and cross-sectionally in each
16 of five related diseases.

17 1 Introduction

18 Magnetic resonance image (MRI) datasets capturing in vivo longitudinal change in the human brain
19 are currently available at unprecedented scale. These data allow us to quantify the complex etiology
20 of neurodegenerative disease during life. A fundamental problem in quantifying brain disorders
21 from imaging is that many anatomical structures are small in comparison to image resolution. This
22 is caused by not only limited image resolution but also the potentially convoluted shape of the
23 targeted anatomy [1]. Thinner, more oblate and/or curved structures undergo more distortion due
24 to sampling-related aliasing in comparison to larger, more spherical structures. These distortions
25 can limit detection power in the context of either clinical trials and/or at the level of patient specific
26 medicine [2, 3]. These results also show that, based on first principles, many disease relevant
27 anatomical structures in the brain, in particular cortical regions, mid-brain regions and hippocampal
28 subfields, should be quantified at higher resolutions (e.g. $\approx 0.5\text{mm}^3$ or smaller rather than the
29 more commonly available $\approx 1\text{mm}^3$). The need for increased resolution is only heightened when
30 considering aging and neurodegeneration where some brain structures may lose half or more of their
31 pre-disease onset volume or thickness.

32 Perceptual super resolution (PSR) for 2D RGB imagery consistently demonstrates the ability to
33 estimate more “realistic” looking upsampled data in comparison to traditional linear or nearest
34 neighbor interpolants [4]. While many competitive methods are available, the deep back projection
35 network (DBPN) [5] performed consistently in several competitions including NTIRE 2018 and 2019

Submitted to 36th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2022). Do not distribute.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

36 [6], AIM 2019 [7] and PIRM 2018 [8]). These large challenges compared dozens of methods with
37 respect to a variety of both perceptual and reconstruction metrics at different levels of upsampling
38 and noise.

39 Can the 2D RGB performance advantages of methods like the DBPN translate to improvements in
40 the 3D quantification of brain regions as seen in MRI? If so, then PSR for 3D neuroimaging promises
41 to improve quantification by better resolving the brain's internal structures and tissue boundaries.
42 While traditional evaluations of PSR focus on reconstruction error and perceptual impression, these
43 measurements do not provide clinically relevant evidence of PSR's value in quantification. One barrier
44 to evaluating PSR's impact on clinically relevant outcomes (segmentation volumes) is that ground
45 truth segmentations do not exist at the super-resolved scale. To address this concern, [9] simulated low
46 resolution magnetic resonance images (MRI) of the brain from high-resolution (HR) images obtained
47 from the Human Connectome Project [10, 11]. They then applied a very deep super resolution
48 (VDSR) model to the simulated data and the high-resolution data and compared the accuracy of an
49 automated cortical segmentation method. This careful evaluation study demonstrated that cortical
50 segmentation on the VDSR images closely approximated the HR data. However, relatively few
51 details are provided about the training of this model and associated loss functions. Furthermore, it
52 remains unclear whether these improvements in reconstruction error would translate to the detection
53 of population-level effects in real world data particularly in the aging populations that are the target
54 of the majority of interventional trials for the brain.

55 A more recent effort in volumetric PSR for medical images [12] proposed SOUP-GAN: Super-
56 resolution Optimized Using Perceptual-tuned Generative Adversarial Network (GAN). SOUP-GAN
57 adopts transfer learning from 2D VGG19 to 3D as proposed in [13] to produce a pseudo-volumetric
58 perceptual metric [14]. Shan et al. used this metric to denoise low-dose computed tomography
59 (CT) images and showed its effectiveness at preserving small anatomical structures. Similarly, the
60 SOUP-GAN effort demonstrates that the pseudo-3D perceptual metric improves both PSNR and
61 SSIM as well as shows visually appealing upsampling for a variety of medical imaging modalities.
62 That is, the surprising utility (in 2D) of VGG weights as a feature space [15] appears to at least
63 partially transfer to PSR in 3D medical imaging.

64 The current research provides perhaps the first broadly scoped, real world evaluation of MRI PSR for
65 quantification of neurodegenerative disease. Moreover, we demonstrate that a regression network
66 (ResNet) that predicts T1w image quality can yield a directly useful perceptual feature space that
67 performs competitively with pseudo-3D VGG19 features. We build these contributions upon the
68 backbone of a set of methods that we call concurrent super resolution and segmentation (CSRS) that
69 extends the proven 2D DBPN to 3D and also includes extra output channel(s) enabling segmentation
70 maps to be upsampled concurrently. We use this framework to test the impact of different loss
71 functions on a set of domain-specific, clinically relevant segmentation measurements related to
72 brain atrophy. Specifically, we evaluate CSRS on the quantification of frontotemporal disorders [3]
73 from publicly available longitudinal T1-weighted (T1w) neuroimaging (i.e. MRI). Of the several
74 combinations of losses that we evaluate, the best model improves not only segmentation performance
75 (when ground truth is available) but also detection power across all our related disorders: structural
76 changes in behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia (bvFTD), semantic variant primary progressive
77 aphasia (svPPA), nonfluent/agrammatic PPA (naPPA), progressive supranuclear palsy (PSP) and
78 corticobasal syndrome (CBS) each of which impacts known networks in the brain. CSRS with a new
79 perceptual loss based on a shallow ResNet layer performs as well or better than VGG-based models
80 in this test of the practical usefulness of PSR.

