# DentalSegmentator: robust deep learning-based CBCT image segmentation

### Original Research Report

 $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \end{bmatrix}$ 

くらこ しょうしょう Gauthier Dot<sup>-14,2</sup>\*, Akhilanand Chaurasia<sup>3</sup><br>Sarina Azimian<sup>8</sup>, Ali Rahbar Taramsari<sup>9</sup>, G<br>Thomas Schouman<sup>3,14</sup>, Laurent Gajny<sup>3</sup><br>**Abstract**<br>**Objectives:** Segmentation of anatomi<br>tomography (CT) or cone beam compute<br>dent , Guillaume Dubois<sup>99</sup>, Charles Savoldelli<sup>9</sup><br>owri Sivaramakrishnan<sup>10</sup>, Julien Issa<sup>11,12</sup>,<br>cal structures on dento-maxillo-facia<br>d tomography (CBCT) scans is increasin,<br>was to propose and evaluate a novel ope<br>segmentatio , Sara Haghighat'<br>Abhishek Dubey<sup>1</sup><br>I (DMF) compu'<br>gly needed in dig<br>en source tool cal<br>res on DMF CT a<br>dibular canal.<br>g/validation set. ,<br>,<br>,<br>,<br>,<br>,<br>,<br>,<br>,<br>,<br>,<br>,<br>,<br>,<br>, Sarina Azimian"<br>Thomas Schoun<br>**Abstract<br>Objectives**: Se<br>tomography (C<sup>-</sup><br>dentistry. The n<br>DentalSegment<br>CBCT scans: ma<br>Methods: A ret<br>performance ar , Ali Rahbar Taramsari<br>nan<sup>3,14</sup>, Laurent Gajny<sup>3</sup><br>gmentation of anato<br>F) or cone beam compi<br>nain aim of this researc<br>ator for fully automat<br>xilla/upper skull, mand<br>rospective sample of 4:<br>nd generalizability of th , Gowri Sivaramakrishnan<sup>26</sup>, Julien Issa<sup>22,222</sup>, Abhishek Dubey<sup>25</sup>,<br>mical structures on dento-maxillo-facial (DMF) compute<br>uted tomography (CBCT) scans is increasingly needed in digita<br>th was to propose and evaluate a n Thomas Schouman<sup>9,44</sup>, Laurent Gajny<sup>3</sup><br> **Abstract**<br> **Objectives**: Segmentation of anato<br>
tomography (CT) or cone beam comp<br>
dentistry. The main aim of this researe<br>
DentalSegmentator for fully automat<br>
CBCT scans: maxilla

**Conservies:** Segmentation of anatomical structures on dento-maximo-actar (DMF) computed tomography (CT) or cone beam computed tomography (CBCT) scans is increasingly needed in digital dentistry. The main aim of this rese the start of the main and of this research was to propose and evaluate a novel open source tool called<br>DentalSegmentator for fully automatic segmentation of five anatomic structures on DMF CT and<br>CBCT scans: maxilla/upper DentalSegmentator for fully automatic segmentation of five anatomic structures on DMF CT and CBCT scans: maxilla/upper skull, mandible, upper teeth, lower teeth, and the mandibular canal.<br>Methods: A retrospective sample o CBCT scans: maxilla/upper skull, mandible, upper teeth, lower teeth, and the mandibular canal.<br>
Methods: A retrospective sample of 470 CT and CBCT scans was used as a training/validation set. The<br>
performance and generali **CEPT SCANS:** A retrospective sample of 470 CT and CBCT scans was used as a training/validation se<br>performance and generalizability of the tool was evaluated by comparing segmentations provid<br>experts and automatic segmenta Methods: A retrospective sample of 470 CT and CBCT scans was used as a training/validation set. The<br>performance and generalizability of the tool was evaluated by comparing segmentations provided by<br>experts and automatic se

experts and automatic segmentations in two hold-out test datasets: an internal dataset of 133 CT<br>and CBCT scans acquired before orthognathic surgery and an external dataset of 123 CBCT scans<br>randomly sampled from routine experiment of Dentisiant Baltic series and an external dataset of 123 CBCT scans randomly sampled from routine examinations in 5 institutions.<br> **Results**: The mean overall results in the internal test dataset ( $n = 133$ ) we and CBCT scans according to the internal dataset ( $n = 133$ ) were a Dice similarity coefficient (DSC) of 92.2 ± 6.3% and a normalised surface distance (NSD) of 98.2 ± 2.2%. The mean overall results on the external test dat **Results:** The mean overall results in the internal test data:<br>coefficient (DSC) of 92.2 ± 6.3% and a normalised surface dist<br>overall results on the external test dataset  $(n = 123)$  were a D.<br>3.6%.<br>**Conclusions:** The resul

Results: The mean overall results in the internal test dataset (n = 133) were a Dice similarity<br>coefficient (DSC) of 92.2 ± 6.3% and a normalised surface distance (NSD) of 98.2 ± 2.2%. The mean<br>overall results on the exter overall results on the external test dataset (*n* = 123) were a DSC of 94.2 ± 7.4% and a NSD of 98.4 ± 3.6%.<br>**Conclusions:** The results obtained from this highly diverse dataset demonstrate that this tool can provide fully Somethial results on the external rest dataset (n = 123) were a DSC of 94.2 ± 7.4% and a NSD of 93.4 ± 2.4%.<br> **Conclusions:** The results obtained from this highly diverse dataset demonstrate that this tool can<br>
provide ful Conclu<br>provid<br>encou<br>made<br>Clinica<br>easy-t<br>scans.<br>treatm Conclusions: The results obtained from this highly diverse dataset demonstrate that this tool can<br>provide fully automatic and robust multiclass segmentation for DMF CT and CBCT scans. To<br>encourage the clinical deployment o provides the clinical deployment of DentalSegmentator, the pre-trained nnU-Net model has been<br>made publicly available along with an extension for the 3D Slicer software.<br>Clinical Significance: DentalSegmentator open source encourage the clinical deploy available along with an extension for the 3D Slicer software.<br>
Clinical Significance: DentalSegmentator open source 3D Slicer extension provides a free, robust, and<br>
easy-to-use approach to ob Clinical Significance: DentalSegmentator open source 3D Slicer extension p<br>easy-to-use approach to obtaining patient-specific three-dimensional m<br>scans. These models serve various purposes in a digital dentistry workfl<br>tre Clinical Significance: DentalSegmentator open source 3D Slicer extension provides a free, robust, and<br>easy-to-use approach to obtaining patient-specific three-dimensional models from CT and CBCT<br>scans. These models serve v exans. These models serve various purposes in a digital dentistry workflow, such as visualization,<br>treatment planning, intervention, and follow-up.<br>TE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer scans. These models in the serve various purposes in a digital dentistry workflow, such as visualization,<br>treatment planning, intervention, and follow-up.<br>TE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified

IC is a set of  $\frac{1}{2}$  is a set of  $\frac{1}{2}$ Reywords: dental informatics, patient specific modeling, cone-beam computer-assisted surgery, artificial<br>intelligence<br><sup>2</sup> APHP, Hopital Pitie-Salpetriere, Service de Medecine Bucco-Dentaire, Paris, France;<br><sup>3</sup> APHP, Hopita

<sup>-</sup> UFR Odontologie, Universite Paris Cité, Paris, France;

<sup>-</sup> AP-HP, Hopital Pitie-Salpetriere, Service de Medecine Bucco-Dentaire, Paris, France;<br>-

<sup>-</sup> Institut de Biomecanique Humaine Georges Charpak, Arts et Metiers Institute of Technology, Paris, France; I<br>.

intelligence<br>
<sup>1</sup> UFR Odontologie, Universite Paris Cité, Paris, France;<br>
<sup>1</sup> Nexter-assisted radiographic image interpretation, School Dentation, Paris, France;<br>
<sup>4</sup> Department of Oral Medicine and Radiology, Faculty of D <sup>1</sup> UFR Odontolog<br><sup>2</sup> AP-HP, Hopit<br><sup>3</sup> Institut de Bid<br><sup>4</sup> Department d<br><sup>4</sup> Department d<br><sup>5</sup> Materialise Fr<br><sup>6</sup> Head and Ned<br><sup>7</sup> School of Der<br><sup>8</sup> Research Con<br><sup>9</sup> Private dentis 1<br>2<br>4<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>2<br>3<br>1<br>1<br>2<br>1<br>1<br>1 4 Department of Oral Medicine and Radiology, Faculty of Dental Sciences, King George Medical University, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India;

5 Materialise France, Malakoff, France;

 $^6$  Head and Neck Institute, department of oral and maxillofacial surgery. University Hospital of Nice;

 $<sup>7</sup>$  School of Dentistry, Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Shiraz, Iran;</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Research Committee, School of Dentistry, Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran;

 $9$  Private dentist practitioner, Rasht, Iran;

 $10$  Speciality Dental Residency Program, Primary Health Care centers, Bahrain;

 $11$  Chair of Practical Clinical Dentistry, Department of Diagnostics, Poznan University of Medical Sciences, Poznan, Poland;

 $12$  Doctoral School, Poznan University of Medical Sciences, Poznan, Poland;

<sup>13</sup> Department of Oral Medicine and Radiology, Maharana Pratap Dental College, Kanpur, India ;

14 Medecine Sorbonne Universite, AP-HP, Hopital Pitie-Salpetriere, Service de Chirurgie Maxillo-Faciale, Paris, France.

1. Introduction<br>The clinical practice of<br>increasing use of digital<br>(DMF) computed tomog<br>scanners, and facial sca<br>and patient follow-up i<br>models derived from CT<br>surgical planning or navi<br>for orthodontic treatme - i (sice is fi - i (siceres file The clinical practice of digital three-dimensional (3D) data that can be gathered from dento-maxillo-facial<br>(DMF) computed tomography (CT) scans, cone beam computed tomography (CBCT) scans, intraoral<br>scanners, and facial s increases (DMF) computed tomography (CT) scans, cone beam computed tomography (CBCT) scans, intraoral scanners, and facial scanners. This data has improved diagnosis, treatment planning, intervention, and patient follow-up (Summers, and facial scanners. This data has improved diagnosis, treatment planning, intervention, and patient follow-up in several areas of dentistry [1–4]. More specifically, patient-specific 3D models derived from CT or and patient follow-up in several areas of dentistry [1–4]. More specifically, patient-specific 3D<br>models derived from CT or CBCT scans are already used for educational purposes, computer-assisted<br>surgical planning or navig models derived from CT or CBCT scans are already used for educational purposes, computer-assisted<br>surgical planning or navigation, tooth auto-transplantation planning, and virtual treatment planning<br>for orthodontic treatme models planning or navigation, tooth auto-transplantation planning, and virtual treatment planning<br>surgical planning for orthodontic treatments [5–8]. It may not be long before these 3D models become a key part of<br>precisio sure or orthodontic treatments [5–8]. It may not be long before these 3D models become a key part of precision medicine in dental practice based on finite element methods, providing an opportunity to individually assess an Frecision medicine in dental practice based on finite element methods, providing an opportunity to<br>individually assess anatomical and biomechanical characteristics and adapt treatment options<br>accordingly [9].<br>2 precision meaning in dental practice based on finite elements on finite elements, providing an opportunity to<br>individually assess anatomical and biomechanical characteristics and adapt treatment options<br>accordingly [9]. individually assess and biomechanical and biomechanical characteristics and adapt treatment options<br>accordingly [9].  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha$  is the correction of  $\alpha$ .

