INVITED SURVEY PAPER Special Section on Medical Imaging

Machine Learning in Computer-Aided Diagnosis of the Thorax and Colon in CT: A Survey

Kenji SUZUKI^{†a)}, *Member*

Computer-aided detection (CADe) and diagnosis (CAD) SUMMARY has been a rapidly growing, active area of research in medical imaging. Machine leaning (ML) plays an essential role in CAD, because objects such as lesions and organs may not be represented accurately by a simple equation; thus, medical pattern recognition essentially require "learning from examples." One of the most popular uses of ML is the classification of objects such as lesion candidates into certain classes (e.g., abnormal or normal, and lesions or non-lesions) based on input features (e.g., contrast and area) obtained from segmented lesion candidates. The task of ML is to determine "optimal" boundaries for separating classes in the multi-dimensional feature space which is formed by the input features. ML algorithms for classification include linear discriminant analysis (LDA), quadratic discriminant analysis (QDA), multilayer perceptrons, and support vector machines (SVM). Recently, pixel/voxel-based ML (PML) emerged in medical image processing/analysis, which uses pixel/voxel values in images directly, instead of features calculated from segmented lesions, as input information; thus, feature calculation or segmentation is not required. In this paper, ML techniques used in CAD schemes for detection and diagnosis of lung nodules in thoracic CT and for detection of polyps in CT colonography (CTC) are surveyed and reviewed.

key words: machine learning in medical imaging, computer-aided diagnosis, classification, pixel-based machine learning, lung nodule, colorectal polyp, CT colonography

1. Introduction

CAD [1], [2] has been a rapidly growing, active area of research in medical imaging. CAD is defined as detection and/or diagnosis made by a radiologist/physician who takes into account the computer output as a "second opinion" [2]. Evidence suggests that CAD can help improve the diagnostic performance of radiologists/physicians in their image interpretations [3]–[6]. Consequently, many investigators have participated and developed CAD schemes such as those for detection of lung nodules in chest radiographs (also known as chest x-rays; CXRs) [7]–[10] and in thoracic CT [11]–[14], those for detection of microcal-cifications/masses in mammography [15], breast MRI [16], and breast US [17], and those for detection of polyps in CTC [18]–[21].

A CADe scheme of lesions in medical images generally consists of two major components: (1) identification of lesion candidates and (2) classification of the identified candidates into lesions or non-lesions. Segmentation of the organ of interest is the first necessary step before the

[†]The author is with the Department of Radiology, The University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637, USA.

identification of lesion candidates. The development of the first component, the identification of lesion candidates, generally aims at obtaining a high sensitivity level, because the sensitivity lost in this step cannot be recovered in the later step. The second component, the classification of the identified candidates, is very important, because it determines the final performance of a CAD scheme. The development of the second component aims at removing as many nonlesions (i.e., false-positive (FP) detections in the first step) as possible while minimizing the removal of lesions (i.e., truepositive detections in the first step). Minimizing FPs is very important, because a large number of FPs could adversely affect the clinical application of CADe. A large number of FPs is likely to confound the radiologist's task of image interpretation and thus lower radiologist efficiency. In addition, radiologists may lose their confidence in CADe as a useful tool. The evaluation of the standalone performance of a developed CAD scheme is the last step of CAD development, and the evaluation of radiologists' performance with the use of the developed CAD scheme is the important last step in CAD research.

ML plays a very important role in a CAD scheme, because tasks on medical images in a CAD scheme require "learning from examples (or data)." Objects in medical images such as lesions and organs may be too complex to be represented accurately by a simple equation. Modeling of such complex objects often requires a number of parameters that have to be determined by examples or data. For example, a lung nodule is generally modeled as a solid sphere, but there are nodules of various shapes and nodules with internal inhomogeneities, such as spiculated nodules and ground-glass nodules. A polyp in the colon is modeled as a bulbous object, but there are also polyps which have a flat shape [22], [23]. Thus, CAD schemes need "learning from examples or data" to determine a number of parameters in a complex model. ML has been used in the second major step of a CAD scheme, i.e., classification of identified lesion candidates into certain classes (e.g., abnormal or normal, lesions or non-lesions, and malignant or benign) based on input features (e.g., contrast, area, and circularity) obtained from segmented lesion candidates (This class of ML is referred to as feature-based ML, or simply as a classifier). The task of ML here is to determine "optimal" boundaries for separating classes in the multi-dimensional feature space which is formed by the input features.

ML algorithms for classification include LDA, QDA, multilayer perceptron (one of the most popular artificial

Manuscript received June 10, 2012.

Manuscript revised December 4, 2012.

a) E-mail: suzuki@uchicago.edu

DOI: 10.1587/transinf.E96.D.772

neural network (ANN) models) [24], and support vector machines [25]. Such ML algorithms have been applied to lung nodule detection in CXR [26] and thoracic CT [12], [27], classification of lung nodules into benign or malignant in CXR [28] and thoracic CT [29], and polyp detection in CTC [18], [30]. Recently, as available computational power has increased dramatically, PML emerged in medical image processing/analysis which uses pixel/voxel values in images directly, instead of features calculated from segmented regions, as input information; thus, feature calculation or segmentation is not required. PML has also been used in the classification of the identified lesion candidates in CAD schemes.

In this paper, ML techniques used in CAD schemes for detection and diagnosis of lung nodules in CT and for detection of polyps in CTC are surveyed and reviewed. Survey papers for CAD in thoracic CT have been published, including one for lung image analysis in CT with emphasis on a comprehensive survey for computer analysis of the lungs [31], one for CAD in thin-section CT [32], one for CAD in CT with emphasis on CAD performance [33], one for CAD in CT with emphasis on performance comparisons with clinical aspects [34], and one for CAD in both thoracic CT and CTC with emphasis on a methodological overview of major steps in CAD schemes [35]. This present paper focuses on surveys and comparisons of ML techniques in CADe and CADx schemes in thoracic CT and CTC.

2. Classes of Classification Techniques in CAD

There are three classes of classification techniques that have been developed and used in CAD schemes: feature-based classifiers (or feature-based ML), PML, and non-ML-based methods that are defined as methods that do not use ML techniques, such as a procedure that uses a geometrical relationship in a non-learning way. Non-ML methods are not surveyed in this paper.

2.1 Feature-based Classifiers

When an ML algorithm is used for classification, it is generally called a classifier. A standard classification approach based on a classifier such as a multilayer perceptron is illustrated in Fig. 1. First, target lesions are segmented by using a segmentation method. Next, features are extracted from the segmented lesions. Features may include morphologic (or shape-based), gray-level-based (including histogrambased), and texture features. Then, extracted features are entered as input to an ML model such as a multilayer perceptron [24]. The ML model is trained with sets of input features and correct class labels. A class label of 1 is assigned to the corresponding output unit when a training sample belongs to a certain class (e.g., class A), and 0 is assigned to the other output units (e.g., classes B, C, etc.). In the case of two-class classification, one output unit instead of two output units is often used with the output value 0 being class A, and 1 being class B. After training, the class of the unit with



Fig.1 Feature-based ML (feature-based classifier) for classification of a detected and segmented lesion.

the maximum value is determined to be the corresponding class to which an unknown sample belongs. For details of feature-based classifiers, refer to one of many textbooks in pattern recognition such as [24], [25], [36], [37].

There are several important issues to be considered in the design of ML techniques: generalization, over-fitting, curse of dimensionality, training data annotation, and feature selection.

Generalization in ML is the ability of a trained ML model to perform on unseen cases. The generalization performance of the ML model is estimated by using cases in a test database, which is often lower than the performance for training cases. How to design an ML model with a high generalization performance is an important topic, which is closely related to the over-fitting issue. If an ML model is trained with only a small number of cases, the generalization ability will be lower, because the ML model may fit only the training cases. This is known as "over-training" (or "over-fitting") [38]. Over-fitting occurs when the number of training cases is too small to determine parameters in the ML model sufficiently. For achieving a high generalization performance, a large number of training cases, e.g., 400-800 cases, is generally required for an ANN in a CADs scheme [39]. For detailed information, please refer to the literature such as [37], [40].

How to estimate the generalization performance with a finite number of testing cases is an important topic as well. To estimate the generalization performance better, resampling schemes such as leave-one-out cross validation, N-fold cross validation, and bootstrapping are often employed [40]. The curse of dimensionality [41] is referred to as the following phenomenon: As the dimensionality of the input feature space for a ML model increases subject to the number of input features, the number of training samples required for the ML model increases exponentially. For detailed information, please refer to the literature such as [40]. To avoid the curse of dimensionality, feature selection and/or dimensionality reduction techniques are often utilized.

Annotating training cases is also an important topic, because the annotation is expensive or time-consuming when the number of training cases is large. There are methods for reducing the annotation labor or annotation itself in the general ML field, but the quality of annotation (or determining "gold standard") is more important in the CAD research area. In order for the study to be clinically meaningful, "gold standard" annotations (or labels) have to be determined by using more reliable/accurate examinations, e.g., the "gold standard" for lung nodule presence in screening CT should be established by using their confirmation in upper-level follow-up examinations such as diagnostic CT or high-resolution CT (HRCT).

Feature selection has long been an active research topic in ML, because it is one of the main factors that determine the performance of a classifier. It avoids the curse of dimensionality by reducing the input dimension to the classifier. In general, many features are extracted from segmented lesions as the classifier input. Not all of the features, however, would be useful for a classifier to distinguish between lesions and non-lesions, because some of them might be highly correlated with each other or redundant; some of them may not be strongly associated with the given classification task. For designing a classifier with high performance, it is crucial to select "effective" features. In the field of CADe research, one of the most popular feature selection methods is a stepwise feature selection based on Wilks' lambda. The method has been applied in various CADe schemes because of its simplicity [12], [29], [42]. The Wilks' lambda criterion is good for LDA, but not necessarily for nonlinear classifiers. One of the most widely used deterministic feature selection methods is sequential forward or backward floating selection (SFFS or SBFS) [43]. SBFS was used for selection of input features for ANNs [44], [45]. SFFS was used for feature selection combined with various classifiers such as Naïve Bayes, SVMs, and AdaBoost [46] in different CADe schemes. Recently, Xu and Suzuki proposed SFFS coupled with an SVM for selection of the most relevant features that maximize the area under the receiver-operating-characteristic (ROC) curve (AUC) [47].

2.2 Pixel/voxel/patch-Based Machine Learning (PML)

Recently, as available computational power has increased dramatically, pixel/voxel/patch-based ML (PML) [35] emerged in medical image processing/analysis, which uses pixel/voxel values in images directly instead of features calculated from segmented regions as input information; thus, feature calculation or segmentation is not required. Because PML can avoid errors caused by inaccurate feature calculation and segmentation, the performance of PML can potentially be better for subtle/complex lesions than that of common feature-based classifiers.

There are three classes of PMLs: neural filters [48]–[50] (including neural edge enhancers [51], [52]), convolution neural networks (NNs) [53]–[57] (including shift-invariant NNs [58], [59]), and massive-training artificial neural networks (MTANNs) [19], [60]–[63] (including multiple MTANNs [12], [49], [50], [60], [64], [65], a mixture of expert MTANNs [20], [66], a multi-resolution MTANN [61], a Laplacian eigenfunction MTANN (LAP-MTANN) [67], a massive-training support vector regression (MTSVR), and a massive-training Gaussian process regression [68]). For details of the architectures and applications



Fig. 2 Architecture of an MTANN (a class of PML) consisting of an ML regression model (e.g., linear-output ANN regression and support-vector regression) with sub-region (local window or patch) input and single-pixel output.

of PMLs in medical imaging, refer to a survey paper on PMLs [35].

By extending the neural filter and the neural edge enhancer, two-dimensional (2D) MTANNs [11], which are a class of a PML based on an ANN regression model, have been developed for accommodating the task of distinguishing a specific opacity from other opacities in medical images. The MTANN learns the relationship between input images and corresponding "teaching" images (i.e., ideal or desired images) to distinguish lesions from nonlesions (i.e., FPs). The MTANN is trained with a massive number of subregions/subvolumes extracted from input images together with teaching pixels; hence the term "massive training". The architecture of an MTANN is shown in Fig. 2. A 2D MTANN consists of a linear-output multilayer ANN regression model, which is capable of operating on voxel data directly [51], [52]. The MTANN is trained with input images/volumes and the corresponding "teaching" images/volumes for enhancement of a specific pattern and suppression of other patterns. The input to the MTANN consists of voxel values in a sub-region/volume (local window or patch) extracted from an input image/volume. The class of MTANNs has been used for classification, such as FP reduction in CAD schemes for detection of lung nodules in CXR [7] and CT [5], [11], [12], distinction between benign and malignant lung nodules in CT [65], and FP reduction in a CAD scheme for polyp detection in CTC [19], [20], [66]-[68]. The MTANNs have also been applied to pattern enhancement and suppression such as separation of bones from soft tissue in CXR [61], [62], and enhancement of lung nodules in CT [63].

3. Classification in CAD of the Thorax

Lung cancer continues to rank as the leading cause of cancer

deaths in America and other nations such as Japan. The number of lung cancer deaths in each year is greater than the combined number of breast, colon, and prostate cancer deaths in the United States [69]. Because CT is more sensitive than CXR in the detection of small nodules and of lung carcinoma at an early stage [70]-[72], lung cancer screening programs are being investigated in the United States [73], Japan [70], [71], and other countries with lowdose (LD) helical CT as the screening modality. Evidence suggests that early detection of lung cancer may allow more timely therapeutic intervention and thus a more favorable prognosis for the patient [71], [74]. Helical CT, however, generates a large number of images that must be read by radiologists/physicians. This may lead to "information overload" for the radiologists/physicians. Furthermore, radiologists/physicians may miss some cancers during interpretation of CT images. Therefore, a CAD scheme for detection of lung nodules in LDCT images has been investigated as a useful tool for lung cancer screening.

Classification is a major component in CAD schemes for detection and diagnosis of lung nodules in CT. CAD schemes for detection of lung nodules in thoracic CT (i.e., CADe) generally consists of two major steps: (1) identification of nodule candidates, followed by (2) classification of the identified nodule candidates into nodules or non-nodules (i.e., normal anatomic structures). The second major step in a CADe scheme aims at classification of the nodule candidates identified in the first step into nodules or non-nodules, whereas a CAD scheme for diagnosis (often abbreviated as CADx) aims at classification of the detected nodules (either by a computer or by a radiologist) into benign or malignant nodules.

3.1 Detection of Lung Nodules

Technical developments of the classification step in CADe schemes for detection of lung nodules in CT are summarized in Table 1. In 1994, Giger et al. [75] developed a CADe scheme for detection of lung nodules in CT. In 1999, Armato et al. [13], [27] extended the method to include 3D feature analysis, a rule-based scheme, and LDA for classification. They evaluated the performance of their scheme with a leave-one-out cross-validation (LOO) test. Kanazawa et al. [76] employed a rule-based scheme with features for classification in their CADe scheme. Gurcan et al. [77] employed a rule-based scheme based on 2D and 3D features, followed by LDA for classification. Lee et al. [78] employed a simpler approach which is a rule-based scheme based on 13 features for classification. Suzuki et al. [60] developed a PML technique called an MTANN for reduction of a single source of FPs and a multiple MTANN scheme for reduction of multiple sources of FPs that had not been removed by LDA. This MTANN approach did not require a large number of training cases: the MTANN was able to be trained with 10 positive and 10 negative cases [79]-[81], whereas feature-based classifiers generally require 400-800 training cases [79]-[81]. Arimura et al. [12] employed a rulebased scheme followed by LDA or by the MTANN [60] for classification. Farag et al. [82] developed a templatemodeling approach that uses level sets for classification. Ge et al. [83] incorporated 3D gradient field descriptors and ellipsoid features in LDA for classification. Matsumoto et al. [84] employed LDA with 8 features for classification. Yuan et al. [85] tested a commercially available CADe system (ImageChecker CT, R2 Technology, CA). Bi et al. [86] developed an asymmetric cascade of classifiers for classification. Pu et al. [87] developed a scoring method based on the similarity distance of medial axis-like shapes for classification. Retico et al. [88] used the MTANN approach (i.e., a PML technique) for classification. Ye et al. [89] used a rule-based scheme followed by a weighted SVM for classification. Golosio et al. [90] used a fixed-topology ANN for classification, and they evaluated their CADe scheme with a publicly available database from the Lung Image Database Consortium (LIDC) [91]. Murphy et al. [92] used a knearest-neighbor classifier for classification. Tan et al. [93] developed a feature-selective classifier based on a genetic algorithm and ANNs for classification. Messay et al. [94] developed a sequential forward selection process for selecting the optimum features for LDA and QDA. Riccard et al. [95] used a heuristic approach based on geometric features, followed by an SVM for classification. Other than the development of CADe schemes, Rao et al. [96] performed an observer performance study with a CADe scheme. Thus, various approaches have been proposed for the classification component in CADe schemes. There are large variations in the performance of CADe schemes: sensitivities ranged from 70-94% with 0.7-64.1 FPs per case. It is difficult to say which CADe scheme performs better because of different databases and testing methods used, without a direct comparison. Some studies used thick-slice CT, and others used thin-slice CT. Some studies used nodules missed by radiologists, and some used nodules detected by radiologists. Evaluation of a CAD scheme with missed cases would be desirable, because the CAD scheme is likely to help radiologists more with such cases. Some studies used screening CT, some used diagnostic CT, and some used HRCT. Testing with screening CT cases would be more appropriate, given the purpose of CADe schemes. Some studies used an LOO test, some used an independent test, and some used N-fold cross-validation. Each testing method has its own advantages and limitations. For detailed information, please refer to the literature [39], [40], [97]. Since the current sensitivity and FP rate of CADe schemes are not high enough compared to radiologists' performance, further developments of techniques to improve the performance would be necessary. In addition, more studies on the proof of the usefulness of CADe such as observer performance studies and clinical trials would be beneficial in the field.