81 The primary contributions of this work include:

- 82 • new PSR that upsamples multi-label segmentations at the same time as intensity;
- 83 • a new real world evaluation paradigm for PSR in neuroimaging;
- 84 • comparison of three perceptual loss functions for PSR, two of which are new;
- 85 • demonstration that loss choice impacts detection power in [natural history studies of neurodegenerative disease](#). [Standard intensity similarity and segmentation overlap metrics, on the other hand, do not discriminate performance between the candidate CSRS options.](#)

88 Model weights, sample data, and training code will be made publicly available after anonymous
89 review.

90 2 Methods

91 **Software platform:** We employ the ANTsX platform [16] version 2.3.5 for anatomical labeling,
92 data augmentation/sampling during model training and to form the tabular data for the statistical
93 evaluation. All MRI processing details follow [16]. Tensorflow 2.6.2 is used for deep learning
94 including a ResNet implementation and the CSRS architecture. R version 4.1 is used for statistical
95 analysis with packages lmer and ggplot2. All MRI processing was done on Amazon Web Services
96 parallel cluster with 24 cores and 32GB RAM per process (Intel(R) Xeon(R) Platinum 8259CL
97 CPU @ 2.50GHz).

98 **Data: Human Connectome Project (HCP):** We downloaded 1,113 high-resolution 0.7mm³ T1-
99 weighted images from the HCP on which to train CSRS. These T1w data were acquired using a
100 magnetization-prepared rapid gradient-echo (MPRAGE) sequence on a customized 3T Siemens
101 Skyra; see [10] for all details of acquisition. As such, these images provide both high resolution and
102 high quality in comparison to the majority of publicly available T1w MRI. Critically, they provide
103 superior resolution for the thin convoluted cortical layer that is critical to the measurement of brain
104 atrophy in frontotemporal disorders. We transformed these data into numpy blocks with randomly
105 selected high-resolution 64³ patches and paired low-resolution 32³ patches. For each patch pair, we
106 also provide a high-resolution binary segmentation and a low-resolution downsampled version of
107 that binary segmentation. Each patch segmentation was gained by 2-class k-means performed on
108 the patch where the center voxel's label determines which class (1 or 2) is used as foreground. This
109 collection of 16,640 patches is then divided randomly into train (n=16,384) and test sets.

110 **Data: Parkinson's Progression Markers Initiative (PPMI):** PPMI is a longitudinal multi-center
111 clinical study of PD patients and age-matched healthy controls <http://www.ppmi-info.org>.
112 PPMI employed(s) over 20 data collection sites with scanners that span the primary manufacturers
113 (Siemens, GE, Phillips), a variety of head coils and also magnet strengths (1.5T, 3T). This heterogeneity
114 of data collection provides a rich set of T1w images with highly variable image contrast, resolution
115 and quality. We manually reviewed and labelled 1,431 raw T1w from PPMI to capture the range of
116 quality in an ordinal scale. This resulted in a ground truth dataset with 456 images given grade "A"
117 (superior), 568 given grade "B", 350 given grade "C" and 57 given grade "F" which represents images
118 that are of little to no use for quantitative studies of brain structure. We then employed a standard
119 3D ResNet (antspynet.create_resnet_model_3d with parameters lowest_resolution=32,
120 number_of_classification_labels=4, cardinality=1, 39,424,004 parameters, 53 3D convo-
121 lutional layers) to learn to predict this scale automatically and reliably from the input T1w. We denote
122 this network as a T1w Quality Rating Resnet (T1wQRResNet). Details of training T1wQRResNet
123 are in Supplementary Information.

124 **Data: Frontotemporal Lobar Degeneration Neuroimaging Initiative (NIFD) & 4-Repeat
125 Tauopathy Neuroimaging Initiative (4RTNI):** These inter-related multi-site studies share the goal
126 of improving the quantification of frontotemporal spectrum disorders with both imaging and clinical
127 scores. Like PPMI and HCP, these studies provide longitudinal T1w images that enable measurement
128 of not only the baseline brain structure differences between controls (individuals without a disease
129 i.e. normal aging) and disease groups but also differences in rates of change due to neurodegeneration.
130 We downloaded and curated 4RTNI and NIFD T1w data and merged these images into a common
131 database. These images were collected at three different sites using protocols consistent with ADNI
132 3T guidelines [2]. The images overall have a median spacing that is isotropically 1mm with a minority
133 of subjects with out-of-plane spacing up to 1.2mm. As such, these data suit the goals of testing PSR
134 for benefits to the quantification of neurodegenerative disease. After filtering data for very low quality
135 images and the presence of longitudinal data collected within 2 years of baseline, we obtained 128
136 baseline/171 followup images for controls, 60/112 for bvFTD, 38/72 for naPPA, 37/71 for svPPA,
137 55/70 for CBS and 75/102 for PSP. Further cohort details (age, education, sex, etc) are available in
138 supplementary information. We processed all images consistently and automatically with default
139 ANTsX pipelines to gain cortical, medial temporal lobe and deep brain structure segmentations for
140 every subject as described in [16]. By consensus, co-authors selected a priori regions for testing
141 within each of four groups CBS/PSP [17], bvFTD, svPPA and naPPA [18–24]. Details of the regions
142 and rationale for their selection are available in the Supplementary Information. See Figure 1 for an
143 overview of processing, the CSRS method and a visualization of the regions (1.C).




