Review of Contemporary Philosophy
ISSN: 1841-5261, e-ISSN: 2471-089X
Vol 22 (1), 2023
Pp 4531 - 4540

The Role of Deep Learning in Advancing Computer-Aided Diagnosis in Medical Imaging: A Comprehensive Review

[1]- Naif Abdulaziz Alhamdan,[2]- Ahmad Salem Alenzi,[3]- Ghazi Shujan Ayed Alnefaie ,[4]- Gaber Fatem Al Mutairi,[5]- Maged Dagheleb Alotaibi,[6]- Omar Hamed Alanazi,[7]- Abdullah Hadi Haddadi,[8]- Bassam Abdullah Alanazi,[9]- Abdulmalik Sulaiman Alkhames,[10]- Abdulaziz Mohammed Alotaibi,[11]-Ahmed A. Alhazim,[12]- Ali Majed Malhan ,[13]-Salem Nasser Alotibi,[14]- Saad Mohammed Nasser Al-Baker,[15]-Ali Hussain Albasrawi

[1] KSA, Ministry of Health, Thadiq
[2] KSA, Ministry of Health, Thadiq
[3] KSA, Ministry of Health, DURMA GENERAL HOSPITAL
[4] KSA, Ministry of Health, Thadiq
[5] KSA, Ministry of Health, Nefe General Hospital
[6] KSA, Ministry of Health, Third Health Cluster
[7] KSA, Ministry of Health, Third Health Cluster
[8] KSA, Ministry of Health, Al Hisi Primary Health Care Center
[9] KSA, Ministry of Health, Thadiq General Hospital
[10]KSA, Ministry of Health, Marrat General Hospital
[11]KSA, Ministry of Health, West Center Of Primary Health Care - Dawadmi Hospital
[12]KSA, Ministry of Health, PMNH
[13]KSA, Ministry of Health, Ruwydah General Hospital
[14]KSA, Ministry of Health, King Khalid Hospital, Hail
[15]KSA, Ministry of Health, Eastern Sector Of Al-Ahsa Health Cluster

Abstract

Background: Medical imaging is vital for diagnosing numerous health conditions, yet the increasing volume of imaging data presents significant challenges for radiologists. Traditional computer-aided diagnosis (CAD) systems have shown limited clinical implementation due to inadequate performance. The advent of deep learning technologies offers promising solutions to enhance imaging analysis and diagnostic accuracy.

Methods: This review examines the evolution and application of deep learning techniques in medical imaging, particularly in CAD systems. We analyze the transition from traditional machine learning to deep learning, highlighting methodologies such as deep convolutional neural networks (DCNNs) that enable automated feature extraction from complex imaging data. A comprehensive literature search was conducted to assess the performance of deep learning in various imaging modalities.

Results: The findings indicate that deep learning approaches, particularly DCNNs, significantly outperform traditional CAD systems by autonomously identifying and classifying pathological features in medical images. Studies demonstrate enhanced sensitivity and specificity in detecting malignancies, improving overall diagnostic accuracy. However, challenges remain regarding the integration of these technologies into clinical workflows, including the need for extensive training datasets and the potential for over-reliance on automated systems.

Conclusion: Deep learning represents a transformative advancement in the field of medical imaging and CAD. While promising results have been reported, further research is necessary to address existing barriers to clinical adoption. Standardization of performance metrics, rigorous testing across diverse populations,

and comprehensive training for healthcare professionals are essential for the successful implementation of deep learning-based CAD systems in routine clinical practice.

Keywords: Deep learning, medical imaging, computer-aided diagnosis, convolutional neural networks, diagnostic accuracy.

Received: 10 October 2023 **Revised**: 24 November 2023 **Accepted**: 08 December 2023

1. Introduction

Medical imaging serves as a crucial diagnostic instrument for several disorders. In 1895, Roentgen found that X-rays could peer inside the human body without causing any harm. Shortly after, X-ray radiography emerged as the first diagnostic imaging technique. Since then, several imaging modalities have been created, including computed tomography, ultrasound, magnetic resonance imaging, and positron emission tomography, alongside more complicated imaging methods. Image information is essential for decision-making across several phases of patient care, including detection, characterization, staging, treatment response evaluation, disease recurrence monitoring, and the guidance of interventional treatments, and surgeries, including radiation therapy. The quantity of pictures for a certain patient case escalates significantly from a few two-dimensional (2D) images to hundreds with three-dimensional (3D) imaging and thousands with four-dimensional (4D) dynamic imaging. The use of multi-modality imaging increases the volume of picture data requiring interpretation. The increasing workload hampers radiologists and doctors in sustaining workflow efficiency while using all available imaging data to enhance accuracy and patient care. Recent advancements in machine learning and computational techniques have highlighted the necessity of creating effective and reliable computerized methods to aid radiologists and physicians in image analysis throughout various disease diagnosis and management stages in patient care.

