An improved model for joint segmentation and registration based on linear curvature smoother
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Abstract
Image segmentation and registration are two of the most challenging tasks in medical imaging. They are closely related because both tasks are often required simultaneously. In this article, we present an improved variational model for a joint segmentation and registration based on active contour without edges and the linear curvature model. The proposed model allows large deformation to occur by solving in this way the difficulties other jointly performed segmentation and registration models have in case of encountering multiple objects into an image or their highly dependence on the initialisation or the need for a pre-registration step, which has an impact on the segmentation results. Through different numerical results, we show that the proposed model gives correct registration results when there are different features inside the object to be segmented or features that have clear boundaries but without fine details in which the old model would not be able to cope.
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Introduction
Image segmentation aims to separate objects or features in the image that have similar characteristics into different classes or sub-regions, via detection and visualisation of the contours of the objects in the images. Meanwhile, image registration is the process of finding a geometric transformation between images such that the template (target) images are aligned with the reference (source) images. In a wide range of fields, such as medical image processing, pattern recognition, geophysics, comparison of data to a common reference frame, comparison of images taken at different times, shape tracking or similar problems are challenging issues that are encountered. In those cases, image registration and segmentation depend on each other and should be treated simultaneously in a joint framework. One important applications of such a combination can be found in Gooya et al.1 and similar article where atlases are constructed from magnetic resonance (MR) scans to analyse and understand brain tumour development. The task of construction of the atlases requires alignment of the brain tumour MR scans to a common coordinate system and the automatic segmentation of the scans. According to Erdt et al.,2 25% of published works in medical imaging literature are joint segmentation and registration methods. Many of the methods developed in this context used shape prior models in an energy minimisation framework. The first work on variational model for joint region based segmentation and registration was proposed for rigid registration by Yezzi et al.3 Later, other publications extended the work on segmentation and rigid registration, see literature.4–8 Those
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approach however involves a pre-registration step, using different criteria for segmentation and rigid registration in a sequence of images, hence is not a joint segmentation and registration approach and will fail for shapes, which non-rigidly deforms in different images. On the other hand, it is worth mentioning approaches developed for the purpose of non-rigid registration. These techniques globally register images and estimate the deformation field over the whole image and work for non-rigid deformations, such as registration for CT and MR images. These models have difficulties with multiple objects or they do highly depend on the initialisation, which has an impact on the segmentation results. In difference with literature, Wang and Vemuri use the parametric model based on cubic B-spline and for segmentation the piecewise constant Chan–Vese (CV) model. However, the model requires segmentation of the reference image and the work can be considered as registration driven by segmentation.

On the other hand, it is worth mentioning the work of Le Guyader and Vese (GV-JSR), which presents a segmentation driven by registration. The GV-JSR model replaces the non-linear elastic term in the GV-JSR model. The idea of joining the tasks of segmentation and registration utilised by Le Guyader and Vese using level set representation, which aligns the contour of the template image and simultaneously segment the reference image demonstrate a state of art work with a potential of large deformation of displacement field guided by a segmentation process. The method relates both problems using an active contour based segmentation idea, which is solved in terms of the displacement field. In this section, we provide a brief review of the variational formulation of GV-JSR model for joint segmentation and registration. Before we proceed, we introduce some notation.

Let $T$ denote the template image and $R$ the reference image, $R: \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$, given as compactly support functions and denote by $\varphi = \varphi(x) : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^2$, the unknown transformation aiming for $T(\varphi(x)) \approx R(x)$ with $x = (x_1, x_2)$. In the non-parametric (variational approach) image registration, the transformation is written as $\varphi(x) = x + u(x)$, with $u(x)$ the displacement vector field defined as $u(x) : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^2$, ($n = 2$ or $3$). This transformation enables us to focus on the unknown displacement vector $u(x) = (u_1(x), u_2(x))$. Here, $u(x)$ is searched over admissible functions in the set $\mathcal{U}$, a linear subspace of a Hilbert space with Euclidean scalar product.