Figure 1: (A) Image processing begins with raw MRI, extracts the brain, labels cortical regions, labels medial temporal lobe regions and labels deep brain regions. (B) The CSRS method is used, here, to upsample data by a factor of 2 isotropically; the sketch of the algorithm provides an example of how two nearby regions would flow through the method and be stitched back together at high resolution. (C) The impact of SR on quantifying neurodegeneration is assessed on a priori regions that are specific to each clinical diagnostic group; all regions are bilateral except for svPPA which uses only left hemisphere cortical and medial temporal labels.

144 2.1 Concurrent super resolution and segmentation methods

145 CSRS uses, as a sub-algorithm, a three-dimensional and multi-output version of the neural network
 146 architecture defined by the 2D deep back projection network (DBPN) [5]. The DBPN is uniquely
 147 relevant to medical imaging in that it is perhaps the first published SR method that integrates the
 148 downsampling-upsampling error (i.e. residual layers) as a feature map. This novel architecture may
 149 prevent feature hallucination and constrain the high-resolution image to maintain features that are
 150 consistent with the low-resolution input. We extend the 2D DBPN to 3D MRI data by, first, translating
 151 2D convolutions, padding, striding and other relevant parameters to 3D. To generalize the architecture
 152 further, we allow options for not only convolutional upsampling (transposed convolution) but also
 153 nearest neighbor (or linear) interpolation layers at the user’s choice. Lastly, we implement flexible
 154 choices of input channels, the number of residual layers (backprojection) layers and the number of
 155 outputs. This 3D DBPN network implementation is available within R and python. All parameters
 156 were the same as the published work [25] (though in translation to 3D) with the exception of the
 157 number of back projection layers which has a large impact on the number of parameters. We reduced
 158 the number of backprojection layers to 5 (16,264,322 parameters) due to the memory limitations
 159 caused by working with large 3D images and limited GPU resources (all GPU computations in this
 160 work were implemented with Nvidia V100s locally).

161 Efficient computational strategy is essential for CSRS to be applied to large 3D images (a brain
 162 image may contain 10 million voxels) when CPUs and RAM are limited. As such, a local patch-work
 163 strategy is necessary. Sampling, upsampling, mapping and unification (SUMU) are the common steps
 164 needed for not only training but also inference. “Sampling” decides the form of the input data: full
 165 images (not used here), image patches (used here in training) or anatomical image regions (used here
 166 in inference). Upsampling determines the core approach to transferring the low-resolution data to a
 167 higher-resolution output. Mapping compensates for shape or intensity distortion. Finally, “unification”
 168 is an ensembling or merging step that brings together several sub-estimates of an SR image into a
 169 single joined (final/full) SR image. We detail each of the 4 components below.

170 *Sampling*: We choose a patch-based model for training as these can easily be applied to input data
171 with different resolutions and fields of view. A second reason for patch-based modeling is that a
172 candidate network does not need to learn the full scope of image variation. This results in shallower
173 and faster to train networks that fit more easily onto readily available GPUs. The choices made
174 during sampling step define the feature basis set. Because prior super-resolution competitions suggest
175 larger patches lead to better performance, we choose the largest patches that would permit efficient
176 batch sizes of 4 (64x64x64). An additional ad hoc support for this choice is that cortical features
177 are relatively well-resolved in sub-1mm training images when voxel cubes of this sized are used.
178 However, there is no direct evidence that this size of patch domain is optimal for this problem.

179 *Upscaling*: is done with the CSRS's DBPN architecture using nearest neighbor interpolation for
180 the upsampling layers. The software interface to CSRS also allows the user to optionally employ
181 standard linear (tri-linear) interpolation. We use the linear option as a reference in evaluation studies
182 below.

183 *Mapping*: may be used to compensate for distortions in the image shape or intensity space. Because
184 each patch is scaled independently on training data (to have an intensity range of -127.5 to 127.5),
185 the output of the PSR upsampled image intensities must be mapped back to the original quantitative
186 space. This is performed by directly comparing the output of the PSR upsampled patch/region to the
187 original data upsampled by nearest neighbor or linear interpolation. As such, we can accurately retain
188 quantitative intensity data at the original scale/units with minimal distortion and/or stitching artifacts.

189 *Unification*: this is a general term that, here, refers to the algorithm that is used to derive a single
190 CSRS image and multi-label segmentation from multiple CSRS sub-images (not necessarily isotropic
191 patches as in training). In 2D, multiple input images are typically generated from a single input by
192 "augmentation" e.g. random flipping, translation, etc thus allowing a practitioner to gain multiple
193 "votes" about how the SR image should appear at any given voxel. Such a step is used in most PSR
194 competitions to reduce aliasing or artifacts and may involve averaging, sharpening or more complex
195 modeling such as joint intensity fusion, multi-channel deep learning or other ensemble methods.
196 Due to the high memory and computation cost of running CSRS on 3D images, we instead apply
197 CSRS to either sub-regions of interest or, when a full T1w brain image is desired, each hemisphere.
198 The unification step then maps each local patch intensity range back to the original MRI range and
199 then joins the sub-regions back together to complete the SR reconstruction. Augmentation can be
200 employed beyond this but at substantial increase in computation time (e.g. 10x to see meaningful
201 gains due to augmentation).

