

1 MAUDGAN: Motion Artifact Unsupervised Disentanglement 2 Generative Adversarial Network of Multicenter MRI Data with 3 Different Brain tumors

4 **Mojtaba Safari, MSc^{a,b,*}, Ali Fatemi, PhD^{c,d}, Louis Archambault, PhD^{a,b}**

5 ^aDépartement de physique, de génie physique et d'optique, et Centre de recherche sur le cancer, Université Laval,
6 Québec, Québec, Canada

7 ^bService de physique médicale et radioprotection, Centre Intégré de Cancérologie, CHU de Québec – Université
8 Laval et Centre de recherche du CHU de Québec, Québec, Québec, Canada

9 ^cDepartment of Physics, Jackson State University, Mississippi, USA

10 ^dMerit Health Central, Department of Radiation Oncology, Gamma Knife Center, Mississippi, USA

11 **Abstract. Purpose:** This study proposed a novel retrospective motion reduction method named motion artifact
12 unsupervised disentanglement generative adversarial network (MAUDGAN) that reduces the motion artifacts from
13 brain images with tumors and metastases. The MAUDGAN was trained using a multimodal multicenter 3D T1-
14 Gd and T2-fluid attenuated inversion recovery MRI images. **Approach:** The motion artifact with different artifact
15 levels were simulated in k -space for the 3D T1-Gd MRI images. The MAUDGAN consisted of two generators,
16 two discriminators and two feature extractor networks constructed using the residual blocks. The generators map
17 the images from content space to artifact space and vice-versa. On the other hand, the discriminators attempted to
18 discriminate the content codes to learn the motion-free and motion-corrupted content spaces. **Results:** We compared
19 the MAUDGAN with the CycleGAN and Pix2pix-GAN. Qualitatively, the MAUDGAN could remove the motion
20 with the highest level of soft-tissue contrasts without adding spatial and frequency distortions. Quantitatively, we
21 reported six metrics including normalized mean squared error (NMSE), structural similarity index (SSIM), multi-
22 scale structural similarity index (MS-SSIM), peak signal-to-noise ratio (PSNR), visual information fidelity (VIF), and
23 multi-scale gradient magnitude similarity deviation (MS-GMSD). The MAUDGAN got the lowest NMSE and MS-
24 GMSD. On average, the proposed MAUDGAN reconstructed motion-free images with the highest SSIM, PSNR, and
25 VIF values and comparable MS-SSIM values. **Conclusions:** The MAUDGAN can disentangle motion artifacts from
26 the 3D T1-Gd dataset under a multimodal framework. The motion reduction will improve automatic and manual
27 post-processing algorithms including auto-segmentations, registrations, and contouring for guided therapies such as
28 radiotherapy and surgery.

29 **Keywords:** MRI artifact reduction, motion artifact simulation, deep learning, multi-modal MRI, k -space.

30 *Mojtaba Safari, mojtaba.safari.1@ulaval.ca

31 1 Introduction

32 Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) with different sequences provides excellent soft tissue contrast
33 for diagnosis and treatment planning. However, high MRI acquisition time limits the quality of
34 high-resolution images¹ because of the increased probability of patient motion. Involuntary and
35 voluntary subject motions during data acquisition cause image blurring and ghosting along the

36 phase-encoding direction. The prevalence of motion artifacts is high for infants and patients with
37 acute distress.²

38 To tackle motion artifacts, retrospective motion correction (RMC) and prospective motion cor-
39 rection (PMC) methods were developed. PMC approaches modify the gradient magnetic fields
40 using the imaged object positions that are tracked during imaging to maintain a constant relation-
41 ship between imaged object and imaged volume.^{3,4} PMC can maintain a uniform k -space sampling
42 density, which avoids Nyquist violation, and compensate for spin-history effects.⁵ However, PMC
43 methods require additional hardware and complicated pulse sequences that increase the imaging
44 time. On the other hand, RMC methods are post-processing approaches, and do not require ad-
45 ditional hardware and pulse sequence modifications during imaging. Traditional RMC methods,
46 such as auto-focusing, attempt to optimize image quality metrics like entropy and gradient,⁶ iter-
47 ative methods to estimate motion trajectory,⁷ compressed-sensing theory,⁸ and modified imaging
48 sequences.⁹ They are either limited to 2D imaging methods or require raw k -space data that are
49 not widely available. In addition, these methods are computationally expensive.