 Interest must be carefully delineated on the 3D image slices, a process called segmentation. The<br>most frequent workflows require the segmentation of jaws (maxilla and mandible), teeth (upper and<br>lower), and the mandibular most frequent workflows require the segmentation of jaws (maxilla and mandible), teeth (upper and<br>lower), and the mandibular canal. When performed manually, this segmentation process takes an<br>expert two to five hours to co mover), and the mandibular canal. When performed manually, this segmentation process takes an expert two to five hours to complete [10,11]. The current gold standard for 3D DMF image segmentation is the semi-automatic meth expert two to five hours to complete [10,11]. The current gold standard for 3D DMF image<br>segmentation is the semi-automatic method where automatic segmentations are refined manually<br>by an expert [12]. In recent years, seve

expert that is the semi-automatic method where automatic segmentations are refined manually<br>by an expert [12]. In recent years, several research reports have shown that deep learning-based<br>(DL) methods could fully automate segmentation 122. In recent years, several research reports have shown that deep learning-based<br>(DL) methods could fully automate this task with results on a par with those of the experts<br>10,11,13–16]. Several commercially by an expert [12]. In recent years, several research reports have shown and the experts [10,11,13–16]. Several commercially available solutions already claim to use DL methods for CBCT<br>segmentation [17–19].<br>Despite these p (10,11,13–16). Several commercially available solutions already claim to use DL methods for CBCT<br>segmentation [17–19].<br>Despite these promising results, a recent systematic review of automatic tooth segmentation<br>approaches Experience of 17–19]. Despite these promising results, a recent systematic review of automatic tooth segmentation<br>approaches using CBCT scans revealed that most of the studies were at high risk of bias in data<br>selection le Despite these p<br>approaches using CBC<sup>-</sup><br>selection leading to po<br>studies report results fr<br>50 CBCT scans), which<br>the methods in real-wo<br>In an effort to<br>biomedical computer i<br>development of intern<br>sharing of DL framewor<br>segm

Despite these promining results, a recent systemate control of an alternative results, and a heading to potential overestimation of the accuracy of the methods [20]. Most published report results from cross-validation appr represent all that the studies that in the studies of the methods [20]. Most published<br>studies report results from cross-validation approaches or small-sized hold-out test dataset (less than<br>50 CBCT scans), which is probab studies report results from cross-validation approaches or small-sized hold-out test dataset (less than<br>50 CBCT scans), which is probably insufficient for evaluating the robustness and generalizability of<br>the methods in re studies report of the methods in real-world clinical settings [21].<br>
In an effort to help the deployment and broad evaluation of rapidly evolving research, the<br>
biomedical computer imaging community has relied heavily on o <sup>50</sup> Chemethods in real-world clinical settings [21].<br>
In an effort to help the deployment and broad evaluation of rapidly evolving research, the<br>
biomedical computer imaging community has relied heavily on open research. In an effort to help the deployment are<br>biomedical computer imaging community has<br>development of international challenges such<br>sharing of DL frameworks such as nnU-Net [23]<br>segmentation tasks such as TotalSegmentator [<br>DL biomedical computer imaging community has relied heavily on open research. This has led to the<br>development of international challenges such as The Medical Segmentation Decathlon [22], the<br>sharing of DL frameworks such as n development of international challenges such as The Medical Segmentation Decathlon [22], the sharing of DL frameworks such as nnU-Net [23], and the sharing of pre-trained DL models for various segmentation tasks such as To Example in the international challenges such as international challenges such as internation tasks such as TotalSegmentation  $[24]$ . As far as the authors know, only two pre-trained<br>DL models for DMF CT and CBCT segmentati share in the share in the share in the share in the seamentation tasks such as TotalSegmentator [24]. As far as the authors know, only two pre-trained DL models for DMF CT and CBCT segmentation are currently publicly share segmentation to DMF CT and CBCT segmentation are currently publicly shared. The first one is integrated in 3D Slicer software (version 5.6.1 and later - <u>http://www.slicer.org/</u>) [25] as an extension called Slicer Automate Integrated in 3D Slicer software (version 5.6.1 and later - <u>http://www.slicer.org/</u>) [25] as an extension called Slicer Automated Dental Tools and provides segmentation of 4 anatomical structures: the mandible, the maxill integral of Slicer Automated Dental Tools and provides segmentation of 4 anatomical structures: the mandible, the maxilla, the cranial base and the cervical vertebrae [15]. Unfortunately, this tool does not delineate the t mandible, the maxilla, the cranial base and the cervical vertebrae [15]. Unfortunately, this tool does<br>not delineate the teeth from the jaws, which is a critical limitation in most digital dentistry and<br>surgery workflows. mand delineate the teeth from the jaws, which is a critical limitation in most digital dentistry and<br>surgery workflows. The second one is based on the nnU-Net framework and provides segmentation<br>of the tissues of interest,

not delineate the tectors. The second one is based on the nnU-Net framework and provides segmentation<br>of the tissues of interest, but is not supposed to be used with CBCT scan data as it has been<br>developed and tested exclu surfact the tissues of interest, but is not supposed to be used with CBCT scan data as it has been developed and tested exclusively on CT scan data [26].<br>The main aim of the research presented in this paper was to propose developed and tested exclusively on CT scan data [26].<br>
The main aim of the research presented in this paper was to propose and evaluate a novel<br>
tool for multiclass DMF CT and CBCT image segmentation called DentalSegmenta The main aim of the research presented in this<br>tool for multiclass DMF CT and CBCT image se,<br>performance of the tool was thoroughly evaluated c<br>routine clinical practice in seven clinical centers.<br>3 The main aim of the research presented in the perpendicular presented in the research presented in the performance of the tool was thoroughly evaluated on two hold-out test datasets acquired from routine clinical practice the formance of the tool was thoroughly evaluated on two hold-out test datasets acquired from<br>routine clinical practice in seven clinical centers.<br>3 performance of the tool was thoroughly evaluated on the two hold-out test datasets acquired from routine clinical practice in seven clinical centers. routine clinical practice in seven clinical centers.

/ st c c c c c c A DET SERVIE SURFALL THE FRAME INTERTATION (The index test) were compared with those<br>
Scans. The results obtained from this DL-based method (the index test) on two hold-out test datasets. The<br>
poutcome set included both vo scans and the results of the reference test) on two hold-out test datasets. The outcome set included both volume-based and surface-based metrics. The Institutional Review Board<br>
"Comité d'Ethique pour la Recherche en Image outcome set included both volume-based and surface-based metrics. The Institutional Review Board<br>
"Comité d'Ethique pour la Recherche en Imagerie Médicale" (CERIM) gave ethical approval for this<br>
research (IRB No. CRM-2001

# 2.1.Dataset

### 2.1.1. Patient selection

"Comité d'Ethique pour la Recherche en Imagerie Médicale" (CERIM) gave ethical approval for this<br>research (IRB No. CRM-2001-051b), and its reporting conforms to recently published<br>recommendations on artificial intelligence "Comité d'Ethique pour la Recherche en Imagerie Médicale" (CERIM) gave ethical approval for this<br>research (IRB No. CRM-2001-051b), and its reporting conforms to recently published<br>recommendations on artificial intelligence recommendations on artificial intelligence in dental research [21].<br>
2.1. Dataset<br>
2.1.1. Patient selection<br>
The dataset was composed of an internal dataset and an external dataset. Data from the internal<br>
dataset was sele **2.1. Dataset**<br>2.1.1. Patient selection<br>The dataset was composed of an internal dataset and an extern<br>dataset was selected from a retrospective sample of consecut<br>orthognathic surgery in two French maxillofacial surgery de The dataset was selected from a retrospective sample of consecutive patients who had undergone<br>
orthognathic surgery in two French maxillofacial surgery departments. Patients referred to these<br>
public centers presented a w orthognathic surgery in two French maxillofacial surgery departments. Patients referred to these<br>public centers presented a wide variety of dentofacial deformities, came from a variety of<br>socioeconomic backgrounds, and wer Final contents and wide variety of dentofacial deformities, came from a variety of<br>public centers presented a wide variety of dentofacial deformities, came from a variety of<br>socioeconomic backgrounds, and were ethnically d

public centers and were ethnically diverse. Patients were considered for inclusion regardless of the dental deformity they presented, and there was no minimum age. Exclusion criteria were refusal to participate in the rese Frances of the dental deformity they presented, and there was no minimum age. Exclusion criteria<br>
were refusal to participate in the research and lack of industry-certified CT or CBCT scan<br>
segmentation. As a result, 603 s referrigation and lack of industry-certified CT or CBCT scanes are referration. As a result, 603 subjects (453 CT scans, 150 CBCT scans) were included in the internal dataset.<br>
Data from the external test dataset was rando Were refusal to participate is a result, 603 subjects (453 CT scans, 150 CBCT scans) were included in the internal<br>dataset.<br>Data from the external test dataset was randomly sampled retrospectively from routine CBCT<br>examina segmentation. As a result, the standard controlled parameters (can result to the subjects were referred for a CBCT scans for various reasons such as surgical planning, orthodontic management of impacted teeth, temporomandi I<br>examina<br>for varie<br>temporo<br>for included<br>2.1.2<br>All the scof<br>the scof is a five private centers located in India. All of the subjects were referred for a CBCT scance ous reasons such as surgical planning, orthodontic management of impacted teeth, by mandibular joint (TMJ) disorders, or diagn For various reasons such as surgical planning, orthodontic management of impacted teeth,<br>temporomandibular joint (TMJ) disorders, or diagnosis of cysts of the jaws. Patients were considered<br>for inclusion regardless of the temporomandibular joint (TMJ) disorders, or diagnosis of cysts of the jaws. Patients were considered<br>for inclusion regardless of the condition they presented, and there was no minimum age. The only<br>exclusion criterion was

### 2.1.2. Data characteristics

the inclusion regardless of the condition they presented, and there was no minimum age. The only exclusion criterion was refusal to participate in the research. 123 subjects (123 CBCT scans) were included in the external t exclusion criterion was refusal to participate in the research. 123 subjects (123 CBCT scans) were<br>included in the external test dataset.<br>2.1.2. Data characteristics<br>All the scans in the internal dataset had a full-head f excluded in the external test dataset.<br>
2.1.2. Data characteristics<br>
All the scans in the internal dataset had a full-head field of view (FOV). The median in-space pixel size<br>
of the scans was 0.43\*0.43mm<sup>2</sup> and their medi 2.1.2. Data characteristics<br>All the scans in the internal dataset h<br>of the scans was 0.43\*0.43mm<sup>2</sup> and<br>417) were obtained using a GE Health<br>150) were obtained using a Carestrea  $\begin{array}{c}\n1 \\
2 \\
3\n\end{array}$ of the scans was  $0.43*0.43mm^2$  and their median slice thickness was  $0.31mm$ . Most CT scans (*n* = 417) were obtained using a GE Healthcare Discovery (GEHC) CT750HD scanner and all CBCT scans (*n* = 150) were obtained usi of the scans was 0.43\*0.43mm<sup>-</sup><br>417) were obtained using a GE H<sub>1</sub><br>150) were obtained using a Care and their median slice thickness was 0.31mm. Most Cr scans (n =<br>ealthcare Discovery (GEHC) CT750HD scanner and all CBCT scans (n =<br>stream CS 9600 scanner. Scans were randomly distributed between<br>4  $417$ ) were obtained using a GE Healthcare Discovery (GEHC) CT750HD scanner and all CBCT scans (n =<br>150) were obtained using a Carestream CS 9600 scanner. Scans were randomly distributed between<br>4  $\frac{1}{3}$ 

contractors of the contractors o a training/validation set (n = 470; 374 CT scans and 96 CBCT scans) and an internal test set (n = 133),<br>79 CT scans and 54 CBCT scans). 91% of the scans in the internal test set exhibited metal artefacts.<br>The FOV of the s The FOV of the scans in the external test dataset ranged from full-head to being localized<br>
anatomical parts (maxilla and mandible or only part of the maxilla or mandible). The median vo<br>
size of the CBCT scans was 0.16\*0 anatomical parts (maxilla and mandible or only part of the maxilla or mandible). The median voxel<br>
size of the CBCT scans was 0.16\*0.16\*0.16mm<sup>3</sup>. The scans were acquired using five CBCT devices:<br>
Vatech Smart Plus ( $n = 2$ 



"Prognathic maxilla and/or retrognathic mandible evaluated on the 3D models. "Retrognathic maxilla and/or prognathic mandible evaluated on the 3D models.