202 *Loss functions for CSRS*: We employ a loss function that seeks to balance reconstruction error
203 (intensity difference, abbreviated here as R), edge preserving denoising (total variation, abbreviated
204 as TV), perceptual quality (based on VGG or ResNet) and segmentation overlap (Dice, abbreviated
205 as D). Each of these terms can be up or down weighted to control the network's performance where
206 mean squared error (L2 intensity error) leads to smoother results, L1 (or total variation) provides
207 denoising and the perceptual loss yields more natural appearing output textures and shapes. The
208 Dice loss term seeks to minimize distortions in the shape of segmentation objects on the output
209 of CSRS. The Dice loss is only applied to the second output channel of the network which uses a
210 sigmoid activation function appropriate for probabilistic/binary data. We refer to CSRS trained with
211 specific combinations of these losses by concatenation of the abbreviations above. For example,
212 CSRS.R.TV.D.Res6 refers to a network trained with reconstruction loss, TV regularization, Dice loss
213 and the 6th layer of the T1wQRResNet for perceptual loss.

214 Recent research demonstrates that deep learning models trained on large-scale object detection
215 reference datasets (e.g. imagenet) encode a feature space that may mimic human perception
216 [26]. Such perceptual spaces typically arise from the activations that occur within the layers of
217 convolutional networks trained on massive classification datasets. Here, however, we compare a
218 standard VGG based perceptual space (block2_conv2) (mapped to 3D as described before) to
219 those defined by the T1wQRResNet. From T1wQRResNet, we choose two different deep layers
220 that have similar numbers of parameters to the 3D version of the VGG19 block2_conv2 network:
221 res_conv_block_6 (the 2nd convolutional block) and res_conv_block_21 (the 7th convolutional
222 block). This allows us to compare perceptual metrics based on either pseudo-3D VGG19 or our
223 intrinsically 3D res_conv_block choices.

224 Quantification of medical images requires a high degree of faithfulness to the input data. "Halluci-
225 nated" features are undesirable. As such, our baseline loss function focuses on reconstruction error




Figure 2: Best model CSRS applied to three categories of anatomy where row (A) is the original resolution (OR) and segmentation and row (B) is the output of CSRS.R.TV.D.Res6.

226 and TV for both intensity and segmentation images. We then add perceptual and Dice losses for
 227 further comparison. If we denote I as the estimated super-resolution, I_s as the estimated segmentation
 228 from the sigmoid output channel, J as the real high resolution image, J_s as the real high resolution
 229 segmentation, then the final loss function that we optimize is:

$$\|I - J\|^2 w_r^i + \|I_s - J_s\|^2 w_r^s + TV(I, J) w_t^i + TV(I_s, J_s) w_t^s + \|f_n(I) - f_n(J)\|^2 w_f + Dice(I_s, J_s) w_d$$

230 where the term $\|\cdot\|$ indicates the euclidean norm, $TV(\cdot, \cdot)$ indicates the total variation norm (which
 231 provides denoising), $w_{r,t,f,d}$ (superscripts for intensity or segmentation) indicates a term-specific
 232 scalar weight and $f_n(\cdot)$ indicates a perceptual feature map. The weight terms can be tuned for
 233 performance and application area given an objective and quantitative evaluation metric. We initially
 234 manually tuned the training of a DBPN model with only the reconstruction metrics ($\|I - J\|^2 w_r^i +$
 235 $\|I_s - J_s\|^2 w_r^s$ with $w_r^i = 5e - 4$ and $w_r^s = 1$) using adam optimizer and learning rate $5e-5$. We
 236 then set weights relative to the value of the reconstruction error after convergence such that: the TV
 237 loss is roughly $2/3$ the reconstruction term (R); the perceptual loss is roughly $3x$ R; the Dice loss is
 238 roughly equivalent to the perceptual loss. This strategy, based on our task-specific goals, enables us
 239 to compare models consistently and add/subtract terms without extensive weight optimization.

240 *Computation and inference:* All models were implemented with tensorflow. The computation to
 241 double magnification – for a single T1w – takes (generally on a modern computational platform)
 242 between 10 and 40 minutes. Results are computed region-wise over the set of segmentation labels
 243 where CSRS is run on each cropped label and its associated intensity. When multiple regions are
 244 used (as is done here), then results are stitched back together while using a linear mapping back
 245 to the original intensity space and a `arg_max` operation to define the hard segmentation labels at
 246 every voxel in the stitched, joint intensity/probability double magnification space. See Figure 2 for
 247 an example result of CSRS as applied to the variety of brain regions in this study. Figure 3 shows a
 248 zoomed visual comparison of the impact on intensity and the lack of stitching artifacts.

249 2.2 Quantification of CSRS impact on segmentation and intensity in ground truth data

250 Evaluation of PSR results on simulated downsampled-upsampled data does not constitute real world
 251 conditions. However, for reference, we include evaluation results based on an independent set of
 252 labeled brain images [27]. For these images, we downsample with nearest neighbor interpolation
 253 and upsample with linear interpolation (for the intensity) and a “generic label” interpolation that is
 254 designed for multi-label images [28] thereby allowing us to report standard metrics of Dice overlap,
 255 PSNR and SSIM to complement our study of brain atrophy detection. Figure 4 demonstrates example
 256 results illustrating this component of our evaluation.




Figure 3: Comparison of CSRS with different loss functions to original resolution and linear upsampling. The bold (panel E) is the best performing model according to quantitative criteria. However, visual differences between the perceptual models (D,E,F) are not easy to discern.