3.2 Diagnosis of Lung Nodules

Although CT has been shown to be sensitive to the detection lung nodules, it may be difficult for radiologists

Table 1	Classification com	onents in CADe	e schemes for	detection of	lung nodules	in CT
					<u> </u>	

Giger of tablesComparison of semaining of geometric featuresComparison of semaining of geometric featuresSemaining of semaining of	Study	Database	Classifier/Method	Performance				
 al. [75] diagnostic CT scans notalies Armato t al. [74] diagnostic CT scans 171 notalies Kanza Thick-slice (10 mm) at screening LTS and 3D fatures and and and and and and and and and and	Giger et	Thick-slice	Comparison of	Sensitivity of		patients with 628	Technology	FPs per case in
of 8 patients with 47 FPs per case Bit et al. HRCT scans of 80 Asymmetric cascade of 4. (13, 27) of 4.3 patients with and LDA with 92 D FPs per case in Bit et al. HRCT scans of 80 Asymmetric cascade of 88% with 0.7 Kanzat Thick-slice (10 mm) and LDA with 92 D FPs per case in Thick-slice (10 mm) Rule-based scheme Sensitivity of Kanzat Thick-slice (10 mm) Rule-based scheme Sensitivity of Sensitivity of Guram Thick-slice (10 mm) Rule-based scheme Sensitivity of at 1781 afformation framewith 73 nodules and LDA with 62 Sensitivity of Suzaki Thick-slice (10 mm) Rule-based scheme Sensitivity of starter modules Rule-based scheme Sensitivity of Suzaki Thick-slice (10 mm) Rule-based scheme Sensitivity of starter modules Sensitivity of Sensitivity of Suzaki Thick-slice (10 mm) Rule-based scheme Sensitivity of starter Sensitivity of Sensitivity of Sensitivity of starter Thick-slice (10 mm) Sensitivity of Sensitivity of starter Sof patients Multiple MTANNs Sensi	al. [75]	diagnostic CT scans	geometric features	94% with 1.25		nodules		an independent
andalesmatemodulesBit et al.HRCT scans of AAsymmetricSensitivity of(13, 27)of 43 patients withand 3D featuresFPs per case in an LOD testFPs per case in an an LOD testPu et al.Thin-slice (2.5 mm) followed by similarity distanceSensitivity of sensitivity of sensitivity of sensitivity of sensitivity of sensitivity of 		of 8 patients with 47		FPs per case				test
ArmatoThick-slice (10 mm) rat al, Expansion of C stansSensitivity of and LDA with 92 D7 (% with 42.2 PFs per case in and LDA with 92 D7 (% with 42.2 Free case in of 43 patients with at al, 17 in datasCascade column generation screening CT scansSensitivity of screening CT scansSensitivity		nodules			Bi et al.	HRCT scans of 86	Asymmetric	Sensitivity of
et al. diagnostic CT scams including 66 carrest with 63 nodules and DD averth 92D modules 70% with 42.2 mathef mathef carrest with 63 nodules nodules classifiers with a a Validation boosting feature based on the screening CT scams of 52 patients with and DD averth 62D screening CT scams of 53 patients with a screening CT scams of 54 patients with a screening CT scams of 54 patients with process of 54 patients with a screening CT scams of 54 patients with process of 54 patients with a screening CT scams of 54 patients wi	Armato	Thick-slice (10 mm)	Rule-based scheme	Sensitivity of	[86]	patients with 48	cascade of	88% with 0.7
[15, 27]of 4.9 patients with at al.and DO test and LDA with 6.20and LOO test scensitivity of scens of 4.50 patients with and DO testCounting features scensitivity of scens of 4.50 patients with scensitivity of scens of 3 patients with 17 nodulesRule-based scheme scensitivity of scens of 3 patients with 17 nodulesCounting features scensitivity of scensitivity of scens of 3 patients with 17 nodulesCounting features scensitivity of scensitivity of scens of 3 patients with 17 nodulesCounting features scensitivity of scensitivity of scensitivity of scens of 3 patients with 17 nodulesCounting features scensitivity of scensitivity of scensitivity of scens of 63 patients with 17 nodulesCounting features scensitivity of scensitivity of scensitivity of scensitivity of scens of 63 patients with 19 nodulesCounting features scensitivity of scensitivity of<	et al.	diagnostic CT scans	and LDA with 9 2D	70% with 42.2		nodules	classifiers with	FPs per case in
Kanza Wa et al.In induction screening CT scans screening CT scans of 30 patients with 230 nodulesRule-based scheme 90%Sensitivity of 90%Pu et al. (87)Thin-slice (2.5 mm) screening CT scans of 32 patients with and 1DA with 62DSensitivity of 84% with 7.4 radius featuresThin-slice (2.5 mm) 84% with 7.4 radius featuresSensitivity of 84% with 7.4 radius radius radiusThin-slice (2.5 mm) radius radius featuresSensitivity of 84% with 7.4 radius radius radiusThin-slice (1.6 mm) radius radius radius radiusSensitivity of 80.3% with 4.8 radiusThin-slice (1.6 mm) radius radius radius radiusSensitivity of 80.3% with 4.8 	[13, 27]	171 podulos	and 3D leatures	rrs per case in			boosting feature	a vanuation
Variat al. (76)Carceming CT some of 450 patients with 230 notatesConstruction and LDA with 62D and LDA with 62D and DA with 62D and So patients with f12D classing and Carsens of 813 patients with 119 andulesConcession and DA with 62D and Carsens of 813 and Carsens of 814 patients with 119 andulesConcession and DA with 62D and Carsens of 814 and Carsens of 814 patients with 119 andulesConcession and Carsens of 814 and Carsens of 814 and Carsens of 814 patients with 119 andulesConcession and Carsens of 814 and Carsens of 814 and Car	Kanaza	Thick-slice (10 mm)	Rule-based scheme	Sensitivity of			selection	test
 [76] of 450 patients with products of 52 patients with products simularly discussed on the simularity discussed on the simularity discussed on the simularity discussed on the simularity discussed of 52 patients with products and DB retures with 62 Data and DB retures and DA with 162 Data and DB retures products the sector of 27 patients with 10-13 FPs per case in an LOQ test sector of 52 patients with products and DA with 13 screening LDCT for patients with products with pro	wa et al.	screening CT scans	Rule-based seneme	90%	Pu et al.	Thin-slice (2.5 mm)	Scoring method	Sensitivity of
 230 nodules Gurcan et al. mm) diagnostic CT scans of 34 patients and LDA with 62D ad JCB Rule-based scheme ad LDA with 62D ad JD atterns ad LDA with 62D ad JD atterns ad LDA with 74.4 FPs per case in an LOO test apso subregion apso subregion at [82] at [83] at [84] at [84] at [84] at [84] at [85] at [85] at [86] at [86] at [87] at [88] at [88]	[76]	of 450 patients with			[87]	screening CT scans	based on the	81.5% with 6.5
Gurcan et al. (71) scans of 34 patients with 63 nodulesRule-based scheme and JD featuresSensitivity of PS per case in and LOA tsith 3.06 (72) with 3.06 (73) patients with 98 of 20 patients with 98 of 100-13 FPs per case in and LOA tsith 3.06 (73) patients with 98 with 71 nodules with screening LDCTNulleipe MTANNS sensitivity of screening LDCTNulleipe MTANNS sensitivity of screening LDCTYe et al. (89)184 reduces screening CT scans of 39 patients with 98 screening CT scans of 63 patients with 71 nodules with solid patterns, including 66 cancersNulleipe MTANNS sensitivity of screening LDCTNulleipe MTANNS sensitivity of screening LDCTYe et al. screening CT scans of 73 patients with 98 a 9.99 subregion patients with 90 with 92 subregion patients with 90 with 92 subregion patients with 90 solid patterns. solid patternsNulleipe MTANNS sensitivity of screening LDCT scans of 73 patients with 19 nodules and solid patternsNulleipe MTANNS sensitivity of and 99 subregion as test (or an solid patterns with 19 nodulesNulleipe MTANNS sensitivity of an ultiple MTANNS sensitivity of an ultiple MTANNS sensitivity of solid patternsNulleipe MTANNS sensitivity of an ultiple MTANNS sensitivity of an ultiple MTANNS sensitivity of and 182184 sensitivity of an ultiple MTANNS sensitivity of an ultiple MTANNS sensitivity of an ultiple MTANNS sensitivity of an ultiple MTANNS sensitivity of scans of 16 patients with 119 nodules and solid nodulesNulleipe MTANNS s		230 nodules				of 52 patients with	similarity distance	FPs per case
et al. mm) diagnostic CT marching 16 non- solid nodules marching 16 non- solid nodul	Gurcan	Thick-slice (2.5-5	Rule-based scheme	Sensitivity of		184 nodules	combined with a	
[77]scans of 34 patients with 63 nodulesand 3D features notalesFPs per case in an LOO test followedsensitivity of scans of 12 patients with pixel values in a subvolume as input rinck-slice (10 mm) with 71 nodules with sincluding 66 cancersand 3D features sensitivity of sensitivity of sensitivity of subvergion as testRetice t ant.OO test for availation testRetice (1 time-slice (1 mm) subvolume as input rinc-slice (1 mm) rinc-slice (10 mm) subvolume as input followed by a with 71 nodules with solid patterns, including 66 cancersand 3D features sensitivity of sensitivity of solid patterns, including 66 cancersPresper case in a validation testRetice t sensitivity of solid nodulesand 3D features sensitivity of sensitivity of sensitivity of sensitivity of sensitivity of solid patterns, solid patternsand 3D features sensitivity of sensitivity of sensitivity of sensitivity of sensitivity of sensitivity of sensitivity of sensitivity of solid patternsand 3D features sensitivity of sensitivity of sensitiv	et al.	mm) diagnostic CT	and LDA with 6 2D	84% with 74.4		including 16 non-	marching cube	
 with 63 modules an LOO test an LOO test and LDA with 13 Sensitivity of and LDA with 14 Sensitivity of a 9x9 subregion a 9x9 subregion as a 9x3 subregion as a 118 a 9x3 subregion as a 128 a 129 a 129 a 120 a 120 a 125 	[77]	scans of 34 patients	and 3D features	FPs per case in	D	solid nodules	algorithm	G 141 141 G
LeeetIntex-stice (10 mm) of 20 patients with 98 of 20 patients with 98 of 20 patients with 98 nodulesKule-based scheme FPs per caseSensitivity of PS per caseat. [85]of 30 patients with pixel values in a screening LDCT scans of 63 patientsSensitivity of a 9x0 subregion a 106 thick-stice (10 mm) solid, part-solid patterns, with 71 nodules with solid patternsMultiple MTANNs solid patterns, including 66 cancersSensitivity of a validation testYe et al.Tin-slice (1 mm) testRule-based scheme sensitivity of a validation testSensitivity of et al.Nulliple MTANNs solid nodulesSensitivity of et al.Nulliple MTANNs solid nodulesSensitivity of et al.Tin-slice (1 S-30.Fixed-topology sensitivity of multiple MTANNs solid patternsSensitivity of a validation test (or an aparesolid patternsFixed-topology sensitivity of et al.Fixed-topology sensitivity of et al.Sensitivity of an independent testFarag et al. [82]Thin-slice (2.5 mm) solid patternsTemplate modeling approach using approach using test (or an solid patternsSensitivity of sensitivity of sensitivity of test (sensor 56 b patients with 116 sensitivity of features selectionSensitivity of sensitivity of ser	T .	with 63 nodules	D 1 1 1 1	an LOO test	Retico et	Thin-slice (T mm)	Voxel-based neural	Sensitivities of
ain (1)and LDA with 1512/2 with 15/010/10 (11/2 with 15/0odules50 patients with 98featuresFPs per casenodulesscreeningLDCTMultiple MTANNsSensitivity ofet al.screeningLDCTwith pixel values in80.3% with 4.8[60]scans of 63 patients9 sub region80.3% with 4.8[70]holdes withfollowed by a90.2% with 8.2[70]bit obstance9.2% with 2.4FPs per case[70]bit obstancefollowed by80.5% with 4.8[71]patients with100 nodulesfollowed byet al.mon -solid and non-solid patterns,followed by83% with 5.8[72]LDCT scans of 73multiple MTANNsFPs per case inpatients with 109patients with 109with sizel values ina validationpatients with 109non-solid patternsa 93.9 subregion asa validationsolid patternsbit ks' lambdastepwisefeaturesscans of 16 patientsfeaturesSensitivity of[81]mm) CT scans of 56features[82]patients with 116features[83]mm) CT scans of 56lambda stepwise[84]Scans of 56 patients (4)featuresof which usedfond with 45[84]Scans of 50LDA with 8[84]Scans of 150LDA with 8[84]Scans of 160[84]Scans of 56[84]Scans of 56[85]<	Lee et	l'hick-slice (10 mm)	Rule-based scheme	Sensitivity of	ai. [00]	of 30 patients with	(MTANN) with	10 13 EPc per
Suzuki Suzuki Suzuki (al. <td>ai. [70]</td> <td>of 20 patients with 98</td> <td>features</td> <td>FPs per case</td> <td></td> <td>102 nodules</td> <td>nixel values in a</td> <td>case</td>	ai. [70]	of 20 patients with 98	features	FPs per case		102 nodules	nixel values in a	case
Suzuki et al.Thick-slice (10 mm) screening LDCTMultiple MTANNs with pixel values in 		nodules	Teutures	r i s per euse		102 hounes	subvolume as input	euse
etal.screeningLDCTwith pixel values in a 9x9 subregion (clasl window or solid, part-solid and non-solid patterns, including 66 cancers80.3% with 4.8 a 9x9 subregion (clasl window or a validation test[89]screening CT scans of 54 patients with 118 nondules90.0% with 8.2 FPs per case in an independent testArimura (12)106 thick-slice (10 patients with 109 solid patterns, including 66 cancersRule-based scheme followed by spatients with 109 solid patternsRule-based scheme including 67 scans of 73 patients with 109 solid patternsRule-based scheme inpatients with 109 solid patternsSensitivity of a 9x9 subregion as input (or LDA with with 119 nodules stepwise feature selection)Sensitivity of a 9x9 subregion as input (or LDA with testSensitivity of a 9x3% with 3.2[89]screening CT scans of 54 patients with 142 monous of 54 patients with 155 multiple MTANNs inpatients with 109 screening LDCT scans of 16 patients with 119 nodules and 34 normal patientsRule-based scheme input (or LDA with Wiks' scensing LDCT approach using 93.3% with 14.7 feature selection fram testSensitivity of and 202 scensitivity of feature selection from 120 clatabaseFNs per case in an independent testFarag et al. [82]Thin-slice (1.0-2.5 patients with 110 sciel of 10-2.5Thin-slice CT scans featuresSensitivity of featuresTan et sclid nodulesThin-slice CT scans of 84 patients with an independent testSensitivity of featuresFarag et al. [83]Thin-slice (1.0-2.5 patients with 110 sclid	Suzuki	Thick-slice (10 mm)	Multiple MTANNs	Sensitivity of	Ye et al.	Thin-slice (1 mm)	Rule-based scheme	Sensitivity of
[60]scans of 63 patientsa 9x9 subregion with 71 nodules with with 71 nodules with solid, patreshid and non-solid patterns, including 66 cancersa validation testof 54 patients with including 17 non- solid nodulesFPs per case in a validation testArimura et al.106 thick-slice (10 totak-slice (10 patients with 109 cancers with solid, patreshid and non- solid patternsRule-based scheme followed by s3% with 5.8 followed by s3% with 5.8 a 9x9 subregion as test (or an solid patternsSensitivity of a validation test (or an a 9x9 subregion as test (or an solid patternsSensitivity of a nindependent testFPs per case in a validation test (or an a patreshid and non- solid patternsMurphy Wilks' lambda stepwise feature selection)Sensitivity of aproach using 93.3% with an a level setsSensitivity of aproach using 93.3% with an a LOC test for LDA with Wilks' Sensitivity of al 193Tan et an independent testTan et al [93]Tan et thin-slice C scans an independent testFPs per case in an independent testFe et al.Thin-slice (1.2-5.3 mm) and independent testLDA with Wilks' scans of 5 patientsSensitivity of an independent testTan et al [93]Tain-slice C scans from LIDC databaseFPs per case in an independent testGe et al.82 thim-slice (1.2-5.3 mm) and modulesLDA with Wilks' scans of 5 patientsSensitivity of an LOC test and LOC test from LIDC databaseTain-slice C scans from LIDC databaseFeatures selected initial featuresFPs per case in an in	et al.	screening LDCT	with pixel values in	80.3% with 4.8	[89]	screening CT scans	followed by a	90.2% with 8.2
with 71 nodules with solid, part-solid and non-solid patterns, including 66 cancers(local window or a validation test18nodules15 featuresan independent testArimura et al.mm) screening patients with 109 cancers with solid, part-solid and non- solid patternsRule-based scheme followed by with jxke values in a validation test (or an input (or LDA with selection)Sensitivity of solid patternsFixed-topology testSensitivity of restFarag et al. [82]Thin-slice (2.5 mm) screening LB2Thin-slice (2.5 mm) fourus with 119 nodules solid notulesTemplate modeling sensitivity of aptress with 119 nodules and stepwise feature selection)Sensitivity of sensitivity of al. [82]Tan et screening screening LDCTTan et from LDC databaseNN with 42 features selectionSensitivity of sensitivity of al. [93]Tan et solid nodulesTan et radiologist agreed rom LDC databaseSensitivity of sensitivity of features selectionFe et al. solid nodulesThin-slice (2.5 mm) al norus solid nodulesTemplate modeling sensitivity of features selectionSensitivity of features sensitivity of featuresTan et selectionTan et radiologist agreed rom LDC databaseFeature-selective selection from 245 features selection from 245Sensitivity of sensitivity of featuresFor et al. solid nodulesThin-slice (1.25 mm) four which used of which used to et al. solid nodulesLDA with % features selection from 245 featuresSensitivity of features selection from	[60]	scans of 63 patients	a 9x9 subregion	FPs per case in		of 54 patients with	weighted SVM with	FPs per case in
 solid, part-solid and patterns, including 66 cancers Arimura 106 thick-slice (10 Rule-based scheme Sensitivity of et al. mm) screening patients with solid, part-solid and non-solid patterns patients with solid, part-solid and non-solid patterns scancers with solid, part-solid and non-solid patterns screening LDCT screeni		with 71 nodules with	(local window or	a validation		118 nodules	15 features	an independent
ArimuraInon-solidpatterns, including 66 cancersSensitivity of to thick-slice (1.22.3)Solid nodulesFixed-topologySensitivity of to tet al.Arimura106 thick-slice (10Rule-based schemeSensitivity of to thip 24 cancersSensitivity of to to tet al.Fixed-topologySensitivity of tet al.[12]LDCT scans of 73 patients with 109 cancers with solid, and sup art-solid and non- solid patternsSensitivity of tet al.Sensitivity of tet al.Fixed-topologySensitivity of tet al.Farag et al. [82]Thin-slice (2.5 mm) screening uith 19 nodules and scans of 16 patientsSensitivity of approach using approach using approach using scans of 16 patientsSensitivity of sensitivity of scans of 16 patientsSensitivity of sensitivity of scans of 16 patientsSensitivity of sensitivity of scans of 16 patientsSensitivity of sensitivity of solid nodulesTan et an independent radiologists agreed of 125 patients with al. [93]Tan et solid nodulesThin-slice CT scans from LIDC database from LIDC databaseFeature-selective selectionSensitivity of sensitivity of features selection from 44 featuresMatsum ot ot et al. (184) ot ot et al. solid nodulesIndegendeer selection from 44 featuresSensitivity of sensitivity of features selection from 44 featuresSensitivity of sensitivity of featuresThin-slice CT scans featuresRecarel selection from 245 frest-reseSensitivity of sensitivity of featuresMatsum ot ot et al. (184) <td></td> <td>solid, part-solid and</td> <td>patch) as input</td> <td>test</td> <td></td> <td>including 17 non-</td> <td></td> <td>test</td>		solid, part-solid and	patch) as input	test		including 17 non-		test
Arimura tet al.Inde titles/slee (10- soil of addersRule-based scheme followed by 		non-solid patterns,			Calasia	solid nodules	Eined to release	Constitution of