# 2.1.3. Ground truth segmentation process (Reference Test)

Table 1: Characteristics of the data in the training/validation, internal test, and external test<br>datasets.<br>the datasets.<br>Treatments carried out on patients in the internal dataset involved segmentation of the 3D s-<br>to stu ss (Referer<br>internal d<br>ons were<br>-printed s<br>ccording t<br>5 prior to study. The ground truth segmentations were used for diagnosis, computer-aided surgical<br>planning, and manufacture of personalized 3D-printed surgical guides and fixation implants. This was<br>carried out by Materialis planning, and manufacture of personalized 3D-printed surgical guides and fixation implants. This was<br>carried out by Materialise (Leuven, Belgium) according to a certified internal procedure which cannot<br>5 planning, and manufacture of personalized 3D-printed surgical guide and fixation implants. This was<br>carried out by Materialise (Leuven, Belgium) according to a certified internal procedure which cannot<br>5 carried out by Materialise (Leuven, Belgium) according to a certified internal procedure which cannot

 be fully described here for reasons of confidentiality. The two-step procedure started with semiinitial operator from a trained team [Step 1]. The segmentations were then verified slice-by-slice for validation by a senior operator from a trained team [Step 2] with a focus on the regions of interest (the external surf

segmentations were then corrected manually by five dentists familiar with 3D image visualization validation by a senior operator from a trained team [Step 2] with a focus on the regions of interest<br>
(the external surface of the bones, teeth, and mandibular canals). Steps 1 and 2 were repeated until<br>
the segmentations (the external surface of the bones, teeth, and mandibular canals). Steps 1 and 2 were repeated until<br>the segmentations were approved and certified for clinical use. This process resulted in five<br>segmentation masks: maxilla (the external surface of the external surface of thincal use. This process resulted in five<br>segmentation masks: maxilla/upper skull; mandible; upper teeth; lower teeth; and both mandibular<br>canals.<br>The CBCT scans in the ext the segmentation masks: maxilla/upper skull; mandible; upper teeth; lower teeth; and both mandibular canals.<br>The CBCT scans in the external dataset were segmented specifically for this study by using a<br>semi-automatic three segmentation masks: maxilla/upper skull; mandible; upper teeth; lower teeth, and both mandibular canals.<br>The CBCT scans in the external dataset were segmented specifically for this study by using a<br>semi-automatic three-ste semi-au<br>publicly<br>segmer<br>and trai<br>verified<br>five yea<br>in five<br>mandib<br>2.2. The CDCT scans in the external dataset were segmented specifically for this study by damigration<br>Semi-automatic three-step approach. First, the CBCT scans were segmented automatically using a<br>publicly available deep-learni semi-automatic three-step approach. The Case of CF scans [26] [Step 1]. Second, the proposed segmentations were then corrected manually by five dentists familiar with 3D image visualization and trained for the task in 3D S publicly available serp realing model manually by five dentists familiar with 3D image visualization<br>same trained for the task in 3D Slicer software (version 5.6.0) [Step 2]. Finally, the segmentations were<br>verified slicesegmentations were then corrected where necessary by a senior expect (a dentist with more than five years of experience in 3D image evaluation) in 3D Slicer software [Step 3]. This process resulted<br>in five years of experie verified slice-by-slice and corrected where necessary by a senior expert (a dentist with more than<br>five years of experience in 3D image evaluation) in 3D Slicer software [Step 3]. This process resulted<br>in five segmentation

### 2.2.Deep-Learning based segmentation (Index Test)

### 2.2.1. Training

is the years of experience in 3D image evaluation) in 3D Slicer software [Step 3]. This process resulted<br>in five segmentation masks: maxilla/upper skull, mandible, upper teeth, lower teeth, and both<br>mandibular canals.<br>2.2. five segmentation masks: maxilla/upper skull, mandible, upper teeth, lower teeth, and both<br>mandibular canals.<br>2.2. Deep-Learning based segmentation (Index Test)<br>2.2.1. Training<br>The nnU-Net deep learning framework (version in five segmentation masks: manufolder cannot masks: mandibular canals.<br>
2.2. Deep-Learning based segmentation (Index Test)<br>
2.2.1. *Training*<br>
The nnU-Net deep learning framework (version 2.2.1) was used as an out-of-the-**2.2. Deep-Learn**<br>2.2.1. Training<br>The nnU-Net deep<br>to instructions give<br>automatically confi<br>pipelines. No mod<br>augmentation strat<br>was about 24 hour:<br>GPU Nvidia Titan RT The numeral external guidelinear and pair and the nnumeral space of the nnumeral defined as an outomatically configure preprocessing, network architecture, and 3D full resolution U-Net training pipelines. No modifications The instructions were made in setting, and the leader of D-Net training<br>pipelines. No modifications were made in setting the nnU-Net hyperparameters and data<br>augmentation strategy, and the target spacing of the model was 0 pipelines. No modifications were made in setting the nnU-Net hyperparameters and data<br>augmentation strategy, and the target spacing of the model was 0.31\*0.43\*0.43mm<sup>3</sup>. Training time<br>was about 24 hours on our laboratory w phericular technology, and the target spacing of the model was 0.31\*0.43\*0.43mm<sup>3</sup>. Training time<br>augmentation strategy, and the target spacing of the model was 0.31\*0.43\*0.43mm<sup>3</sup>. Training time<br>was about 24 hours on our augmentation strategy, and the target spacing of the model was 0.31\*0.43\*0.43mm\*<br>was about 24 hours on our laboratory workstation (CPU AMD Ryzen 9 3900X 12-Core<br>GPU Nvidia Titan RTX 24Gb).<br>2.2.2. Inference<br>Inference (predi .<br>2 : 128Gb RAM;<br>al and external<br>d external test<br>segmentations

### 2.2.2. Inference

Was about 24 hours on our laboratory workstation, working the common significant core; the preference (prediction made by the trained model) was performed once on the internal and external<br>test datasets following nnU-Net g 2.2.2. Inference<br>Inference (prediction made k<br>test datasets following nnU-N<br>2.3. Evaluation<br>Quantitative evaluation of th<br>datasets by comparing grou  $\frac{1}{3}$ 

### 2.3.Evaluation

Inference (prediction matrix) and trained model, prediction of the internal and model) and trained model performed was carried out on the internal and external test<br>datasets by comparing ground truth segmentations (referen 2.3. Evaluation<br>Quantitative evaluation of the model perfo<br>datasets by comparing ground truth segm  $\frac{1}{2}$ datasets by comparing ground truth segmentations (reference test) with DL-based segmentations<br>6  $\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{d} \\ \text{e} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array}$ 

 (128) were followed by using both volume-based Dice similarity coefficient (DSC) and surface-<br>based normalized surface distance (NSD). The tolerance for NSD was set at 1 mm, consistent with<br>recent international challenges

# 2.4.Statistical Analysis

compare DSC and NSD results from different CT/CBCT devices; when significant, post-hoc Dunn's test recent international challenges in biomedical imaging [22]. Furthermore, recent studies have shown<br>that NSD was more strongly correlated with the amount of time needed to correct a segmentation<br>for clinical use compared to that NSD was more strongly correlated with the amount of time needed to correct a segmentation<br>for clinical use compared to classic metrics such as DSC [29].<br>**2.4. Statistical Analysis**<br>Continuous variables were presented that NSD was more interestingly contained with the amount of time in the amount of time needed with the segment<br>That NSD relations variables were presented as mean ± standard deviation and categorical variables were<br>expres **Example 20 Statistical Analysis**<br> **Continuous variables were presented as mean ± standard c**<br>
expressed as numbers and percentages. DSC and NSD rest<br>
The results were nonparametric (Shapiro-Wilk normality test<br>
used to co Expressed as numbers and percentages. DSC and NSD results were presented as percentages (%).<br>The results were nonparametric (Shapiro-Wilk normality test). The Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney test was<br>used to compare results from int expressed as numbers and percentages. The Wilson Mann-Whitney test was used to compare results from internal and external test datasets. The Kruskal-Wallis test was used to compare escults from inferent CT/CBCT devices; wh Interact the results from internal and external test datasets. The Kruskal-Wallis test was used to compare nosC and NSD results from different CT/CBCT devices; when significant, post-hoc Dunn's test was used to compare eac

# 3.1.Quantitative evaluation

compare DSC and NSD results from different CT/CBCT devices; when significant, post-hoc Dunn's test<br>was used to compare each group. p values <0.05 were considered to be statistically significant. All of<br>the data was analyse compare DSC and NSD results from different CT/CBCT devices; when significant, post-hoc Dunn's test<br>was used to compare each group, p values <0.05 were considered to be statistically significant. All of<br>the data was analyse Was used to compare each group. p values solos were considered to be statistically significant. All of<br>the data was analysed using Python (v.3.7) and R Statistical Software (v4.2.2; R Core Team 2022).<br>**3. Results**<br>**3.1. Q 3. Results**<br> **3.1. Quantitative evaluation**<br>
Inference time was approximately 1 to 2 minutes for one 3D scan performed on the labora<br>
workstation described above. The mean overall results in the internal test dataset (*n* 

Workstation described above. The mean overall results in the internal test dataset ( $n = 133$ ) were a<br>DSC of 92.2 ± 6.3% and an NSD of 98.2 ± 2.2% (Table 2). The mean overall results in the external test<br>dataset ( $n = 123$ ) workstation described above. The mean overall results in the internal test dataset (n = 133) were a<br>
DSC of 92.2 ± 6.3% and an NSD of 98.2 ± 2.2% (Table 2). The mean overall results in the external test<br>
dataset (n = 123) dataset (*n* = 123) were a DSC of 94.2 ± 7.4% and an NSD of 98.4 ± 3.6% (Table 3). The distribution of<br>results is shown in Figure 1.<br>The statistical analysis showed similar results for both DSC and NSD metrics. Overall, t dataset (n = 123) were a DSC of 94.2 ± 7.4% and an NSD of 98.4 ± 3.6% (Table 3). The distribution of<br>results is shown in Figure 1.<br>The statistical analysis showed similar results for both DSC and NSD metrics. Overall, the<br> The statistical analy<br>results obtained on the external<br>statistical difference in the i<br>compared. In the external<br>9300 and Sirona Orthophos<br>Metric, mean ± SD<br>[%]<br>DSC<br>NSD<br>Table 2: DSC and NSD re The statistical and internal test dataset were statistically different. There was no<br>al difference in the internal test dataset when scans obtained using the various devices were<br>ed. In the external test dataset, the resul



Table 2: DSC and NSD results from the internal test dataset  $(n - 133)$ . SD: Standard Deviation.