The GV-JSR model uses the initial given segmentation of the template image to find the geometric transformation of the template image and the segmentation of the reference image. The segmentation of the template image is represented by the zero level line $\phi_0 : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ to represent target contour $\Gamma$ given as

$$
\Gamma = \partial \Omega_1 = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \Omega | \phi_0(x_1, x_2) = 0\},
\text{inside}(\Gamma) = \Omega_1 = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \Omega | \phi_0(x_1, x_2) > 0\},
\text{outside}(\Gamma) = \Omega_2 = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \Omega | \phi_0(x_1, x_2) < 0\}.
$$

Relation to previous work: The GV-JSR model

The idea of joining the tasks of segmentation and registration is as follows: In “Relation to previous work: The GV-JSR model” section, we review the task of joining segmentation and registration. In “The proposed NJSR model” section, we introduce our proposed new joint segmentation and registration (NJSR) model, which improves the original GV-JSR model. We show in “Numerical results” section, some numerical tests including comparisons. Finally, we present our conclusion and future work in the “Conclusion” section.
The joint functional for segmentation and registration\(^{19}\) is given by

\[
\min_{c_1, c_2, u(x)} \mathcal{J}(c_1, c_2, u(x))
\]

\[
= \lambda_1 \int_\Omega |R(x) - c_1|^2 H_e(\phi_0(x + u(x)))dx
\]

\[
+ \lambda_2 \int_\Omega |R(x) - c_2|^2 (1 - H_e(\phi_0(x + u(x))))dx
\]

\[
+ \alpha S^{\text{NLE}}(p) + \alpha \beta \|p - \nabla u(x)\|^2
\]

(2)

where \(c_1\) and \(c_2\) are the average intensities inside and outside the curve \(\Gamma\) in the reference image, which is represented by the zero level line as in equation (1) and \(H_e\) is a regularised Heaviside function

\[
H_e(z) = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{2}{\pi} \arctan \frac{z}{\epsilon} \right)
\]

with its corresponding Delta function

\[
\delta_e(z) = \frac{dH_e(z)}{dz} = \frac{\epsilon}{\pi(\epsilon^2 + z^2)}
\]

The variable \(p\) shown in equation (2) is a matrix auxiliary variable, which approximates the Jacobian matrix of \(\nabla u(x)\) helping in reducing the nonlinearity in the regularisation term. It is given by

\[
p = \begin{pmatrix} p_{11} & p_{12} \\ p_{21} & p_{22} \end{pmatrix} \approx \nabla u(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x_1} & \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x_2} \\ \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial x_1} & \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial x_2} \end{pmatrix}
\]

(3)

The regularisation term in (2), denoted by \(S^{\text{NLE}}\), is the nonlinear elastic regularisation term for image registration based on Yanovsky et al.,\(^{20-22}\) which is given by

\[
S^{\text{NLE}}(p) = \int_\Omega \frac{\lambda}{8} (2(p_{11} + p_{22}) + p_{11}^2 + p_{12}^2 + p_{21}^2 + p_{22}^2)^2
\]

\[
+ \frac{\mu}{4} ((2p_{11} + p_{12}^2 + p_{21}^2)^2
\]

\[
+ (2p_{22} + p_{12}^2 + p_{22}^2)^2
\]

\[
+ 2(p_{12} + p_{21} + p_{11}p_{22} + p_{21}p_{22})^2)dx
\]

(4)

where \(\lambda\) and \(\mu\) are the Lame constants. The model uses the Dirichlet boundary condition.

The GV-JSR model\(^{14,19}\) is incorporated with the regridding step, thus it manages to recover large deformation. The idea of regridding is proposed by Christensen et al.\(^{23}\) to model large deformation. The regridding step is as follows. The determinant of the Jacobian matrix of the transformation is calculated during the registration process to make sure there is no folding or cracking in the deformation field. If the minimum value of the determinant falls below a certain threshold, the last displacement field is stored and the template image is initialised using the last displacement field. Then, the displacement field is set to zero and the process continues until convergence. In Cahill et al.,\(^{24}\) the authors extend the regridding concept and show how the method can be applied in the case of other regularisation terms such as diffusion, linear curvature and linear elastic with several types of boundary conditions. For example, to solve the famous large deformation problem, where we want to align a letter C with a dot (refer to Modersitzki\(^{18}\) for more details), the model requires two regridding step. So, it is natural to apply regularisation based models to recover large deformation as long as the regridding step is incorporated in the model.