Figure 4: Panel (A) shows the original 1mm^3 resolution ground truth image and its segmentation. Panel (B) shows the impact of linear/generic label upsampling of ground truth data artificially downsampled to 2mm^3 . Panel (C) shows a CSRS result where other models are visually similar to this. Panel (D) demonstrates that all regions improve with CSRS (all differences > 0) and that regions with lower Dice overlap under the linear/generic label model improve more when upsampled with CSRS.

257 2.3 Quantification of effect sizes in frontotemporal disorder atrophy

258 The frontotemporal disorders produce a profound and debilitating effect on patients with concomitant,
 259 symptom-related atrophy. Measuring this atrophy is critical to detecting the effects, for instance,
 260 of disease modifying therapies that may slow atrophy. Such measurements are challenged by low
 261 resolution and this challenge is compounded by the degeneration process itself.

262 We use statistical modeling to determine if CSRS can mitigate the known limitations of resolution on
 263 atrophy measurement. We adopt an interpretable mixed effects modeling approach (lmer)[29] to
 264 estimate effect sizes per brain region, per diagnostic category and per resolution/CSRS model. The
 265 baseline performance is determined by the effect sizes estimated on the original resolution (OR) data.
 266 We estimate effect sizes following [30, 31]. Better methods, under this design, should more reliably
 267 identify disease-related atrophy which will be reflected in increased effect sizes for a given set of *a*
 268 *priori* diagnosis-specific regions. The model for the region of interest i (ROI_i) is:

$$ROI_i \approx Age_b + Sex + BV_b + DX + \Delta T * DX + (1|ID),$$

269 with $(1|ID)$ representing a subject-specific random effect, Age_b is the subject's age at the first visit,
 270 BV_b is the first visit brain volume, DX is the diagnosis for the subject, ΔT is the change in time
 271 since baseline and the $\Delta T * DX$ represents an interaction between time and diagnosis. The ROI_i
 272 represents the volume for all regions. However, for cortical regions, we also use the region's thickness
 273 measurement as a second outcome (as this is a standard measurement in morphometry of the human
 274 cortex). We estimate effect sizes for cross-sectional effects via the model's parameter fit for the
 275 diagnosis (DX) term; we estimate longitudinal effect sizes via the parameter on the interaction term.

Table 1: Summary of results where the comparison of the model impact on effect size is computed by bootstrapped (n=1000) paired t.test. The number of pairs is 274 (see Table 2 for further breakdown by category). CSRS losses are abbreviated as R=reconstruction, TV=total variation, D=dice, VGG=VGG19 pseudo 3D features, Res6 is from the 6th layer of T1wQRResNet and Res21 is the 21st layer of T1wQRResNet. srmeanES indicates the mean effect size for the model averaged over all a priori regions; boot.95ci is the 95 percent confidence interval for the improvement in effect size due to the model. t represents the *t*-statistic and boot.p represents the bootstrapped p-value for the significance of the improvement in effect size. Columns psnr and ssim show the standard PSNR and SSIM values for an image for which we have ground truth high-resolution intensity and segmentation. The dice columns show the mean and standard deviation of the Dice overlap between ground truth and the upsampled simulated data with each model, estimated over all regions. Best = **bold**.

Model	srmeanES	boot.95ci	t	boot.p	psnr	ssim	dice.mean	dice.sd
OR	0.559	0 / 0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Linear	0.468	-0.1006 / -0.08163	-18.61	0	40.6	0.996	0.769	0.047
CSRS.R.TV	0.574	0.01124 / 0.01854	7.96	0	42.0	0.997	0.884	0.031
CSRS.R.TV.D	0.582	0.01868 / 0.0273	10.38	0	41.8	0.997	0.883	0.031
CSRS.R.TV.VGG	0.581	0.01775 / 0.02559	10.76	0	42.0	0.997	0.885	0.031
CSRS.R.TV.D.VGG	0.577	0.01403 / 0.02209	8.86	0	41.9	0.997	0.884	0.031
CSRS.R.TV.Res6	0.572	0.009741 / 0.01665	7.49	0	42.4	0.997	0.886	0.031
CSRS.R.TV.D.Res6	0.588	0.02497 / 0.0331	14.02	0	42.4	0.997	0.885	0.032
CSRS.R.TV.Res21	0.577	0.01462 / 0.02143	10.40	0	42.3	0.997	0.884	0.031
CSRS.R.TV.D.Res21	0.581	0.01814 / 0.02627	10.59	0	42.3	0.997	0.887	0.03




Figure 5: Bland-Altman plots for model CSRS.R.TV.D.Res6 demonstrate variability in the performance by type of anatomy and by diagnostic grouping with some individual points generating substantially greater % improvement than suggested by the overall trend. Similarly, a few points show decreased performance relative to OR.

276 3 Results

277 Table 1 summarizes overall results where we show original resolution and results from linear
 278 upsampling, as baseline, and compare to eight variants of CSRS. Two of these do not use perceptual
 279 metrics. The remaining six add or subtract Dice loss and each of our candidate perceptual losses.
 280 Table 1 shows both the aggregate impact of model on effect size estimates in the neurodegeneration
 281 data as well as intensity similarity (reconstruction) and Dice overlap in the ground truth data. Dice
 282 overlap (a measure that varies between zero and one) improves by a margin of 0.11 to 0.123 (95% CI
 283 bootstrapped percentile confidence interval, $p < 1e - 16$. See Figure 4.