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) . **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. medRxiv preprint doi: [https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.18.24304458;](https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.18.24304458) this version posted June 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint







# 3.2.Three-Dimensional Visualization

Figure 1: DSC and NSD results from the internal (left) and external (right) test datasets.<br>
Three-Dimensional Visualization<br>
ects representative of the test dataset were chosen to illustrate the segmentation results<br>
resit cent de la comme de la comme de la comme de<br>Desertes de la comme de la the diversity of the CBCT data (Figure 2). When segmentation failures occurred, they were mainly under-segmentations of thin bony parts (resulting in holes in the maxilla or mandible inferior border) and missing mandibular the diversity of the CBCT data (Figure 2). Which considers a matter channel consider segmentations of thin bony parts (resulting in holes in the maxilla or mandible inferior border) and missing mandibular canal parts (Figu and missing mandibular canal parts (Figure 3).<br> $\frac{1}{2}$ <br>8 and missing mandibular canal parts (Figure 3).





Figure 3: 3D surface models for four subjects, exhibiting some typical failures (red circles). (A) Onder-<br>segmentation of the mandibular inferior border and mandibular canal; (B) Under-segmentation of<br>the anterior maxillar segmentation of the mandibular inferior border and mandibular canal; (b) onder-segmentation of<br>the anterior maxillary sinus walls; (C) Under-segmentation of the palate; (D) Discontinuity of the<br>mandibular canal. the anterior maxillary sinus walls; (C) onder-segmentation of the palate; (D) Discontinuity of the<br>mandibular canal. mandibular canal.

### 3.3.DentalSegmentator model sharing and 3D Slicer extension

- 7 1 1 2 1 2 1 in the nnU-Net version 2.2.1 command-line interface.<br>
Implementation in a user-friendly interface to encourage clinicians to use the DL method is<br>
also proposed. DentalSegmentator is an open source extension for the 3D Sli Implementation in a user-friendly interface to<br>also proposed. DentalSegmentator is an open source<br>5.7.0 and later), which is a free, open source software<br>medical 3D images (http://www.slicer.org/) [25]. The<br>manager of 3D S Implementation is an open source extension for the 3D Slicer software (version d later), which is a free, open source software for visualization, processing, and analysis of 3D images (http://www.slicer.org/) [25]. The ext also proposed. This is a free, open source software for visualization, processing, and analysis of medical 3D images (http://www.slicer.org/) [25]. The extension, downloadable from the extension manager of 3D Slicer, offer 5.7.1 and 13.7.1 and 13. manager of 3D Slicer, offers an easy-to-use approach for DMF CT and CBCT scans automatic<br>segmentation and 3D patient-specific model export (Figure 4). Slice-by-slice verification and manual<br>refinement of the segmentations manager of 3D Slice, oriers an easy-to-use approach for DMF CT and CBCT seans automnation<br>segmentation and 3D patient-specific model export (Figure 4). Slice-by-slice verification and manual<br>refinement of the segmentation

segmentation and its code are shared on the Github platform:<br>
Information about the extension and its code are shared on the Github platform:<br>
Int<u>us://github.com/gaudot/SlicerDentalSegmentator</u>.<br>
These tools work on all



Figure 4: Screenshot of DentalSegmentator 3D Slicer extension.

- IGE SE The Fig. of the numeral section and CBCT images. This tool, based on the nnU-Net framework, was evaluated on a highly<br>diverse test dataset of 79 CT and 177 CBCT scans from seven institutions. The comprehensive<br>evaluation w DMF CT and 177 CBCT scans from seven institutions. The comprehensive evaluation was composed of both volume-based and surface-based metrics, and demonstrated that DentalSegmentator was able to provide fully automatic robus

evaluation was composed of both volume-based and surface-based metrics, and demonstrated that<br>DentalSegmentator was able to provide fully automatic robust segmentation results for the five<br>segmentation labels: maxilla/uppe DentalSegmentator was able to provide fully automatic robust segmentation results for the five<br>segmentation labels: maxilla/upper skull, mandible, upper teeth, lower teeth, and the mandibular<br>canal. The pre-trained model Dental Segmentation labels: maxilla/upper skull, mandible, upper teeth, lower teeth, and the mandibular canal. The pre-trained model is publicly available along with an open source 3D Slicer extension with an easy-to-use g segmentation labels: many station of pertricant process of Slicer extension with<br>an easy-to-use graphic interface.<br>Due to the lack of a publicly available DMF CT and CBCT segmentation dataset, it is difficult to<br>compare th Each Dream and the pre-trained model interface.<br>
Due to the lack of a publicly available DMF CT and CBCT segmentation dataset, it is difficult to<br>
compare the results obtained here directly with those previously published. Due to the lack of a public<br>compare the results obtained h<br>review highlighted that the DSC<br>97.9 ± 1.5% [20]. Only a few stud<br>been proposed by the biomedica<br>the heterogeneity in the metho<br>frequent problem in DL studies [<br>s compare the results obtained here directly with those previously published. A recent systematic<br>review highlighted that the DSC results obtained in the 23 selected studies ranged from 90 ± 3% to<br>97.9 ± 1.5% [20]. Only a f review highlighted that the DSC results obtained in the 23 selected studies ranged from 90 ± 3% to<br>97.9 ± 1.5% [20]. Only a few studies in dentistry report NSC results because this metric has recently<br>been proposed by the 27.9 ± 1.5% [20]. Only a few studies in dentistry report NSC results because this metric has recently<br>been proposed by the biomedical community [28,29]. This systematic review also pointed out that<br>the heterogeneity in th been proposed by the biomedical community  $[28,29]$ . This systematic review also pointed out that<br>the heterogeneity in the methods employed for dataset construction and model evaluation is a<br>frequent problem in DL studies be heterogeneity in the methods employed for dataset construction and model evaluation is a frequent problem in DL studies [21]. Some of the studies excluded patients with metal artefacts or significant skeletal deformitie frequent problem in DL studies [21]. Some of the studies excluded patients with metal artefacts or significant skeletal deformities, while most of the models were evaluated on cross-validation datasets or on hold-out test Frequent problem in the studies of the models were evaluated on cross-validation<br>datasets or on hold-out test datasets of fewer than 50 CBCT scans. The main risk of these approaches<br>is that they may yield over-optimistic r <sup>2</sup><br>datasets or on hold-out test datasets of fewer than 50 CBCT scans. The main risk of these approaches<br>is that they may yield over-optimistic results which could be difficult to reproduce in routine clinical<br>care (i.e. p is that they may yield over-optimistic results which could be difficult to reproduce in routine clinical<br>care (i.e. poor generalizability of the model). As far as the authors know, the only study reporting<br>results of DMF s If the solution of the model). As far as the authors know, the only study reporting<br>results of DMF segmentation on a large-scale external test dataset (n = 407) had a mean DSC result of<br>93.8% [11], a result very close to t results of DMF segmentation on a large-scale external test dataset  $(n = 407)$  had a mean DSC result of 93.8% [11], a result very close to that found in the present study. However, this model is not publicly available, whic results of DMF segmentation on a large-scale external test dataset (n = 407) had a mean DSC result of 3.8% [11], a result very close to that found in the present study. However, this model is not publicly available, which Frame that is further that found in the presention. As the dataset used in the present study was randomly selected from clinical practice, most of the test images (67.6%) showed metal artefacts. The images in our external as randomly selected from clinical practice, most of the test images (67.6%) showed metal<br>artefacts. The images in our external dataset exhibited fewer metal artefacts than our internal test<br>dataset, which might explain th antefacts. The images in our external dataset exhibited fewer metal artefacts than our internal test<br>dataset, which might explain the statistically significant difference between the results obtained on<br>these two datasets. dataset, which might explain the statistically significant difference between the results obtained on<br>these two datasets. Despite these statistical results, the clinical impact of the variations observed<br>between our intern many many meptation to the statistical results, the clinical impact of the variations observed<br>between our internal and external test results is questionable. Part of the DSC errors found in the<br>external dataset may be cau

between our internal and external test results is questionable. Part of the DSC errors found in the external dataset may be caused by the resolution of the external dataset as the median voxel size of this data was half th between our internal dataset may be caused by the resolution of the external dataset as the median voxel size of<br>this data was half the target spacing of the model presented in this paper.<br>In recent years, several deep lea external data was half the target spacing of the model presented in this paper.<br>
In recent years, several deep learning architectures have been proposed for the<br>
segmentation of 3D biomedical data. The study presented in t In recent years, several deep learning architectures have<br>segmentation of 3D biomedical data. The study presented in this paper u<br>Net framework, which was introduced in 2018 [23]. This framework is<br>shown to provide state-o In recent years, segmentation of 3D biomedical data. The study presented in this paper used the open source nnU-<br>
In the framework, which was introduced in 2018 [23]. This framework is well supported, has been<br>
shown to pr Net framework is above to provide state-of-the-art results on numerous datasets, and does not necessarily require<br>11 shown to provide state-of-the-art results on numerous datasets, and does not necessarily require

e i reserverses de la communicación de la communicación de la communicación de la communicación de la communic<br>Communicación expertent the sexpert was terms, pertained matched showledge. This likely that slightly better<br>results could be obtained by tailoring the deep learning architecture to the task, but that would<br>require additional expertise. Figure 2.1 The results could be obtained by tailoring the deep learning architecture to the task, but that would<br>require additional expertise.<br>The results demonstrated the robustness and generalizability of the model for t require additional expertise.<br>
The results demonstrated the robustness and generalizability of the model for the<br>
segmentation of routine CT and CBCT scans acquired in several cases of use such as orthognathic<br>
surgery pla The results demons<br>segmentation of routine CT<br>surgery planning, guided im<br>Methods in health data scie<br>constantly improving results<br>data is obtained from differ<br>example, to fill in some of<br>segmentation for DMF CT<br>researcher Segmentation of routine CT and CBCT scans acquired in several cases of use such as orthognathic<br>surgery planning, guided implant surgery, impacted teeth visualization, and digital orthodontics.<br>Methods in health data scien surgery planning, guided implant surgery, impacted teeth visualization, and digital orthodontics.<br>Methods in health data science are evolving at a very fast pace, with growing dataset sizes and<br>constantly improving results Surgery planning, guided implant surgery, impediate visualization (Methods in health data science are evolving at a very fast pace, with growing dataset sizes and constantly improving results [32]. The results presented in constantly improving results [32]. The results presented in this paper should improve if more training<br>data is obtained from different CT and CBCT machines, or if post-processing steps are added (for<br>example, to fill in so Example of the more of the under-segmentations shown in Figure 3). However, automatic segmentation for DMF CT and CBCT scans is now mature enough for dental practitioners and researchers to use. This is why the pre-trained Example, to fill in some of the under-segmentations shown in Figure 3). However, automatic segmentation for DMF CT and CBCT scans is now mature enough for dental practitioners and researchers to use. This is why the pre-tr example, the mean text of the under-segmentation for DMF CT and CBCT scans is now mature enough for dental practitioners and researchers to use. This is why the pre-trained nnU-Net network and the DentalSegmentator extensi segmentation for DMF CT and MP-Net network and the DentalSegmentator<br>extension for the 3D Slicer software have been publicly shared. It is hoped that this effort will help<br>disseminate the use of 3D models in dentistry and extension for the 3D Slicer software have been publicly shared. It is hoped that this effort will help disseminate the use of 3D models in dentistry and encourage the sharing of open datasets and improved methods. It has t disseminate the use of 3D models in dentistry and encourage the sharing of open datasets and<br>improved methods. It has to be said that while quantitative evaluation is necessary to assess the<br>performance of the models, such improved methods. It has to be said that while quantitative evaluation is necessary to assess the performance of the models, such evaluation is not always clinically relevant A clinical application such as personalized imp