One of the main advantages of the GV-JSR model is the ability to produce topology-preserving segmentation where the initial contour from the template image is deformed to the contour of the reference image without merging or breaking. The contour of the reference image is the deformed version of the contour of the template image using the found smooth transformation. It is deformed without separation of the initial contour from the template image, which is difficult to achieve with the standard level set implementation of the active contour.\(^{14}\) Topology preservation is important for several applications in medical imaging such as in computational brain anatomy. The GV-JSR model manages to preserve the topology of the initial contour without corporation of soft or hard constraint in the model. Based on our experiments, however, we found that the model is only suitable to single object in a well-defined image with relatively large structures. Registration process is only drive by the forces on the boundary of the outer structures of the objects and does produce an incomplete deformation field for the inner structures of the objects.

**The proposed NJSR model**

Since in GV-JSR model, the registration process is only drive by the forces on the boundary of the outer structures of the objects, it produces an incomplete deformation field for the inner structures of the objects. To deal with the two cases where the GV-JSR model fails to register, we propose to include two new terms in the functional (2). The first term is a SSD term of the form

\[
\mathcal{D}^{\text{SSD}}(T, R, u(x)) = \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega (T(x + u(x)) - R(x))^2 dx
\]

(5)
which is weighted by the parameter $\lambda_3$ and the term $H_c(\phi_0(x + u(x)))$ and the second term is the linear curvature term to regularise the deformation field in the NJSR model. Thus, our new NJSR model is the following

$$\min_{c_1, c_2, u(x)} J(c_1, c_2, u(x))$$

$$= \lambda_1 \int_{\Omega} |R(x) - c_1|^2 H_c(\phi_0(x + u(x)))dx$$

$$+ \lambda_2 \int_{\Omega} |R(x) - c_2|^2 (1 - H_c(\phi_0(x + u(x))))dx$$

$$+ D_{SSDH}(T, R, \phi_0(x), u(x)) + \alpha S^{LC}(u)$$

where

$$D_{SSDH}(T, R, \phi_0(x), u(x)) = \lambda_3 \int_{\Omega} (T((x + u(x)) - R(x)))^2 H_c(\phi_0(x + u(x)))dx$$

and

$$S^{LC}(u) = \int_{\Omega} (\Delta u_1)^2 + (\Delta u_2)^2 dx.$$

$D_{SSDH}$ is a weighted $L_2$ norm of the difference in the intensity value between the reference and template images. When the intensity values of the region in the transformed template image is not equal to the intensity of the corresponding region in the reference image, this term will be turn on (active). The strength of this term is controlled by the regularised Heaviside function ($H_c$) of the deformed level set from the transformed template image. Schumacher et al.25 also present similar work in registration where the fitting term in their model is the SSD term weighted by the segmentation of the template and reference images. For the term $D_{SSDH}$ to be successful, the intensities of the reference and template images must be comparable. Thus, it is only applicable to mono-modal applications where images generated from the same imaging machine. However, the term can be adjusted to multi-modal images using normalised gradient field or cross correlation distance measures. The other term $S^{LC}$ is a smoothing term based on linear curvature registration as introduced in Fischer and Modersitzki.26 As stated in Fischer and Modersitzki,26 the integral can be viewed as an approximation to the mean curvature of the first and second component of the displacement field $u(x)$. Thus, the term penalises oscillations. It has a non-trivial kernel containing affine linear transformation where

$$S^{LC}(Cx + B) = 0$$

for all $C \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Based on this observation, the linear curvature registration does not require an addition of pre-registration step with affine linear registration in contrast with the conventional registration schemes such as diffusion or linear elastic image registration models. In addition, the proposed model can be extended to the mean and Gaussian curvature registration models.27-29

As $c_1$ and $c_2$ in equation (6) are the average intensity values inside and outside the boundary $\phi_0(x)$ in the reference image, by adopting a level set formulation, $\phi_0(x)$ as in Chan–Vese, we minimise over equation (6) to obtain:

$$c_1 = \frac{\int R(x)H_c(\phi_0(x + u(x)))dx}{\int H_c(\phi_0(x + u(x)))dx},$$

$$c_2 = \frac{\int R(x)(1 - H_c(\phi_0(x + u(x))))dx}{\int 1 - H_c(\phi_0(x + u(x)))dx}. (9)$$

For any given parameter set $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$ and $\alpha$, we can compute a numerical solution $u(x)$ of the minimisation problem (6) using two main types of numerical schemes. First, the so-called optimise-then-discretise approach where the resulting Euler–Lagrange equations in the continuous domain is discretise using finite difference method. Second, the so-called discretise-then-optimise approach where the discrete version of the minimisation problem (6) is solved using standard optimisation problem such as steepest descent method. From either of these two approaches, we would obtain a nonlinear system of equations to be solved iteratively to obtain the final solution. We adopt the second approach to solve for $u(x)$ in problem (6) using LBFGS method as our optimisation scheme. Since we are dealing with a large system of unknown, we use multilevel representation of the reference and template images for fast and efficient implementation. The problem in (6) is solve on the coarser level first, before interpolating the solution to next finer level.