The endeavor to use computers for the automated analysis of medical photographs originated in the 1960s [1-4]. Numerous studies have shown the viability of using computers for medical image analysis; nevertheless, this research has garnered little attention, perhaps due to restricted access to high-quality digitized image data and computing resources. Doi et al. [5] at the Kurt Rossmann Laboratory, University of Chicago, initiated the systematic advancement of machine learning and image analysis methodologies for medical imaging in the 1980s, aiming to create computer-aided diagnosis (CAD) as a supplementary opinion to aid radiologists in image interpretation. Chan et al. [6,7] created a CAD system for the identification of microcalcifications in mammograms and executed the inaugural observer performance research, which evidenced the efficacy of CAD in enhancing breast radiologists' detection capabilities for microcalcifications. The first CAD commercial system received approval from the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in 1998 for use as a secondary opinion in screening mammography. Computer-aided design and computer-assisted image analysis have been a significant focus of study and development in medical imaging during the last few decades. CAD techniques have been explored for several applications, including disease detection, characterization, staging, treatment response evaluation, prognosis prediction, and risk assessment across numerous illnesses and imaging modalities. The volume of work in the CAD area has been consistently rising, as shown by the trend of publications in peer-reviewed journal articles identified by a literature search on the Web of Science.

Despite the growing research in CAD, only a limited number of CAD systems are widely used in clinical settings. A primary factor might be that CAD tools created using traditional machine learning techniques have not achieved the high performance required to enhance both diagnosis accuracy and workflow efficiency for clinicians. Given the success of deep learning in numerous machine learning applications, including text and speech recognition, facial recognition, autonomous vehicles, and games like chess and Go, there are elevated expectations that deep learning will yield significant advancements in CAD performance and facilitate the extensive adoption of deep-learning-based CAD, or artificial intelligence (AI), across various tasks in patient care. This passion has catalyzed a multitude of research and publications in CAD using deep learning. This chapter will address many concerns and challenges associated with the development of deep-learning-based computer-aided detection (CAD) in medical imaging, along with considerations necessary for future clinical deployment of CAD.

2. Advanced Learning Techniques for Medical Image Evaluation and Computer-Aided Diagnosis

Computer-aided design systems are built with machine-learning techniques. The traditional machine learning methodology in computer-aided diagnosis (CAD) for medical imaging used image analysis techniques to identify illness patterns and differentiate various structural classifications in pictures, such as normal vs aberrant and malignant versus benign. CAD developers create image processing and feature extraction methodologies informed by domain expertise to delineate visual attributes that differentiate diverse states. The efficacy of feature descriptors often relies on the subject knowledge of CAD developers and the proficiency of the mathematical formulations or empirical image analysis methods used to convert visual attributes into numerical values. The extracted features serve as input predictor variables for a classifier, and a predictive model is developed by modifying the weights of the various features according to the statistical characteristics of a training sample set to estimate the likelihood that an image corresponds to one of the states. The conventional machine learning technique is limited by the inability of human developers to convert intricate illness patterns into a finite set of feature descriptors, even after extensive exposure to many instances within the patient population. The manually developed characteristics may struggle to maintain robustness against the significant variability of normal and pathological patterns within the population. The efficacy of the established CAD system is often constrained by its discriminative capability or generalizability, leading to a high false positive rate at elevated sensitivity or the opposite.

Deep learning has become the preeminent machine learning technique in several applications. Deep learning is a representation learning technique whereby a sophisticated multi-layer neural network architecture autonomously learns data representations by converting input information into various degrees of abstraction. Deep convolutional neural networks (DCNN) are the predominant deep learning architectures used for picture pattern recognition applications. Given an adequately extensive training set, a Deep Convolutional Neural Network (DCNN) may autonomously extract relevant features from the training samples for a specified task by repeatedly modifying its weights via backpropagation. DCNN hence identifies feature representations via training and does not need manually crafted features as input. When adequately trained on a substantial and representative dataset, the features extracted by DCNNs are anticipated to surpass those derived from hand-engineered methods because of their enhanced selectivity and invariance [8]. Significantly, because of the automated nature of the learning process, deep learning can proficiently assess hundreds or millions of examples that may elude human specialists' observation and retention during their careers. Deep learning may therefore exhibit more robustness to the extensive variances in characteristics across distinct classes, provided that the training set is sufficiently vast and varied for analysis.