improvements of the models, such evaluation is not always clinically relevant A clinical application<br>such as personalized implant manufacturing will be particularly demanding in terms of segmentation<br>precision. The more de France of the models, and the models, such as personalized implant manufacturing will be particularly demanding in terms of segmentation precision while computer-aided diagnosis or other digital dentistry tasks may not req precision while computer-aided diagnosis or other digital dentistry tasks may not require such<br>precision. The more demanding the clinical situation, the more human oversight of validation and<br>correction must be incorporate precision. The more demanding the clinical situation, the more human oversight of validation and<br>correction must be incorporated into the workflow [33].<br>The results presented in this paper have several limitations. The fir precision must be incorporated into the workflow [33].<br>The results presented in this paper have several limitations. The first one is their<br>retrospective and relatively small-scale nature. A large prospective multi-center The results presented in this paper have s<br>retrospective and relatively small-scale nature. A large<br>fully evaluate the generalizability of the tool. The mo<br>number compared to the 47 CBCT devices marketed by<br>[34]. Moreover, retrospective and relatively small-scale nature. A large prospective multi-center study is needed to fully evaluate the generalizability of the tool. The model was tested on 6 CBCT devices, a small number compared to the 4 retrospective and relations of the tool. The model was tested on 6 CBCT devices, a small number compared to the 47 CBCT devices marketed by 20 companies that were available in 2012<br>[34]. Moreover, it was not possible to re Fully example and generalized of the 47 CBCT devices marketed by 20 companies that were available in 2012<br>[34]. Moreover, it was not possible to retrieve the age of the patients in the dataset, which calls into<br>question th [34]. Moreover, it was not possible to retrieve the age of the patients in the dataset, which calls into question the applicability of the solution for subjects with primary teeth. Secondly, the construction of the referen Expression the applicability of the solution for subjects with primary teeth. Secondly, the construction of the reference test was a major problem due to the lack of a hard "gold standard" like dry skulls. A solid segmenta The reference test was a major problem due to the lack of a hard "gold standard" like dry skulls. A<br>solid segmentation process with industry-certified segmentations (for the internal dataset) and a<br>multi-stage approach inv solid segmentation process with industry-certified segmentations (for the internal dataset) and a multi-stage approach involving experts (for the external dataset) have been provided, but bias remains possible. Finally, ea soluti-stage approach involving experts (for the external dataset) have been provided, but bias<br>remains possible. Finally, each tooth was not segmented and labelled separately as proposed in<br>several other methods [11,13,16

multimestage approach internal dataseting appear (for the external dataseting) internal dataseting appear and the several other methods [11,13,16,17,19], which could be a limitation in some applications.<br>The ethical implic remains the methods [11,13,16,17,19], which could be a limitation in some applications.<br>The ethical implications of developing and using a tool such as DentalSegmentator have not<br>been studied at length in the literature. A The ethical implications of developing and using a tool such as DentalSegmentation<br>been studied at length in the literature. A checklist for the evaluation of artificial<br>applications in dentistry from an ethical perspectiv The ethical interactions of artificial intelligence<br>applications in dentistry from an ethical perspective has recently been proposed [35]. When<br>12 applications in dentistry from an ethical perspective has recently been proposed [35]. When<br>12 applications in dentistry from an ethical perspective has recently been proposed  $\frac{35}{5}$ .

et a sill diffit examples the study presented in the pepter study protection, presented in the periodic and addressed. More research needs to be carried out to address the pillars related to the clinical use of such a tool: wellness, respe the pullar state of the control of the control of a tool: wellness, respect of autonomous decision-making, accountability and responsibility, prudence, and sustainable development.<br>The perspectives of this study will depen such a tool: wellness, respect of autonomous decision-making, accountability and responsibility,<br>prudence, and sustainable development.<br>The perspectives of this study will depend on the adoption of the tool by the dental<br>c Frudence, and sustainable development.<br>
The perspectives of this study will depend on the adoption of the tool by the dental<br>
community. The main targets of this study in the short term are dental researchers and educators The perspectives of this study<br>community. The main targets of this study<br>community. The main targets of this stu<br>because 3D Slicer software is not approve<br>for research use. Clinical use of this tool<br>regulation such as the The perspective of this study in the short term are dental researchers and educators<br>The perspectivate is not approved for clinical use and the application distributed is intended<br>arch use. Clinical use of this tool will r Example 20 Slicer software is not approved for clinical use and the application distributed is intended<br>for research use. Clinical use of this tool will require a few adaptations and further research to meet<br>regulation suc <sup>11</sup><br>
in the research use. Clinical use of this tool will require a few adaptations and further research to meet<br>
regulation such as the Artificial Intelligence Act recently adopted by the European Parliament [36]. In<br>
par For resulation such as the Artificial Intelligence Act recently adopted by the European Parliament [36]. In particular, several developments will be needed to mitigate the risk of automation bias and ensure that clinicials regularity such as the Artificial Intelligence Artificial Intelligence Act results before their clinical use. Thanks to the open source that clinicials review and check the results before their clinical use. Thanks to the particular, several developments with the results before their clinical use. Thanks to the open source<br>nature of the nnU-Net framework, the model could be easily fine-tuned with more CT and CBCT data<br>to meet specific needs This study, based on a highly diverse dataset of more than 700 CT and CBCT scans, demonstrated the results on political users and the results before the results before the results before the results be added to the method to meet specific needs. Detection of specific pathologies like periapical lesions or bone lesions could<br>be added to the method [37,38]. In the medium term, it is likely that other DL methods will exceed<br>the classical 3D Uto meet specific meet specific needs. This meet in this study. For example, foundation models like the recently proposed<br>the classical 3D U-Net used in this study. For example, foundation models like the recently proposed<br> the classical 3D U-Net used in this study. For example, foundation models like the recently proposed<br>MedSAM could allow for universal image segmentation, improving the generalizability of the current<br>methods [39].<br>**5. Conc** 

# 5. Conclusions

The classical 3D U-Net used in the classical 3D U-Net used in the recent methods (39).<br> **S. Conclusions**<br>
This study, based on a highly diverse dataset of more than 700 CT and CBCT scans, demonstrated the<br>
robustness of De Media (39).<br> **S. Conclusions**<br>
This study, based on a highly diverse dataset of more than 700 CT and CBCT scans, demonstrated the<br>
robustness of DentalSegmentator, a free open source tool for automatic segmentation of five 5. Conc<br>This study, bas<br>robustness of<br>anatomical stri<br>References<br>[1]. SEDEN<br>guidelines), Eu<br>[2]. S.D. Kandications (d) ∈ il (siesion) This study, the more tool for automatic segmentation of five key<br>
anatomical structures on DMF CT and CBCT scans.<br>
The stereon and the study of more than 100 CHC scans<br>
(1) SEDENTEXCT project, Cone Beam CT for dental and m

# References

robustical structures on DMF CT and CBCT scans.<br> **References**<br>
[1] SEDENTEXCT project, Cone Beam CT for dental and maxillofacial radiology (evidence based<br>
guidelines), European Commission, 2012.<br>
[2] S.D. Kapila, J.M. Ner References<br>
[1] SEDENTEXCT project, Cone Beam CT for c<br>
guidelines), European Commission, 2012.<br>
[2] S.D. Kapila, J.M. Nervina, CBCT in ortho<br>
indications for its use, Dentomaxill<br>
https://doi.org/10.1259/dmfr.20140282.<br>
[ | | { {| i || i || ∴ || c || i eration Section Cone-beam Commission, 2012.<br>
19 S.D. Kapila, J.M. Nervina, CBCT in orthodontics: assessment of treatment outcomes and<br>
indications for its use, Dentomaxillofacial Radiol. 44 (2015) 20140282.<br>
19 H. Assiri, guidelines), European Commission, CBCT<br>[2] S.D. Kapila, J.M. Nervina, CBCT<br>indications for its use, Der<br>https://doi.org/10.1259/dmfr.20140282.<br>[3] H. Assiri, A.A. Dawasaz, A. Alahn<br>periodontal diseases: a Systematic reviev

[3] H. Assiri, A.A. Dawasaz, A. Alahn<br>periodontal diseases: a Systematic reviev<br>191. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12903-020<br>[4] S. Chogle, M. Zuaitar, R. Sarkis, N<br>Cone-beam Computed Tomography and<br>J. Endod. 46 (2020) 162–168.

Indications for its use, Dentomaxillofacial Radiol. 44 (2015) 20140282.<br>
https://doi.org/10.1259/dmfr.20140282.<br>
[3] H. Assiri, A.A. Dawasaz, A. Alahmari, Z. Asiri, Cone beam computed tomography (CBCT) in<br>
periodontal dise indications for its use of the efficial Radiology (CBCT) in periodontal diseases: a Systematic review based on the efficacy model, BMC Oral Health 20 (2020)<br>periodontal diseases: a Systematic review based on the efficacy m (13) H. A. Althayer, A. Sarkin, A. Sarkin, A. M. Sandoun, A. Mecham, Y. Zhao, The Recommendation of Cone-beam Computed Tomography and Its Effect on Endodontic Diagnosis and Treatment Planning, J. Endod. 46 (2020) 162–168. period onto the S. (10.1186/s12903-020-01106-6.<br>
period on the efficacy of the efficiency of the effect on the efficacy of t 191. S. Chogle, M. Zuaitar, R. Sarkis, M. Saadou<br>
Cone-beam Computed Tomography and Its Effect c<br>
J. Endod. 46 (2020) 162–168. https://doi.org/10.101<br>
[5] A. Alkhayer, J. Piffkó, C. Lippold, E. Segat<br>
13 (Sone-beam Computed Tomography and Its Effect on Endodontic Diagnosis and Treatment Planning,<br>
1. Endod. 46 (2020) 162–168. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joen.2019.10.034.<br>
[5] A. Alkhayer, J. Piffkó, C. Lippold, E. Segatto, A Cone-beam Cone-beam Cone-beam Cone-beam Computed Tomography A. Alkhayer, J. Piffkó, C. Lippold, E. Segatto, Accuracy of virtual planning in orthognathic 15] A. Alkhayer, J. Piffkó, C. Lippold, E. Segatto, Accuracy of virtu

 $[5]$  A. Alkhayer, J. Piffkó, C. Lippold, E. Segatto, Accuracy of virtua<br>13  $\begin{aligned} \text{13} \end{aligned}$ 

ミハーシジー りょうしょう

Surface of a CBCT-deression of third molar automolay and algorithm, J. Clin. Orthod. JCO 55 (2021)<br>
16 C.L. Borohovitz, Z. Abraham, W.R. Redmond, The diagnostic advantage of a CBCT-derived<br>
361–369.<br>
17 L. Hu, R. Rong, W. [6] C<br>
segmente<br>
361–369.<br>
[7] L.<br>
enhanced<br>
Assoc. De<br>
[8] M<br>
replicas of<br>
Traumatc<br>
[9] P<br>
patient-s<br>
[2022) 51<br>
[10] H<br>
Segmenta<br>
https://d<br>
[11] Z<br>
linn 7 Di (16) The Many Many State of the teeth and jaws using an Al algorithm, J. Clin. Orthod. JCO 55 (2021)<br>
161–369.<br>
17] L. Hu, R. Rong, W. Song, H. Wu, S. Jia, Z. He, Y. Sa, Patient-specific 3D printed models for<br>
17] L. Hu, R