The grid points are located at the centre of the cell

$$\Omega^\delta = \{x_{ij} = (x_{1,i}, x_{2,j})$$

$$= ((i - 0.5)h, (j - 0.5)h)|1 \leq i,j \leq N\}$$

where the domain $\Omega^\delta$ is split into $N \times N$ cells of size $h \times h$. We shall re-use the notation $T, R$ for discrete images of size $N \times N$. We re-define the solution vector

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{bmatrix}_{2N^2 \times 1}, \quad x = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix}_{2N^2 \times 1}, (11)$$
and $x_1, x_2$ are similarly defined.

The discretised form of the functional in (6), by a finite difference method is

$$
\min_{c_1, c_2, U} J^h(c_1, c_2, U) = \\
\lambda_1 \sum_{i,j=1}^N \left| R(x_{ij}) - c_1 x_{ij} \right|^2 H_x(\phi_0(x_{ij} + u(x_{ij}))) \\
+ \lambda_2 \sum_{i,j=1}^N \left| R(x_{ij}) - c_2^2 (1 - H_x(\phi_0(x_{ij} + u(x_{ij})))) \right|^2 \\
+ \lambda_3 \sum_{i,j=1}^N (T((x_{ij} + u(x_{ij}))) \\
- R(x_{ij}))^2 H_x(\phi_0(x_{ij} + u(x_{ij}))) \\
+ \alpha \sum_{i,j=1}^N (-4u_i(x_{ij}) + u_i(x_{i+1,j})) \\
+ u_i(x_{i-1,j}) + u_i(x_{ij+1}) + u_i(x_{ij-1}))^2.
$$

(12)

Here, we are using homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions where

$$
u_i(x_{ij}) = \begin{cases} 
0 & i = 1, 2, \ldots, N-1 \\
\nu_i(x_{ij}) & i = 1, 2, \ldots, N \\
\nu_i(x_{ij}) & i = 1, 2, \ldots, N 
\end{cases}
$$

Starting with zero initial guess,

$$
U = 0,
$$

we solve

$$
H\delta U = -G
$$

(15)

for $\delta U$ and update $U \leftarrow U + \tau H\delta U$ with $\tau$ as the Armijo line search parameter. $H$ and $G$ are the Hessian and gradient matrix for the functional $J^h$ in equation (12) with respect to the displacement vector $U$. The algorithm for the proposed model is given in Algorithm 1

Algorithm 1. The NJSR model for joint segmentation and registration.

1. Initialisation:

$$
R, T, \alpha, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, U = 0, \phi_0(x).
$$

2. For level = Minlevel, ..., Maxlevel

(a) Solve registration problem on this level using Quasi-Newton method (Algorithm 2),

$$
U^{level} \leftarrow \text{Register}(T^{level}, R^{level}, \phi_0^{level}, U^{level,0}).
$$

(16)

(b) If level < Maxlevel, interpolate $U^{level}$ to the next finer level.

3. End for.

where the multilevel of images of the reference and template images denoted by $T^{level}, R^{level}$ using standard coarsening in the implementation. The multilevel representation of the surface $\phi_0(x)$ represents the contour $\Gamma$ of the template image. The coarsest and finest levels of images are denoted by Minlevel and Maxlevel, respectively. We start with zero initial guess for the displacement field on the Minlevel. After registration on each level using Algorithm 2, the deformation field $U^{level}$ is interpolated to the next finer level (level = level + 1) using bilinear interpolation. These recursive procedures are perform iteratively until we reach level = Maxlevel.

Algorithm 2. The NJSR model on one fixed level.

$$
U^{level} \leftarrow \text{Register}(T^{level}, R^{level}, \phi_0^{level}, U^{level,0}).
$$

1. For $k = 1, \ldots, MAXIT$

(a) Update $c_1$ and $c_2$ using equation (9).
(b) Solve equation (15) for $\delta U^{level}$ and update $U^{level}$ with $U^{level,0}$ as initial values.
(c) Check convergence criterion, if satisfied exit, else continue.