50 Recently, deep learning techniques, in particular, convolutional neural networks (CNNs) have
51 been used to quantify^{10,11} and reduce^{12,13} MRI motion artifact retrospectively. These models learn
52 the task through a supervised framework using the simulating motion artifacts. Unpaired deep
53 learning models attempted to use data without the motion artifact as a ground truth to reduce the
54 artifacts from MRI with the same imaging sequence.¹⁴

55 This study aimed to address the problem in a more practical setting where one motion-free MRI
56 modality removes artifacts from the motion-corrupted images acquired with different MRI imag-
57 ing sequences. This study reformulated MRI motion artifacts as an unsupervised disentanglement
58 problem. Thus, we introduced a novel motion artifact unsupervised disentanglement generative




Fig 1: Content and artifact components of 3D T1-Gd MRI (x_a) in the motion-corrupted space \mathcal{T}_a and T2-FLAIR in artifact-free space \mathcal{T} are mapped to the content space \mathcal{C} and artifact space \mathcal{A} , respectively. MAUDGAN maps the data in \mathcal{T}_a space to \mathcal{T} space ($x_a \rightarrow \hat{x}$) shown by blue arrows. Conversely, MADuGAN learns to map from \mathcal{T} space to \mathcal{T}_a space ($y \rightarrow \hat{y}_a$) shown by green arrows.

59 adversarial network (MAUDGAN). The novel MAUDGAN was applied to reduce the motion of
 60 3D T1-Gd MRI sequences using motion-free T2-fluid attenuated inversion recovery (FLAIR) se-
 61 quences for the patients with different brain cancers metastasis. This study used a multicenter
 62 dataset to improve the MUADGAN’s generalization.

63 This study leverages an inductive bias¹⁵ that the MAUDGAN learn to disentangle motion ar-
 64 tifacts from motion-free contents by comparing 3D T1-Gd MRI sequences (typically with motion
 65 artifacts) with motion-free T2-FLAIR (Figure 1) in the latent space.

66 The MAUDGAN consists of U-net¹⁶ generators to perform different forms of image transla-
 67 tions including motion artifact reduction and synthesis. Discriminators were used to distinguish
 68 between the motion-free and the motion-corrupted MRI sequences in the latent spaces. To our
 69 knowledge, MAUDGAN is the first study in multi-modal anatomical MRI motion artifact reduc-
 70 tion.

71 The rest of this paper is as follows: Section 2 explains the dataset and motion simulation
 72 steps. Section 3 gives a detail about the MAUDGAN architecture and loss functions. Results and
 73 comparisons with two generative models are illustrated in Section 4. Finally, Sections 6 and 5

74 discuss the significance of the MAUDGAN and its possible use in the context of diagnosis and
75 therapy.

76 **2 Material**

77 *2.1 Dataset*

78 We used a publicly available multicenter medical GLIS-RT dataset from the Cancer Imaging
79 Archive¹⁷ consisting of 230 patients (100 males and 130 females). All patients with different
80 brain tumor types underwent 3D T1-Gd, 2D T2-FLAIR MRI sequences, and a CT scan under dif-
81 ferent imaging protocols. The brain tumor types were glioblastoma (GBM - 198 cases), anaplastic
82 astrocytoma (AAC - 23 cases), astrocytoma (AC - 5 cases), anaplastic oligodendroglioma (AODG
83 - 2 cases), and oligodendroglioma (ODG - 2 case). We used 80% (11246 image slices) and 20%
84 (2276 image slices) of data for training and testing our method, respectively.

85 The median of the T2-FLAIR and 3D T1-Gd images' resolution was $1.1 \times 1.1 \times 5 \text{ mm}^3$ (standard
86 deviation $0.53 \times 0.53 \times 0.87 \text{ mm}^3$) and $0.94 \times 0.94 \times 1. \text{ mm}^3$ (standard deviation $0.24 \times 0.24 \times 1.21$
87 mm^3), respectively. The T2-FLAIR imaging parameters were (median \pm std); TE = 119 ± 64.06
88 ms , TR = 9000 ± 936.20 ms , TI = 2500 ± 174.02 ms, and flip angle = $150^\circ \pm 13.56^\circ$. Those
89 parameters for T1-Gd were (median \pm std); TE = 2.98 ± 3.86 ms , TR = 2200 ± 1031.76 ms , TI =
90 900 ± 235.50 ms, and flip angle = $9^\circ \pm 5.45^\circ$ About 30% of data were acquired using MRI scanners
91 with B_0 of 1.5 T and the others were acquired using 3T scanners. Out of 230 cases, 55 cases were
92 obtained using GE MRI scanners and the rest were obtained using Siemens MRI scanners.

93 Finally, we evaluated the MAUDGAN performance on anonymized clinical data with real mo-
94 tion artifacts. This retrospective single-centre study was approved by the institutional review board,
95 and the requirement for written informed consent was waived.

96 2.2 Motion simulation

97 The head motion was simulated in the Fourier domain (k -space), and the motion-corrupted data was
98 generated after the inverse discrete Fourier transform. We adapted the piecewise constant motion
99 simulation approach with a low computation burden because it provides a similar generalization
100 than to the complex motion simulation techniques.¹³ Moreover, the generated motion artifacts
101 were similar to the real motion artifacts.¹³

102 We assumed the phase encoding interval was much faster than the head motion. Thus, the
103 same motion parameters could be used at each phase encoding direction (Figure 2). The k -space
104 lines within the randomly selected slabs were translated in the phase encoding direction. However,
105 the middle of the k -space that corresponds to the low-frequency content of the MRI images was
106 excluded in the motion artifact simulation process, shown as a forbidden region in Figure 2. Our
107 motion simulation method could successfully model the ghosting of the bright fat tissue, due to the
108 motion artifact, to the background around the skull, which is common in structural MRI images.¹⁸