Alimital et al.Init CF scans of 05 and cancers with sold, a patients with 109 cancers with sold, an on- solid patternsFor yer case in a validation test (or an input (or LDA with with 19 nodulesFor yer case in a validation test (or an input (or LDA with VIR's lambda seperise feature selection)For yer case in a validation test (or an input (or LDA with VIR's lambda stepwise feature selection)For yer case in a validation test (or an input (or LDA with VIR's lambda stepwise feature selection)For yer case in a validation test (or an input (or LDA with vith 19 nodulesFor yer case in an independent testFarag et al. [82]Thin-slice (2.5 mm) screening LDCT scans of 16 patients with 119 nodules and 34 normal patientsTemplate modeling sensitivity of features selection features selection from 44 features an LOO testSensitivity of sensitivity of features selection from 44 features an LOO testTan et tan et from 1025 patients with and ANNs with 45 an independent testFan et an independent testMatsum to et al. of ot et al. of ot et al. of which used of et al.LDA with %18's sensitivity of featuresSensitivity of features an LOO testSensitivity of featuresTan et an et an et an odulesTan et tan et from LDC databaseTan et tan et tan et and ANNs with 45 an independent testMatsum ot ot et al. of to et al. matsum to et al.IDA with %18 sensitivity of featuresSensitivity of featuresSensitivity of featuresYuan et bio hodulesIDA with %18<	Arimuro	106 thick slice (10	Pula basad sahama	Sonaitivity of	Golosio et al	1 mm CT scans of 83	ANN with 42	70% with 4
CtandImage CheckerCTSensitivity of al. [85]FP sper case in a validationnodulesnultiptersold ROIan independent test[12]LDCT scans of 73 	Ariinuia et al	mm) screening	followed by	83% with 5.8	[90]	natients with 148	features from	FPs per case in
[15]Datients with 109 cancers with solid, part-solid and non- solid patternswith pixel values in 	[12]	LDCT scans of 73	multiple MTANNs	FPs per case in	[20]	nodules that one	multithreshold ROI	an independent
cancers with solid, part-solid and non- solid patternsa 9x9 subregion as input (or LDA with Wilks' lambda stepwise feature selection)test (or an LOO test for LDA)from LDC databasefrom LDC databasefrom LDC databaseSensitivity of features selected nodulessensitivity of an independent testFarag et al. [82]Thin-slice (2.5 mm) scraes of 16 patients with 119 nodules and 34 normal patientsTemplate modeling approach level setsSensitivity of ga3,3% with an level setsSensitivity of ga3,3% with an level setsTan et solid nodulesThin-slice CT scans of 125 patients with radiologists agreed from LDC databaseFeature-selective from LDC databaseSensitivity of an independent testGe et al. [83] mm) CT scans of 56 patients with 116 solid nodulesLDA with Wilks' features solid nodulesSensitivity of features solid nodulesSensitivity of features solid nodulesSensitivity of an LDC databaseTan et al. [93]Thin-slice CT scans of 84 patients with testFPs per case in an LOO testTan et al. [94]Thin-slice CT scans featuresFPs per case in a 7-fol cross- validation testMatsum of which used contrast media) with 50 nodulesThin-slice (1.25 mm) al. [85]ImageChecker CT LN-1000 by R2Sensitivity of and NO by R2Sensitivity of and NO by R2Riccardi radio logists agreed on from LIDCThin-slice CT scans from a volume of validation testYuan et fall [85]Thin-slice (1.25 mm) al. [85]ImageChecker CT LN-1000 by R2Sensitivity of s	[]	patients with 109	with pixel values in	a validation		radiologist detected		test
part-solid and non- solid patternsinput (or LDA with Wilk's tepwise feature selection)LOO test for LDA)Murphy et al.Thin-slice screening patients with 1,525k-nearest-neighbor classifier modulesSensitivity of classifier and lagenderFarag et al. [82]Thin-slice (2.5 mm) scans of 16 patients with 119 nodules and 34 normal patientsTemplate modeling aproach using 93.3% with an 34 normal patientsSensitivity of 93.3% with an 34 normal patientsTan et al. [93]Tan et ratiologists agreed from LIDC databaseTan et ratiologists agreed from LIDC databaseTan et ratiologists agreed ratiologists agreed to 84 patients with 106 nodulesFPs per case in an independent testMatsum ot ot et al. (84] scans of 5 patients (4 of which used contrast media) with 50 nodulesLDA with 88 sensitivity of features for 4 features of which used contrast media) with 50 nodulesImageChecker CT Sensitivity of an LOO testRiccardi ratiolableThin-slice CT scans ratiologists agreed thin-slice CT scans of 84 patients with radiologists agreed to et al.Heuristic approach selection from 245 ratiolabaseSensitivity of selection from 245 ratiolabaseMatsum al. [85]Thin-slice (1.25 mm) rodulesImageChecker CT LN-1000 by R2Sensitivity of ratiolabaseRiccardi ratiolabaseThin-slice CT scans ratiolabaseHeuristic approach ratiolabaseSensitivity of ratiolabaseMatsum al. [85]Thin-slice (1.25 mm) rodulesImageChecker CT LN-1000 by R2Sensitivity of ratiolabase <td></td> <td>cancers with solid,</td> <td>a 9x9 subregion as</td> <td>test (or an</td> <td></td> <td>from LIDC database</td> <td></td> <td></td>		cancers with solid,	a 9x9 subregion as	test (or an		from LIDC database		
solid patternsWilks' stepwise feature selection)Wilks' feature selection)LDA)etal.CTscans of813 patients withclassifier selection80 with4.2 features selectionFarag et al. [82]Thin-slice (2.5 mm) screening al. [82]Template modeling approach and ad normal patientsSensitivity of approach advintSensitivity of approach advintSensitivity of approach advintTan et al. [93]Tan et radiologists agreed from LIDC databaseTan et radiologists agreed an and ANNs with 42 features from LIDC databaseFeature-selective classifier based on a an and ANNs with 45 an independent testGe et al. [83] mm) CT scans of 56 patients with 116 solid nodules for 416 eature solid nodulesLDA with Wilks' features from 44 features an LOO testSensitivity of features featuresTan et radiologists agreed from LIDC databaseTan et radiologists agreed from LIDC databaseTan et radiologists agreed from LIDC databaseTan et radiologists agreed from LIDC databaseLDA with 42 featuresMatsum tot et al. (54) rot et al. of which al. [85]Thick-slice (5 or 7 rot with 4 featuresLDA with 8 sensitivity of features featuresSensitivity of features selectionSensitivity of rot et al. of 84 patients with [94]Hait features rot et al. of 154 patients with rot ult at projection data radiologists agreed on from LIDC databaseHeuristic approach rot seas featuresSensitivity of rot 14.7Mat		part-solid and non-	input (or LDA with	LOO test for	Murphy	Thin-slice screening	k-nearest-neighbor	Sensitivity of
Farag et al. [82]Thin-slice (2.5 mm) screening LDCT scass of 16 patients with 119 nodules and 34 normal patientsTemplate modeling using 93.3% with an 34 normal patientsSensitivity of al. [82]Tan et al. [93]Thin-slice CT scans of 125 patients with al. [93]Features selected nodulesFPs per case in an independentGe et al. [83] Matsum toto et al. (50 nodulesStatus mm) CT scans of 56 patients with 116 solid nodules of which used contrast media) with 50 nodulesLDA with Wilks' featuresSensitivity of sensitivity of featuresTan et al. [93]Thin-slice CT scans radiologists agreed et al.Feature-selective from LIDC databaseFeature-selective selection from 44 features an LOO testSensitivity of featuresTan et radiologists agreed and ANNs with 45Tan et an independent initial featuresTan et radiologists agreed from LIDC databaseThin-slice CT scans from LIDC databaseFeature selective selection from 245Sensitivity of selection from 245Matsum (184) al. [85]Thin-slice (1.25 mm) featuresLDA with 8 sensitivity of featuresSensitivity of sensitivity of an LOO test an LOO testRiccardi radiologists agreed of 154 patients with and SVM with al. [85]Features featuresSensitivity of sensitivity of an LOO testYuan et al. [85]Thin-slice (1.25 mm) contesImageChecker CT sensitivity of an LOO by R2Sensitivity of radio negativity of sensitivity of an LOO by R2Riccardi radiologists agreed on from LIDC sensitivity of and SVM with an <b< td=""><td></td><td>solid patterns</td><td>Wilks' lambda</td><td>LDA)</td><td>et al.</td><td>CT scans of 813</td><td>classifier with</td><td>80 with 4.2</td></b<>		solid patterns	Wilks' lambda	LDA)	et al.	CT scans of 813	classifier with	80 with 4.2
Farag et al. [82]Thin-slice (2.5 mm) scans of 16 patients with 119 nodules and 34 normal patientsTemplate modeling approach scans of 16 patients with 119 nodules and 34 normal patientsSensitivity of al. [82]Tan et al. [93]Thin-slice CT scans of 125 patients with 80 nodules that 4 radiologists agreed from LIDC databaseFeature-selective scans of 56 lambda stepwiseSensitivity of sensitivity of solid nodulesTan et al. [93]Thin-slice CT scans of 125 patients with an independent testFeature-selective sensitivity of an independent testMatsum ot cet al. of which al. [85]Thick-slice (1.0-2.5 patients with allod nodulesLDA with Wilks' sensitivity of features an LOO test form 44 features an LOO test of which used contrast media) with 50 nodulesLDA with 8 sensitivity of featuresSensitivity of sensitivity of et al. of sensitivity of featuresThin-slice CT scans testFPs per case in an independent testYuan et al. [85]Thin-slice (1.25 mm) al. [85]ImageChecker CT cor scans of 150Sensitivity of testRiccardi an LOO test an LOO test an LOO testRiccardi and LOO test an LOO testHeuristic approach and SVM with 4.1Sensitivity of selection from 245Yuan et al. [85]Thin-slice (1.25 mm) cor scans of 150ImageChecker CT LN-1000 by R2Sensitivity of an LNO testRiccardi an LOO test an LOO testThin-slice CT scans testHeuristic approach and SVM with 7 and SVM with 4.2Yuan et al. [85]Thin-slice (1.25 mm) cor scans of 150<			stepwise feature		[92]	patients with 1,525	features selected	FPs per case in
Farag etTim-slice (2.5 mm)Template modelingSensitivity ofal. [82]screeningLDCapproachusing93.3% with anscans of 16 patientsivith 119 nodules and3.4%Tan etThin-slice CT scansFeature-selectiveSensitivity ofGe et al.82 thin-slice (1.0-2.5LDA with Wilks'Sensitivity of80% with 14.780 nodules that 4an independent[83]mm) CT scans of 56lambda stepwise80% with 14.7MessayThin-slice CT scansLDA and QDASensitivity of[84]scans of 5 patients (4from 44 featuresan LOO test[94]143 nodules fromLDC databaseEastres ease ina 7-fold cross-validation test[84]scans of 5 patients (4FPs per case inan LOO testPis per case inRiccardiThin-slice CT scansHeuristic approachSensitivity of[84]scans of 5 patients (4FPs per case inan LOO testPis per case inan LOO testPis per case ina 7-fold cross-validation test[84]scans of 5 patients (4FPs per case inan LOO testPis per case inan LOO testPis per case ina 2-fold cross-validation test[84]scans of 5 patients (4FPs per case inan LOO testPis per case inand Col testSensitivity of[84]scans of 5 patients (4FPs per case inan LOO testPis per case ina 2-fold cross-validation test[84]scans of 5 patients (4FPs per case inan LOO testof 154 patients withana		TI: 1: (0.5)	selection)	a		nodules	from 135 features	an independent
al. [82]scens of 16 patientsLDC Iapploadinusing95.3% with andrain et al.full state et al.<	Farag et	Thin-slice (2.5 mm)	Template modeling	Sensitivity of	Tan et	Thin-clice CT scane	Feature-selective	Sensitivity of
with 119 nodules and 34 normal patients3.4%80 nodules interest80 nodules intial genetic algorithm and ANNs with 45 an independentFPs per case in an independentGe et al.82 thin-slice (1.0-2.5 patients with 116 solid nodulesLDA with Wilks' feature selection from 44 featuresSensitivity of features80% with 14.7 FPs per case in an LOO testMessay et al.Thin-slice CT scans of 84 patients with LDC databaseEDA and QDA solid nodules from test stivity of featuresSensitivity of featuresMatsumThick-slice (5 or 7 to te t al.LDA with 8 of which used contrast media) with 50 nodulesFPs per case in an LOO testRiccardi an LOO testThin-slice CT scans et al.LDC databaseHeuristic approach rease in an Solid nodules from LIDC databaseSensitivity of featuresYuan et al. [85]Thin-slice (1.25 mm) al. [85]ImageChecker CT LN-1000 by R2Sensitivity of and NN suith 3.2Riccardi radiologists agreed on from LIDC on from LIDCHeuristic approach and SVM with radiologists agreed on from LIDCSensitivity of and sVM with 6.2	ai. [02]	screening LDCT	level sets	FP rate of	al [93]	of 125 patients with	classifier based on a	87.5% with 4
34 normal patientsan independentGe et al.82 thin-slice (1.0-2.5 patients with 116 solid nodulesLDA with Wilks' featuresSensitivity of featuresand ANNs with 45 initial featuresan independent testMatsumThick-slice (5 or 7 to to et al.LDA with 8 featuresSensitivity of featuresMessay of 84 patients with LIDC databaseand ANNs with 45 initial featuresan independent testMatsumThick-slice (5 or 7 to to et al.LDA with 8 of which used contrast media) with 50 nodulesBoother featuresSensitivity of featuresMessay of 84 patients with LIDC databaseand ANNs with 45 mitial featuresan independent testYuan et al. [85]Thin-slice (1.25 mm) al. [85]ImageChecker CT LN-1000 by R2Sensitivity of and LOO testMessay an LOO test of sensitivity of featuresRiccardi radiologists agreed from LIDC databaseand ANNs with 45 mital featuresan independent testYuan et al. [85]Thin-slice (1.25 mm) LN-1000 by R2ImageChecker CT 73% with 3.2Sensitivity of and LOO test radiologists agreed on from LIDCThin-slice LDC atabaseSensitivity of reatures		with 119 nodules and	level sets	3.4%	ui. [99]	80 nodules that 4	genetic algorithm	FPs per case in
Ge et al.82 thin-slice (1.0-2.5) mm) CT scans of 56 patients with 116 solid nodulesLDA with Wilks' featureSensitivity of 80% with 14.7 FPs per case in an LOO testfrom LIDC database the selection from 44 featuresinitial features selection from 44 featurestestMatsum to et al.Thick-slice (5 or 7) of which used contrast media) with 50 nodulesLDA with 8 mageChecker CTSensitivity of sensitivity of an LOO testfrom 44 features sensitivity of patients with 64.1 FPs per case in an LOO testMessay et al.from LIDC database of 84 patients with LIDC databaseinitial features selection from 245 selection from 246 conservation test[84] soluesscans of 5 patients (4 of which used contrast media) with 50 nodulesFPs per case in an LOO testRiccardi et al.Thin-slice CT scans of 154 patients with radiologists agreed on from LIDCHeuristic approach and SVM with a 2-fold cross- validation testYuan et al. [85]Thin-slice (1.25 mm) CT scans of 150ImageChecker CT LN-1000 by R2Sensitivity of 73% with 3.2Riccardi radiologists agreed on from LIDCfrom a volume of interestsensitivity of a 2-fold cross- validation test		34 normal patients				radiologists agreed	and ANNs with 45	an independent
[83]mm) CT scans of 56 patients with 116 solid noduleslambdastepwise feature80% with 14.7 FPs per case in an LOO test of to et al.Messay from 44 featuresThin-slice CT scans of 84 patients with 143 nodules from 245LDAand QDASensitivity of 83% with 3Matsum tot et al.Thick-slice (5 or 7 featuresLDA with 8 featuresSensitivity of an LOO test featuresMessay an LOO test featuresThin-slice CT scans featuresLDA and QDA selection from 245Sensitivity of 83% with 3[84] [84]scans of 5 patients (4 of which used contrast media) with 50 nodulesFPs per case in an LOO testRiccardi featuresThin-slice CT scans et al.Heuristic approach and SVM with et al.Sensitivity of an 7-fold cross- validation testYuan et al. [85]Thin-slice (1.25 mm) CT scans of 150ImageChecker CT LN-1000 by R2Sensitivity of raw with 3.2Thin-slice CT scans et al.Heuristic approach and SVM with radiologists agreed on from LIDC databaseSensitivity of radiologists agreed from a volume of validation test	Ge et al.	82 thin-slice (1.0-2.5	LDA with Wilks'	Sensitivity of		from LIDC database	initial features	test
patientswith116featureselectionFPs per case in an LOO testetal.of84 patientswithfeature83%83%with3Matsum Matsum Thick-slice (5 or 7 tot et al.Thick-slice (5 or 7 mm)LDAwith8Sensitivity of features90% with 64.1 FPs per case in an LOO test143nodulesfrom245FPs per case in relatabase7-fold cross- validation test[84]scans of 5 patients (4 of which used contrast media) with 50 nodulesFPs per case in an LOO testRiccardiThin-slice CT scans et al.Heuristic approach and SVM with (95)Heuristic approach and SVM with a 2-fold cross- validation testYuan et al. [85]Thin-slice (1.25 mm)ImageChecker CT LN-1000 by R2Sensitivity of 73% with 3.2nodules mageCheckerFPs per case in an LOO test contrast media)Junce al. [85]LN-1000 by R273% with 3.2mageChecker contrast media)Sensitivity of and LOO test radiologists agreed on from LIDCfrom a volume of validation test	[83]	mm) CT scans of 56	lambda stepwise	80% with 14.7	Messay	Thin-slice CT scans	LDA and QDA	Sensitivity of
solid nodulesfrom 44 featuresan LOO test[94]143 nodulesfromselectionfrom 245FPs per case inMatsumThick-slice (5 or 7 tot et al.LDAwith8Sensitivity offeatures90% with 64.1[84]scans of 5 patients (4 ofFPs per case in an LOO testFPs per case in an LOO testRiccardiThin-slice CT scans of 154 patients with projectionHeuristic approach and SVM with 6.5Yuan etThin-slice (1.25 mm)ImageChecker CT LN-1000 by R2Sensitivity of 73% with 3.2ImageCheckerCT Sensitivity of and S.2		patients with 116	feature selection	FPs per case in	et al.	of 84 patients with	with feature	83% with 3
Matsum Thick-slice (5 or 7 LDA with 8 Sensitivity of features LDC database features a 7-told cross- validation test [84] scans of 5 patients (4 of which used contrast media) with 50 nodules FPs per case in an LOO test Riccardi Thin-slice CT scans et al. Heuristic approach and SVM with Sensitivity of and SVM with Sensitivity of al. [85] a/-told cross- validation test Yuan et Thin-slice (1.25 mm) ImageChecker CT Sensitivity of sensitivity of al. [85] Thin-slice (1.25 mm) ImageChecker CT Sensitivity of sensitivity of al. [85] on from LIDC from a volume of interest validation test		solid nodules	from 44 features	an LOO test	[94]	143 nodules from	selection from 245	FPs per case in
of o et al. mm) diagnostic C1 features 90% with 64.1 validation test [84] scans of 5 patients (4 FPs per case in of which used contrast media) with 50 nodules FPs per case in the scans of 150 Riccardi Thin-slice CT scans Heuristic approach Sensitivity of and SVM with 6.5 Yuan et Thin-slice (1.25 mm) ImageChecker CT Sensitivity of al. [85] CT scans of 150 LN-1000 by R2 73% with 3.2 database interest validation test	Matsum	Thick-slice (5 or 7	LDA with 8	Sensitivity of		LIDC database	features	a /-fold cross-
[84] scans of 5 patients (4 FPS per case in of which used contrast media) with 50 nodules intersite 4 phroating sensitivity of et al. of 154 patients with 50 nodules that 4 radiologists agreed intersite 4 phroating sensitivity of al. [85] intersite 4 phroating sensitivity of radiologists agreed Yuan et Thin-slice (1.25 mm) ImageChecker CT Sensitivity of al. [85] intersite 4 phroating sensitivity of radiologists agreed intersite 4 phroating sens	oto et al.	mm) diagnostic CT	features	90% with 64.1	Piggardi	Thin clica, CT, scores	Houristia approach	Sansitivity of
of which asculationand bookstfor the patients which and bookstfor the patients which and bookstfor the patients which and bookstcontrast media) with 50 nodules50 nodules[95]117 nodules that 4 radiologists agreedmaximum-intensityFPs per case in a 2-fold cross-Yuan etThin-slice (1.25 mm)ImageChecker CTSensitivity of al. [85]CT scans of 150LN-1000 by R273% with 3.2databaseinterest	[04]	of which used		an I OO test	et al	of 154 patients with	and SVM with	71% with 65
50 nodules radiologists agreed projection data 2-fold cross- on from Yuan et Thin-slice (1.25 mm) ImageChecker CT Sensitivity of al. [85] CT scans of 150 LN-1000 by R2 73% with 3.2 database interest		contrast media) with		un LOO test	[95]	117 nodules that 4	maximum-intensity	FPs per case in
Yuan et Thin-slice (1.25 mm) ImageChecker CT Sensitivity of al. [85] on from LIDC from a volume of validation test database al. [85] CT scans of 150 LN-1000 by R2 73% with 3.2 database interest		50 nodules				radiologists agreed	projection data	a 2-fold cross-
al. [85] CT scans of 150 LN-1000 by R2 73% with 3.2 database interest	Yuan et	Thin-slice (1.25 mm)	ImageChecker CT	Sensitivity of		on from LIDC	from a volume of	validation test
	al. [85]	CT scans of 150	LN-1000 by R2	73% with 3.2		database	interest	