CNN originates from the neocognitron introduced by Fukushima et al. in the early 1980s [9]. In 1990, LeCun first trained a convolutional neural network (CNN) using backpropagation to categorize handwritten digit patterns [10]. Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN) were used in several applications, including object identification, character recognition, and facial recognition, throughout the early 1990s. In 1993, Lo et al. pioneered the use of CNNs in medical image processing and developed a CNN for detecting lung nodules in chest radiography [11, 12]. In the same year, Chan et al. used CNN for microcalcification identification on mammograms [13, 14], and then in the following year, they applied it to bulk detection [15-18]. Zhang et al. used a similar shift-invariant neural network for the identification of microcalcification clusters in 1994 [19]. Despite their limited depth, the pattern recognition efficacy of CNNs in medical imaging was shown.

Deep CNNs were facilitated by several pivotal neural network training methodologies developed over time, including layer-wise unsupervised pre-training succeeded by supervised fine-tuning [20-22], the adoption of rectified linear units (ReLU) as activation functions instead of sigmoid-type functions, pooling to enhance feature invariance and diminish dimensionality, dropout to mitigate overfitting, and batch normalization, which further lessens the risk of internal covariate shift, vanishing gradients, and overfitting, while also accelerating training convergence [23-27]. These strategies enable the training of neural networks with increasing layers and millions of weights. In 2012, Krizhevsky et al. [28] introduced a convolutional neural network (CNN) comprising five convolutional layers and three fully connected layers, termed "AlexNet," which encompassed over 60 million parameters and attained unprecedented performance in the ImageNet Large Scale Visual Recognition Challenge (ILSVRC) [29], classifying over 1000 categories of commonplace objects in photographic images. AlexNet illustrated the pattern recognition proficiency of the several levels inside a deep architecture. Deep Convolutional Neural Networks (DCNNs) have been built with increasing depth since the introduction of AlexNet. He et al. [30] introduced residual learning, demonstrating that a residual network (ResNet) with 110–152 layers could surpass many other deep convolutional neural networks (DCNNs) and secured victory at the ILSVRC in 2015. Sun et al. [31] showed that the learning potential of a DCNN augmented with depth, although this ability could only be effectively harnessed with enough extensive training data.

The achievements of deep learning and artificial intelligence in personal electronics, social media, autonomous vehicles, chess, and the game of Go have generated extraordinary anticipation for its use in medicine. Deep learning has been used in several medical image processing tasks for computer-aided diagnosis (CAD) [32-34]. The predominant domains of CAD application with deep learning include the categorization of disease vs normal patterns, the differentiation between malignant and benign lesions, and the prognostication of high-risk and low-risk patterns for future cancer development. Additional applications were the segmentation and categorization of various organs and tumors, the classification of changes in tumor size or texture for evaluating treatment response, and the prediction of prognosis or recurrence. Due to the availability of substantial public datasets for chest radiographs, thoracic CT scans, and mammograms, several research has been undertaken on lung illnesses and breast cancer using these datasets [35, 36]. Deep learning-based image analysis has been used for the diagnosis of ocular illnesses in fundus pictures or optical coherence tomography, as well as for the categorization of cell types in histopathological images. The majority of research indicated very encouraging outcomes, hence enhancing the enthusiasm around deep-learning-based computer-aided diagnosis. This latest generation of CAD is termed AI, however, these CAD tools function as intricate mathematical models that retain knowledge via millions of weights and are far from being really "intelligent."

3. Obstacles in Deep Learning-Driven Computer-Aided Diagnosis

Computer-aided diagnosis (CAD) or Artificial Intelligence (AI) is anticipated to serve as valuable decision-support instruments in the medical field shortly. In addition to the identification and characterization of anomalies, applications such as pre-screening, triaging, cancer staging, treatment response evaluation, recurrence monitoring, and prognosis or survival prediction are under investigation. While no CAD systems using novel AI algorithms have undergone extensive clinical testing so far, information gleaned from CAD applications in screening mammography may provide expectations about the performance of CAD tools in clinical settings [37].