2. End for.

Numerical results

We use four sets of images for testing the GV-JSR model and the NJSR model (Algorithm 1) on a variety of images and deformation. To judge the quality of the registration, we calculate the relative reduction
of the similarity measure

\[ \varepsilon = \frac{D_{\text{SSD}}(T, R, u(x))}{D_{\text{SSD}}(T, R)}. \] (17)

In all of the experiments, we do not use the regridding step for fair comparison and the value of the regularisation parameters are chosen such that the minimum value of the determinant of the Jacobian matrix \( J \) of the transformation, denoted as \( \mathcal{F} \)

\[ J = \begin{bmatrix} 1 + \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x_1} & \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x_2} \\ \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial x_1} & 1 + \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x_2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{F} = \min(\det(J)), \] (18)

is greater than zero. This indicates that the deformed grid obtained from the displacement field is free from folding and cracking. Details of the experiments are:

- Experiment 1 (Comparison between GV-JSR and NJSR Models for One Feature Object) Experiment 1 consists of two X-ray images of a human hand from Modersitzki\textsuperscript{17} to illustrate the type of images where the GV-JSR and NJSR models are able to segment and register. The images in Experiment 1 consist of one object with relatively large structure.
- Experiment 2 (Brain MRI with GV-JSR and NJSR Models) Experiment 2 is used to illustrate that the GV-JSR and NJSR models are capable to solve registration problem using real medical images. We use brain MRI from IBSR\textsuperscript{9} (https://www.nitrc.org/project/ibsr) database to test the models. We choose a pair of brain images from different individuals to test the models.
- Experiment 3 (Global Deformation with GV-JSR and NJSR Models using Synthetic Images) The images for the Experiment 3 come from H"omke\textsuperscript{31} where the GV-JSR and NJSR models manage to deliver good results because the features inside the objects in the template image pose the same deformation with the boundary of the object to be segmented.
- Experiment 4 (Local Deformation with GV-JSR and NJSR Models) Experiment 4 is used to illustrate images where the GV-JSR model fails to provide the deformation field between the reference and template images where the data set is from Henn.\textsuperscript{32} In this experiment, the features inside the contour pose different kinds of deformation with the contour. Since the GV-JSR model is based on the boundary mapping, we
obtain no alignment for the features inside the contour $C_0$. Note that the outer structure is nicely registered whereas the inner structure is poorly registered. We show that our proposed model, NJSR, is able to solve the existing problem Experiment 3, which involves different kinds of deformation for the boundary (contour) of the object and the features inside the contour.

In all experiments, we use $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 1$ and $\alpha = 0.5$. In Experiment 1, we use $l_1 = l_2 = 250$, $l_3 = 0.5$, $\mu = 0.005$ for the GV-JSR model in a single level implementation. The parameters values chosen above are based on GV-JSR model for an optimum performance of this model. We solve the GV-JSR model based on the numerical solver provided in Le Guyader and Vese without the regridding step.

**Experiment 1: One feature with GV-JSR and NJSR models**

Images for Experiment 1 are the same as Moderitzki where X-ray images of two hands of different individuals need to be aligned. The size of the images is $128 \times 128$ and the recovered transformation is expected
to be smooth. For this experiment, we take $\alpha = 1$. We also have smaller value of $\varepsilon = 0.1187$ for the NJSR model than $\varepsilon = 0.2605$, which is obtained from the GV-JSR model.

Figure 4. Experiment 2: NJSR model. We have better results using the NJSR model for Experiment 2. Here, we are using $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 1$ and $\alpha = 1$. We also have smaller value of $\varepsilon = 0.1187$ for the NJSR model than $\varepsilon = 0.2605$, which is obtained from the GV-JSR model. (a) $x + u(x), F = 0.5389$; (b) $R$ and $\phi_0(x + u)$; (c) $T(x + u(x)), \varepsilon = 0.1187.$

Figure 5. Experiment 3: GV-JSR model. Illustration of the second class of problem where the GV-JSR model manages to provide good results where the deformation of the features inside the object to be segmented pose the same deformation with the object itself. (a) $T$ and $\phi_0(x)$; (b) $(x + u)$; (c) $T(x + u(x))$; (d) $x + u(x), F = 0.7424$; (e) $R$ and $\phi_0(x + u)$; (f) $T(x + u(x)), \varepsilon = 0.0518$. 