361–369.<br>
(7) L. Hu, R. Rong, W. Song, H. Wu, S. Jia, Z. He, Y. Sa, Patient-specific 3D printed models for<br>
enhanced learning of immediate implant procedures and provisionalization, Eur. J. Dent. Educ. Off. J.<br>
Assoc. Dent [7] L.<br>enhanced<br>Assoc. Del<br>(8] M<br>replicas o<br>Traumato<br>(9] P. patient-sp<br>(2022) 511<br>(10] H.<br>Segmenta<br>https://dc<br>(11] Z.<br>Lian, Z. Di<br>from cone<br>29637-2. (a) Elementation of thodontics with peep Learning, J. Dent. Resolution (and the signed model in the signed model in the signed model in the signed model in the signed model of the signed model in the duction of third model Assoc. Dent. Educ. Eur. 27 (2023) 765–772. https://doi.org/10.1111/eje.12928.<br>
[8] M. Lejnieks, I. Akota, G. Jäkobsone, L. Neimane, O. Radzins, S.E. Uribe, Effect of 3D printed<br>
replicas on the duration of third molar auto 18] M. Lejnieks, I. Akota, G. Jäkobsone, L. Neimane, O. Radzins, S.E. Uribe<br>replicas on the duration of third molar autotransplantation surgery: A control<br>Traumatol. n/a (2023). https://doi.org/10.1111/edt.12905.<br>19] P. La replicas on the duration of third molar autotransplantation surgery: A controlled clinical trial, Dent.<br>Traumatol. n/a (2023). https://doi.org/10.1111/edt.12905.<br>[9] P. Lahoud, R. Jacobs, P. Boisse, M. EzEldeen, M. Ducret, Traumatol. n/a (2023). https://doi.org/10.1111/edt.12905.<br>
[9] P. Lahoud, R. Jacobs, P. Boisse, M. EzEldeen, M. Ducret, R. Richert, Precision medicine using<br>
patient-specific modelling: state of the art and perspectives in [9] P. Lahoud, R. Jacobs, P. Boisse, M. EzEldeen, M. Du<br>patient-specific modelling: state of the art and perspective<br>(2022) 5117–5128. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00784-022-04<br>[10] H. Wang, J. Minnema, K.J. Batenburg, T. Foro [9] patient-specific modelling: state of the art and perspectives in dental practice, Clin. Oral Investig. 26<br>
[9022] 5117-5128. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00784-022-04572-0.<br>
[10] H. Wang, J. Minnema, K.J. Batenburg, T. For 222) 5117–5128. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00784-022-04572-0.<br>
2222) 5117–5128. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00784-022-04572-0.<br>
100] H. Wang, J. Minnema, K.J. Batenburg, T. Forouzanfar, F.J. Hu, G. Wu, Multiclass CBCT Image<br>
Se (10) H. Wang, J. Minnema, K.J. Batenburg, T. Forouzanfar, F.J. Segmentation for Orthodontics with Deep Learning, J. Do<br>
https://doi.org/10.1177/00220345211005338.<br>
[11] Z. Cui, Y. Fang, L. Mei, B. Zhang, B. Yu, J. Liu, C. Examentation for Orthodontics with Deep Learning, J. Dent. Res. 100 (2021) 943–949.<br>
https://doi.org/10.1177/00220345211005338.<br>
[11] Z. Cui, Y. Fang, L. Mei, B. Zhang, B. Yu, J. Liu, C. Jiang, Y. Sun, L. Ma, J. Huang, Y. September 2021, 1177/00220345211005338.<br>
(11) Z. Cui, Y. Fang, L. Mei, B. Zhang, B. Yu, J. Liu, C. Jiang, Y. Sun, L. Ma, J. Huang, Y. Liu, Y. Zhao, C.<br>
(11) Z. Cui, Y. Fang, L. Mei, B. Zhang, B. Yu, J. Liu, C. Jiang, Y. Su map 2. Cui, Y. Fang, L. Mei, B. Zhang, B. Yu, J.<br>Lian, Z. Ding, M. Zhu, D. Shen, A fully automatiofrom cone-beam CT images, Nat. Commun. 1<br>19637-2.<br>[12] J. Wallner, M. Schwaiger, K. Hochegg<br>multiplatform evaluations of sem

12. Cui, X. Ding, M. Zhu, D. Shen, A fully automatic Al system for tooth and alveolar bone segmentation<br>
from cone-beam CT images, Nat. Commun. 13 (2022) 2096. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-<br>
29637-2.<br>
29203-2-2.<br>
112 1973. The mean CT images, Nat. Commun. 13 (2022) 2096. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-<br>29637-2.<br>112] J. Wallner, M. Schwaiger, K. Hochegger, C. Gsaxner, W. Zemann, J. Egger, A review on<br>maxillofacial surgery, Comput. M

29637-2.<br>
121 J. Wallner, M. Schwaiger, K. Hochegger, C. Gsaxner, W. Zemann, J. Egger, A review on<br>
maxillofacial surgery, Comput. Methods Programs Biomed. 182 (2019) 105102.<br>
131 E. Shaheen, A. Leite, K.A. Alqahtani, A. S [12] J.<br>
multiplatt<br>
maxillofa<br>
maxillofa<br>
https://d<br>
[13] E.<br>
novel decomputed<br>
computed<br>
computed<br>
framewol<br>
[15] M.A. Turk<br>
Massaro,<br>
Fillion-Ro<br>
segmenta (multiplatform evaluations of semi-automatic open-source based image segmentation for cranio-<br>maxillofacial surgery, Comput. Methods Programs Biomed. 182 (2019) 105102.<br>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmpb.2019.105102.<br>[13] E. S maxillofacial Surgery, Computer assisted orthographic method in the Biometh Computer (1922)<br>
1931 E. Shaheen, A. Leite, K.A. Alqahtani, A. Smolders, A. Van Gerven, H. Willems, R. Jacobs, A<br>
novel deep learning system for m [13]  $\cdot$  E. Shaheen, A. Leite, K.A. Alqahtani, *novel deep learning system for multi-class t* computed tomography. A validation https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdent.2021.103865.<br>[14] G. Dot, T. Schouman, G. Dubois, P. craniom movel deep learning system for multi-class tooth segmentation and classification on cone beam<br>computed tomography. A validation study, J. Dent. 115 (2021) 103865.<br>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdent.2021.103865.<br>[14] G. Dot, T nomputed tomography. A validation study, J. Dent. 115 (2021) 103865.<br>
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdent.2021.103865.<br>
[14] G. Dot, T. Schouman, G. Dubois, P. Rouch, L. Gajny, Fully automatic egementation of<br>
cranning suing t computed tomography. But and Solidary and Solidation study, and the particle is the muth of craniomaxillofacial CT scans for computer-assisted orthographic surgery planning using the nnU-Net<br>
ranework, Eur. Radiol. 32 (202 [14] G. Dot, T. Schouman, G. Dubois, P<br>craniomaxillofacial CT scans for computer-ass<br>framework, Eur. Radiol. 32 (2022) 3639–3648.<br>[15] M. Gillot, B. Baquero, C. Le, R. Delea<br>N.A. Turkestani, K. Najarian, R. Soroushmehr, S. Examiomaxillofacial CT scans for computer-assisted orthogonathic surgery planning using the nnU-Net<br>framework, Eur. Radiol. 32 (2022) 3639–3648. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00330-021-08455-y.<br>The Gill G. B. Baquero, C. Le, R. Framework, Eur. Radiol. 32 (2022) 3639–3648. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00330-021-08455-y.<br>
[15] M. Gillot, B. Baquero, C. Le, R. Deleat-Besson, J. Bianchi, A. Ruellas, M. Gurgel, M. Yatabe,<br>
N.A. Turkestani, K. Najarian, R. Framework, Eur. Radiol. 19 (2021) 1539–3648. Https://doi.org/10.10031/s41598-021-94093-9.<br>
IMA. Turkestani, K. Najarian, R. Soroushmehr, S. Pieper, R. Kikinis, B. Paniagua, J. Gryak, M. Io.<br>
Ma. Turkestani, K. Najarian, R. N. Gillon, R. M. Gillon, M. Gillon, B. Biannian, J. Gryak, M. Ioshida, C.<br>
M.A. Turkestani, K. Najarian, R. Soroushmehr, S. Pieper, R. Kikinis, B. Paniagua, J. Gryak, M. Ioshida, C.<br>
Fillion-Robin, H. Joshi, L. Cevidanes, Massaro, L. Gomes, H. Oh, K. Evangelista, C.M.C. Junior, D. Garib, F. Costa, E. Benavides, F. Soki, J.-C.<br>Fillion-Robin, H. Joshi, L. Cevidanes, J.C. Prieto, Automatic multi-anatomical skull structure<br>segmentation of cone-

[16] K. Ayidh Alqahtani, R. Jacobs, A. Smolders, A. Van Gerven, H. Willems, S. Shujaat, E. Shaheen,<br>Deep convolutional neural network-based automated segmentation and classification of teeth with Fillion-Robin, H. Joshi, L. Cevidanes, J.C. Prieto, Automatic multi-anatomical skull structure<br>segmentation of cone-beam computed tomography scans using 3D UNETR, PLOS ONE 17 (2022)<br>e0275033. https://doi.org/10.1371/journa Segmentation of cone-beam computed tomography scans using 3D UNETR, PLOS ONE 17 (2022)<br>e0275033. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0275033.<br>[16] K. Ayidh Alqahtani, R. Jacobs, A. Smolders, A. Van Gerven, H. Willems, S. sed 1931 Kths://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0275033.<br>
116] K. Ayidh Alqahtani, R. Jacobs, A. Smolders, A. Van Gerven, H. Willems, S. Shujaat, E. Shaheen,<br>
Deep convolutional neural network-based automated segmentation and [16] K. Ayidh Alqahtani, R. Jacobs, A. Smolders, A. Van G<br>Deep convolutional neural network-based automated segr<br>orthodontic brackets on cone-beam computed-tomograj<br>Orthod. 45 (2023) 169–174. https://doi.org/10.1093/ejo/cj [16] Constantial Almahtani, Almahtani, Almahtani, A. Morenton, A. Ayidi, A. Ayidi, A. Solidi, A. S. Aksoly, E. (17) M. Edit

orthodontic brackets on cone-beam computed-tomographic images: a validation study, Eur. J.<br>Orthod. 45 (2023) 169–174. https://doi.org/10.1093/ejo/cjac047.<br>[17] M. Ezhov, M. Gusarev, M. Golitsyna, J.M. Yates, E. Kushnerev, Orthod. 45 (2023) 169–174. https://doi.org/10.1093/ejo/cjac047.<br>
[17] M. Ezhov, M. Gusarev, M. Golitsyna, J.M. Yates, E. Kushnerev, D. Tamimi, S. Aksov, E.<br>
Shumilov, A. Sanders, K. Orhan, Clinically applicable artificial [17] M. Ezhov, M. Gusarev, M. Golitsyna, J.M. Yates, E. Ku<br>Shumilov, A. Sanders, K. Orhan, Clinically applicable artificial intel<br>with CBCT, Sci. Rep. 11 (2021) 15006. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41<br>[18] R.R. Ilesan, M. Beyer [19] F. Naglers, R. Orhan, Clinically applicable artificial intelligence system for dental diagnosis<br>
Shumilov, A. Sanders, K. Orhan, Clinically applicable artificial intelligence system for dental diagnosis<br>
18] R.R. Iles With CBCT, Sci. Rep. 11 (2021) 15006. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-94093-9.<br>
[18] R.R. Ilesan, M. Beyer, C. Kunz, F.M. Thieringer, Comparison of Artificial Intelligence-Based<br>
Applications for Mandible Segmentation: Table 180, M. Heyar, C. Kunz, F.M. Thieringer, Comparison of Artificial Ir Applications for Mandible Segmentation: From Established Platforms to In-Software, Bioengineering 10 (2023) 604. https://doi.org/10.3390/bioenginee

Applications for Mandible Segmentation: From Established Platforms to In-House-Developed<br>
Software, Bioengineering 10 (2023) 604. https://doi.org/10.3390/bioengineering 10050604.<br>
[19] F. Nogueira-Reis, N. Morgan, I.R. Sur Software, Bioengineering 10 (2023) 604. https://doi.org/10.3390/bioengineering10050604.<br>
[19] F. Nogueira-Reis, N. Morgan, I.R. Suryani, C.P.M. Tabchoury, R. Jacobs, Full virtual patient<br>
generated by artificial intelligen F. Nogueira-Reis, N. Morgan, I.R. Suryani, C.P.M. Tabchoury, R. Jacobs, Full virtual<br>generated by artificial intelligence-driven integrated segmentation of craniomaxillofacial s<br>from CBCT images, J. Dent. 141 (2024) 104829 expredience diversion integrated segmentation of craniomaxillofacial structures<br>from CBCT images, J. Dent. 141 (2024) 104829. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdent.2023.104829.<br>[20] A. Polizzi, V. Quinzi, V. Ronsivalle, P. Venez generation CBCT images, J. Dent. 141 (2024) 104829. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdent.2023.104829.<br>[20] A. Polizzi, V. Quinzi, V. Ronsivalle, P. Venezia, S. Santonocito, A. Lo Giudice, R. Leonardi, G.<br>14

from CBCT images,  $\mu$  Dent. 141 (2024) 104829. https://goi.org/2020-1029. j.j. particles in the control of the cont [20] A. Polizzi, V. Quinzi, V. Ronsivalle, P. Venezia, S. Santonocito, A. Lo Giudice, R. Leonardi, G.