The traditional machine-learning-based CAD for breast cancer detection in screening mammography is the only CAD application now used in clinical practice. These methods demonstrate sensitivity equivalent to or exceeding that of radiologists, particularly with microcalcifications; nonetheless, they also provide an average of several false positives in each case [38]. Despite the low efficiency of CAD systems, they may identify lesions with features distinct from those recognized by radiologists. The synergistic detections by the radiologist and CAD may enhance overall sensitivity during the radiologist's interpretation with CAD assistance. Research indicates that the accuracy of radiologists was markedly enhanced while using CAD. Consequently, CAD systems received FDA approval for use as a secondary opinion, but not as a main reader or pre-screener. Initial therapeutic studies [39, 40] comparing single reading with CAD to double reading yielded encouraging outcomes. The CADET II research by Gilbert et al. [39] was a prospective randomized clinical trial performed at three locations in the United Kingdom. More than 28,000 patients were included. The screening mammography of each patient was independently evaluated in two groups: one used single reading with CAD, while the other employed the conventional method of double reading. The experiences of the single readers in the CAD group were compared to those of the first readers in the double-reading group.

Arbitration was used in recall situations involving the second reader or CAD. Arbitration was conducted in 1.3% of instances during a single review with CAD. The average sensitivities in the two groups were similar at 87.2% and 87.7%, respectively. The recall rates at the two locations were similar in both arms, 3.7% compared to 3.6% and 2.7% compared to 2.7%, respectively; however, one site had a substantially elevated recall rate for single reading with CAD, 5.2% against 3.8%. The total recall rate thus rose in the single reading with CAD from 3.4% to 3.9%. Gromet et al. [40] conducted a retrospective analysis of sensitivity and recall rates from single readings with CAD after its adoption, comparing these metrics to those from double readings before CAD usage, using historical controls from the same cohort of nine radiologists at a single mammography facility. The first reading in their dual reading methodology was likewise examined and processed as a singular reading without CAD. The research cohort included more than 110,000 screening exams in each group. Arbitration by a third specialist radiologist was an element of their typical double-reading practice. A second radiologist was contacted for 2.1% of the patients evaluated by single reading with CAD, however, the consultation may or may not be associated with CAD markings. The sensitivity of a single reading with CAD was found to be 90.4%, surpassing the sensitivities of either single reading alone (81.4%) or double reading (88.0%). The memory rate for single reading with CAD was 10.6%, somewhat above the 10.2% recall rate of single reading alone, however falling short of the 11.9% rate seen in double reading. These well-regulated experiments indicated that single reading with CAD may serve as an alternative to double reading, offering enhanced sensitivity but resulting in higher recall rates, which may be mitigated by arbitration similar to that used in double reading.

Taylor et al. [41] performed a meta-analysis of clinical trials that compared single reading with computer-aided detection (CAD) or double reading vs single reading alone. The researchers analysed the cancer detection rate per 1,000 screened women (CDR) and the recall rate, thereafter calculating the average odds ratios weighted by sample size across the trials in each group. The findings indicated that multiple readings with arbitration enhanced the CDR without elevating the recall rates. The singular reading with CAD for the matched studies elevated the CDR, although with some fluctuation; however, in the absence of arbitration, the recall rate saw a substantial boost. The enhancement in recall rate for double reading without arbitration exceeded that of single reading with CAD by more than double.

Taylor et al. demonstrated significant variances in the influence of CAD on the cancer detection rate, which ranges from 0% to 19%, and the recall rate, which spans from 0% to 37%. In addition to the discrepancies in research designs and the radiologists' expertise, the inconsistencies may also stem from the diverse use of CAD by radiologists in clinical settings. Certain users may have misconstrued the constraints and efficacy of the CAD technologies. They may have excessively depended on the CAD markers, resulting in a lack of attentiveness in lesion detection while augmenting their recall rates. Others may have used CAD as an initial evaluator or preliminary reader to enhance workflow efficiency. Despite the absence of systematic studies on the application of CAD in clinical settings, Fenton et al. [42] observed that "radiologists with varying levels of experience and expertise may employ CAD in a non-standardized, idiosyncratic manner," and "some community radiologists, for instance, may opt not to recall women due to the lack of CAD indicators on otherwise suspicious lesions." Lehman et al. [43] conducted a comparison of digital mammogram readings with and without CAD involving 271 radiologists across 66 facilities within the Breast Cancer Surveillance Consortium (BCSC). The average sensitivity decreased by 2.3%, but the recall rate was augmented by 4.5% with the use of CAD. The reduction in sensitivity indicated that the radiologists did not use CAD as a secondary opinion, necessitating users to sustain their interpretative attentiveness and, therefore, their sensitivity, but instead excessively depended on the CAD annotations for recall judgments. The authors recognized that "Previous studies have established that not all cancers are indicated by CAD and that cancers are frequently missed if CAD does not highlight a visible lesion" and that "CAD may enhance mammography efficacy when adequate training is given on its utilization to improve performance."