109 3 Method

110 We denote \mathcal{T}_a and \mathcal{T} as the motion-corrupted image and the motion-free image spaces, respectively.
111 The paired and unpaired motion reduction process is formalized as a $\mathcal{M} = \{(x_a, x) \mid x_c \in \mathcal{T}_a, x \in$
112 $\mathcal{T}, f(x_a) = x\}$ where x_a and x were the motion-corrupted and motion-free single MRI image
113 sequence and $f : \mathcal{T}_a \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$.^{14,19} However, we assumed there is no paired or unpaired dataset of a
114 single modality available to disentangle motion artifacts. Instead, another MRI image sequence,
115 T2-FLAIR, was employed to disentangle the motion artifact of the T1-Gd MRI sequence, which
116 is more practical in clinical settings. Thus, the MAUDGAN is formalized as $\mathcal{M} = \{(x_a, y) \mid x_a \in$
117 $\mathcal{T}_a, y \in \mathcal{T}, f(x_a) = x, g(x_a, y) = y_a\}$ where $f : \mathcal{T}_a \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ and $g : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_a$ are the encoding into a




Fig 2: The motion simulation process. After choosing the phase encoding direction, several random k -space regions were selected. The randomly selected k -space lines were randomly translated within the random regions.

118 content space \mathcal{C} and artifact space \mathcal{A} . Also, x_a and y are motion-corrupted T1-Gd and the motion-
 119 free T2-FLAIR MRI images. After training the MAUDGAN, the image data in the content space
 120 will be free of motion artifacts. In contrast, the motion-corrupted T2-FLAIR could be generated
 121 using the learned motion artifact model.

122 3.1 MAUDGAN

123 The MAUDGAN consists of two generators $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{T}_a \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{G} : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_a$ to map from motion-
 124 corrupted space to motion-free space and vice-versa (Figure 3). In addition, two networks \mathcal{H}_{ν_1} and
 125 \mathcal{H}_{ν_2} were also employed to extract features of the images before feeding them to the generators.

126 Given multimodal MRI images T1-Gd $x_a \in \mathcal{T}_a$ and T2-FLAIR $y \in \mathcal{T}$, the training steps were
 127 as follows:




Fig 3: The proposed MAUDGAN is illustrated. The Generators \mathcal{F} learns disentanglement while the \mathcal{G} learns to generate motion-corrupted images from motion-free images.

- 128 1. \mathcal{F} maps the motion-corrupted T1-Gd x_a to motion-free space \hat{x} ,

$$\hat{x} = \mathcal{F}(x_a; \theta) \quad (1)$$

- 129 2. \mathcal{G} maps the motion-free space T2-FLAIR y to the motion-corrupted space \hat{y}_a ,

$$\hat{y}_a = \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{H}_{\nu_1}(x_a), \mathcal{H}_{\nu_2}(y); \rho) \quad (2)$$

- 130 3. trained \mathcal{F} in step 1 was used to recover motion-free T2-FLAIR \tilde{y} from motion-corrupted \hat{y}_a

- 131 simulated in step 2,

$$\tilde{y} = \mathcal{F}(\hat{y}_a, \theta) = \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{H}_{\nu_1}(x_a), \mathcal{H}_{\nu_2}(y); \rho); \theta) \quad (3)$$

132 4. trained \mathcal{G} in step 2 was used to recover motion corrupted T1-Gd \tilde{x}_a from motion-free \hat{x} and
133 motion-corrupted \hat{y}_a simulated in step 1 and 2,

$$\tilde{x}_a = \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{H}_{\nu_1}(\hat{y}_a), \mathcal{H}_{\nu_2}(\hat{x}); \varrho) \quad (4)$$

134 3.2 Learning

135 The MAUDGAN attempts to train generators in an adversarial scenario to achieve motion artifact
136 disentanglement. Thus, the MAUDGAN employed loss functions to remove motion artifacts from
137 T1-Gd using content information of T2-FLAIR as given in (1)-(4). The MAUDGAN employs four
138 loss functions including two adversarial losses $\mathcal{L}_{adv}^{\mathcal{T}}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{adv}^{\mathcal{T}_a}$, reconstruction loss \mathcal{L}_{rec} , and artifact
139 consistency loss \mathcal{L}_{arti} . The cost function is formalized as the weighted sum of the losses,

$$\mathcal{L} = \lambda_{adv} \times (\mathcal{L}_{adv}^{\mathcal{T}} + \mathcal{L}_{adv}^{\mathcal{T}_a}) + \lambda_{rec} \times \mathcal{L}_{rec} + \lambda_{arti} \times \mathcal{L}_{arti} \quad (5)$$

140 where λ_{adv} , λ_{rec} , and λ_{arti} are the hyper-parameters controlling the importance of each term.