to distinguish between benign and malignant nodules on LDCT images. In a screening program with LDCT in New York, 88% (206/233) of suspicious lesions were found to be benign on follow-up examinations [72]. In a screening program in Japan, only 83 (10%) among 819 scans with suspicious lesions were diagnosed to be cancer cases [98]. According to recent findings at the Mayo Clinic, 2,792 (98.6%) of 2,832 nodules detected by a multidetetor CT were benign, and 40 (1.4%) nodules were malignant [99]. Thus, a large number of benign nodules were found with CT; follow-up examinations such as HRCT and/or biopsy were performed on these patients. Therefore, CADx schemes for distinction between benign and malignant nodules in LDCT would be useful for reducing the number of "unnecessary" follow-up examinations.

A number of researchers developed CADx schemes

for this task, which distinguish malignant nodules from benign nodules automatically and/or determine the likelihood of malignancy for the detected nodules. The performance of the schemes was generally evaluated by means of ROC analysis [100], because this task is a two-class classification. The AUC [101] was often used as a performance index. Studies on the development of CADx schemes for distinction between malignant and benign lung nodules in CT are summarized in Table 2. In 1998, Kawata et al. [102] described the calculation of nodule features for the purpose of distinction between malignant and benign nodules. In 1999, McNitt-Gray et al. [103] developed a classification scheme based on LDA for distinction between malignant and benign nodules in HRCT. They achieved a correct classification rate of 90.3% for a database of 17 malignant and 14 benign nodules. Matsuki et al. [104] used an ANN with

 Table 2
 Classification between malignant and benign nodules (CADx) for thoracic CT.

Study	Database	Classifier/Method	Performance
McNitt-	HRCT scans of 17	LDA with stepwise	Correct
Gray et	malignant and 14	feature selection	classification rate
al. [103]	benign nodules		of 90.3%
Matsuki	HRCT scans of 99	ANN with 16	AUC value of
et al.	malignant and 56	radiologists'	0.951 in an LOO
[104]	benign nodules	subjective features	test
		and 7 clinical data	
Aoyama	Thick-slice (10	LDA with Wilks'	AUC of 0.846 in
et al.	mm) screening	lambda stepwise	an LOO test
[113]	LDCT scans of 76	feature selection	
	malignant and 413		
	benign nodules		
Mori et	Thin-slice (2 mm)	LDA with 3	AUC of 0.91 and
al. [105]	CE-CT scans of	features	1.0 with non-CE
	35 malignant and		CT and CE-CT,
	27 benign nodules		respectively, in an
~			LOO test
Shah et	Thin-slice (≤ 3)	Logistic regression	AUC of 0.92 with
al. [106]	mm) CE-CT scans	or QDA with	QDA in an LOO
	of 19 malignant	stepwise feature	test
	and 16 benign	selection from 31	
0 1	nodules (10	reatures	ATTC: 00.00 's
Suzuki	Thick-slice (10	winnpie witAnns	AUC of 0.88 in an
	LDCT assess of 76	a OvO submassion as	LOO lest
[05]	malignant and 413	a 9x9 subregion as	
	hanign nodules	mput	
Iwano et	HPCT (0.5.1 mm	IDA with 2	Sensitivity of
al [107]	slice) scars of 52	features	76.0% and a
ai. [107]	malignant and 55	leatures	specificity of 80%
	henign nodules		specificity of 8070
Way et	CT scans of 124	LDA or SVM with	AUC of 0.857 in
al [108]	malignant and 132	stenwise feature	an LOO test
[100]	benign nodules in	selection	
	152 patients		
Chen et	CT (slice	ANN ensemble	AUC of 0.915 in
al. [109]	thickness of 2.5 or	with selected	an LOO test
	5 mm) scans of 19	features	
	malignant and 13		
	benign nodules		
Lee et	Thick-slice (5	GA-based feature	AUC value of
al. [110]	mm) CT scans of	selection and a	0.889 in an LOO
	62 malignant and	random subspace	test
	63 benign nodules	method	

subjective features determined by radiologists for classification between 99 malignant and 56 benign nodules in HRCT and achieved an AUC value of 0.951. Aoyama et al. [42] used LDA for distinction between malignant and benign nodules in thick-slice screening LDCT. They achieved an AUC value of 0.846 for a database of 73 patients with 76 primary cancers and 342 patients with 413 benign nodules. Mori et al. [105] developed a classification scheme for distinction between malignant and benign nodules in contrastenhanced (CE) CT by using LDA with 3 features (i.e., attenuation, shape index, and curvedness value). Shah et al. [106] employed different classifiers such as logistic regression and QDA with features selected from a group of 31 by using stepwise feature selection based on the Akaike information criterion. Their scheme with logistic regression achieved an AUC value of 0.92 in the distinction between 19 malignant and 16 benign nodules in thin-slice CE-CT. Suzuki et al. [65] developed a PML technique called a multiple MTANN scheme for the classification task. They achieved an AUC value of 0.88 for thick-slice screening LDCT scans of 73 patients with 76 primary cancers and 342 patients with 413 benign nodules. Iwano et al. [107] achieved a sensitivity of 76.9% and a specificity of 80% with their scheme based on LDA with 2 features in their evaluation of HRCT images of 52 malignant and 55 benign nodules. Way et al. [108] incorporated nodule surface features into their classification based on LDA or an SVM, and they achieved an AUC value of 0.857 in the classification of 124 malignant and 132 benign nodules in 152 patients. Chen et al. [109] employed an ANN ensemble to classify 19 malignant and 13 benign nodules, and they achieved an AUC value of 0.915. Lee et al. [110] developed a two-step supervised learning scheme combining a genetic algorithm with a random subspace method, and they achieved an AUC value of 0.889 in the classification between 62 malignant and 63 benign nodules. Other than CADx approaches, Kawata et al. [111] developed a content-based image retrieval approach to provide radiologists with similar images for improving their diagnostic performance in distinction between benign and malignant nodules. Kawata et al. [112] also developed quantitative classification measures that correlate with pathologic characteristics of lung cancer and patients' prognosis. Thus, various approaches to CADx schemes have been proposed. The database size varied in different studies, from 31-489. Generally achieving high performance for a large database is challenging, because it is likely to contain more variations of nodules. CT scans in the databases included screening LDCT, standard diagnostic CT, and HRCT. Diagnosis of lung nodules on LDCT images would be the most challenging due to a low image quality. Most studies used an LOO test. There are variations in the performance of CADx schemes: AUC values ranged from 0.846-0.951. Once again, it is difficult to say which CADx scheme performs better without a direct comparison. Since the current performance of CADx schemes would be close to or comparable to radiologists' performance, more studies on the proof of the usefulness of CADx such as observer performance studies and clinical trials would be beneficial in the field.

4. Classification in CADe of the Colon

4.1 CADe for Detection of Polyps in CTC

Colorectal cancer is the second leading cause of cancer deaths in the United States [114]. Evidence suggests that early detection and removal of polyps (i.e., precursors of colorectal cancer) can reduce the incidence of colorectal cancer [115]. CTC, also known as virtual colonoscopy, is a technique for detecting colorectal neoplasms by use of CT scans of the colon. The diagnostic performance of CTC in detecting polyps, however, remains uncertain due to a propensity for perceptual errors in detection of polyps. CADe of polyps has been investigated to address that issue with CTC [116]. CADe has the potential to improve radiologists' diagnostic performance in the detection of polyps. A number of investigators have developed automated or semi-automated CADe schemes for the detection of polyps in CTC [117]–[120].

 Table 3
 Classification components in CADe schemes for detection of polyps in CT colonography.

