



Vision-based endoscope tracking for 3D ultrasound image-guided surgical navigation [Yang et al. 2014, *Comp Med Imaging and Graphics*]

### Gustavo Sato dos Santos

IGI Journal Club 23.10.2014

**wellcome**trust











# **Motivation**

**Goal**: Surgical navigation for minimally-invasive fetal surgery

#### **Disadvantages of other tracking methods**

- Optical: line-of-sight between tracker and markers
- Electromagnetic (EM): prone to noise electronic devices in OR
- EM tracker + inertia measurement unit (IMU): issues with tracking initialisation, drift errors, accuracy
- Vision-based (Structure-from-Motion): not suitable due to unpredictable amniotic fluid, need to minimise illumination

#### Approach

- Initial camera position by ultrasound image-based localisation;
- Vision-based tracking







- <u>Ultrasound</u>: Hitachi ProSound α10 w/ 3D tilt-scanning convex sector transducer
  - mounted on rigid bracket (to minimise motion artefacts)
- Endoscope: Shinko Optical, 5.4mm diam. rigid endoscope, Xenon light source
- Translation stage: Sigma Koki, 4 µm/pulse resolution, 1 µm precision











# Workflow







# U/S image-based initialisation



- Scene geometry acquired by 3D ultrasound imaging
  - Manual selection of placenta ROI;
  - Thresholding with isovalue  $\rightarrow$  meshed surface model (50,000 vertices)
- Camera position acquired by localising fiducial (8 cm length, 0.3 cm diam.)
  - Prior fiducial-camera calibration (f  $\rightarrow$  c transformation)
- Localisation error ≈ 1.32 mm
- Low acquisition rate, multiple sampling required for robustness





## Underwater camera calibration

#### **Optical properties of medium** $\rightarrow$ **intrinsic parameters of camera**

- Camera pre-calibrated in saline solution used for experiments
  - Camera calibration toolbox for Matlab (Bouguet JY, 2004)
- Images corrected for radial and tangential lens distortions
  - Brown-Conrady model (Brown DC, *Photon Eng* 1971)





# Inter-frame feature matching

# **Speed-Up-Robust-Features (SURF) algorithm** [Bay et al., *Comput Vis Image Und* 2008]

- Scale and rotation invariant features
- FAST-Hessian feature detection, 64-element descriptor representing distribution of Haar-wavelet responses of feature neighbourhood
- Robust even in scenes with poor texture (important for tissue imaging)
- Outlier removal: RANSAC algorithm
- <u>Result</u>: 10-30 reliable feature matches (20 required for subsequent processing)





### Inter-frame feature matching

Phantom

#### Ex-vivo monkey placenta



(a)

(b)







Texture conditions:

(a)Desirable

#### (b) Moderate

(c) Poor





# 2D-3D point correspondence

#### Mapping image coordinates $(i_p, j_p)$ to 3D coordinates $(x_p, y_p, z_p)$

• Project 3D vertices of ultrasound image model to the camera plane to obtain their image coordinates:

$$^{k-1}\mathbf{z}^{\bullet}\begin{pmatrix}k-1& i & j & 1\end{pmatrix}^{\mathrm{T}} = \mathbf{K}\begin{pmatrix}k-1\mathbf{R}_{u} & k-1\mathbf{t}_{u}\end{pmatrix}^{u}\begin{pmatrix}x & y & z & 1\end{pmatrix}^{\mathrm{T}}$$

**K:** intrinsic camera parameter matrix;  ${}^{k-1}\mathbf{R}_{u}, {}^{k-1}\mathbf{t}_{u}$ : rotation matrix and translation vector from camera's viewpoint at frame *k*-1

- Delaunay triangulation of points  $(i,j,^{k-1}z) \rightarrow$  dense depth map Z(i,j)
- 3D camera-centric coordinates of interest points:

$${}^{k-1}\mathbf{p}_{l} = \left( {}^{k-1}(i_{p} - i_{o}) \cdot \frac{{}^{k-1}\mathbf{Z}(i_{p},j_{p})}{f_{x}}, {}^{k-1}(j_{p} - j_{o}) \cdot \frac{{}^{k-1}\mathbf{Z}(i_{p},j_{p})}{f_{y}}, {}^{k-1}\mathbf{Z}(i_{p},j_{p}) \right)$$

(*i*<sub>0</sub>,*j*<sub>0</sub>) and ( $f_x$ , $f_y$ ): principal point and focal length from **K** 





# 2D-3D point correspondence



3D interest points are updated every frame, according to matching features across two adjacent images





# Pose estimation

#### Pose estimation as Perspective-n-Point (PnP) problem

- Better accuracy and stability than Direct Linear Transformation (DLT)
- EPnP algorithm (Lepetit V et al., Int J Comput Vision 2009):
  - non-iterative
  - solves coordinates of M=4 virtual control points  $\boldsymbol{n} = \{q_1, \dots, q_M\}$

$${}^{k}\mathbf{z}_{l}^{\bullet}\begin{pmatrix} k(i_{l} \quad j_{l} \quad 1)^{\mathrm{T}} \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{K} \sum_{m}^{M} \lambda_{lm}{}^{c}q_{m}$$

 $\lambda_{lm}$ : homogeneous barycentric coordinates summing to one

- Control points q consist of the centroid of interest points p and another 3 points that align closely to the principal direction of p
- Computational time: O(n)
- Performs well even with noisy non-fixed interest points





### **Pose estimation**



**EPnP implementation**. Pink surface = placental scene geometry; textured patch = camera views projected onto constructed surface model.





# Overview of workflow







## Results: phantom study, controlled trajectory



Each processing frame was at an interval of 10 acquisition frames (approx. 7s). Total displacement = 15-25 mm.





## Results: phantom study, controlled trajectory



Each processing frame was at an interval of 10 acquisition frames (approx. 7s). Total displacement = 15-25 mm.





## Results: phantom study, freehand trajectory



In the trajectory of approx. 30 mm, the mean absolute error was 2.69 mm in the 30 processed frames (300 acquired frames in 10 s).





### Results: ex vivo study, static estimation



Position estimation error for ex vivo placenta imaging.

| Axis | Monkey's placenta imaging |                    |               |                    |
|------|---------------------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------------|
|      | Orientation (Deg.)        |                    | Position (mm) |                    |
|      | Mean                      | Standard deviation | Mean          | Standard deviation |
| x    | 0.317                     | 0.089              | 0.10          | 0.11               |
| У    | 0.225                     | 0.251              | 0.18          | 0.11               |
| Ζ    | 0.095                     | 0.246              | 0.03          | 0.03               |

- Analysis of 100 estimations (5 positions x 20 frames)
- Validation against optical tracking, which has ~0.17 mm error
- Errors larger than phantom validation of static estimation





## Results: effect of relocalisation (phantom)



- Ultrasound image-based delocalisation at 200th frame of 400-frame video
- Rectification of cumulative errors in vision-based tracking
- Final positional error reduced from 11.35 mm to 4.61 mm over total displacement of 45 mm





### **Results: computation time**



• On a workstation with Intel Core i7-2600 3.4 GHz processor



# Contributions / Future work

- Approach essentially vision-based, augmented with scene geometry information from ultrasound
- Relocalisation corrects cumulative errors or tracking failures
- Need to check performance under conditions closer to clinical setting (various kinematics, scene geometries, and illumination)
- Limitations in quality of endoscopic images can be addressed by:
  - fluorescence endoscope;
  - ultra-high sensitive endoscopic camera;
  - hyperspectral imaging of placental vasculature
- Ultrasound image artefacts lowered accuracy in the *ex vivo* study