The research conducted by Cole et al. [38] revealed an additional aspect of using CAD. Observational research was performed to evaluate single readings with and without computer-aided detection (CAD) using two commercial CAD systems on 300 screening cases (150 malignancies and 150 benign or normal) from the Digital Mammographic Imaging Screening Trial (DMIST). All study readers were seasoned breast radiologists who have used CAD in their clinical practice. The independent sensitivity of both CAD systems was 25% more than that of the radiologists, regardless of CAD use, although they averaged over two false positive indications in each case. The findings markedly contrasted with those noted during the first phases of CAD research, when radiologists expressed much enthusiasm for CAD. The findings suggest that prolonged use of CAD by radiologists may have dulled their attention to many false positive markings, resulting in the dismissal of many indications, including actual positives. In a screening context, the duration required for a radiologist to eliminate over 2000 false positive indications to identify one or two tumors per 1000 tests is deemed economically unviable by several radiologists. This research demonstrated that the specificity of a decision support tool must be elevated to prevent clinician fatigue in reaction to the computer's suggestions.

4. Transfer Learning

Transfer learning is a prevalent strategy used by deep learning practitioners when the training dataset is limited. In transfer learning, a well-trained Deep Convolutional Neural Network (DCNN) from a source domain is converted to a new target task by fine-tuning it using a comparatively small training set from the target domain. DCNN functions as a feature extractor, acquiring representations of input data by extracting various degrees of abstraction via its convolutional layers [44-47]. Yosinski et al. [48] have shown that the features acquired in the shallow layers are more general, whereas those in the deeper layers become more tailored to the particular job for which the DCNN is being trained. Due to the decomposition of features into several components in a DCNN, and the prevalence of similar fundamental elements in most photos, the information acquired by a trained DCNN in feature extraction is demonstrably transferable across diverse image domains. The transferability of characteristics diminishes when the disparities between the source domain and the destination domain increase. Nonetheless, even for markedly distinct source and target tasks, transfer learning by initializing a DCNN with weights acquired from another source task may surpass the performance of the identical DCNN trained with randomly initialized weights for the target task.

The bulk of work on training deep learning models in medical imaging used transfer learning because of the scarcity of accessible data. The biggest annotated public dataset currently accessible is ImageNet, which comprises photographic pictures of over 1000 categories of ordinary items, including animals, automobiles, plants, ships, and aircraft. The majority of DCNN models in medical imaging were developed using transfer learning, utilizing models that started with ImageNet-pretrained weights and then fine-tuned with a small dataset of medical images. Transfer learning was typically seen to enhance the training convergence and resilience of deep convolutional neural networks (DCNNs). In several instances, pre-trained DCNNs were used as feature extractors without fine-tuning; the deep features obtained from applying the pre-trained DCNN to the picture data of the target domain served as predictor variables for training an external classifier for the target task.

While transfer learning may somewhat mitigate the issue of insufficient data, a substantial training dataset remains essential for attaining a high-performance DCNN model for a certain target task. Samala et al. [49] performed research to assess the impact of training set size on the efficacy of a transfer-trained Deep Convolutional Neural Network (DCNN) in diagnosing malignant and benign breast masses in digital breast tomosynthesis (DBT). The ImageNet-pretrained AlexNet, including 5 convolutional layers and 3 fully connected layers, was augmented with 2 additional fully connected layers (resulting in a total of 5 fully connected layers) to condense the classification from over 1000 categories to 2 (malignant and benign) and then transfer-trained for the target task. Due to the limited size of the DBT dataset and the relative abundance of mammogram data, the pre-trained AlexNet underwent transfer training in the initial phase for the classification of masses in mammograms, thereby transitioning from an unrelated classification task on non-medical ImageNet data to a task (mammography) more closely aligned with the target task (DBT).

5. Synopsis

Deep learning is anticipated to transform CAD and image analysis in the medical field. Despite the use of machine learning in CAD and medical image analysis for over thirty years, CAD has not been widely implemented in clinical settings owing to the inadequate performance of traditional machine learning methods. The recent triumph of deep learning technology stimulates fresh initiatives to create CAD or AI solutions for various applications in healthcare. A multitude of research has shown encouraging outcomes. Despite the elevated expectations about the precision and efficacy that AI may contribute to medicine, several hurdles need to be addressed to incorporate the latest generation of CAD technologies into clinical practice and to mitigate the danger of inadvertent injury to patients. This chapter's subject extends beyond computer-aided lesion identification. Comparable issues apply to all CAD technologies broadly, including those used for disease definition, staging, treatment planning, surgical guiding, treatment response evaluation, recurrence monitoring, and prognosis or survival prediction.