Study Database Classifier/Met Performance hod Gokur CTC data (1.25-5) SVM with Sensitivity of 100% (215 mm) Suzuki CTC data (1.25-5) Bayesian ANN mm collimation) of including 28 polyse and a mixture supine and protec, including 29 polyse Suzuki CTC data (1.25-5) MTANNS with Prepatient in an LOO rest of the containing 40 polyse (2-15 mm) Night CTC data (1.25-5) SVM classifie and a mixture including 21 polyse (2-15 mm) Suzuki CTC data (1.25-5) SVM classifie sensitivity of 100% with 54 sensitivity of 100% containing 40 polyse (2-15 mm) Suzuki CTC data (1.25-5) SVM with mon collimation) of molecular (2-5 mm) Suzuki CTC data (1.25-5) SVM with mon collimation) of molecular (2-5 mm) Suzuki Sensitivity of 10% containing 40 polyse (2-5 mm) Suzuki				1		1 11	• • •	
Gokur CTC data (2.5-30) SYM with Semistivity of 100%, (2.15 mm) (2.9) 73 patients in both signature (109%) with 1.1 Nappi (12) CTC data Shapi (2.15 mm) DA PF*patient (12) SVM void this oparama LOO test of the containing 40 polyse (2.15 mm) Semistivity of 0.0%, void there Semistivity of 0.0%, void there Life CTC data CTC data Semistivity of 0.0%, void there Semistiv	 Study	Database	Classifier/Met hod	Performance	Suzuki et al.	CTC data (1.25-5 mm collimation) of	Bayesian ANN and a mixture	By-polyp (by-patient) sensitivity of 96.4%
k et al. min colimation) of agine and prone, containing 40 polyse signature presentations (121) 44 polyse (6-20 mm) in 45 section (12, 122) patients in both supine and prone, including 12 polyse statistics of the containing 40 polyse (6-20 mm) in 45 section (12, 123) 44 polyse (6-20 mm) in 45 section (12, 123) 44 polyse (6-20 mm) in 45 section (12, 123) 44 polyse (6-20 mm) in 45 section (12, 123) 44 polyse (6-20 mm) in 45 section (12, 123) 44 polyse (6-20 mm) in 45 section (12, 123) 44 polyse (6-20 mm) in 45 section (12, 123) 44 polyse (6-20 mm) in 45 section (12, 123) 44 polyse (6-20 mm) in 45 section (12, 123) 44 polyse (6-20 mm) in 45 section (12, 123) 44 polyse (6-20 mm) in 45 section (12, 123) 44 polyse (6-20 mm) in 45 section (12, 123) 44 polyse (123) polyse (133) poly	Goktur	CTC data (2.5-3.0	SVM with	Sensitivity of 100%	[20]	73 patients in both	of expert 3D	(100%) with 1.1
 In 21 (2) supple to protect protection part in 15 are 75/52 are	k et al.	mm collimation) of 48 patients in either	high- dimensional	(95%) with a specificity of 0.69		including 28 polyps	with voxel values in	LOO test of the
 containing 40 polyse (2-15 mm) Näppi CTC data (5 mm (12) spatients in both including 12 polyse (12) spatients in both including 12 polyse (2-55 mm) det al. collimation) of 40 patients in both subcolume as including 12 polyse (2-55 mm) det al. collimation) of 40 patients in both subcolume as sensitivity of 100% (95%) with 2.4 FFs/patient factures 0 or polyse (16-9 mm) det al. collimation) of 40 patients in both subcolume as including 12 polyse (2-55 mm) det al. collimation) of 40 patients in both subcolume as including 12 polyse (2-55 mm) det al. collimation) of 40 patients in both subcolume as including 22 polyse (2-55 mm) det al. collimation) of 40 polyse (2-10 mm) det al. collimation) of 40 subcolume as sensitivity of 100% vith a specificity of 0.47 (0-5) det al. collimation) of 40 subcolume as sensitivity of 90% (2-55 mm) det al. collimation) of 40 subcolume as sensitivity of 90% (2-52 mm) det al. collimation) of 40 subcolume as sensitivity of 82% vith a specificity of (2-52 mm) det al. collimation) of sensitivity of 80.4% (2-52 mm) det al. collimation) of sensitivity of 80.4% (2-52 mm) det al. collimation) of sensitivity of 90.5% (2-52 mm) det al. collimation) of spotentins in both suptotame as	[121]	supine or prone,	histograms	(0.74) [14.3		(5-25 mm) in 15	a 7x7x7	classification part
 (2-15 mm) signature (2-15 mm) (DA or ODE Asy-point (Fs-polyp) (DS - Asy-point (Fs-polyp) (DS - Asy-point (Fs-polyp) (DS - Asy-point (Fs-polyp) (DS - Asy-point (FS - Asy-polyp) (DS - Asy-polyp) (DS		containing 40 polyps	used as shape	FPs/patient (12.0		patients	subvolume as	*
 Napp. C1C data (5 mm) L1 et C1C data (5 mm) L2 et al. collimation) of 40 experision both sensitivity of 100%, et al. collimation of catures of features of the classification part in a 4-fold cressing particular in a		(2-15 mm)	signature	FPs/patient)]	т:	CTC data of 44	input	Sauditiaita - 6 710/
[12] patients in both submetric 9 (95%), with 2.4 [12] apatients in both submetric 9 (95%), with 2.4 Acar et 1 patients in elitatis co 16 features 9 [12] 4k polyps (6-9 mm) based features 9 [12] 4k polyps (2-10 mm) and 25 5KM with 9 FEspatient 9 [13] patients in both supine and prone, including 29 polyps (2-10 mm) and compatient 17 [13] patients in both supine and prone, including 21 polyps (6-10 mm) and 5XM with 6r larger polyps (5-25 mm) A committe 6 supine and prone, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm) A committe 6 of the classification part 90/5K (100%) and 6.9 FPs/patient in a dicher polyps with 1.2 and 6.9 FPs/patient in a independent est 1 man collimation) of a polyps (2-10 mm) and 4.9 FPs/patient in a independent est 1 man collimation of a polyps (2-10 mm) and 4.9 FPs/patient in a independent est 1 man collimation of a polyps (2-10 mm) and 4.9 FPs/pati	Nappi et al	collimation) of 40	LDA or QDA with 54	By-patient (by-polyp)	al et	natients containing	with wavelet-	with 5.4 FPs/patient
 supine and prone, including 12 polyps (2-10mm) Acar et CTC data (12-5-25 famt) Jerebk CTC data (5 mm) exercisivity of 90%, with 4 features specificity of 4.3% with 5 perceptrone, including 22 polyps (2-25 mm) in 2.5 mm), including 22 polyps (2-25 mm) Jerebk CTC data (5 mm) A multilayer perceptrone, including 22 polyps (2-25 mm) Jerebk CTC data (5 mm) A committee Sensitivity of 82.9% with 4 sepecificity of 95% with 4 sepecificity of 82.9% with 4 sepecificity of 82.9% with 3 specificity of 82.9% with 4 sepecificity of 82.9% with 4 sepecificity of 95% with 5.4% respectively patients in both supine and prone, including 21 polyps (2-10mm) Jerebk CTC data (5 mm) A committee Sensitivity of 82.9% with 5.25 mm) in 2.0 Kested for multilayer features of the model interval features of the model interval features of the supine and prone, including 21 polyps (2-10mm) and of SVMs with features fination) of 4.0 of multilayer features for the supine and prone, including 21 polyps (2-10mm) and of SVMs with 6 ranger polyps (2-10mm) and a mixture features fination of of VMs with for larger polyps (2-10mm) and of SVMs with 6 ranger polyps (2-10mm) and other polyps with 1.2 Jerebk CTC data (5 mm) A committe Sensitivity of 86.7% for larger polyps (2-10mm) and of SVMs with for larger polyps (2-10mm) and other polyps with 1.2 Jerebk CTC data (125-52 mm) in 2.0 kwith and 6.9 FPs patient in a independent test model interval and 6.9 FPs patient, respectively apatients in both spine and prone, including 31 polyps (2-10mm) and other polyps with 1.2 Jerebk CTC data (125-52 mm) in 2.0 kwith model interval and 100% for larger polyps (2-10mm) and other polyps with 1.2 Jerebk CTC data (125-51 mm) Jerebk Stread (5 mm) Jerebk Stread	[122].	patients in both	volumetric	(95%) with 2.4	[128]	45 polyps (6-9 mm)	based features	in a 4-fold cross-
including 12 polyps including 12 polyps (al. macolimation) of al. macolimation) of 40 (121) Jerebk (colimation) of 40 of et al. collimation) of (30] patients in both supine and prone, including 22 polyps (2-15 mm) o et al. collimation) of (31] patients in both supine and prone, including 22 polyps (2-15 mm) in 20 patients in both supine and prone, including 23 polyps (2-25 mm) in 20 patients in both supine and prone, including 24 polyps (2-10 mm) (2-55 mm) in 20 patients in both supine and prone, including 25 polyps (2-10 mm) in 20 patients in both supine and prone, including 29 polyps with 12 features (5-25 mm) (121) Jerebk (122) Jerebk (121) Jerebk (121) Jerebk (121) Jerebk (121) Jerebk (121) Jerebk (121) Jerebk (121) Jerebk (122) Jerebk (121) Jerebk (122) Jerebk (121) Jerebk (122) Jerebk (123) Jerebk (123) Jerebk (123) Jerebk (123) Jerebk (125) Jer		supine and prone,	features (9	FPs/patient				validation test of the
Acar et al. in 11 patients mm collimation) of al. QDA with enables Sensitivity of 100% (95%) with a supine or prone, containing 40 polyps mm collimation) of displacement supine or prone, containing 40 polyps mm collimation) of rol patients in both including 21 polyps mm collimation) of rol patients in both including 21 polyps NM with mm collimation) of rol patients in both including 21 polyps Sensitivity of rol match including 21 polyps NM with including 21 polyps Sensitivity of rol match including 21 polyps Sensitivity of rol match including 22 polyps Sensitivity of rol match including 22 polyps Sensitivity of rol match including 23 polyps Style match including 24 polyps Style match i		including 12 polyps	statistics of 6		Wana	CTC data (1.25.2.5	CV/M with	classification part
 al. mm collimation) of [123] 48 patients in either supplie or processitivity of 0,047 (0.56) (125) supplie and proces including 29 polyps (2-15 mm) Jerebk CTC data (5 mm other supplie and processitivity of 82.9% with 32 (3-25 mm) in 20 patients in both supplie and proces including 21 polyps (3-25 mm) Jerebk CTC data (5 mm other supplie and processitivity of 90% with 3 specificity of 95.3% with 5.4 FPs/patient Jerebk CTC data (5 mm other supplie and processitivity of 52.9% with 32 (5-25 mm) Jerebk CTC data (5 mm other supplie and processitivity of 58.7% for larger polyps (5-20 mm) and a collimation) of 25 WM supple and processitivity of 96.8% with 5.4 FPs/patient in an including 21 polyps (5-20 mm) Jerebk CTC data (5 mm other supplie and processitivity of 58.7% for larger polyps (5-25 mm) Wang et al. collimation) of 153 supplie and proces, including 21 polyps (5-20 mm) Wang et al. collimation) of 153 supplie and proces, including 21 polyps (2-10 mm) and a muticenter collimation) of 153 supplie and proces, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm) Wang et al. collimation) of 153 supplie and proces, including 21 polyps (2-10 mm) and a single TCT data (1.25-5 supplie and proces, including 21 polyps (2-10 mm) and a single TCT data (1.25-5 mm) Wang et al. collimation) of 153 supplie and proces, including 21 polyps (2-10 mm) and a single TCT data (1.25-5 supplie and proces, including 24 polyps (2-10 mm) and a single TCT data (1.25-5 mm) Suzuki et al. collimation of for 30 MTANN (with vocel patients in both supplic and proces, including 347 polyps and maxes (5-60 mm) and a single TCT data (1.25-5 mm) Suzuki et al. mm collimation of for an a single and proces, including 347 polyps and maxes (5-60 mm) and a single Suzuki et al. mm collimation of for 30 MTANN (with vocel includi	Acar et	CTC data (2.5-3.0	ODA with	Sensitivity of 100%	et al.	mm collimation) of	nonlinear	for polyps (6-9 mm)
 [123] 48 patients in either supine or prone, containing 40 polyps (2-15 mm) Jerebk ot all collimation) of 40 perceptron sincluding 22 polyps (10 mm) and 25 patients in both supine and prone, including 22 polyps (17 data (1.25-2.5 mm)) Jerebk ot all collimation) of 40 patients in both supine and prone, including 21 polyps (17 data (1.25-25 mm)) Jerebk ot all collimation) of 40 of multilayer patients in both supine and prone, including 21 polyps (21 mm) and a single (2.55 mm)) Jerebk ot all collimation) of 133 patients in both supine and prone, including 21 polyps (21 mm) and 45 patients in both supine and prone, including 21 polyps (21 mm) and 55% (2.55 mm)) Wang c CTC data (5 mm or collimation) of 45 polyps with 4 and coller polyps with 4 and coller polyps with 2 patients in both supine and prone, including 21 polyps (21 mm) and 75% (2.55 mm)) Wang c CTC data (5 mm or collimation) of 45 polyps (21 mm) and 55% patients in both supine and prone, including 21 polyps (2.55 mm) Wang c CTC data (5 mm or collimation) of 45 polyps with 24 and collimation) of 133 patients in both supine and prone, including 21 polyps (2.55 mm) Wang c CTC data (5 mm or collimation) of 45 polyps (2.10mm) and 55% patients in both supine and prone, including 21 polyps (2.10mm) and 55% patients in both supine and prone, including 21 polyps (2.10mm) and 55% patients in both supine and prone, including 21 polyps (2.10mm) and 35% polyps (2.10mm) and 55% patients in both supine and prone, including 21 polyps (2.10mm) and other polyps with 4 and coller polyps with 2 and coller polyps variation in an including 21 polyps (2.25 mm) in 15 patients in both supine and prone, including 21 polyps (2.25 mm) in 15 patients in both supine and pro	al.	mm collimation) of	edge-	(95%) with a	[129]	791 patients in both	dimensionality	with 9 FPs/patient
supine or prone, containing 40 polyps (2-15 mm) Jerebk supine and prone, including 21 polyps (3-25 mm) Derebk o et al. collimation) of 40 ot al. collimation) of 53 supine and prone, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm) collimation) of 153 supine and prone, including 21 polyps (C-25 mm) collimation) of 153 supine and prone, including 21 polyps (C-25 mm) collimation) of 153 supine and prone, including 21 polyps (C-25 mm) internal collimation) of 153 supine and prone, including 21 polyps (C-25 mm) internal supine and prone, including 21 polyps (C-25 mm) supine and prone, including 21 polyps (C-25 mm) internal supine and prone, including 21 polyps (C-25 mm) internal supine and prone, including 21 polyps (C-25 mm) internal supine and prone, including 24 polyps (C-25 mm) in 45 supine and prone, including 24 polyps (C-25 mm) in 45 supho and prone, including 24 po	[123]	48 patients in either	displacement	specificity of 0.47		supine and prone,	reduction (i.e.,	
Londaning 40 polyps Polyps <t< td=""><td></td><td>supine or prone,</td><td>fields</td><td>(0.56)</td><td></td><td>including 123 polyps</td><td>diffusion map</td><td></td></t<>		supine or prone,	fields	(0.56)		including 123 polyps	diffusion map	
Jerebk o et al. [30] spine and prone, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm)A multilayer perceptronSensitivity of 90% with a specificity of \$Ps/patientCTC data (1.25-2.5 mm collimation) of 40 patientsCTC data (1.25-2.5 mm collimation) of and 76% for larger including 21 polyps (5-25 mm)Bayesian ANN selected from at al. collimation) of 40 patientsA committee of multilayer selected from of all multilayer selected from of all all collimation) of 40 patientsA committee of multilayer selected from of all multilayer selected from of all all collimation) of 40 perceptrons (5-25 mm)A committee of multilayer selected from of sVMs with 5.4 FPs/patient fro larger polyps with all 200% for larger (2-25 mm)Yao at all collimation) of 40 perceptrons spine and prone, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm)A committee of sVMs with of SVM swith for larger polyps with all down for larger polyps (2-10mm) and 75% for ther polyps with all down for larger polyps (2-10mm) and supine and prone, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm)A committee featuresSensitivity of 80.7% for larger polyps with all down for larger polyps with all down for larger polyps with 4 all down for larger polyps (2-10mm) and there polyps with all down for larger polyps (2-10mm) and supine and prone, including 61 polyps (120]A committee featuresSensitivity of 100% and 6.9 FPs/patient, respectivelyCTC data (1.25-5.0 mm collimation) of all down for larger polyps (2-10mm) and supine and prone, including 61 polyps (121]A committee featuresSensitivity of 90.8% for larger polyps (2-10mm) and supine and prone, inclu		(2-15 mm)				polyps (>10mm)	linear	
 o et al. collimation) of 40 perceptron with a specificity of 30% with 32 supine and prone, including 29 polyps (3-26 mm) in 20 patients Jerebk CTC data (5 mm of autiliayer perceptrons 95.3% with 5.4 supine and prone, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm) including 21 polyps (5-25 mm) Jerebk CTC data (5 mm of 40 of multilayer perceptrons 95.3% with 5.4 supine and prone, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm) Jerebk CTC data (5 mm of 40 of SVMs with 12 FPs/patient in a including 21 polyps (5-25 mm) Jerebk CTC data (5 mm of 40 of SVMs with 3 specificity of 82.9% with 3.4 committee (2-52 mm) Jerebk CTC data (5 mm of 40 of SVMs with 3 specificity of 82.9% with 5.4 supine and prone, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm) Jerebk CTC data (5 mm of 40 of SVMs with 3 specificity of 82.9% with 3.4 supine and prone, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm) Wang CTC data (5 mm of 153 internal and 100% for larger polyps with 3 af PS/patient in a including 21 polyps (4-30 mm) in 45 polyps of polyps atients in both supine and prone, including 61 polyps (4-30 mm) in 45 polyps (200mm) and 59. FPs/patient, and component supine and prone, including 12 polyps (2-10 mm) and 59. FPs/patient, respectively Staruki CTC data (1.25-5.0 mm) Staruki A specif	Jerebk	CTC data (5 mm	A multilayer	Sensitivity of 90%		r - , r - (= - · · · · ·)	embedding)	
[30]patientsmb obthwith 4 features95% with32al.mm collimation) ofwith teaturesand 76% for larger(3-25 mm)(3-25 mm)in 2017 featuresFPs/patientfrom an logge (210 mm) andtorggraphicfrom an logge (210 mm) andtorggraphicJerebkCTC data (5 mmA committeSensitivity of 82.9%Sensitivity of 82.9%supine and prone,including 21 polypsteat of the classification part[124]patientsin bothperceptrons95.3%with 5.4SuzukiCTC data (1.25-5Bayesian ANN[125]patientsin bothsupine and prone,for larger polypsfor larger polypstor dragermm collimation) ofMTANNs withtorgeraphic[125]patientsin both9 selectedfor other polyps with3 FPs/patientincluding 21 polypsfeaturesfor other polyps with[126]patientsin bothsensitivity of 100%sensitivity of 100%for largermas and prone,independent test[126]patientsin bothsensitivity of 100%and 100% for largerfeaturesfor other polyps with[127]73 patientsin bothsensitivity of 66.4%GTC data (1.25-5.0SVM classifier[127]73 patientsin bothsensitivity of 66.4%GTC data (1.25-5.7SVM classifier[127]73 patientsin bothsensitivity of 66.4%GTC data (1.25-5.7SVM classifier[127]73 patientsin bothsensitivity of	o et al.	collimation) of 40	perceptron	with a specificity of	Yao at	CTC data (1.25-2.5	SVM classifier	Sensitivity of 93%
signifie and prote, including 21 polyps (3-25 mm) in 20 patients supine and prote, including 21 polyps (124] patients in both supine and prote, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm) 12 Feb/ (5-25 mm) (5-25 mm) (5-	[30]	patients in both	with 4 features	95% with 32 FPs/patient	al. [130]	mm collimation) of 792 patients in both	from a	and 76% for larger
		including 29 polyps	17 features	FF 8/patient	[150]	supine and prone,	topographic	other polyps with 1.2
patients patients $(> 6 m)$ respectively, in a 10- fold cross-validation test of the classification part $(> 6 m)$ is $(> 6 m)$ respectively, in a 10- fold cross-validation test of the classification part $(> 6 m)$ is $(> 6 m$		(3-25 mm) in 20				including 226 polyps	height map	and 3.1 FPs/patient,