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) . **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. medRxiv preprint doi: [https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.18.24304458;](https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.18.24304458) this version posted June 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint

ーノー・コード こしょう (2023) 3363–3378. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00784-023-05048-5.<br>
[21] F. Schwendicke, T. Singh, J.-H. Lee, R. Gaudin, A. Chaurasia, T. Wiegand, S. Uribe, J. Krois, Artificial intellignece in dental research: Checklist for au (21) F. Schwendicke, T. Singh, J.-H. Lee, R. Gaudin, A. Chaura<br>
Artificial intelligence in dental research: Checklist for authors, revi<br>
103610. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdent.2021.103610.<br>
[22] M. Antonelli, A. Reinke, S 21 Interligence in dental research: Checklist for authors, reviewers, readers, J. Dent. 107 (2021)<br>
103610. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdent.2021.103610.<br>
[22] M. Antonelli, A. Reinke, S. Bakas, K. Farahani, A. Kopp-Schneid 103610. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdent.2021.103610.<br>
[22] M. Antonelli, A. Reinke, S. Bakas, K. Farahani, A. Kopp-Schneider, B.A. Landman, G. Litjens, B.<br>
Menze, O. Ronneberger, R.M. Summers, B. van Ginneken, M. Biello, P [22] M. Antonelli, A. Reinke, S. Bakas, K. Farahani, *A*<br>Menze, O. Ronneberger, R.M. Summers, B. van Ginne<br>M.J. Gollub, S.H. Heckers, H. Huisman, W.R. Jarnagir<br>Rhode, C. Tobon-Gomez, E. Vorontsov, J.A. Meakin, S.<br>S. Chen, Menze, O. Ronneberger, R.M. Summers, B. van Ginneken, M. Bilello, P. Bilic, P.F. Christ, R.K.G. Do,<br>M.J. Gollub, S.H. Heckers, H. Huisman, W.R. Jarnagin, M.K. McHugo, S. Napel, J.S.G. Pernicka, K.<br>Rhode, C. Tobon-Gomez, E. M.J. Gollub, S.H. Heckers, H. Huisman, W.R. Jarnagin, M.K. McHugo, S. Napel, J.S.G. Pernicka, K.<br>Rhode, C. Tobon-Gomez, E. Vorontsov, J.A. Meakin, S. Ourselin, M. Wiesenfarth, P. Arbeláez, B. Bae,<br>S. Chen, L. Daza, J. Feng R. S. R. R. H. A. Miesenfarth, P. Arbeláez, B. Bae, S. Chen, L. Daza, J. Feng, B. He, F. Ismsee, Y. Ji, F. Jia, I. Kim, K. Maier-Hein, D. Mer S. Chen, L. Daza, J. Feng, B. He, F. Isensee, V. Ji, F. Jia, J. Kim, K. Maier-Hein, D. Merhof, A. Pal, B. Park,<br>M. Perslev, R. Rezaiifar, O. Rippel, I. Sarasua, W. Shen, J. Son, C. Wachinger, L. Wang, Y. Wang, Y. Xia,<br>D. X

M. Perslev, R. Rezairfar, O. Rippel, I. Sarasua, W. Shen, J. Son, C. Wachinger, L. Wang, Y. Wang, Y. Xia,<br>D. Xu, Z. Xu, Y. Zheng, A.L. Simpson, L. Maier-Hein, M.J. Cardoso, The Medical Segmentation<br>Decathlon, Nat. Commun. D. Xu, Z. Xu, Y. Zheng, A.L. Simpson, L. Maier-Hein, M.J. Cardoso, The Medical Segmentation<br>Decathlon, Nat. Commun. 13 (2022) 4128. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-30695-9.<br>[23] F. Isensee, P.F. Jaeger, S.A.A. Kohl, J. Decathlon, Nat. Commun. 13 (2022) 4128. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-30695-9.<br>
[23] F. Isensee, P.F. Jaeger, S.A.A. Kohl, J. Petersen, K.H. Maier-Hein, nnU-Net: a self-configuring<br>
method for deep learning-based biom 123] F. Isensee, P.F. Jaeger, S.A.A. Kohl, J. Petersen, K.H. Maier-Hein, nnU-Net: a self<br>method for deep learning-based biomedical image segmentation, Nat. Methods 18 (202<br>https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-020-01008-2.<br>[24] J (method for deep learning-based biomedical image segmentation, Nat. Methods 18 (2021) 203–211.<br>
https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-020-01008-z.<br>
[24] J. Wasserthal, H.-C. Breit, M.T. Meyer, M. Pradella, D. Hinck, A.W. Sauter, method for Contention of 10.11038/s41592-020-01008-2.<br>
[24] J. Wasserthal, H.-C. Breit, M.T. Meyer, M. Pradella, D. Hinck, A.W. Sauter, T. Heye, D.T. Boll, J.<br>
Cyriac, S. Yang, M. Bach, M. Segeroth, TotalSegmentator: Robus

124] J. Wasserthal, H.-C. Breit, M.T. Meyer,<br>Cyriac, S. Yang, M. Bach, M. Segeroth, Total<br>Structures in CT Images, Radiol. Artif. Intell. 5 (<br>125] A. Fedorov, R. Beichel, J. Kalpathy-Cra<br>Jennings, F. Fennessy, M. Sonka, J. (Cyriac, S. Yang, M. Bach, M. Segeroth, TotalSegmentator: Robust Segmentation of 104 Anatomic<br>
Structures in CT Images, Radiol. Artif. Intell. 5 (2023) e230024. https://doi.org/10.1148/ryai.230024.<br>
(25] A. Fedorov, R. Bei Structures in CT Images, Radiol. Artif. Intell. 5 (2023) e230024. https://doi.org/10.1148/ryai.230024.<br>
(25) A. Fedorov, R. Beichel, J. Kalpathy-Cramer, J. Finet, J.-C. Fillion-Robin, S. Pujol, C. Bauer, D.<br>
Jennings, F. F (25) A. Fedorov, R. Beichel, J. Kalpathy-Cramer, J. Finet, J.-C. Fillion-Robin, S. Pujol, C. Bauer, Dennings, F. Fennessy, M. Sonka, J. Buatti, S. Aylward, J.V. Miller, S. Pieper, R. Kikinis, 3D Slicer as at any angle comp (28) L. Maier-Hein, A. Eisten, R. Beichel, M. Beithel, S. Pieper, R. Kikinis, 3D Slicer as an image computing platform for the Quantitative Imaging Network, Magn. Reson. Imaging 30 (2012)<br>
1323–1341. https://doi.org/10.101 image computing platform for the Quantitative Imaging Network, Magn. Reson. Imaging 30 (2012)<br>
1323–1341. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mri.2012.05.001.<br>
[26] G. Dot, T. Schouman, G. Dubois, P. Rouch, L. Gajny, Pretrained mode 1323–1341. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mri.2012.05.001.<br>
[26] G. Dot, T. Schouman, G. Dubois, P. Rouch, L. Gajny, Pretrained model for segmentation of<br>
craniomaxillofacial CT scans with nnU-Net, (2023). https://doi.org/10.52 [26] G. Dot, T. Schouman, G. Dubois, P. Rouch, L. Containmaxillofacial CT scans with nnU-Net, (2023). https:<br>[27] P. Coupé, J.V. Manjón, V. Fonov, J. Pruess<br>segmentation using expert priors: Application to I<br>Neurolmage 54 (crain) C. Dot) (1991) 1940–954, Hanny C. P. Dots, T. School, T. Schouman, C. Dollins, Patch-based segmentation using expert priors: Application to hippocampus and ventricle segmentation, Neurolmage 2010, 90, D. P. Collins [27] P. Coupé, J.V. Manjón, V. Fonov, J. Pruessner, M. Robles, D.L. Collins, Pate<br>segmentation using expert priors: Application to hippocampus and ventricle segme<br>Neurolmage 54 (2011) 940–954. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neu exprentation using expert priors: Application to hippocampus and ventricle segmentation,<br>Neurolmage 54 (2011) 940–954. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.09.018.<br>[28] L. Maier-Hein, A. Reinke, P. Godau, M.D. Tizabi, Segmentation 1940–954. Https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.09.018.<br>
[28] L. Maier-Hein, A. Reinke, P. Godau, M.D. Tizabi, F. Buettner, E. Christodoulou, B. Glocker, F. Isensee, J. Kleesiek, M. Kozubek, M. Reyes, M.A. 28 (B. Marier-Hein, A. Reinke, P. Godau, M.D. Tizabi, F. Buettner, E. Christodoulo<br>
Isensee, J. Kleesiek, M. Kozubek, M. Reyes, M.A. Riegler, M. Wiesenfarth, A.E. Kavur<br>
Baumgartner, M. Eisenmann, D. Heckmann-Nötzel, A.T. Consider Revision Maistan, D. Maistan, A. Reigler, M. Wiesenfarth, A.E. Kavur, C.H. Sudre, M. Baumgartner, M. Eisenmann, D. Heckmann-Nötzel, A.T. Rädsch, L. Acion, M. Antonelli, T. Arbel, S. Bakas, A. Benis, M. Biaschko, M Baumgartner, M. Eisenmann, D. Heckmann-Nötzel, A.T. Rädsch, L. Acion, M. Antonelli, T. Arbel, S.<br>Bakas, A. Benis, M. Blaschko, M.J. Cardoso, V. Cheplygina, B.A. Cimini, G.S. Collins, K. Farahani, L.<br>Ferrer, A. Galdran, B. Bakas, A. Benis, M. Blaschko, M.J. Cardoso, V. Cheplygina, B.A. Cimini, G.S. Collins, K. Farahani, L.<br>Ferrer, A. Galdran, B. van Ginneken, R. Haase, D.A. Harahimoto, M.M. Hoffman, M. Huisman, P.<br>Jannin, C.E. Kahn, D. Kaimm Ferrer, A. Galdran, B. van Ginneken, R. Haase, D.A. Hashimoto, M.M. Hoffman, M. Huisman, P.<br>Jannin, C.E. Kahn, D. Kainmueller, B. Kainz, A. Karargyris, A. Karthikesalingam, H. Kenngott, F. Kofler, A.<br>Martel, P. Mattson, E. Jannin, C.E. Kahn, D. Kainmueller, B. Kainz, A. Karargyris, A. Karthikesalingam, H. Kenngott, F. Kofler, A. Korea<br>- A. Kopp-Schneider, A. Kreshuk, T. Kurc, B.A. Landman, G. Litjens, A. Madani, K. Maier-Hein, A.L.<br>Martel, P A. Kopp-Schneider, A. Kreshuk, T. Kurc, B.A. Landman, G. Litjens, A. Madani, K. Maier-Hein, A.L.<br>Martel, P. Mattson, E. Meijering, B. Menze, K.G.M. Moons, H. Müller, B. Nichyporuk, F. Nickel, J.<br>Petersen, N. Rajpoot, N. Ri

