## On the performance of manually or automatically segmented DATSCAN-SPECT for biomarker extraction in PD

**A. Palombit<sup>1</sup>, R. Manber<sup>1</sup>, R. Joules<sup>1</sup>, R. Wolz<sup>1,2</sup>** <sup>1</sup>IXICO plc, London, UK; <sup>2</sup>Imperial College of London, London, UK

JI DXICO

## Introduction

- Current clinical standard for Parkinson's Disease (PD) requires the assessment of degeneration of dopaminergic neurons in brain's striatum region.
- In-vivo, this assessment can be done by imaging the dopamine transporter (DaT) activity by means of single photon emission computerized tomography (SPECT) after the injection of Iodine-123 fluoropropyl (123I-FP-CIT).
- Visual read can be complemented by quantitative binding assessment for objective striatal markers derived from the tracer biodistribution.
- We assessed the impact of the regional delineation methodology (see Figure 1) used to extract such biomarkers on their classification performances in a mixed controls/PD cohort.



Current standard (manual delineation)

Whole-brain analysis (fully automatic)

Figure 1. Approaches for striatal binding ratio (SBR) by delineation method.



## Results

- The model trained with different feature set achieved performances reported in Table 1.
- Improvement in performances by using binding descriptors (LEAP-ALL) in addition to SBR-only (LEAP-SBR) consistent with [Prashanth et al., 2017] and offer balanced error types (see Figure 2).
- The simple feature set (intensity-based only) defined did not reach, if not loosely (within the standard deviation) the performances of classification based on SBR from manual delineations (PPMI-SBR).

## Conclusions

This study shows results of a fully automatic quantitative analysis of DaT-SPECT based on MRI data for accurate withinsubject anatomical striatal delineations.

Imaging biomarkers from automatic SPECT processing provided classification performances close to PPMI measures on early-PD subjects.

The proposed processing, however, requires no manual intervention for a repeatable biomarker extraction suitable for large clinical studies whose comparison is shown in Table 2.

| Feature set | Accuracy        | Precision       |  |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| PPMI-SBR    | 0.96 ± 0.05     | 0.95 ± 0.06     |  |
| LEAP-SBR    | $0.82 \pm 0.11$ | $0.84 \pm 0.10$ |  |
| LEAP-ALL    | $0.88 \pm 0.10$ | 0.91 ± 0.07     |  |

**Table 1.** Classifier results fromdifferent feature sets. Results arereported as average cross folds ±the standard deviation acrossfolds.



**Figure 2**. Confusion matrices across dataset from **PPMI-SBR** (left box), **LEAP-SBR** (central box) or **LEAP-ALL** (left box) features. Intensity scales by number of datasets.

| Method               | Sensitivity     | Human<br>time   | Endpoint<br>reproducibility | Resources required                                | Extensibility<br>of analysis |
|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| Manual<br>(PPMI)     | High (variable) | Medium-<br>high | Variable                    | Trained radiologist, manual segmentation software | Limited                      |
| Automatic<br>(IXICO) | Medium/high     | Low             | High                        | Processing facility                               | High                         |

**Table 2**. Head to head comparison of DaT-SPECT analysis approaches by criteria.