284 Table 2 focuses on the two perceptual models with the greatest improvement from original resolution
 285 as assessed by pairwise *t*-test. It breaks down the effect size results in relation to which type of effect
 286 size is being analyzed (cross-sectional or longitudinal) and by brain region / diagnostic grouping.
 287 Relatedly, Figure 5 shows a Bland-Altman style plot that demonstrates, for the CSRS.R.TV.D.Res6
 288 model, the range of effect size changes due to CSRS across all 274 measurement points.

Table 2: Summary of results for the two best perceptual models broken down by anatomical class, type of predictor (longitudinal or cross-sectional) and diagnostic groups. The n column indicates the number of samples used in the statistical testing. The codes in the AnatClass column are: CtxV - cortical volume; CtxT - cortical thickness; MB - deep brain (for CBS/PSP); MTL - medial temporal lobe (for svPPA). The columns that have non-NA DX2 means that both DX and DX2 groups were aggregated in the computation of the bootstrapped paired *t*-test for the given group of anatomy.

Model	AnatClass	isLong	DX	DX2	n	srmeanES	boot.95ci	t	boot.p
CSRS.R.TV.VGG	All	Both	NA	NA	274	0.581	0.01775 / 0.02559	10.763	0.0000
CSRS.R.TV.VGG	CtxV	Cross	bvFTD	naPPA	28	0.826	0.007153 / 0.01626	4.936	0.0000
CSRS.R.TV.VGG	CtxT	Cross	bvFTD	naPPA	28	1.016	-0.009547 / 0.01006	0.033	0.9769
CSRS.R.TV.VGG	MB	Cross	CBS/PSP	NA	8	0.600	0.03683 / 0.1208	3.458	0.0246
CSRS.R.TV.VGG	MTL	Cross	svPPA	NA	7	1.003	0.02801 / 0.06981	4.190	0.0112
CSRS.R.TV.VGG	CtxV	Long	bvFTD	naPPA	28	0.645	0.01848 / 0.03313	6.719	0.0000
CSRS.R.TV.VGG	CtxT	Long	bvFTD	naPPA	28	0.527	0.03521 / 0.05297	9.445	0.0000
CSRS.R.TV.VGG	MB	Long	CBS/PSP	NA	8	0.201	0.01409 / 0.03941	3.924	0.0110
CSRS.R.TV.VGG	MTL	Long	svPPA	NA	7	0.701	-0.0159 / 0.002513	-1.309	0.2652
CSRS.R.TV.D.Res6	All	Both	All	NA	274	0.588	0.02497 / 0.0331	14.021	0.0000
CSRS.R.TV.D.Res6	CtxV	Cross	bvFTD	naPPA	28	0.831	0.01199 / 0.02182	6.573	0.0000
CSRS.R.TV.D.Res6	CtxT	Cross	bvFTD	naPPA	28	1.023	-0.002896 / 0.01832	1.394	0.1604
CSRS.R.TV.D.Res6	MB	Cross	CBS/PSP	NA	8	0.589	0.02166 / 0.1131	2.718	0.0454
CSRS.R.TV.D.Res6	MTL	Cross	svPPA	NA	7	1.004	0.02782 / 0.07253	4.021	0.0102
CSRS.R.TV.D.Res6	CtxV	Long	bvFTD	naPPA	28	0.658	0.03203 / 0.04756	9.751	0.0000
CSRS.R.TV.D.Res6	CtxT	Long	bvFTD	naPPA	28	0.545	0.05421 / 0.06995	15.151	0.0000
CSRS.R.TV.D.Res6	MB	Long	CBS/PSP	NA	8	0.198	0.006017 / 0.04464	2.233	0.0166
CSRS.R.TV.D.Res6	MTL	Long	svPPA	NA	7	0.704	-0.0177 / 0.01214	-0.369	0.7511

289 4 Discussion

290 The PSNR and SSIM improve similarly across all CSRS models and do not substantively differentiate
 291 performance. Dice overlap is consistently superior than linear upsampling across all models but shows
 292 little difference between models with perhaps a small advantage for the ResNet features. Greater
 293 stratification may be seen when looking at results that relate to quantifying the phenotypic hetero-
 294 geneity of brain atrophy in frontotemporal spectrum diagnostic groups. Model CSRS.R.TV.D.Res6
 295 stands out under this criteria with Table 2 suggesting that the majority of the improvement arises
 296 for cortical measurements, particularly longitudinally. Performance improvements are not, however,
 297 perfectly consistent. Figure 5 shows that CSRS augments effect size in the large majority of regions
 298 (some greatly so) but a few regions are subtly better at OR. Additional discussion of performance
 299 implications with respect to individual regions and diagnoses is in supplementary information.

300 The extension of PSR to 3D raises opportunities as well as challenges. Parameter exploration is
 301 fundamentally limited because training a model on our patch dataset for 1 epoch takes over 12 hours
 302 (we trained each model for 2 epochs or until convergence). Other architectures than DBPN may
 303 perform better with CSRS such as ESRGAN [32] or, potentially, methods with stronger modality
 304 specific priors on the convolutional kernels [33]. Specifically, fast-training, fewer parameter models
 305 may ease some of the computational burden and facilitate more parameter exploration.

306 CSRS performance is fundamentally limited by the quality of its segmentation inputs. It may be
 307 more beneficial to develop new methods that operate at high resolution (HR) – adding substantial
 308 computational cost if the goal is to take advantage of HR features – or that take advantage of
 309 intrinsically HR ground truth data. The primary barrier to such an effort is the current lack of HR
 310 ground truth labels for neuroimaging and in particular for neurodegenerative disease. Moreover,
 311 most methods embed resolution assumptions in their own processing choices and optimize for these
 312 choices. As such, CSRS bridges a performance gap with a practical solution readily available today.