141 3.2.1 Adversarial loss

142 The MAUDGAN was trained to map from motion-corrupted space to motion-free space as given
143 in (1) and (3) and vice versa as given in (2) and (4). Learning those two tasks are important
144 to disentangle motion artifact from the image content. As the MAUDGAN is trained on multi-
145 modal MRI sequences, regression losses like \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 could not be employed due to the do-
146 main difference between T2-FLAIR and T1-Gd MRI images. Therefore, the adversarial learning
147 technique,²⁰ introduced $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}_a}$ discriminators, was employed to regularize the plausibility
148 between motion-corrected and motion-free images using $\mathcal{L}_{adv}^{\mathcal{T}}$ loss and between motion-corrupted

149 and motion-simulated images using $\mathcal{L}_{adv}^{\mathcal{T}_a}$ loss. Thus, the MAUDGAN is trained to fool the dis-
 150 criminators, so they could not determine whether the motion was generated or real. The adversarial
 151 losses are as follows;

$$\mathcal{L}_{adv}^{\mathcal{T}} = \mathbb{E}_{z \sim q_{\theta}(z|\hat{y}_a)} [\|\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(z) - \mathbb{I}\|_1] + \mathbb{E}_{z \sim q_{\theta}(z|x_a)} [\|\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(z)\|_1] \quad (6)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{adv}^{\mathcal{T}_a} = \mathbb{E}_{z \sim q_{\theta}(z|\hat{y}_a, \hat{x})} [\|\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}_a}(z) - \mathbb{I}\|_1] + \mathbb{E}_{z \sim q_{\theta}(z|y, x_a)} [\|\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}_a}(z)\|_1]$$

152 where z is the latent variable generators, $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}_a}$ are the discriminators to distinguish between
 153 motion-corrupted and motion-free content data sampled from \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}_a domains, respectively. \mathbb{I}
 154 is an unit matrix with a size $M \times M$, where M is substantially smaller than the image dimension
 155 size, that matched the discriminators' output.

156 3.2.2 Reconstruction loss

157 Despite motion artifact disentanglement, the whole process needed to be lossless. In other words,
 158 the MAUDGAN was required to recover the original motion-corrupted T1-Gd \tilde{x}_a from motion-
 159 corrected \hat{x} and to recover motion-free T2-FLAIR \tilde{y} from motion-simulated \hat{y}_a . Therefore, two
 160 reconstruction losses given in (7) were used to encourage the MAUDGAN to preserve the infor-
 161 mation.

$$\mathcal{L}_{rec} = \mathbb{E}_{x_a \sim \mathcal{T}_a, y \sim \mathcal{T}} [\|\tilde{x}_a - x_a\|_1 + \|\tilde{y} - y\|_1] \quad (7)$$

162 where \tilde{y} and \tilde{x}_a shown in Figure 3 are given in (3) and (4). We adapted the \mathcal{L}_1 loss rather than
 163 the \mathcal{L}_2 to generate sharper images.²¹




Fig 4: The Generator with the blocks used to construct discriminator and \mathcal{H}_{ν_s} are illustrated.

164 3.2.3 Artifact consistency loss

165 Adversarial losses encouraged the content of generated motion-corrupted \hat{y}_a and motion-free \hat{x}
 166 images to be indistinguishable from T1-Gd x_a and T2-FLAIR y images, respectively. However,
 167 the discriminators lose the spatial resolution. To preserve the spatial resolution, \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 could be
 168 used. But, due to the domain difference between T1-Gd and T2-FLAIR, direct use of losses would
 169 transfer the images' domain. We proposed artifact loss \mathcal{L}_{artif} given in (8) to induce motion artifacts
 170 to the motion-corrected \hat{x} images. Thus, \mathcal{L}_{artif} conflicts with adversarial losses and comprises the
 171 overall learning process.

$$\mathcal{L}_{artif} = \mathbb{E}_{x_a \sim \mathcal{T}_a, y \sim \mathcal{T}} [\|(\hat{x} - x_a) - (\hat{y}_a - y)\|_1] \quad (8)$$

172 Equation (8) encourages the difference between x_a and \hat{x} to be similar to y and \hat{y}_a . Unlike a
 173 direct minimization by \mathcal{L}_1 that would cause an image domain translation, \mathcal{L}_{artif} requires the \hat{x} and
 174 x_a to be anatomically close rather be exactly close to preserve structural information.

175 3.3 Network architecture

176 The MAUDGAN network generator is illustrated in Figure 4-(a). The generator employed residual
177 blocks²² (Figure 4-(b)) for a better generalization than convolution blocks without skip connection.
178 To improve the generators' performance,²³ the convolution layers were used to down-sample the
179 data in the encoder part of the generator. However, the decoder part of the generator employed
180 the up-sampling layers rather than the transpose convolution layers to preserve the image edge
181 information and avoid the checkerboard effect.²⁴

182 The discriminator consists of four residual blocks (Figure 4-(b)) and down-sampling blocks.
183 Finally, the discriminators were constructed by four convolution blocks shown in Figure 4-(c)
184 and the final layer with one convolution layer. The feature extractors (\mathcal{H}_{ν_i} for $i \in \{1, 2\}$) were
185 constructed using five residual blocks (Figure 4-(b)).