JerebkCTC data (s mmA committeeSensitivity of 82.9% with supine and prone, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm)Sensitivity of 95.3% with 5.4 sprine and prone, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm)SuzukiCTC data (1.25-5 (100%) with 12Bayesian ANN (100%) with 1.1By-polyp (by-patient) (66]Bayesian ANN (100%) with 1.1JerebkCTC data (f 5 mmA committeeSensitivity of 86.7% (210mm) and 75% (5-25 mm)SuzukiCTC data (1.25-5 (24 patients in both supine and prone, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm)Bayesian ANN (210mm) and 75% (62-25 mm)Bayesian ANN (210mm) and 75% (62-25 mm)SuzukiCTC data (1.25-50 (1.25-50Bayesian ANN (100%) with 1.1Wang et al.CTC data (1.25-5 (1.25-50 patientsBayesian ANN (100%) with 2.1 (1.25-50DMTANN (100%) with 2.1 (210mm) and 75% (5-25 mm) in 45 patientsLDA with sensitivity of 100% and 6.9 Fbr/patient in a and 00% for larger polyps (≥10mm) and of 92.57 at and a single supine and prone, including 21 polypsSVM classifier (1.25-50By-polyp sensitivity of 93.1% and 80.6% (210mm) and other polyps with 4 and a single supine and prone, including 28 polyps (2127)Symatents in both supine and prone, including 28 polyps (2127)By-polyp sensitivity of 92.5%SVM classifier (210mm) and other polyps with 1.9 and and a single and a singleBy-polyp sensitivity of 93.4%By-polyp sensitivity of 93.4%1261Suzuki (127)TTC data (1.25-50 patients supine and prone, including 28 polyps (2-25 mm) in 15 patientsBy-polyp sensitivity of 96.4% (patients				(> 6 mm)		respectively, in a 10-
[124] patients in both supine and prone, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm) 95.3 % with 5.4 perceptrons 95.3 % with 5.4 perceptrons Suzuki CTC data (1.25-5 tet al. Bayesian ANN and a mixture of sVMs with supine and prone, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm) Bayesian ANN and a mixture of sVMs with supine and prone, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm) Bayesian ANN and a mixture of sVMs with supine and prone, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm) Bayesian ANN and a mixture of sVMs with supine and prone, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm) Bayesian ANN and a mixture of sVMs with supine and prone, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm) Bayesian ANN and a mixture of sVMs with supine and prone, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm) Bayesian ANN and a mixture features Suzuki CTC data (1.25-5 mm) Bayesian ANN and a mixture features Bayesian ANN and a mixture features Suzuki CTC data (1.25-5 mm) SVM classifier with projection including 61 polyps (210mm) and 52 patients By-polyp (by-patient) and a single sensitivity of 96.4% Suzuki CTC data (1.25-5 mm) SVM classifier with projection including 347 polyps with statistical and/or prone, including 28 polyps (5-25 mm) in 15 patients By-polyp (by-patient) and a single sensitivity of 96.4% By-polyp (by-patient) and a mixture independent test mm collimation) of supolyps SVM classifier with voxel By-polyp sensitivity of 93.1% and 80.6% [127] 73 patients in both supine and prone, including 28 polyps (5-25 mm) in 15 patients Bayesian ANN and a mixture including 24 polyps Supolyps and/or prone, including 96 polyps	Jerebk	collimation) of 40	A committee	sensitivity of 82.9%				test of the
supine and prone, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm)with features12 featuresFPs/patient featuresSuzuki featuresCTC data (1.25-5 et al.Bayesian ANN and a mixture or and a mixture supine and prone, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm)Bayesian ANN and a mixture supine and prone, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm)Bayesian ANN and a mixture supine and prone, including 61 polyps (4-30 mm) in 45 patients in both supine and prone, including 61 polyps (127)Suzuki respectivelyCTC data (1.25-50 featuresBy-polyp (by-patient) supine and prone, including 61 polyps and a single supine and prone, including 28 polyps (5-25 mm) in 15 patients in both supine and prone, including 28 polyps (5-25 mm) in 15 patientsBy-polyp (by-patient) sensitivity of 96.4% for larger polyps (210mm) and of 93.1% and 80.6% for larger polyps (by-patient) and a single supine and prone, including 28 polyps (5-25 mm) in 15 patientsBy-polyp (by-patient) sensitivity of 96.4% (127)Bayesian ANN and a single sensitivity of 96.4% (127)By-polyp (by-patient) sensitivity of 96.4% (127)Bayesian ANN and a single sensitivity of 96.4% (5-25 mm) in 15 patientsBy-polyp (by-patient) sensitivity of 96.4% and a single sensitivity of 96.4% (127)Bayesian ANN and a single sensitivity of 96.4% and a single sensitivity of 96.4% and a singleBy-polyp (by-patient) sensitivity of 96.4% and a single sensitivity of 96.4% and a single sensitivity of 96.4% and a singleBy-polyp sensitivity sensitivity of 96.4% and a single sensitivity of 96.4% and a singleBy-polyp sensitivity sensitivity of	[124]	patients in both	perceptrons	95.3% with 5.4				classification part
including 21 polyps (5-25 mm)featuresfeatureset al.mm collimation) of 24 patients in both supine and prone, including 21 polypsfeaturessensitivity of 96.4% (210mm) and 75% featureset al.mm collimation) of a apaientsand a mixture of expert 3Dsensitivity of 96.4% (100%) with 1.1125]patients in both supine and prone, including 21 polyps9 selected (210mm) and 75% featuresSensitivity of 100% tinternalfor other polyps with and 6.9 FPs/patient, respectivelya 7x7x7a 7x7x7classification part126]patients in both supine and prone, including 61 polyps (4.30 mm) in 45 patientsLDA with sensitivity of 90.4% (210mm) and other polyps with 4 and 6.9 FPs/patient, respectivelySVM classifier sensitivity of 96.4% and 6.9 FPs/patient, respectivelySVM classifier mmBy-polyp sensitivity of 93.1% and 80.6% for larger polyps (210mm) and other polyps with 4 and a singleBy-polyp polyp sensitivity of 93.1% and 80.6% for larger polyps with 2.1 mmSuzukiCTC data (1.25-5 and a singleBayesia ANN values in a uncluding 28 polyps (5-25 mm) in 15 patientsBy-polyp polyp-spatient polyps with 2.21 with voxelBy-polyp (by-patient) respectivelyWang classification partCTC data (1.25-2.5 subvolume as inputMultiple- sensitivity of 86.4% and a singleSVM classification part subvolume as including 96 polypsSVM classification part subvolume as including 96 polyps127]73 patients15 patientsSTXT values in a ulcoling 28 polyps values in a<		supine and prone,	with 12	FPs/patient	Suzuki	CTC data (1.25-5	Bayesian ANN	By-polyp (by-patient)
Jerebk o et al.CTC data (5 mm supine and prone, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm)A committee of SVMs with p selected (clorm) and 75%, for other polyps with at al.CTC data (5 mm (5-25 mm)A committee of SVMs with (5-25 mm)Sensitivity of 86.7%, for other polyps with and 100% for larger polypsSensitivity of 86.7%, for other polyps with and 00% for larger polyps (210mm) and other polyps with 4 and 6.9 FPs/patient, respectivelyThe sensitivity of 100%, respectivelyThe sensiti		including 21 polyps	features		et al.	mm collimation) of 24 patients in both	and a mixture	sensitivity of 96.4%
o et al. [125]collimation) of 40 patients in both supine and prone, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm)of SVMs with 9 selected for other polyps with 3 FPs/patient in a independent testincluding 23 polyps (≥10mm) and 75% for other polyps with a FPs/patient in a independent testvoxel values in a 75% (≥10mm) and 75% for other polyps with and 100% for larger polypsincluding 23 polyps (>100% and 75% for other polyps with and 100% for larger polypsvoxel values in a (210mm) and 75% for other polyps with and 100% for larger polyps (≥10mm) and and 100% for larger polyps (≥10mm) and and 6.9 FPs/patient, respectivelyincluding 23 polyps (>100% and 75% for larger mass (35 mm), that had been "missed" by radiologists in a mm collimation) of and 6.9 FPs/patient, respectivelyincluding 2.3 polyps (>100% and 100% for larger mm collimation) of and 6.9 FPs/patient, respectivelyvoxel values in a thad been "missed" by radiologists in a mm collimation) of and a single supine and prone, including 28 polyps (5-25 mm) in 15 patientsLOA with supine and prone, including 28 polyps values in a to look a to lo	Jerebk	CTC data (5 mm	A committee	Sensitivity of 86.7%	[00]	supine and prone,	MTANNs with	FPs/patient in an
[125]patients in both supine and prone, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm)9 selected for other polyps with 3 FPs/patient in a independent test(e-25 mm) and a mass (35 mm), that had been "missed" by radiologists in a multicenter clinical trial [132]a a 7x7x77x7x7classification part subvolume as inputWang et al.CTC data (5 mm patients in both supine and prone, including 61 polyps (4-30 mm) in 45 patientsLDA with internal and 100% for larger polypsSensitivity of 100% and 6.9 FPs/patient, respectivelyCTC data (1.25-5.0 supine and prone, including 61 polyps (4-30 mm) in 45 patientsSuzukiCTC data (1.25-5 and a single and 6.9 FPs/patient, respectivelySvy olyp sensitivity of 96.4% and a single sensitivity of 96.4% and a single(6-25 mm) and a mass (35 mm), that had been "missed" by radiologists in a multicenter clinical trial [132]SVM classifier with projection of 93.1% and 80.6% for larger polyps (≥10mm) and other polyps with 1.9 and and mm collimation) of supine and prone, including 28 polyps (5-25 mm) in 15 patientsBy-polyp (by-patient) supine and prone, including 28 polyps values in a LOO test of the classification part subvolume as inputMultiple- kernel learning with statistical and/or prone, including 96 polypsMultiple- kernel learning with statistical and/or prone, including 96 polypsSource supine and a single supine and a singlea a 7x7x7Source a 7x7x7Source a 7x7x7Image: trial supine apatientsSource supineSource and a single supineSou	o et al.	collimation) of 40	of SVMs with	for larger polyps		including 23 polyps	voxel values in	LOO test of the
supine and prone, including 21 polyps (5-25 mm)featuresfor other polyps with independent testmass (35 mm), that thad been "missed" by radiologists in a multicenter clinical trial [132]subvolume as inputWang et al. [126]CTC data (5 mm totation) of 153 internalLDA with sensitivity of 100% and 100% for larger polyps (≥10mm) and other polyps with 4 and 6.9 FPs/patient, respectivelymass (35 mm), that had been "missed" by radiologists in a multicenter clinical trial [132]SVM classifier with projectionBy-polyp sensitivity of 93.1% and 80.6% for larger polypsSuzuki et al. patientsCTC data (1.25-5 and a single supine and prone, including 28 polyps (5-25 mm) in 15 patientsBy-polyp (by-patient) sensitivity of 96.4% and a single sensitivity of 96.4% classification part subvolume as including 28 polyps (5-25 mm) in 15 patientsBy-polyp (by-patient) sensitivity of 96.4% classification part subvolume as including 96 polypsMultiple- kernel learning with statistical an LOO test of the classification part including 96 polypsMultiple- kernel learning with statistical an LOO test of the classification part	[125]	patients in both	9 selected	(≥10mm) and 75%		(6-25 mm) and a	a 7x7x7	classification part
Wang et al.CTC data (5 mm collimation) of 153 internalLDA independent testand 100% for larger polyps (≥10mm) and other polyps with 4 and 6.9 FPs/patient, respectivelyradiologists inal trial [132]multicenter clinical trial [132]By-polyp sensitivity of 93.1% and 80.6% for larger polyps et al.SuzukiCTC data (1.25-5 and 6.9 FPs/patient, patientsBayesian ANN supine and prone, including 61 polyps and 6.9 FPs/patient, respectivelyBy-polyp sensitivity of 93.1% and 80.6% et al.SVM classifier for larger polyps (≥10mm) and other polyps with 4 and 6.9 FPs/patient, respectivelySVM classifier for larger polyps (≥10mm) and other polyps with 1.9 and 5.2 FPs/patient, respectivelySuzukiCTC data (1.25-5 atientsBayesian ANN supine and prone, including 28 polyps (5-25 mm) in 15 patientsBy-polyp (by-patient) sensitivity of 96.4% and a singleSuzuki sensitivity of 96.4% classification part subvolume as inputWang cTC data (1.25-2.5 et al.Multiple- with statistical and/or prone, including 96 polypsSuzuki 1.9 and and/or prone, including 96 polypsMultiple- kernel learning with statistical and/or prone, including 96 polypsMultiple- kernel learning with statistical and/or prone, including 96 polypsMultiple- kernel learning with statistical and/or prone, including 96 polyps		supine and prone,	features	for other polyps with 3 EPs/patient in a		mass (35 mm), that	subvolume as	
Wang et al.CTC data (5 mm collimation) of 153 patients in both supine and prone, including 61 polyps (4-30 mm) in 45 patientsLDA with internal and 100% for larger polyps (≥10mm) and other polyps with 4 and 6.9 FPs/patient, respectivelymulticenter clinical trial [132]multicenter clinical trial [132]By-polyp sensitivity of 93.1% and 8.6% for larger polyps (≥10mm) and of 93.1% and 8.6%Suzuki et al. mm collimation) of [127]CTC data (1.25-5 mm collimation) of supine and prone, including 28 polyps (5-25 mm) in 15 patientsBayesian ANN supine and prone, with voxel (5-25 mm) in 15 patientsBy-polyp (by-patient) sensitivity of 96.4% and a single sensitivity of 96.4% classification part subvolume as inputMultiple- sensitivity of 96.4% and a singleSVM classifier supine and prone, including 347 polyps and a singleBy-polyp sensitivity of 93.1% and 80.6% for larger polyps (≥10mm) and other polyps with 1.9 and 5.2 FPs/patient, respectivelySupolyp (by-patient) supine and prone, including 28 polyps (5-25 mm) in 15 patientsBayesian ANN and a single subvolume as inputBy-polyp (by-patient) sensitivity of 96.4% and a singleMultiple- subvolume as inputMultiple- subvolume as inputMultiple- subvolume as input		(5-25 mm)		independent test		radiologists in a	mput	
et al.collimation) of 153 patientsinternal featuresand 100% for larger polyps (≥10mm) and other polyps with 4 and 6.9 FPs/patient, respectivelytral [132]SVM classifier with projection featuresBy-polyp sensitivity of 93.1% and 80.6%SuzukiCTC data (1.25-5 patientsBayesian ANN and a singleBy-polyp (by-patient) sensitivity of 96.4% 3D MTANNBy-polyp (by-patient) sensitivity of 96.4% and a singleZhou and masses (5-60 mm) in 15 patientsSVM classifier for larger polyps (≥10mm) and other polyps with 1.9 and 5.2 FPs/patient, respectively[127]73 patients in both including 28 polyps (5-25 mm) in 15 patientsBy-polyp (by-patient in an tubou me as inputDV Taking and polyps (210mm) and sensitivity of 96.4% sensitivity of 96.4% sensitivity of 96.4%Wang (CTC data (1.25-2.5 mm)Multiple- kernel learning with statistical and/or prone, including 28 polyps values in a tubou me as inputNultiple- subvolume as inputWang (CTC data (1.25-2.5 (210mm))Multiple- kernel learning with statistical and/or prone, including 96 polypsMultiple- kernel learning with statistical and/or prone, including 96 polypsSUM tubou me and/or prone, including 96 polypsSUM tubou me and/or prone, including 96 polypsSUM tubou me and/or prone, including 96 polyps	Wang	CTC data (5 mm	LDA with	Sensitivity of 100%		multicenter clinical		
[126]patientsfeaturesofpolyps(≥10mm) andcrespectivelysubtract<	et al.	collimation) of 153	internal	and 100% for larger	Zhou	trial [132] CTC_data_(1.25.5.0	SVM classifier	By polyn consitivity
Suzuki (4-30 mm) in 45 patientsBayesian ANN susukiBy-polyp (by-patient) sensitivity of 96.4%[133]325 patients in supine and/or including 347 polypsfeaturesfor larger polyps (≥10mm) and other polyps with 1.9 and 5.2Suzuki et al. [127]CTC data (1.25-5 mm collimation) of including 28 polypsBayesian ANN and a single supine and prone, with voxel (5-25 mm) in 15 patientsBayesian ANN supine and prone, values in a LOO test of the classification partBy-polyp (by-patient) sensitivity of 96.4% supine and prone, including 28 polypsImage: polyps (210mm) and other polyps with 1.9 and Sensitivity of 96.4% mm)[134]66 patients in supine and/orCTC data (1.25-2.5 with statistical and/or prone, including 96 polypsMultiple- with statistical and/or prone, including 96 polypsSensitivity of 83% with statistical and/or prone, including 96 polyps	[120]	supine and prope	nolvns	other polyps (\geq 10mm) and	et al.	mm collimation) of	with projection	of 93.1% and 80.6%
(4-30 mm) in 45 patientsrespectivelyand/or prone, including 347 polyps(≥10mm) and other polyps with 1.9 and solution 347 polypsSuzukiCTC data (1.25-5 and a single supine and prone, including 28 polyps patientsBayesian ANN 3D MTANN (100%) with 2.1 FPs/patient in an including 28 polyps patientsBayesian ANN a single songle and prone, with voxelBy-polyp (by-patient) sensitivity of 96.4% sensitivity of 96.4% et al.mmand masses (5-60 mm)5.2 sensitivity of 83% with 54% sensitivity of 83% with 54% et al.mmCTC data (1.25-2.5 with 1.9 and sensitivity of 83% with 54% et al.Multiple- sensitivity of 83% with 54% tet al.Sensitivity of 83% with 54% tet al.[134]66 patients in supine and/or including 96 polypsnu CO0 test of the curvature and 18 geometric features18 geometric features		including 61 polyps	Perips	and 6.9 FPs/patient,	[133]	325 patients in supine	features	for larger polyps
patientspatientspolype (by-patient)including 34/ polypspolype (by-patient, and a single sensitivity of 96.4%polype (by-patient, and a assess (5-605.2FPs/patient, respectively[127]73 patients in both 3DMTANN(100%) with 2.1mmmmCTC data (1.25-2.5Multiple-Sensitivity of 83%supine and prone, with voxelFPs/patient in an including 28 polypsvalues in aLOO test of the (5-25 mm) in 15Tx7x7classification part[134]66 patients in supine and/or prone, curvature and including 96 polypswith statistical an LOO test of the including 96 polypsand/or prone, curvature and 18 geometric features		(4-30 mm) in 45		respectively		and/or prone,		$(\geq 10 \text{mm})$ and other
et al. mm collimation) of and a single sensitivity of 96.4% mm) respectively [127] 73 patients in both 3D MTANN (100%) with 2.1 supine and prone, with voxel FPs/patient in an including 28 polyps values in a LOO test of the (5-25 mm) in 15 7x7x7 classification part patients subvolume as input log classification part including 96 polyps are classification part including 96	Sumla	patients	Powerien ANN	Pre palum (by nation)		and masses (5-60		5.2 EPs/patient
[127]73 patients in both supine and prone, including 28 polyps patients3DMTANN (100%)(100%)with youth2.1Wang etCTCdata (1.25-2.5 mmMultiple- kernel learning with statistical an LOO test of the classification part inputWang supineCTCdata (1.25-2.5 mmMultiple- kernel learning with statistical an LOO test of the classification partSensitivity of 83% with 5 FPs/patient in an LOO test of the classification part[134]66 patients in supine and/or including 96 polypsand/or 18 geometric featuresSensitivity of 83%	et al.	mm collimation) of	and a single	sensitivity of 96.4%		mm)		respectively
supine and prone, with voxel FPs/patient in an including 28 polyps values in a LOO test of the (5-25 mm) in 15 7x7x7 classification part patients subvolume as input et al. mm collimation) of kernel learning with 5 FPs/patient in [134] 66 patients in supine with statistical an LOO test of the and/or prone, curvature and classification part including 96 polyps 18 geometric features	[127]	73 patients in both	3D MTANN	(100%) with 2.1	Wang	CTC data (1.25-2.5	Multiple-	Sensitivity of 83%
(5-25 mm) in 15 7x7x7 classification part patients subvolume as input input in the construction of the classification part patients subvolume as input including 96 polyps 18 geometric features		supine and prone,	with voxel	FPs/patient in an	et al.	mm collimation) of	kernel learning	with 5 FPs/patient in
patients subvolume as input including 96 polyps 18 geometric features		(5-25 mm) in 15	values in a $7x7x7$	classification part	[134]	and/or prope	curvature and	classification part
input features		patients	subvolume as	erassification part		including 96 polyps	18 geometric	Part
			input				features	