Extensive databases must be amassed to furnish adequate training and validation samples for the development of robust deep learning models, alongside independent testing utilizing both internal and external multi-institutional data to evaluate generalizability. Performance standards, acceptance testing, and quality assurance protocols should be instituted for each application type to guarantee that the deep learning model's performance aligns with local clinical requirements and remains consistent over time. Comprehensive user training concerning the local patient population is essential to enable users to comprehend the capabilities and limitations of the CAD tool, establish realistic expectations, and prevent misuse or disillusionment. Additionally, CAD recommendations must be interpretable to empower clinicians in making informed decisions. Workflow efficiency and costs are essential issues in healthcare. A decision support tool will be deemed unacceptable if it necessitates more time and/or expenses without substantial therapeutic advantages. CAD researchers and developers must comprehend clinicians' preferred help modes for various clinical activities to build successful CAD tools and provide interpretable outputs while addressing practical challenges in clinical environments. When adequately created, evaluated, and deployed, efficient data analytics from CAD or AI technologies are anticipated to enhance doctors' human intelligence, hence improving accuracy, efficiency, and patient care.

References

[1] Winsberg F, Elkin M, Macy J, Bordaz V, Weymouth W (1967) Detection of radiographic abnormalities in mammograms by means of optical scanning and computer analysis. Radiology 89:211–215

[2] Kimme C, O'Laughlin BJ, Sklansky J (1977) Automatic detection of suspicious abnormalities in breast radiographs. Data structures, computer graphics and pattern recognition. Academic Press, New York

[3] Spiesberger W (1979) Mammogram inspection by computer. IEEE Trans Biomed Eng 26:213–219

[4] Semmlow JL, Shadagopappan A, Ackerman LV, Hand W, Alcorn FS (1980) A fully automated system for screening mammograms. Comput Biomed Res 13:350–362

[5] Doi K (2015) Chapter 1. Historical overview. In: Li Q, Nishikawa RM (eds) Computer-aided detection and diagnosis in medical imaging. Taylor & Francis Group, LLC, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, pp 1–17

[6] Chan H-P, Doi K, Galhotra S, Vyborny CJ, MacMahon H, Jokich PM (1987) Image feature analysis and computer-aided diagnosis in digital radiography. 1. Automated detection of microcalcifications in mammography. Med Phys 14:538–548

[7] Chan H-P, Doi K, Vyborny CJ, Schmidt RA, Metz CE, Lam KL et al (1990) Improvement in radiologists' detection of clustered microcalcifications on mammograms. The potential of computer-aided diagnosis. Investig Radiol 25:1102–1110

[8] LeCun Y, Bengio Y, Hinton G (2015) Deep learning. Nature 521:436–444

[9] Gangadhar C, Moutteyan M, Vallabhuni RR, Vijayan VP, Sharma N, Theivadas R. Analysis of optimization algorithms for stability and convergence for natural language processing using deep learning algorithms. Measurement: Sensors. 2023 Jun 1;27:100784.

[10] LeCun Y, Boser B, Denker JS, Henderson D, Howard RE, Hubbard W et al (1990) Handwritten digit recognition with a back-propagation network. Proc Adv Neural Inf Process Syst:396–404

[11] Lo SCB, Lin JS, Freedman MT, Mun SK (1993) Computer-assisted diagnosis of lung nodule detection using artificial convolution neural network. Proc SPIE 1898:859–869