186 We implemented the MAUDGAN under the `PyTorch 1.12.0`¹ deep learning framework
187 using two NVIDIA GPUs RTX 3090. The batch size, optimizer, and the learning rate were 6,
188 RAdam,²⁵ and 2×10^{-4} . We trained the network using hyper-parameters $\lambda_{rec} = 10$, $\lambda_{adv} = 5$, and
189 $\lambda_{artif} = 50$.

190 4 Results

191 To our knowledge the MAUDGAN is the first network that employs the multi-modal MRI images
192 to reduce MRI motion artifacts. Thus, we could only compare the MAUDGAN with two well-
193 known unsupervised image-to-image translation approaches including CycleGAN²⁶ and Pix2pix.²¹
194 The original implementations of the CycleGAN and Pix2pix were used² to compare the results.

¹<https://pytorch.org/>

²<https://github.com/junyanz/pytorch-CycleGAN-and-pix2pix>

195 The supervised methods like U-Net²⁷ were excluded since the ground truth targets were unavail-
196 able, and the domain shifts between the multi-modal images transfer the domain of the input
197 motion-corrupted 3D T1-Gd images to the motion-free T2-FLAIR dataset. We compared the
198 MAUDGAN with those networks for different motion artifact levels. Finally, we evaluated the
199 performance of the MAUDAN to remove real motion artifacts from the patients with head & neck
200 cancer.

201 Motion simulated dataset allowed us to perform qualitative and quantitative comparisons. We
202 report six quantitative metrics including normalized mean squared error (NMSE), structural sim-
203 ilarity index (SSIM),²⁸ multi-scale structural similarity index (MS-SSIM),²⁹ peak signal-to-noise
204 ratio, visual information fidelity (VIF),³⁰ and multi-scale gradient magnitude similarity deviation
205 (MS-GMSD).³¹ The higher metric values are better regarding motion artifact reduction and distor-
206 tion levels except with the NMSE and MS-GMSD metrics.

207 Qualitative comparisons are illustrated in Figure 5 for different motion levels. Qualitatively, the
208 Pix2Pix method had the lowest performance in preserving the MRI soft tissue contrast. CycleGAN
209 reduced soft-tissue contrasts, smeared out the signal intensity, and unrealistically elevated the skull
210 signals. MAUDGAN remove motion artifact with better soft tissue contrast and realistic skull
211 signal intensity.

212 In addition, CycleGAN generated images with high signal intensity voxels mimicking the false
213 tumors (see Figure 6). The false tumors were generated might be attributed to the wrong sampling
214 from data manifolds. Those false tumors differ from water droplet-like artifacts³² cause by the
215 normalization layers. Especially, the false tumor shown in Figure 6b is similar to the post-surgery
216 cases.

217 The quantitative metrics evaluating the motion-corrected image contrast, image distortion level,




Fig 5: Visual comparisons of the motion-reduction methods on the motion-simulated data. The simulated motion artifact was added along the row in (a) and column in (b). The heavy, moderate, and minor motion simulation data and the motion-corrected results are from top to bottom rows.




Fig 6: The white arrows illustrate the false tumors generated by the CycleGAN dataset.

218 and structure and texture similarity to the ground truth data are illustrated in Figure 7. The
219 MAUDGAN with the lowest NMSE and the highest PSNR values indicates the removing the
220 motion artifact with small spatial distortion. However, NMSE and PSNR tend to favor smooth-
221 ness. The MS-SSIM and SSIM were reported to evaluate the structural similarity of the motion-
222 corrected images and the ground truth. Higher MS-SSIM and SSIM indicate better similarity. Our
223 method got better SSIM values and comparable MS-SSIM values for different distortion levels.
224 The MAUDGAN with the highest value of VIF could preserve more information than the other
225 utilized methods. Finally, to evaluate the image gradient, which is related to image contrast, the
226 MS-GMSD was reported for different distortion levels. Lower MS-GMSD indicates a smaller de-
227 viation between the gradients of motion-corrected and ground truth data. The MAUDGAN with
228 smaller MS-GMSD could preserve more, say soft-tissue, the contrast of the ground truth data.

229 We tested the MAUDGAN model on the data with real data with motion artifacts. The data
230 were extracted anonymized from the PACS system. The real artifact was reduced using the
231 MAUDGAN as shown in Figure 8.




Fig 7: Quantitative metrics to evaluate the quality of the motion-corrected data. The proposed MAUDGAN, Pix2Pix, and CycleGAN were evaluated on three motion distortion levels heavy, moderate, and minor.