4.2 Classification Component in CADe Schemes

Major sources of non-polyps (i.e., FPs) remaining after the first step in CADe schemes include haustral folds, residual stool, rectal tubes, the ileocecal valve, and extra-colonic structures such as the small bowel and stomach. Technical developments of the classification step in CADe schemes for detection of polyps in CTC are summarized in Table 3. Many investigators employed feature-based classifiers in the second component of CADe schemes. Gokturk et al. [121] employed an SVM with histogram input that is used as a shape signature for classification. Näppi et al. developed a classification method based on volumetric features [122]. Acar et al. [123] used edge-displacement fields to model the changes in consecutive cross-sectional views of CTC data and QDA for classification. Jerebko et al. [30] used a multilayer perceptron to classify polyp candidates in their CADe scheme and improved the performance by incorporating a committee of multilayer perceptrons [124] and a committee of SVMs [125]. Wang et al. [126] developed a classification method based on LDA with internal features (geometric, morphologic, and textural) of polyps. Suzuki et al. [127] developed a PML technique called a 3D MTANN by extending the structure of a 2D MTANN [11] to process 3D volume data in CTC. They removed FPs due to rectal tubes by using a single 3D MTANN [127] and multiple sources of FPs by developing and using a mixture of expert 3D MTANNs [20]. Li et al. [128] developed a classification method based on an SVM classifier with waveletbased features. Wang et al. [129] improved the SVM performance by using nonlinear dimensionality reduction (i.e., a diffusion map and locally linear embedding). Yao at al. [130] employed a topographic height map for calculating features for an SVM classifier. Suzuki et al. [66] tested a CADe scheme with MTANNs (i.e., a PML technique) on polyps that had been "missed" by radiologists [131] in a multicenter clinical trial [132]. Suzuki et al. [67] also improved the efficiency of the MTANN approach by incorporating principal-component analysis-based and Laplacian eigenmap-based dimension reduction techniques. Xu and Suzuki [68] showed that other nonlinear regression models such as support vector and nonlinear Gaussian process regression models instead of the ANN regression model could be used as the core model in the MTANN framework. Zhou et al. [133] developed projection features for an SVM classifier. Wang et al. [134] improved the performance of a CAD scheme by adding statistical curvature features in multiplekernel learning. Multiple kernel learning is a recent topic in SVM research.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, ML techniques used in CAD schemes for the thorax and colon have been surveyed. These CAD schemes included CADe and CADx of lung nodules in thoracic CT and CADe of polyps in CTC. The second of the two major components of most CAD schemes, i.e., the classification of lesion candidates, used ML techniques. There are three classes of classification techniques used in CAD schemes: feature-based ML, PML, and non-ML methods. Featurebased ML is the most popular technique in the classification step. Various ML models have been used in this class, including LDA, a multilayer perceptron, an SVM, an ML ensemble, and multiple-kernel learning. Feature selection is an important step for maximizing the performance of a feature-based ML technique, and thus it was often used. The most popular feature selection method in CAD is stepwise feature selection with Wilks' lambda for linear classifiers such as LDA. Recently, feature selection for nonlinear classifiers has been studied. The most recent development is SFFS under the maximum AUC criterion coupled with an SVM. Recently, PML emerged and used for removal of FPs that had not been removed by feature-based ML. An MTANN is a representative PML model, and there are variations of the MTANNs, including a mixture of expert MTANNS, MTSVR, and Lap-MTANNS. Thus, many investigators have been studying ML in CAD, which indicates the importance of ML in this field. Most CAD schemes employ feature-based MLs that had originally been developed and established in the pattern recognition field. On the other hand, MTANNs were born in the medical imaging field. Evidence demonstrated that PML including MTANNs was effective for improving the performance of CAD schemes. It is hoped that this survey will be useful for researchers in understanding the past studies and the current status of ML in CAD, and in advancing the research area of ML in CAD. It is also hoped to see more original ML techniques/models created in the CAD field.

Acknowledgments

The author is grateful to Ms. E. Lanzl for improving the manuscript. This work was partly supported by NIH R01CA120549, S10 RR021039 and P30 CA14599. CAD and ML technologies developed at University of Chicago have been licensed to companies including R2 Technology (Hologic), Riverain Technologies, AlgoMedica, Median Technologies, Mitsubishi Space Software, General Electric, and Toshiba. It is the policy of University of Chicago that investigators disclose publicly actual or potential significant financial interests that may appear to be affected by research activities.

References

- M.L. Giger and K. Suzuki, "Computer-aided diagnosis (CAD)," in Biomedical Information Technology, ed. D.D. Feng, pp.359–374, Academic Press, 2007.
- [2] K. Doi, "Current status and future potential of computer-aided diagnosis in medical imaging," Br J Radiol, vol.78, Spec no.1, pp.S3–S19, 2005.
- [3] H.P. Chan, B. Sahiner, M.A. Helvie, N. Petrick, M.A. Roubidoux, T.E. Wilson, D.D. Adler, C. Paramagul, J.S. Newman, and S. Sanjay-Gopal, "Improvement of radiologists' characterization of mammographic masses by using computer-aided diagnosis: an ROC study," Radiology, vol.212, no.3, pp.817–827, Sept. 1999.
- [4] F. Li, M. Aoyama, J. Shiraishi, H. Abe, Q. Li, K. Suzuki, R. Engelmann, S. Sone, H. Macmahon, and K. Doi, "Radiologists' performance for differentiating benign from malignant lung nodules on high-resolution CT using computer-estimated likelihood of malignancy," AJR. Am. J. Roentgenol., vol.183, no.5, pp.1209– 1215, Nov. 2004.
- [5] F. Li, H. Arimura, K. Suzuki, J. Shiraishi, Q. Li, H. Abe, R. Engelmann, S. Sone, H. MacMahon, and K. Doi, "Computeraided detection of peripheral lung cancers missed at CT: ROC analyses without and with localization," Radiology, vol.237, no.2, pp.684–690, Nov. 2005.
- [6] K. Suzuki, M. Hori, E. McFarland, A.C. Friedman, D.C. Rockey, and A.H. Dachman, "Can CAD help improve the performance of radiologists in detection of difficult polyps in CT colonography?," Proc. RSNA Annual Meeting, pp.872, Chicago, IL, 2009.
- [7] K. Suzuki, J. Shiraishi, H. Abe, H. MacMahon, and K. Doi, "Falsepositive reduction in computer-aided diagnostic scheme for detecting nodules in chest radiographs by means of massive training artificial neural network," Academic Radiology, vol.12, no.2, pp.191–201, Feb. 2005.
- [8] B. van Ginneken, B.M. ter Haar Romeny, and M.A. Viergever, "Computer-aided diagnosis in chest radiography: A survey," IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging, vol.20, no.12, pp.1228–1241, Dec. 2001.
- [9] M.L. Giger, K. Doi, and H. MacMahon, "Image feature analysis and computer-aided diagnosis in digital radiography. 3. Automated detection of nodules in peripheral lung fields," Med. Phys., vol.15, no.2, pp.158–166, March-April 1988.
- [10] S. Chen, K. Suzuki, and H. MacMahon, "A computer-aided diagnostic scheme for lung nodule detection in chest radiographs by means of two-stage nodule-enhancement with support vector classification," Med. Phys., vol.38, pp.1844–1858, 2011.
- [11] K. Suzuki, S.G. Armato, F. Li, S. Sone, and K. Doi, "Massive training artificial neural network (MTANN) for reduction of false positives in computerized detection of lung nodules in low-dose CT," Med. Phys., vol.30, no.7, pp.1602–1617, July 2003.
- [12] H. Arimura, S. Katsuragawa, K. Suzuki, F. Li, J. Shiraishi, S. Sone,

and K. Doi, "Computerized scheme for automated detection of lung nodules in low-dose computed tomography images for lung cancer screening," Acad. Radiol., vol.11, no.6, pp.617–629, June 2004.

- [13] S.G. Armato, 3rd, M.L. Giger, C.J. Moran, J.T. Blackburn, K. Doi, and H. MacMahon, "Computerized detection of pulmonary nodules on CT scans," Radiographics, vol.19, no.5, pp.1303–1311, Sept.-Oct. 1999.
- [14] S.G. Armato, 3rd, F. Li, M.L. Giger, H. MacMahon, S. Sone, and K. Doi, "Lung cancer: performance of automated lung nodule detection applied to cancers missed in a CT screening program," Radiology, vol.225, no.3, pp.685–692, Dec. 2002.
- [15] H.P. Chan, K. Doi, S. Galhotra, C.J. Vyborny, H. MacMahon, and P.M. Jokich, "Image feature analysis and computer-aided diagnosis in digital radiography. I. Automated detection of microcalcifications in mammography," Med. Phys., vol.14, no.4, pp.538–548, July-Aug. 1987.
- [16] K.G. Gilhuijs, M.L. Giger, and U. Bick, "Computerized analysis of breast lesions in three dimensions using dynamic magneticresonance imaging," Med. Phys., vol.25, no.9, pp.1647–1654, Sept. 1998.
- [17] K. Drukker, M.L. Giger, and C.E. Metz, "Robustness of computerized lesion detection and classification scheme across different breast US platforms," Radiology, vol.237, no.3, pp.834–840, Dec. 2005.
- [18] H. Yoshida and J. Nappi, "Three-dimensional computer-aided diagnosis scheme for detection of colonic polyps," IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging, vol.20, no.12, pp.1261–1274, Dec. 2001.
- [19] K. Suzuki, H. Yoshida, J. Nappi, and A.H. Dachman, "Massivetraining artificial neural network (MTANN) for reduction of false positives in computer-aided detection of polyps: Suppression of rectal tubes," Medical Physics, vol.33, no.10, pp.3814–3824, 2006.
- [20] K. Suzuki, H. Yoshida, J. Nappi, S.G. Armato, 3rd, and A.H. Dachman, "Mixture of expert 3D massive-training ANNs for reduction of multiple types of false positives in CAD for detection of polyps in CT colonography," Med. Phys., vol.35, no.2, pp.694–703, Feb. 2008.
- [21] R.M. Summers, C.F. Beaulieu, L.M. Pusanik, J.D. Malley, R.B. Jeffrey, Jr., D.I. Glazer, and S. Napel, "Automated polyp detector for CT colonography: Feasibility study," Radiology, vol.216, no.1, pp.284–290, July 2000.
- [22] A. Lostumbo, C. Wanamaker, J. Tsai, K. Suzuki, and A.H. Dachman, "Comparison of 2D and 3D views for evaluation of flat lesions in CT colonography," Acad. Radiol., vol.17, no.1, pp.39–47, Jan. 2010.
- [23] A. Lostumbo, K. Suzuki, and A.H. Dachman, "Flat lesions in CT colonography," Abdom. Imaging, vol.35, no.5, pp.578–583, Oct. 2010.
- [24] D.E. Rumelhart, G.E. Hinton, and R.J. Williams, "Learning representations by back-propagating errors," Nature, vol.323, pp.533–536, 1986.
- [25] V.N. Vapnik, The Nature of Statistical Learning Theory, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995.
- [26] J. Shiraishi, Q. Li, K. Suzuki, R. Engelmann, and K. Doi, "Computer-aided diagnostic scheme for the detection of lung nodules on chest radiographs: localized search method based on anatomical classification," Med. Phys., vol.33, no.7, pp.2642– 2653, July 2006.
- [27] S.G. Armato, 3rd, M.L. Giger, and H. MacMahon, "Automated detection of lung nodules in CT scans: Preliminary results," Med. Phys., vol.28, no.8, pp.1552–1561, Aug. 2001.
- [28] M. Aoyama, Q. Li, S. Katsuragawa, H. MacMahon, and K. Doi, "Automated computerized scheme for distinction between benign and malignant solitary pulmonary nodules on chest images," Med. Phys., vol.29, no.5, pp.701–708, May 2002.
- [29] M. Aoyama, Q. Li, S. Katsuragawa, F. Li, S. Sone, and K. Doi, "Computerized scheme for determination of the likelihood

measure of malignancy for pulmonary nodules on low-dose CT images," Med. Phys., vol.30, no.3, pp.387–394, March 2003.

- [30] A.K. Jerebko, R.M. Summers, J.D. Malley, M. Franaszek, and C.D. Johnson, "Computer-assisted detection of colonic polyps with CT colonography using neural networks and binary classification trees," Medical Physics, vol.30, no.1, pp.52–60, Jan. 2003.
- [31] I. Sluimer, A. Schilham, M. Prokop, and B.van Ginneken, "Computer analysis of computed tomography scans of the lung: a survey," IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging, vol.25, no.4, pp.385–405, April 2006.
- [32] Q. Li, "Recent progress in computer-aided diagnosis of lung nodules on thin-section CT," Comput. Med. Imaging Graph., vol.31, no.4-5, pp.248–257, June-July 2007.
- [33] F. Fraioli, G. Serra, and R. Passariello, "CAD (computed-aided detection) and CADx (computer aided diagnosis) systems in identifying and characterising lung nodules on chest CT: Overview of research, developments and new prospects," Radiol Med, vol.115, no.3, pp.385–402, April 2010.
- [34] J.M. Goo, "A computer-aided diagnosis for evaluating lung nodules on chest CT: The current status and perspective," Korean Journal of Radiology: Official Journal of the Korean Radiological Society, vol.12, no.2, pp.145–155, March-April 2011.
- [35] K. Suzuki, "Pixel-based machine-learning (PML) in medical imaging," Int. J. Biomedical Imaging, vol.2012, Article ID 792079, 792018 2012.
- [36] R.O. Duda, P.E. Hart, and D.G. Stork, in Pattern Recognit., Wiley Interscience, Hoboken, NJ, 2001.
- [37] C.M. Bishop, Neural Networks for Pattern Recognition, Oxford University Press, New York, 1995.
- [38] C.M. Bishop, "An example character recognition," in Neural Networks for Pattern Recognition, ed. C.M. Bishop, pp.1–4, Oxford University Press, New York, 1995.
- [39] H.P. Chan, B. Sahiner, R.F. Wagner, and N. Petrick, "Classifier design for computer-aided diagnosis: Effects of finite sample size on the mean performance of classical and neural network classifiers," Med. Phys., vol.26, no.12, pp.2654–2668, Dec. 1999.
- [40] K. Fukunaga, Introduction to Statistical Pattern Recognition, Academic Press, San Diego, 1990.
- [41] R.E. Bellman, Adaptive control processes: A guided tour, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1961.
- [42] M. Aoyama, Q. Li, S. Katsuragawa, H. MacMahon, and K. Doi, "Automated computerized scheme for distinction between benign and malignant solitary pulmonary nodules on chest images," Med. Phys., vol.29, no.5, pp.701–708, May 2002.
- [43] P. Pudil, J. Novovicova, and J. Kittler, "Floating search methods in feature selection," Pattern Recognit. Lett., vol.15, pp.1119–1125, 1994.
- [44] K. Suzuki, "Determining the receptive field of a neural filter," J Neural Eng, vol.1, no.4, pp.228–237, Dec. 2004.
- [45] K. Suzuki, I. Horiba, and N. Sugie, "A simple neural network pruning algorithm with application to filter synthesis," Neural Process. Lett., vol.13, no.1, pp.43–53, Feb. 2001.
- [46] A. Takemura, A. Shimizu, and K. Hamamoto, "Discrimination of breast tumors in ultrasonic images using an ensemble classifier based on the AdaBoost algorithm with feature selection," IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging, vol.29, no.3, pp.598–609, 2010.
- [47] J. Xu and K. Suzuki, "Computer-aided detection of hepatocellular carcinoma in hepatic CT: False positive reduction with feature selection," IEEE International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging (IEEE ISBI), pp.1097–1100, Chicago, IL, 2011.
- [48] K. Suzuki, I. Horiba, N. Sugie, and S. Ikeda, "Improvement of image quality of X-ray fluoroscopy using spatiotemporal neural filter which learns noise reduction, edge enhancement and motion compensation," Proc. Int. Conf. Signal Processing Applications and Technology (ICSPAT), pp.1382–1386, Boston, MA, 1996.
- [49] K. Suzuki, I. Horiba, N. Sugie, and M. Nanki, "Neural filter with selection of input features and its application to image quality

improvement of medical image sequences," IEICE Trans. Inf. & Syst., vol.E85-D, no.10, pp.1710–1718, Oct. 2002.