[12] Lo SCB, Chan H-P, Lin JS, Li H, Freedman M, Mun SK (1995) Artificial convolution neural network for medical image pattern recognition. Neural Netw 8:1201–1214
[13] Chan H-P, Lo SCB, Helvie MA, Goodsitt MM, Cheng SNC, Adler DD (1993) Recognition of mammographic microcalcifications with artificial neural network. Radiology 189(P):318
[14] Chan H-P, Lo SCB, Sahiner B, Lam KL, Helvie MA (1995) Computer-aided detection of mammographic microcalcifications: pattern recognition with an artificial neural network. Med Phys 22:1555–1567
[15] Chan H-P, Sahiner B, Lo SCB, Helvie MA, Petrick N, Adler DD et al (1994) Computer-aided diagnosis in mammography: detection of masses by artificial neural network. Med Phys 21:875–876
[16] Sahiner B, Chan H-P, Petrick N, Wei D, Helvie MA, Adler DD et al (1995) Image classification using artificial neural networks. Proc SPIE 2434:838–845
[17] Mahoro E, Akhloufi MA. Breast masses detection on mammograms using recent one-shot deep object detectors. In2023 5th International Conference on Bio-engineering for Smart Technologies (BioSMART) 2023 Jun 7 (pp. 1-4). IEEE.
[18] Sahiner B, Chan H-P, Petrick N, Wei D, Helvie MA, Adler DD et al (1996) Classification of mass and normal breast tissue: a convolution neural network classifier with spatial domain and texture images. IEEE Trans Med Imaging 15:598–610
[19] Zhang W, Doi K, Giger ML, Wu Y, Nishikawa RM, Schmidt RA (1994) Computerized detection of clustered microcalcifications in digital mammograms using a shift-invariant artificial neural network. Med Phys 21:517–524
[20] Hinton GE, Osindero S, Teh Y-W (2006) A fast learning algorithm for deep belief nets. Neural Comput 18(7):1527–1554
[21] Bengio Y, Lamblin P, Popovici D, Larochelle H (2006) Greedy layer-wise training of deep networks. Proc Adv Neural Inf Process Syst 19:153–160
[22] Erhan D, Bengio Y, Courville A, Manzagol P-A, Vincent P, Bengio S (2010) Why does unsupervised pre-training help deep learning? J Mach Learn Res 11:625–660
[23] Nair V, Hinton GE (2010) Rectified linear units improve restricted boltzmann machines. In: Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Machine Learning, pp 807–814
[24] Glorot X, Bordes A, Yoshua B (2011) Deep sparse rectifier neural networks. In: Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, pp 315–323
[25] Ranzato MA, Huang FJ, Boureau Y-L, LeCun Y (eds) (2007) Unsupervised learning of invariant feature hierarchies with applications to object recognition. In: IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), 17–22 June 2007. Minneapolis, MN, USA
[26] Srivastava N, Hinton G, Krizhevsky A, Sutskever I, Salakhutdinov R (2014) Dropout: a simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting. J Mach Learn Res 15:1929–1958
[27] Ioffe S, Szegedy C (2015) Batch normalization: accelerating deep network training by reducing internal covariate shift. In: Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML'15), vol 37, pp 448–456. arXiv:1502.03167
[28] Krizhevsky A, Sutskever I, Hinton GE (2012) ImageNet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. Adv Neural Inf Process Syst:1097–1105
[29] Russakovsky O, Deng J, Su H, Krause J, Satheesh S, Ma S et al (2015) Imagenet large scale visual recognition challenge. Int J Comput Vis 115(3):211–252
[30] He K, Zhang X, Ren S, Sun J (2015) Deep residual learning for image recognition. In: Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), pp 770–778. arXiv:1512.03385
[31] Sun C, Shrivastava A, Singh S, Gupta A (2017) Revisiting unreasonable effectiveness of data in deep learning era. arXiv:1707.02968
[32] Litjens G, Kooi T, Bejnordi BE, Setio AAA, Ciompi F, Ghafoorian M et al (2017) A survey on deep learning in medical image analysis. Med Image Anal 42:60–88
[33] Sahiner B, Pezeshk A, Hadjiiski LM, Wang X, Drukker K, Cha KH et al (2019) Deep learning in medical imaging and radiation therapy. Med Phys 46(1):e1–e36

[34] Mazurowski MA, Buda M, Saha A, Bashir MR (2019) Deep learning in radiology: an overview of the concepts and a survey of the state of the art with focus on MRI. J Magn Reson Imaging 49(4):939–954

[35] Fauw JD, Ledsam JR, Romera-Paredes B, Nikolov S, Tomasev N, Blackwell S et al (2018) Clinically applicable deep learning for diagnosis and referral in retinal disease. Nat Med 24(9):1342–1350

[36] Janowczyk A, Madahushi A (2016) Deep learning for digital pathology image analysis: a comprehensive tutorial with selected use cases. J Pathol Inform 7:29

[37] Chan H-P, Hadjiiski LM, Samala RK (2019) Computer-aided diagnosis in the era of deep learning. Med Phys (accepted)

[38] Cole EB, Zhang Z, Marques HS, Hendrick RE, Yaffe MJ, Pisano ED (2014) Impact of computer-aided detection systems on radiologist accuracy with digital mammography. AJR Am J Roentgenol 203:909–916

[39] Gilbert FJ, Astley SM, Gillan MGC, Agbaje OF, Wallis MG, James J et al (2008) Single reading with computer-aided detection for screening mammography. N Engl J Med 359(16):1675–1684

[40] Gromet M (2008) Comparison of computer-aided detection to double reading of screening mammograms: review of 231,221 mammograms. Am J Roentgenol 190(4):854–859.