313 Retooling existing methods and segmentation labels for HR (e.g. 7T MRI) is costly both computationally
 314 and in terms of the effort of human experts due to the already high volume of 3D neuroimaging.
 315 We demonstrated that CSRS, in most of its variants, leads to significant performance improvements
 316 over our reference of original resolution (1mm³) image processing and ground truth labels. Because
 317 CSRS operates on existing images and labels, new HR method and segmentation development is
 318 not required. Thus, CSRS may be used to improve existing ground truth datasets and existing
 319 processed data, today. However, comparison to other and/or larger real world datasets is needed to
 320 help determine the extent to which our results may be deployed to new data without concern.

321 References

- 322 1. Mulder MJ, Keuken MC, Bazin PL, Alkemade A, Forstmann BU. Size and shape matter: The
323 impact of voxel geometry on the identification of small nuclei. *PLoS ONE*. 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0215382>.
324
- 325 2. Veitch DP, Weiner MW, Aisen PS, Beckett LA, Cairns NJ, Green RC, et al. Understanding disease
326 progression and improving Alzheimer's disease clinical trials: Recent highlights from the Alzheimer's
327 disease neuroimaging initiative. *Alzheimer's & Dementia : the Journal of the Alzheimer's Association*.
328 2019;15:106–52.
- 329 3. Boxer AL, Gold M, Feldman H, Boeve BF, Dickinson SL-J, Fillit H, et al. New directions in
330 clinical trials for frontotemporal lobar degeneration: Methods and outcome measures. *Alzheimer's &*
331 *dementia : the journal of the Alzheimer's Association*. 2020;16:131–43.
- 332 4. Blau Y, Michaeli T. The perception-distortion tradeoff. *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference*
333 *on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp 6228-6237, 2018. 2017. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2018.006652)
334 [1109/CVPR.2018.006652](https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2018.006652).
- 335 5. Haris M, Shakhnarovich G, Ukita N. Deep back-projection networks for single image super-
336 resolution. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*. 2020; 43(12):4323-
337 4337.
- 338 6. Agustsson E, Timofte R. NTIRE 2017 challenge on single image super-resolution: Dataset and
339 study. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*
340 2017. pp. 126-135.
- 341 7. Gu S, Danelljan M, Timofte R, Haris M, Akita K, Shakhnarovic G, et al. AIM 2019 challenge on
342 image extreme super-resolution: Methods and results. In: *2019 IEEE/CVF International Conference*
343 *on Computer Vision Workshop (ICCVW)*. Seoul, Korea (South): IEEE. pp. 3556–64.
- 344 8. Blau Y, Mechrez R, Timofte R, Michaeli T, Zelnik-Manor L. The 2018 PIRM challenge on
345 perceptual image super-resolution. In: *2018 Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer*
346 *Vision (ECCV) Workshops*. pp. 334–55.
- 347 9. Tian Q, Bilgic B, Fan Q, Ngamsombat C, Zaretskaya N, Fultz NE, et al. Improving in vivo human
348 cerebral cortical surface reconstruction using data-driven super-resolution. *Cerebral cortex (New*
349 *York, NY : 1991)*. 2021;31:463–82.
- 350 10. Glasser MF, Smith SM, Marcus DS, Andersson JLR, Auerbach EJ, Behrens TEJ, et al. The human
351 connectome project's neuroimaging approach. *Nature Neuroscience*. 2016; 19(9): pp. 1175-1187.
- 352 11. Elam JS, Glasser MF, Harms MP, Sotiropoulos SN, Andersson JL, Burgess GC, et al. The human
353 connectome project: A retrospective. *NeuroImage*. 2021;244:118543.
- 354 12. Zhang K, Hu H, Philbrick K, Conte GM, Sobek JD, Rouzrokh P, et al. SOUP-gan: Super-
355 resolution mri using generative adversarial networks. *Tomography (Ann Arbor, Mich)*. 2022;8:905–
356 19.
- 357 13. Shan H, Zhang Y, Yang Q, Kruger U, Kalra MK, Sun L, et al. 3-d convolutional encoder-decoder
358 network for low-dose ct via transfer learning from a 2-d trained network. *IEEE Transactions on*
359 *Medical Imaging*. 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TMI.2018.2832217>.
- 360 14. Avants B, Greenblatt E, Hesterman J, Tustison N. Deep volumetric feature encoding for biomedical
361 images. In: *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial*
362 *Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*. 2020.
- 363 15. Zhang R, Isola P, Efros AA, Shechtman E, Wang O. The unreasonable effectiveness of deep
364 features as a perceptual metric. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE Computer Society Conference on*
365 *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2018.
- 366 16. Tustison NJ, Cook PA, Holbrook AJ, Johnson HJ, Muschelli J, Devenyi GA, et al. The antsx
367 ecosystem for quantitative biological and medical imaging. *Scientific reports*. 2021;11:9068.
- 368 17. Illán-Gala I, Nigro S, VandeVrede L, Falgàs N, Heuer HW, Painous C, et al. Diagnostic
369 accuracy of magnetic resonance imaging measures of brain atrophy across the spectrum of progressive
370 supranuclear palsy and corticobasal degeneration. *JAMA network open*. 2022;5:e229588.