232 5 Discussion

233 This study aimed to reduce 3D T1-Gd motion artifacts using T2-FLAIR images. 3D T1-Gd images
 234 with high acquisition times are more likely to corrupt with the motion artifact.² In addition, the
 235 high-resolution images' quality acquired with the high B0 magnetic fields is limited due to the mo-
 236 tion artifact, which the PMC methods could partially remove the motion artifacts.¹ Motion artifacts
 237 reduce the image quality reducing the performance of manual and automatic post-processing ap-
 238 proaches like tumor and organ at risks auto-segmentation.^{33,34} This study introduced MAUDGAN
 239 to tackle motion reduction as a disentanglement problem. The multi-center dataset with different




Fig 8: The anonymized data with real motion artifacts were exported from the PACS system to evaluate the MAUDGAN model to remove the real motion artifacts. The first row is the data with real artifact, and the second row illustrates the data after motion reduction. The arrows indicate the motion artifact.

240 brain tumors and metastases was used to train the MAUDGAN, which is expected to improve its
241 generalization. Our qualitative and quantitative comparisons with two well-known GAN methods
242 indicate that the MAUDGAN could disentangle the motion artifact using T2-FLAIR with a lower
243 spatial distortion and a better spatial contrast.

244 The MAUDGAN was qualitatively compared with generative models CycleGAN and Pix2pix.
245 The MAUDGAN could preserve better soft-tissue contrast (see Figure 5). The Pix2pix approach
246 did not preserve soft-tissue contrast, which might because this method was proposed to work under
247 the paired framework which is different from the theory of this study. On the other hand, the
248 CycleGAN smeared out the MRI soft-tissue contrast, which was better than the pix2pix. Finally,
249 the MAUDGAN reduced the motion artifact with better soft-tissue contrast.

250 When a network is trained on datasets with tumors, it is crucial that the network to be ro-
251 bust against spatial distortions because those distortions could be misinterpreted as a tumor. The
252 MAUDGAN was free of spatial distortion, while the CycleGAN added spatial distortions (see Fig-
253 ure 6). The added spatial distortions were similar to the brain tumor of the patient with edema and

254 after tumor resection as illustrated in Figure 6(a) and (b), respectively.

255 The quantitative comparisons shown in Figure 7 between the motion-free ground truth dataset
256 and motion-corrected reconstructed by the CycleGAN, Pix2pix, and MAUDGAN suggest that the
257 MAUDGAN-generated images were more distortion-free with a lower NMSE and a higher PSNR.
258 In addition, MAUDGAN with the higher SSIM, MS-SSIM, and VIF and lower gradient deviations
259 (MS-GMSD) generated more similar to the ground truth dataset.

260 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study reporting on the feasibility of an approach
261 enabling to disentangle motion of 3D T1-Gd using T2-FLAIR. The dataset contains different brain
262 tumors and metastases, which are enhanced differently on the different MRI sequences. Thus, we
263 did not use motion-free images of other patients, which need to be exported from PACS. This way,
264 the dataset of the patients without motion artifacts remain in the clinical system. Moreover, we can
265 use all the data to train the network, which is more than training under an unpaired scenario since
266 we do not need to export the same number of patients' data without motion artifacts.

267 This study is more challenging compared with the unpaired studies^{14,35} because the data space
268 domain of 3D T1-Gd differs from T2-FLAIR. Thus, the MAUDGAN must be robust to the domain
269 shift between datasets. Due to the MAUDGAN's robustness, it could employ other image modal-
270 ities like the T1-w dataset instead of T2-FLAIR. Thus, the MAUDGAN applies to other available
271 MRI sequences than T2-FLAIR. However, this study is limited to the in-plane motion artifact due
272 to the fact T2-FLAIR images were acquired in 2D that is inherently contain geometry distortion
273 along the slice directions.³⁶

274 **6 Conclusion**

275 Our method, MAUDGAN, could disentangle motion artifacts from the 3D T1-Gd dataset under a
276 multi-modal framework. The motion reduction will improve post-processing methods like manual
277 and automatic brain tumors and organ at risk delineations and might increase the CT/MRI co-
278 registration accuracy. Especially, the MAUDGAN would benefit elderly and infant patients with
279 more involuntary motions during the 3D T1-Gd imaging with a long acquisition time. This retro-
280 spective motion correction is free from additional hardware or sequence modifications during the
281 imaging, which makes it more practical.

282 *Disclosures*

283 There are no conflicts of interest declared by the authors.

284 *Acknowledgments*

285 This work was supported by NSERC CREATE RHHDS program and NSERC discovery grant.

286 *Data Availability*

287 The brain dataset was obtained from The Cancer Imaging Archive
288 ([https://wiki.cancerimagingarchive.net/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=](https://wiki.cancerimagingarchive.net/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=95224486)
289 [95224486](https://wiki.cancerimagingarchive.net/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=95224486)).

290 *References*

291 1 D. Stucht, K. A. Danishad, P. Schulze, *et al.*, “Highest resolution in vivo human brain mri
292 using prospective motion correction,” *PloS one* **10**(7), e0133921 (2015).