[41] Taylor P, Potts HWW (2008) Computer aids and human second reading as interventions in screening mammography: two systematic reviews to compare effects on cancer detection and recall rate. Eur J Cancer 44:798–807

[42] Fenton JJ, Abraham L, Taplin SH, Geller BM, Carney PA, D'Orsi C et al (2011) Effectiveness of computer-aided detection in community mammography practice. J Natl Cancer Inst 103(15):1152–1161. https://doi.org/10.1093/jnci/djr206

[43] Lehman CD, Wellman RD, Buist DSM, Kerlikowske K, Tosteson ANA, Miglioretti DL (2015) Diagnostic accuracy of digital screening mammography with and without computer-aided detection. JAMA Intern Med 175(11):1828–1837

[44] Zech J, Pain M, Titano J, Badgeley M, Schefflein J, Su A et al (2018) Natural language-based machine learning models for the annotation of clinical radiology reports. Radiology 287(2):570–580.

[45] Yan K, Wang X, Lu L, Summers RM (2018) DeepLesion: automated mining of large-scale lesion annotations and universal lesion detection with deep learning. J Med Imaging 5(3):036501

[46] Oakden-Rayner L (2017) Exploring the ChestXray14 dataset: problems.https://lukeoakdenrayner.word press.com/2017/12/18/the-chestxray14-dataset-problems/

[47] The Digital mammograph DREAM Challenge (2017).

[48] Yosinski J, Clune J, Bengio Y, Lipson H (2014) How transferable are features in deep neural networks? In: Proceedings of the Advances in neural information processing systems (NIPS'14), pp 3320–3328

[49] Samala RK, Chan H-P, Hadjiiski LM, Helvie MA, Richter CD, Cha K (2019) Breast cancer diagnosis in digital breast tomosynthesis: effects of training sample size on multi-stage transfer learning using deep neural nets. IEEE Trans Med Imaging 38(3):686–696

دور التعلم العميق في تعزيز التشخيص بمساعدة الكمبيوتر في التصوير الطبي: مراجعة شاملة

الملخص

الخلفية :يعد التصوير الطبي أمرًا حيويًا لتشخيص العديد من الحالات الصحية، ولكن الحجم المتزايد من بيانات التصوير يمثل تحديات كبيرة لأطباء الأشعة. لقد أظهرت أنظمة التشخيص بمساعدة الكمبيوتر التقليدية (CAD) تنفيذًا سريريًا محدودًا بسبب أداء غير كافٍ. توفر تقنيات التعلم العميق حلولاً واعدة لتعزيز تحليل الصور ودقة التشخيص.

الطرق :تستعرض هذه المراجعة تطور وتطبيق تقنيات التعلم العميق في التصوير الطبي، وخاصة في أنظمة .CAD نقوم بتحليل الانتقال من التعلم الآلي التقليدي إلى التعلم العميق، مع تسليط الضوء على منهجيات مثل الشبكات العصبية التلافيفية العميقة (DCNNs) التي تمكن من استخراج الميزات تلقائيًا من بيانات التصوير المعقدة. تم تنفيذ بحث شامل في الأدبيات لتقييم أداء التعلم العميق في مختلف أشكال التصوير.

النتائج :تشير النتائج إلى أن الأساليب القائمة على التعلم العميق، خاصةً DCNNs ، تتفوق بشكل كبير على أنظمة CAD التقليدية من خلال التعرف بشكل مستقل على الميزات المرضية وتصنيفها في الصور الطبية. تظهر الدراسات تحسينًا في الحساسية والنوعية عند الكشف عن الأورام، مما

يحسن دقة التشخيص بشكل عام. ومع ذلك، لا تزال هناك تحديات تتعلق بدمج هذه التقنيات في سير العمل السريري، بما في ذلك الحاجة إلى مجموعات بيانات تدريب واسعة وإمكانية الاعتماد المفرط على الأنظمة الآلية

الخاتمة :يمثل التعلم العميق تقدمًا تحولياً في مجال التصوير الطبي و CAD. على الرغم من النتائج الواعدة التي تم الإبلاغ عنها، فإن مزيدًا من البحث ضروري لمعالجة العوائق الحالية أمام الاعتماد السريري. إن توحيد مقاييس الأداء، وإجراء اختبارات دقيقة عبر مجموعات سكانية متنوعة، وتوفير التدريب الشامل للعاملين في الرعاية الصحية أمر ضروري من أجل التنفيذ الناجح لأنظمة التشخيص بمساعدة الكمبيوتر المعتمدة على التعلم العميق في الممارسة السريرية الروتينية.

الكلمات المفتاحية :التعلم العميق، التصوير الطبي، التشخيص بمساعدة الكمبيوتر، الشبكات العصبية التلافيفية، دقة التشخيص.