In this experiment, the object inside $\Gamma$ exhibits the same deformation as $\Gamma$, thus the GV-JSR model manages to deliver an acceptable level of results. Our new model, NJSR with $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 1$ and $\alpha = 0.5$ also manages to solve Experiment 1 with similar results as in Figure 2.
Experiment 2: Brain MRI with GV-JSR and NJSR models

In Experiment 2, we use the images in Figure 3 to illustrate that the proposed model NJSR is capable to solve real medical images. Here, the size of images are $128 \times 128$. However, the model is applicable for larger size of images using parallel computing (Figure 4).

Experiment 3: Global deformation with GV-JSR and NJSR models

Synthetic images for Experiment 2 from Hömke\textsuperscript{31} are used to illustrate cases where the features inside the object have the same deformation as the boundary of the object. The results of Experiment 3 using the GV-JSR model with $\alpha = \beta = 25$ are shown in
Figure 8. Experiment 4: NJSR model. We have better results using the NJSR model for Experiment 3 where the circles in $T$ are deformed to squares as in $R$. Here, we are using $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 1$ and $\alpha = 0.25$. We also have smaller value of $\varepsilon = 0.0062$ for the NJSR model than $\varepsilon = 0.0509$, which is obtained from the GV-JSR model. (a) $x + u(x)$, $F = 0.3004$; (b) $R$ and $\phi_0(x + u)$; (c) $T(x + u(x))$, $\varepsilon = 0.0062$.

Figure 5. The template image and the zero level set of $\Gamma$ in red are shown in Figure 5(a). The resulting deformation field is shown in Figure 5(d) with $F = 0.7424$. The zero level set of $\phi_0(x + u)$ is shown in red with the reference image in Figure 5(e). The resulting transformed template image using the deformation in (d) is shown in Figure 5(f) with $\varepsilon = 0.0518$. In this problem, the object inside $\Gamma$ exhibits the same deformation as $\Gamma$, thus the GV-JSR model manages to deliver an acceptable level of results.

Our new model, NJSR with $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 1$ and $\alpha = 0.5$ also manages to solve this particular experiment with similar results as shown in Figure 6.

**Experiment 4: Local deformation with GV-JSR and NJSR models**

In Experiment 4, we use the images in Figure 7 to illustrate where the GV-JSR model with $\alpha = 5$ and $\beta = 25$ fails to deliver good results. In the figure, we can observe that the deformation inside $\Gamma$ is different from the deformation of $\Gamma$. We can see in Figure 7(f), the resulting transform template image contains a huge difference with the reference image in (b) for the inner squares. However, the model manages to align the outermost square. In the figure, we have $F = 0.3319$ and $\varepsilon = 0.0509$.

We resolve the issues in Experiment 3 by using the NJSR model, and the resulting images are depicted in Figure 8. In this figure, we obtain the segmentation of the reference image as shown in Figure 8(b). Since the NJSR model uses the linear curvature model for registration which contains affine linear transformation, it manages to recover the rotation part of the deformation without affine pre-registration step as shown in Figure 8(a) with $F = 0.3004$. The resulting transformed template image, shown in Figure 8(c), has better alignment with the reference image in Figure 7(b) compared with the one obtained by the GV-JSR model in Figure 7(f). In this experiment, we have $\varepsilon = 0.0062$, which is lower than the one obtain from the GV-JSR model in Figure 7(f).

**Conclusion**

We have present an improved model for joint segmentation and registration in a variational formulation. The proposed model consists of two new terms, which extend the original Le Guyader and Vese (GV-JSR) model’s applicability. The first term is a weighted SSD with a regularised Heaviside of the zero level set function to quantify the different deformations exhibited by the features inside of the contour of the template image. The second term is the linear curvature term to control the smoothness of the deformation field, which is superior than the non-linear elastic term in the old GV-JSR model.

Future work involves developing an efficient multi-grid method to solve the model, analytical justification for the model, and automatic selection of regularisation parameters. While there has been work in parameter selection in registration, further work is required to develop a method for the selection of optimal parameters for regularisation term in the joint segmentation and registration model. In addition, we can further extend the work for selective segmentation method or shape prior segmentation models.
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