- 293 2 J. M. Slipsager, S. L. Glimberg, J. Søgaard, *et al.*, “Quantifying the financial savings of
294 motion correction in brain mri: a model-based estimate of the costs arising from patient
295 head motion and potential savings from implementation of motion correction,” *Journal of*
296 *Magnetic Resonance Imaging* **52**(3), 731–738 (2020).
- 297 3 J. G. Pipe, “Motion correction with propeller mri: application to head motion and free-
298 breathing cardiac imaging,” *Magnetic Resonance in Medicine: An Official Journal of the*
299 *International Society for Magnetic Resonance in Medicine* **42**(5), 963–969 (1999).
- 300 4 J. Maclaren, M. Herbst, O. Speck, *et al.*, “Prospective motion correction in brain imaging: a
301 review,” *Magnetic resonance in medicine* **69**(3), 621–636 (2013).
- 302 5 M. Zaitsev, J. Maclaren, and M. Herbst, “Motion artifacts in mri: A complex problem with
303 many partial solutions,” *Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging* **42**(4), 887–901 (2015).
- 304 6 W. Lin and H. K. Song, “Improved optimization strategies for autofocusing motion compen-
305 sation in mri via the analysis of image metric maps,” *Magnetic resonance imaging* **24**(6),
306 751–760 (2006).
- 307 7 M. W. Haskell, S. F. Cauley, and L. L. Wald, “Targeted motion estimation and reduction
308 (tamer): data consistency based motion mitigation for mri using a reduced model joint opti-
309 mization,” *IEEE transactions on medical imaging* **37**(5), 1253–1265 (2018).
- 310 8 M. Usman, D. Atkinson, F. Odille, *et al.*, “Motion corrected compressed sensing for free-
311 breathing dynamic cardiac mri,” *Magnetic resonance in medicine* **70**(2), 504–516 (2013).
- 312 9 S. Kecskemeti, A. Samsonov, J. Velikina, *et al.*, “Robust motion correction strategy for struc-
313 tural mri in unsedated children demonstrated with three-dimensional radial mprage,” *Radi-*
314 *ology* **289**(2), 509 (2018).

- 315 10 A. Sciarra, S. Chatterjee, M. Dünnwald, *et al.*, “Automated ssim regression for detection
316 and quantification of motion artefacts in brain mr images,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.06725*
317 (2022).
- 318 11 I. Oksuz, B. Ruijsink, E. Puyol-Antón, *et al.*, “Deep learning using k-space based data
319 augmentation for automated cardiac mr motion artefact detection,” in *International Confer-*
320 *ence on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*, 250–258, Springer
321 (2018).
- 322 12 T. Küstner, K. Armanious, J. Yang, *et al.*, “Retrospective correction of motion-affected mr
323 images using deep learning frameworks,” *Magnetic resonance in medicine* **82**(4), 1527–1540
324 (2019).
- 325 13 B. A. Duffy, L. Zhao, F. Sepelband, *et al.*, “Retrospective motion artifact correction of struc-
326 tural mri images using deep learning improves the quality of cortical surface reconstructions,”
327 *Neuroimage* **230**, 117756 (2021).
- 328 14 G. Oh, J. E. Lee, and J. C. Ye, “Unpaired mr motion artifact deep learning using outlier-
329 rejecting bootstrap aggregation,” *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging* **40**(11), 3125–3139
330 (2021).
- 331 15 F. Locatello, S. Bauer, M. Lucic, *et al.*, “Challenging common assumptions in the unsu-
332 pervised learning of disentangled representations,” in *international conference on machine*
333 *learning*, 4114–4124, PMLR (2019).
- 334 16 O. Ronneberger, P. Fischer, and T. Brox, “U-net: Convolutional networks for biomedical im-
335 age segmentation,” in *International Conference on Medical image computing and computer-*
336 *assisted intervention*, 234–241, Springer (2015).

- 337 17 N. Shusharina & T. Bortfeld, “Glioma image segmentation for radiotherapy: Rt targets, bar-
338 riers to cancer spread, and organs at risk [data set],” (2021). The Cancer Imaging Archive,
339 <https://doi.org/10.7937/TCIA.T905-ZQ20>.
- 340 18 B. Mortamet, M. A. Bernstein, C. R. Jack Jr, *et al.*, “Automatic quality assessment in struc-
341 tural brain magnetic resonance imaging,” *Magnetic Resonance in Medicine: An Official Jour-
342 nal of the International Society for Magnetic Resonance in Medicine* **62**(2), 365–372 (2009).
- 343 19 M. Torop, S. V. Kothapalli, Y. Sun, *et al.*, “Deep learning using a biophysical model for robust
344 and accelerated reconstruction of quantitative, artifact-free and denoised images,” *Magnetic
345 resonance in medicine* **84**(6), 2932–2942 (2020).
- 346 20 I. Goodfellow, J. Pouget-Abadie, M. Mirza, *et al.*, “Generative adversarial networks,” *Com-
347 munications of the ACM* **63**(11), 139–144 (2020).
- 348 21 P. Isola, J.-Y. Zhu, T. Zhou, *et al.*, “Image-to-image translation with conditional adversarial
349 networks,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recogni-
350 tion*, 1125–1134 (2017).
- 351 22 K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, *et al.*, “Deep residual learning for image recognition,” in *Proceed-
352 ings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 770–778 (2016).
- 353 23 A. Radford, L. Metz, and S. Chintala, “Unsupervised representation learning with deep con-
354 volutional generative adversarial networks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.06434* (2015).
- 355 24 A. Odena, V. Dumoulin, and C. Olah, “Deconvolution and checkerboard artifacts,” *Distill*
356 **1**(10), e3 (2016).
- 357 25 L. Liu, H. Jiang, P. He, *et al.*, “On the variance of the adaptive learning rate and beyond,”
358 *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.03265* (2019).