- 371 18. Whitwell JL. FTD spectrum: Neuroimaging across the ftd spectrum. 2019;187–223.
- 372 19. Whitwell JL, Josephs KA. Neuroimaging in frontotemporal lobar degeneration—predicting
373 molecular pathology. 2012;8:131–42.
- 374 20. Binney RJ, Pankov A, Marx G, He X, McKenna F, Staffaroni AM, et al. Data-driven regions of
375 interest for longitudinal change in three variants of frontotemporal lobar degeneration. *Brain and*
376 *behavior*. 2017;7:e00675.
- 377 21. McCarthy J, Collins DL, Ducharme S. Morphometric mri as a diagnostic biomarker of fron-
378 totemporal dementia: A systematic review to determine clinical applicability. *NeuroImage Clinical*.
379 2018;20:685–96.
- 380 22. Gunawardena D, Ash S, McMillan C, Avants B, Gee J, Grossman M. Why are patients with
381 progressive nonfluent aphasia nonfluent? *Neurology*. 2010;75.
- 382 23. C.T. M, J.B. T, B.B. A, P.A. C, E.M. W, E. S, et al. Genetic and neuroanatomic associations in
383 sporadic frontotemporal lobar degeneration. *Neurobiology of Aging*. 2014.
- 384 24. Massimo L, Powers C, Moore P, Vesely L, Avants B, Gee J, et al. Neuroanatomy of apathy
385 and disinhibition in frontotemporal lobar degeneration. *Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders*.
386 2009. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000194658>.
- 387 25. Haris M, Shakhnarovich G, Ukita N. Deep back-projection networks for super-resolution. In:
388 *Proceedings of the IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*.
389 2018.
- 390 26. Zhang R, Isola P, Efros AA, Shechtman E, Wang O. The unreasonable effectiveness of deep
391 features as a perceptual metric. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE Computer Society Conference on*
392 *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2018.
- 393 27. Klein A, Tourville J. 101 labeled brain images and a consistent human cortical labeling protocol.
394 *Frontiers in neuroscience*. 2012;6:171.
- 395 28. Schaerer J, Roche F, Belaroussi B. A generic interpolator for multi-label images. 2014. <https://doi.org/10.54294/nr6iii>.
- 397 29. Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4 | bates |
398 *journal of statistical software*. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 2015;67.
- 399 30. Brysbaert M, Stevens M. Power analysis and effect size in mixed effects models: A tutorial.
400 *Journal of Cognition*. 2018;1.
- 401 31. Ben-Shachar M, Lüdtke D, Makowski D. Effectsize: Estimation of effect size indices and
402 standardized parameters. *Journal of Open Source Software*. 2020;5.
- 403 32. Wang X, Yu K, Wu S, Gu J, Liu Y, Dong C, et al. ESRGAN: Enhanced super-resolution generative
404 adversarial networks. *arXiv e-prints*. 2018;arXiv:1809.00219.
- 405 33. Bell-Kligler S, Shocher A, Irani M. Blind super-resolution kernel estimation using an internal-gan.
406 In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. 2019.

407 Checklist

- 408 1. For all authors...
- 409 (a) Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper's
410 contributions and scope? [Yes]
- 411 (b) Did you describe the limitations of your work? [Yes]
- 412 (c) Did you discuss any potential negative societal impacts of your work? [Yes]
- 413 (d) Have you read the ethics review guidelines and ensured that your paper conforms to
414 them? [Yes]
- 415 2. If you are including theoretical results...
- 416 (a) Did you state the full set of assumptions of all theoretical results? [N/A]
- 417 (b) Did you include complete proofs of all theoretical results? [N/A]
- 418 3. If you ran experiments...
- 419 (a) Did you include the code, data, and instructions needed to reproduce the main experi-
420 mental results (either in the supplemental material or as a URL)? [Yes] We provide
421 the data, in supplementary material, that is needed to generate the tables shown in the
422 paper. The raw data is publicly available but we do not have permission to redistribute
423 these data. However, we do provide the ability to reproduce key results in the Tables of
424 the main manuscript via supplementary information.
- 425 (b) Did you specify all the training details (e.g., data splits, hyperparameters, how they
426 were chosen)? [Yes]
- 427 (c) Did you report error bars (e.g., with respect to the random seed after running experi-
428 ments multiple times)? [Yes]
- 429 (d) Did you include the total amount of compute and the type of resources used (e.g., type
430 of GPUs, internal cluster, or cloud provider)? [Yes] See beginning of Methods section
431 and CSRS methods section.
- 432 4. If you are using existing assets (e.g., code, data, models) or curating/releasing new assets...
- 433 (a) If your work uses existing assets, did you cite the creators? [Yes]
- 434 (b) Did you mention the license of the assets? [Yes] in supplemental information.
- 435 (c) Did you include any new assets either in the supplemental material or as a URL? [Yes]
- 436 (d) Did you discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose data you're
437 using/curating? [Yes] in supplemental information.
- 438 (e) Did you discuss whether the data you are using/curating contains personally identifiable
439 information or offensive content? [Yes] in supplemental information.
- 440 5. If you used crowdsourcing or conducted research with human subjects...
- 441 (a) Did you include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if
442 applicable? [N/A]
- 443 (b) Did you describe any potential participant risks, with links to Institutional Review
444 Board (IRB) approvals, if applicable? [N/A]
- 445 (c) Did you include the estimated hourly wage paid to participants and the total amount
446 spent on participant compensation? [N/A]