Martel, P. Mattson, E. Meijering, B. Menze, K.G.M. Moons, H. Müller, B. Nichyporuk, F. Nickel, J.<br>Petersen, N. Rajpoot, N. Rieke, J. Saez-Rodriguez, C.I. Sánchez, S. Shetty, M. van Smeden, R.M.<br>Summers, A.A. Taha, A. Tulpi Petersen, N. Rajpoot, N. Rieke, J. Saez-Rodriguez, C.I. Sánchez, S. Shetty, M. van Smeden, R.M.<br>Summers, A.A. Taha, A. Tiulpin, S.A. Tsaftaris, B. Van Calster, G. Varoquaux, P.F. Jäger, Metrics<br>reloaded: C. Mecommendations Summers, A.A. Taha, A. Tiulpin, S.A. Tsaftaris, B. Van Calster, G. Varoquaux, P.F. Jäger, Metrics<br>
reloaded: Recommendations for image analysis validation, (2023).<br>
https://dol.org/10.48550/arXiv.2206.01653.<br>
[29] S. Nikol reloaded: Recommendations for image analysis validation, (2023).<br>
https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2206.01653.<br>
[29] S. Nikolov, S. Blackwell, A. Zerovich, R. Mendes, M. Livne, J. De Fauw, Y. Patel, C. Meyer, H.<br>
Askham, B. relations://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2206.01653.<br>
(29) S. Nikolov, S. Blackwell, A. Zverovitch, R. Mendes, M. Livne, J. D. Carnel, C. Boon, D. Power, H. Askham, B. Romera-Paredes, C. Kelly, A. Karthikesalingam, C. Chau, D. C [29] S. Nikolov, S. Blackwell, A. Zverovitch<br>Askham, B. Romera-Paredes, C. Kelly, A. Ka<br>S.A. Moinuddin, B. Garie, Y. McQuinlan, S. Ire<br>Suleyman, T. Back, C.O. Hughes, J.R. Ledsam<br>Head and Neck Anatomy for Radiotherapy:<br>Stu Notion, S. Romera-Paredes, C. Kelly, A. Karthikesalingam, C. Chu, D. Carnell, C. Boon, D. D'Souza,<br>S.A. Moinuddin, B. Garie, Y. McQuinlan, S. Ireland, K. Hampton, K. Fuller, H. Montgomery, G. Rees, M.<br>Suleyman, T. Back, C. S.A. Moinuddin, B. Garie, Y. McQuinlan, S. Ireland, K. Hampton, K. Fuller, H. Montgomery, G. Rees, M. Suleyman, T. Back, C.O. Hughes, J.R. Ledsam, O. Ronneberger, Clinically Applicable Segmentation of Head and Neck Anatomy Suleyman, T. Back, C.O. Hughes, J.R. Ledsam, O. Ronneberger, Clinically Applicable Segmentation of<br>
Head and Neck Anatomy for Radiotherapy: Deep Learning Algorithm Development and Validation<br>
Study, J. Med. Internet Res. 2

Head and Neck Anatomy for Radiotherapy: Deep Learning Algorithm Development and Validation<br>Study, J. Med. Internet Res. 23 (2021) e26151. https://doi.org/10.2196/26151.<br>[30] G. Dot, DentalSegmentator nnU-Net pretrained mod Study, J. Med. Internet Res. 23 (2021) e26151. https://doi.org/10.2196/26151.<br>
[30] G. Dot, DentalSegmentator nnU-Net pretrained model for CBCT image segmentation, (2024).<br>
https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.10829675.<br>
[31] F. Study, G. Dot, DentalSegmentator nnU-Net pretrained model for CBCT image<br>
Study, J. Med. C. Mad, C. Ulrich, M. Baumgartner, S. Roy, K. Maier-Hein<br>
Revisited: A Call for Rigorous Validation in 3D Medical Image Studys://doi. (130) F. Isensee, T. Wald, C. Ulrich, M. Baumgartner, S. Roy, K. Maier-Hein, P.F. Jaeger, nnU-Net Revisited: A Call for Rigorous Validation in 3D Medical Image Segmentation, (2024).<br>
Intersection org/10.48550/arxiv.2404.09 F. States, T. Wald, C. Ulrich, M. Bar<br>Revisited: A Call for Rigorous Validation<br>https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2404.09556.<br>[32] F. Schwendicke, M.L. Marazita, N.S. Ja Numisted: A Call for Rigorous Validation in 3D Medical Image Segmentation, (2024).<br>https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2404.09556.<br>[32] F. Schwendicke, M.L. Marazita, N.S. Jakubovics, J. Krois, Big Data and Complex Data Analyti Revisity A Call F. Schwendicke, M.L. Marazita, N.S. Jakubovics, J. Krois, Big Data and Complex Data Analytics:<br>
(32) F. Schwendicke, M.L. Marazita, N.S. Jakubovics, J. Krois, Big Data and Complex Data Analytics:<br>
15

 $[32]$  F. Schwendicke, M.L. Marazita, N.S. J [32] F. Schwendicke, M.L. Marazita, N.S. Jakubovics, J. Krois, Big Data and Complex Data Analytics:

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) . **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. medRxiv preprint doi: [https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.18.24304458;](https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.18.24304458) this version posted June 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint

 1912)<br>
Inttps://doi.org/10.1177/00220345211070983.<br>
[33] F. Schwendicke, W. Samek, J. Krois, Artificial Intelligence in Dentsity: Chances and<br>
Challenges, J. Dent. Res. 99 (2020) 769–774. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022034520 [33] F. Schwendicke, W. Samek, J. Krois<br>Challenges, J. Dent. Res. 99 (2020) 769–774. htt<br>[34] A. Nemtoi, C. Czink, D. Haba, A. Gahle<br>Dentomaxillofacial Radiol. 42 (2013) 20120443.<br>[35] R. Rokhshad, M. Ducret, A. Chaurasia (conditions). Dent. Res. 99 (2020) 769–774. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022034520915714.<br>
[34] A. Nemtoi, C. Czink, D. Haba, A. Gahleitner, Cone beam CT: a current overview of devices,<br>
Dentomaxillofacial Radiol. 42 (2013) 20 [34] A. Nemtoi, C. Czink, D. Haba, A. Gahleitner, Cone beam CT: a current overview<br>Dentomaxillofacial Radiol. 42 (2013) 20120443. https://doi.org/10.1259/dmfr.20120443.<br>[35] R. Rokhshad, M. Ducret, A. Chaurasia, T. Karteva (absolution and Radiol. 42 (2013) 20120443. https://doi.org/10.1259/dmfr.20120443.<br>
[35] R. Rokhshad, M. Ducret, A. Chaurasia, T. Karteva, M. Radenkovic, J. Roganovic, M. Hamdan,<br>
H. Mohammad-Rahimi, J. Krois, P. Lahoud, F 135] R. Rokhshad, M. Ducret, A. Chaurasia, T. Karteva, M. Radenkovic, J. Roganovic, I.<br>
H. Mohammad-Rahimi, J. Krois, P. Lahoud, F. Schwendicke, Ethical considerations<br>
intelligence in dentistry: A framework and checklist,

H. Mohammad-Rahimi, J. Krois, P. Lahoud, F. Schwendicke, Ethical considerations on artificial<br>intelligence in dentistry: A framework and checklist, J. Dent. 135 (2023) 104593.<br>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdent.2023.104593.<br>[ intelligence in dentistry: A framework and checklist, J. Dent. 135 (2023) 104593.<br>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdent.2023.104593.<br>[36] Texts adopted - Artificial Intelligence Act - Wednesday, 13 March 2024, (n.d.).<br>https://ww intelligence in dentical intelligence Act - Wednesday, 13 March 2024, (n.d.).<br>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdent.2023.104593.<br>2024).<br>2024).<br>2024). T. Yeshua, S. Ladyzhensky, A. Abu-Nasser, R. Abdalla-Aslan, T. Boharon, A. Itz matrical Intellige<br>
136] Texts adopted - Artificial Intellige<br>
https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/docu<br>
2024).<br>
137] T. Yeshua, S. Ladyzhensky, A. Abu-N<br>
Alexander, A. Chaurasia, A. Cohen, J. Sosna, I.<br>
segmentation of m 1931 The S://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-9-2024-0138\_EN.html (accessed May 21, 2024).<br>
2024).<br>
2024).<br>
137] T. Yeshua, S. Ladyzhensky, A. Abu-Nasser, R. Abdalla-Aslan, T. Boharon, A. Itzhak-Pur, A.<br>
Alexander, 2024).<br>
2024).<br>
2024).<br>
17. Yeshua, S. Ladyzhensky, A. Abu-Nasser, R. Abdalla-Aslan, T. Boharon, A. Itzhak-Pur, A.<br>
Alexander, A. Chaurasia, A. Cohen, J. Sosna, I. Leichter, C. Nadler, Deep learning for detection and 3D<br>
s 2024). .<br>Alexander, A. Chaurasia, A. Cohen, J. Sosna, I. Leichter, C. Nadler, Deep learning for detection and 3D<br>segmentation of maxillofacial bone lesions in cone beam CT, Eur. Radiol. 33 (2023) 7507–7518.<br>https://doi.org/10.100

segmentation of maxillofacial bone lesions in cone beam CT, Eur. Radiol. 33 (2023) 7507–7518.<br>https://doi.org/10.1007/s00330-023-09726-6.<br>[38] W.T. Fu, Q.K. Zhu, N. Li, Y.Q. Wang, S.L. Deng, H.P. Chen, J. Shen, L.Y. Meng, segment of maxillofacial bone lesions in Cone beam CH, and the signed of maximum of the signal political bone lesions in Changelial bone lesions in cone beam CH, Shen, L.Y. Meng, Z. Bian, Clinically<br>Oriented CBCT Periapica [38] W.T. Fu, Q.K. Zhu, N. Li, Y.Q. Wang, S.L<br>Oriented CBCT Periapical Lesion Evaluation vi<br>https://doi.org/10.1177/00220345231201793.<br>[39] J. Ma, Y. He, F. Li, L. Han, C. You, I<br>Commun. 15 (2024) 654. https://doi.org/10. Continued CBCT Periapical Lesion Evaluation via 3D CNN Algorithm, J. Dent. Res. 103 (2024) 5–12.<br>https://doi.org/10.1177/00220345231201793.<br>[39] J. Ma, Y. He, F. Li, L. Han, C. You, B. Wang, Segment anything in medical ima

https://doi.org/10.1177/00220345231201793.<br>
[39] J. Ma, Y. He, F. Li, L. Han, C. You, B. Wang, Segment anything in medical images, Nat.<br>
Commun. 15 (2024) 654. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-44824-z.<br>
Commun. 15 (2024) [39] J. Ma, Y. He, F. Li, L. Han, C. You, B<br>Commun. 15 (2024) 654. https://doi.org/10.103<br> $\frac{32}{3}$  $\sim$  Commun. 15 (2024) 654. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-44824-z. Commun. 15 (2024) 654. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-44824-z.