- 359 26 J.-Y. Zhu, T. Park, P. Isola, *et al.*, “Unpaired image-to-image translation using cycle-
360 consistent adversarial networks,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on*
361 *computer vision*, 2223–2232 (2017).
- 362 27 K. H. Jin, M. T. McCann, E. Froustey, *et al.*, “Deep convolutional neural network for inverse
363 problems in imaging,” *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* **26**(9), 4509–4522 (2017).
- 364 28 Z. Wang, A. C. Bovik, H. R. Sheikh, *et al.*, “Image quality assessment: from error visibility
365 to structural similarity,” *IEEE transactions on image processing* **13**(4), 600–612 (2004).
- 366 29 Z. Wang, E. P. Simoncelli, and A. C. Bovik, “Multiscale structural similarity for image quality
367 assessment,” in *The Thrity-Seventh Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems & Computers,*
368 *2003*, **2**, 1398–1402, Ieee (2003).
- 369 30 H. R. Sheikh and A. C. Bovik, “Image information and visual quality,” *IEEE Transactions on*
370 *image processing* **15**(2), 430–444 (2006).
- 371 31 B. Zhang, P. V. Sander, and A. Bermak, “Gradient magnitude similarity deviation on mul-
372 tiple scales for color image quality assessment,” in *2017 IEEE International Conference on*
373 *Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 1253–1257, IEEE (2017).
- 374 32 T. Karras, S. Laine, M. Aittala, *et al.*, “Analyzing and improving the image quality of style-
375 gan,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recogni-*
376 *tion*, 8110–8119 (2020).
- 377 33 P. Kemenczky, P. Vakli, E. Somogyi, *et al.*, “Effect of head motion-induced artefacts on the
378 reliability of deep learning-based whole-brain segmentation,” *Scientific reports* **12**(1), 1–13
379 (2022).

- 380 34 N. Aldoj, F. Biavati, F. Michallek, *et al.*, “Automatic prostate and prostate zones segmenta-
381 tion of magnetic resonance images using densenet-like u-net,” *Scientific reports* **10**(1), 1–17
382 (2020).
- 383 35 S. Liu, K.-H. Thung, L. Qu, *et al.*, “Learning mri artefact removal with unpaired data,” *Nature*
384 *Machine Intelligence* **3**(1), 60–67 (2021).
- 385 36 R. W. Brown, Y.-C. N. Cheng, E. M. Haacke, *et al.*, *Magnetic resonance imaging: physical*
386 *principles and sequence design*, ch. 20. John Wiley & Sons (2014).

387 List of Figures

- 388 1 Content and artifact components of 3D T1-Gd MRI (x_a) in the motion-corrupted
389 space \mathcal{T}_a and T2-FLAIR in artifact-free space \mathcal{T} are mapped to the content space
390 \mathcal{C} and artifact space \mathcal{A} , respectively. MAUDGAN maps the data in \mathcal{T}_a space to \mathcal{T}
391 space ($x_a \rightarrow \hat{x}$) shown by blue arrows. Conversely, MADuGAN learns to map
392 from \mathcal{T} space to \mathcal{T}_a space ($y \rightarrow \hat{y}_a$) shown by green arrows.
- 393 2 The motion simulation process. After choosing the phase encoding direction, sev-
394 eral random k -space regions were selected. The randomly selected k -space lines
395 were randomly translated within the random regions.
- 396 3 The proposed MAUDGAN is illustrated. The Generators \mathcal{F} learns disentanglement
397 while the \mathcal{G} learns to generate motion-corrupted images from motion-free images.
- 398 4 The Generator with the blocks used to construct discriminator and \mathcal{H}_{ν_s} are illus-
399 trated.

400 5 Visual comparisons of the motion-reduction methods on the motion-simulated data.
401 The simulated motion artifact was added along the row in (a) and column in (b).
402 The heavy, moderate, and minor motion simulation data and the motion-corrected
403 results are from top to bottom rows.

404 6 The white arrows illustrate the false tumors generated by the CycleGAN dataset.

405 7 Quantitative metrics to evaluate the quality of the motion-corrected data. The pro-
406 posed MAUDGAN, Pix2Pix, and CycleGAN were evaluated on three motion dis-
407 tortion levels heavy, moderate, and minor.

408 8 The anonymized data with real motion artifacts were exported from the PACS sys-
409 tem to evaluate the MAUDGAN model to remove the real motion artifacts. The
410 first row is the data with real artifact, and the second row illustrates the data after
411 motion reduction. The arrows indicate the motion artifact.