- [50] K. Suzuki, I. Horiba, and N. Sugie, "Efficient approximation of neural filters for removing quantum noise from images," IEEE Trans. Signal Process., vol.50, no.7, pp.1787–1799, July 2002.
- [51] K. Suzuki, I. Horiba, and N. Sugie, "Neural edge enhancer for supervised edge enhancement from noisy images," IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell., vol.25, no.12, pp.1582–1596, Dec. 2003.
- [52] K. Suzuki, I. Horiba, N. Sugie, and M. Nanki, "Extraction of left ventricular contours from left ventriculograms by means of a neural edge detector," IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging, vol.23, no.3, pp.330–339, March 2004.
- [53] S.B. Lo, S.A. Lou, J.S. Lin, M.T. Freedman, M.V. Chien, and S.K. Mun, "Artificial convolution neural network techniques and applications for lung nodule detection," IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging, vol.14, no.4, pp.711–718, 1995.
- [54] S.C.B. Lo, H.P. Chan, J.S. Lin, H. Li, M.T. Freedman, and S.K. Mun, "Artificial convolution neural network for medical image pattern recognition," Neural Netw., vol.8, no.7-8, pp.1201–1214, 1995.
- [55] J.S. Lin, S.B. Lo, A. Hasegawa, M.T. Freedman, and S.K. Mun, "Reduction of false positives in lung nodule detection using a twolevel neural classification," IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging, vol.15, no.2, pp.206–217, 1996.
- [56] S.C. Lo, H. Li, Y. Wang, L. Kinnard, and M.T. Freedman, "A multiple circular path convolution neural network system for detection of mammographic masses," IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging, vol.21, no.2, pp.150–158, Feb. 2002.
- [57] B. Sahiner, H.P. Chan, N. Petrick, D. Wei, M.A. Helvie, D.D. Adler, and M.M. Goodsitt, "Classification of mass and normal breast tissue: A convolution neural network classifier with spatial domain and texture images," IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging, vol.15, no.5, pp.598–610, 1996.
- [58] D. Wei, R.M. Nishikawa, and K. Doi, "Application of texture analysis and shift-invariant artificial neural network to microcalcification cluster detection," Radiology, vol.201, pp.696–696, Nov. 1996.
- [59] W. Zhang, K. Doi, M.L. Giger, Y. Wu, R.M. Nishikawa, and R.A. Schmidt, "Computerized detection of clustered microcalcifications in digital mammograms using a shift-invariant artificial neural network," Med. Phys., vol.21, no.4, pp.517–524, April 1994.
- [60] K. Suzuki, S.G. Armato, 3rd, F. Li, S. Sone, and K. Doi, "Massive training artificial neural network (MTANN) for reduction of false positives in computerized detection of lung nodules in low-dose computed tomography," Med. Phys., vol.30, no.7, pp.1602–1617, July 2003.
- [61] K. Suzuki, H. Abe, H. MacMahon, and K. Doi, "Image-processing technique for suppressing ribs in chest radiographs by means of massive training artificial neural network (MTANN)," IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging, vol.25, no.4, pp.406–416, April 2006.
- [62] S. Oda, K. Awai, K. Suzuki, Y. Yanaga, Y. Funama, H. MacMahon, and Y. Yamashita, "Performance of radiologists in detection of small pulmonary nodules on chest radiographs: Effect of rib suppression with a massive-training artificial neural network," AJR. Am. J. Roentgenol., vol.193, no.5, pp.W397–W402, Nov. 2009.
- [63] K. Suzuki, "A supervised 'lesion-enhancement' filter by use of a massive-training artificial neural network (MTANN) in computer-aided diagnosis (CAD)," Phys. Med. Biol., vol.54, no.18, pp.S31–S45, Sept. 2009.
- [64] K. Suzuki, J. Shiraishi, H. Abe, H. MacMahon, and K. Doi, "Falsepositive reduction in computer-aided diagnostic scheme for detecting nodules in chest radiographs by means of massive training artificial neural network," Acad. Radiol., vol.12, no.2, pp.191–201, Feb. 2005.
- [65] K. Suzuki, F. Li, S. Sone, and K. Doi, "Computer-aided diagnostic scheme for distinction between benign and malignant nodules in thoracic low-dose CT by use of massive training artificial neural

network," IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging, vol.24, no.9, pp.1138–1150, Sept. 2005.

- [66] K. Suzuki, D.C. Rockey, and A.H. Dachman, "CT colonography: Advanced computer-aided detection scheme utilizing MTANNs for detection of "missed" polyps in a multicenter clinical trial," Med. Phys., vol.30, pp.2–21, 2010.
- [67] K. Suzuki, J. Zhang, and J. Xu, "Massive-training artificial neural network coupled with Laplacian-eigenfunction-based dimensionality reduction for computer-aided detection of polyps in CT colonography," IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging, vol.29, no.11, pp.1907–1917, Nov. 2010.
- [68] J. Xu and K. Suzuki, "Massive-training support vector regression and Gaussian process for false-positive reduction in computeraided detection of polyps in CT colonography," Med. Phys., vol.38, pp.1888–1902, 2011.
- [69] A. Jemal, R. Siegel, E. Ward, Y. Hao, J. Xu, T. Murray, and M.J. Thun, "Cancer statistics, 2008," CA. Cancer J. Clin., vol.58, no.2, pp.71–96, March-April 2008.
- [70] M. Kaneko, K. Eguchi, H. Ohmatsu, R. Kakinuma, T. Naruke, K. Suemasu, and N. Moriyama, "Peripheral lung cancer: Screening and detection with low-dose spiral CT versus radiography," Radiology, vol.201, no.3, pp.798–802, Dec. 1996.
- [71] S. Sone, S. Takashima, F. Li, Z. Yang, T. Honda, Y. Maruyama, M. Hasegawa, T. Yamanda, K. Kubo, K. Hanamura, and K. Asakura, "Mass screening for lung cancer with mobile spiral computed tomography scanner," Lancet, vol.351, no.9111, pp.1242–1245, April 1998.
- [72] C.I. Henschke, D.I. McCauley, D.F. Yankelevitz, D.P. Naidich, G. McGuinness, O.S. Miettinen, D.M. Libby, M.W. Pasmantier, J. Koizumi, N.K. Altorki, and J.P. Smith, "Early lung cancer action project: Overall design and findings from baseline screening," Lancet, vol.354, no.9173, pp.99–105, July 1999.
- [73] C.I. Henschke, D.F. Yankelevitz, D.P. Naidich, D.I. McCauley, G. McGuinness, D.M. Libby, J.P. Smith, M.W. Pasmantier, and O.S. Miettinen, "CT screening for lung cancer: suspiciousness of nodules according to size on baseline scans," Radiology, vol.231, no.1, pp.164–168, April 2004.
- [74] R.T. Heelan, B.J. Flehinger, M.R. Melamed, M.B. Zaman, W.B. Perchick, J.F. Caravelli, and N. Martini, "Non-small-cell lung cancer: results of the New York screening program," Radiology, vol.151, no.2, pp.289–293, May 1984.
- [75] M.L. Giger, K.T. Bae, and H. MacMahon, "Computerized detection of pulmonary nodules in computed tomography images," Invest. Radiol., vol.29, no.4, pp.459–465, April 1994.
- [76] K. Kanazawa, Y. Kawata, N. Niki, H. Satoh, H. Ohmatsu, R. Kakinuma, M. Kaneko, N. Moriyama, and K. Eguchi, "Computeraided diagnosis for pulmonary nodules based on helical CT images," Comput. Med. Imaging Graph., vol.22, no.2, pp.157–167, March-April 1998.
- [77] M.N. Gurcan, B. Sahiner, N. Petrick, H.P. Chan, E.A. Kazerooni, P.N. Cascade, and L. Hadjiiski, "Lung nodule detection on thoracic computed tomography images: preliminary evaluation of a computer-aided diagnosis system," Med. Phys., vol.29, no.11, pp.2552–2558, Nov. 2002.
- [78] Y. Lee, T. Hara, H. Fujita, S. Itoh, and T. Ishigaki, "Automated detection of pulmonary nodules in helical CT images based on an improved template-matching technique," IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging, vol.20, no.7, pp.595–604, July 2001.
- [79] K. Suzuki and K. Doi, "How can a massive training artificial neural network (MTANN) be trained with a small number of cases in the distinction between nodules and vessels in thoracic CT?," Acad. Radiol., vol.12, no.10, pp.1333–1341, Oct. 2005.
- [80] H.P. Chan, B. Sahiner, R.F. Wagner, and N. Petrick, "Classifier design for computer-aided diagnosis: effects of finite sample size on the mean performance of classical and neural network classifiers," Med. Phys, vol.26, no.12, pp.2654–2668, Dec. 1999.
- [81] B. Sahiner, H.P. Chan, and L. Hadjiiski, "Classifier performance

prediction for computer-aided diagnosis using a limited dataset," Med. Phys, vol.35, no.4, pp.1559–1570, April 2008.

- [82] A.A. Farag, A. El-Baz, G. Gimelfarb, M.A. El-Ghar, and T. Eldiasty, "Quantitative nodule detection in low dose chest CT scans: new template modeling and evaluation for CAD system design," Medical image computing and computer-assisted intervention: MICCAI ... International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention, vol.8, no.Pt 1, pp.720–728, 2005.
- [83] Z. Ge, B. Sahiner, H.P. Chan, L.M. Hadjiiski, P.N. Cascade, N. Bogot, E.A. Kazerooni, J. Wei, and C. Zhou, "Computer-aided detection of lung nodules: false positive reduction using a 3D gradient field method and 3D ellipsoid fitting," Med. Phys., vol.32, no.8, pp.2443–2454, Aug. 2005.
- [84] S. Matsumoto, H.L. Kundel, J.C. Gee, W.B. Gefter, and H. Hatabu, "Pulmonary nodule detection in CT images with quantized convergence index filter," Med. Image Anal., vol.10, no.3, pp.343–352, June 2006.
- [85] R. Yuan, P.M. Vos, and P.L. Cooperberg, "Computer-aided detection in screening CT for pulmonary nodules," AJR. Am. J. Roentgenol., vol.186, no.5, pp.1280–1287, May 2006.
- [86] J. Bi, S. Periaswamy, K. Okada, T. Kubota, G. Fung, M. Salganicoff, and R.B. Rao, "Computer aided detection via asymmetric cascade of sparse hyperplane classifiers," Proc. ACM SIGKDD, pp.837–844, 2006.
- [87] J. Pu, B. Zheng, J.K. Leader, X.H. Wang, and D. Gur, "An automated CT based lung nodule detection scheme using geometric analysis of signed distance field," Med. Phys., vol.35, no.8, pp.3453–3461, Aug. 2008.
- [88] A. Retico, P. Delogu, M.E. Fantacci, I. Gori, and A. Preite Martinez, "Lung nodule detection in low-dose and thin-slice computed tomography," Computers in Biology and Medicine, vol.38, no.4, pp.525–534, April 2008.
- [89] X. Ye, X. Lin, J. Dehmeshki, G. Slabaugh, and G. Beddoe, "Shapebased computer-aided detection of lung nodules in thoracic CT images," IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng., vol.56, no.7, pp.1810–1820, July 2009.
- [90] B. Golosio, G.L. Masala, A. Piccioli, P. Oliva, M. Carpinelli, R. Cataldo, P. Cerello, F. De Carlo, F. Falaschi, M.E. Fantacci, G. Gargano, P. Kasae, and M. Torsello, "A novel multithreshold method for nodule detection in lung CT," Med. Phys., vol.36, no.8, pp.3607–3618, Aug. 2009.
- [91] S.G. Armato, 3rd, G. McLennan, M.F. McNitt-Gray, C.R. Meyer, D. Yankelevitz, D.R. Aberle, C.I. Henschke, E.A. Hoffman, E.A. Kazerooni, H. MacMahon, A.P. Reeves, B.Y. Croft, and L.P. Clarke, "Lung image database consortium: developing a resource for the medical imaging research community," Radiology, vol.232, no.3, pp.739–748, Sept. 2004.
- [92] K. Murphy, B. van Ginneken, A.M. Schilham, B.J. de Hoop, H.A. Gietema, and M. Prokop, "A large-scale evaluation of automatic pulmonary nodule detection in chest CT using local image features and k-nearest-neighbour classification," Med. Image Anal., vol.13, no.5, pp.757–770, Oct. 2009.
- [93] M. Tan, R. Deklerck, B. Jansen, M. Bister, and J. Cornelis, "A novel computer-aided lung nodule detection system for CT images," Med. Phys., vol.38, no.10, pp.5630–5645, Oct. 2011.
- [94] T. Messay, R.C. Hardie, and S.K. Rogers, "A new computationally efficient CAD system for pulmonary nodule detection in CT imagery," Med. Image Anal., vol.14, no.3, pp.390–406, June 2010.
- [95] A. Riccardi, T.S. Petkov, G. Ferri, M. Masotti, and R. Campanini, "Computer-aided detection of lung nodules via 3D fast radial transform, scale space representation, and Zernike MIP classification," Med. Phys., vol.38, no.4, pp.1962–1971, April 2011.
- [96] R.B. Rao, J. Bi, G. Fung, M. Salganicoff, N. Obuchowski, and D. Naidich, "LungCAD: A clinically approved, machine learning system for lung cancer detection," Proc. ACM SIGKDD, pp.1033– 1037, 2007.

- [97] B. Sahiner, H.P. Chan, N. Petrick, R.F. Wagner, and L. Hadjiiski, "Feature selection and classifier performance in computer-aided diagnosis: the effect of finite sample size," Med. Phys., vol.27, no.7, pp.1509–1522, July 2000.
- [98] F. Li, S. Sone, H. Abe, H. MacMahon, S.G. Armato, 3rd, and K. Doi, "Lung cancers missed at low-dose helical CT screening in a general population: comparison of clinical, histopathologic, and imaging findings," Radiology, vol.225, no.3, pp.673–683, Dec. 2002.
- [99] S.J. Swensen, J.R. Jett, T.E. Hartman, D.E. Midthun, J.A. Sloan, A.M. Sykes, G.L. Aughenbaugh, and M.A. Clemens, "Lung cancer screening with CT: Mayo Clinic experience," Radiology, vol.226, no.3, pp.756–761, March 2003.
- [100] C.E. Metz, "ROC methodology in radiologic imaging," Invest. Radiol., vol.21, no.9, pp.720–733, Sept. 1986.
- [101] J.A. Hanley and B.J. McNeil, "A method of comparing the areas under receiver operating characteristic curves derived from the same cases," Radiology, vol.148, no.3, pp.839–843, Sept. 1983.
- [102] Y. Kawata, N. Niki, H. Ohmatsu, R. Kakinuma, K. Eguchi, M. Kaneko, and N. Moriyama, "Quantitative surface characterization of pulmonary nodules based on thin-section CT images," IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci., vol.45, no.4, pp.2132–2138, 1998.
- [103] M.F. McNitt-Gray, E.M. Hart, N. Wyckoff, J.W. Sayre, J.G. Goldin, and D.R. Aberle, "A pattern classification approach to characterizing solitary pulmonary nodules imaged on high resolution CT: Preliminary results," Med. Phys., vol.26, no.6, pp.880–888, June 1999.
- [104] Y. Matsuki, K. Nakamura, H. Watanabe, T. Aoki, H. Nakata, S. Katsuragawa, and K. Doi, "Usefulness of an artificial neural network for differentiating benign from malignant pulmonary nodules on high-resolution CT: Evaluation with receiver operating characteristic analysis," AJR. Am. J. Roentgenol., vol.178, no.3, pp.657–663, March 2002.
- [105] K. Mori, N. Niki, T. Kondo, Y. Kamiyama, T. Kodama, Y. Kawada, and N. Moriyama, "Development of a novel computer-aided diagnosis system for automatic discrimination of malignant from benign solitary pulmonary nodules on thin-section dynamic computed tomography," J. Comput. Assist. Tomogr., vol.29, no.2, pp.215–222, March-April 2005.
- [106] S.K. Shah, M.F. McNitt-Gray, S.R. Rogers, J.G. Goldin, R.D. Suh, J.W. Sayre, I. Petkovska, H.J. Kim, and D.R. Aberle, "Computer aided characterization of the solitary pulmonary nodule using volumetric and contrast enhancement features," Academic Radiology, vol.12, no.10, pp.1310–1319, Oct. 2005.
- [107] S. Iwano, T. Nakamura, Y. Kamioka, M. Ikeda, and T. Ishigaki, "Computer-aided differentiation of malignant from benign solitary pulmonary nodules imaged by high-resolution CT," Comput. Med. Imaging Graph., vol.32, no.5, pp.416–422, July 2008.
- [108] T.W. Way, B. Sahiner, H.P. Chan, L. Hadjiiski, P.N. Cascade, A. Chughtai, N. Bogot, and E. Kazerooni, "Computer-aided diagnosis of pulmonary nodules on CT scans: improvement of classification performance with nodule surface features," Med. Phys., vol.36, no.7, pp.3086–3098, July 2009.
- [109] H. Chen, Y. Xu, Y. Ma, and B. Ma, "Neural network ensemblebased computer-aided diagnosis for differentiation of lung nodules on CT images: clinical evaluation," Acad. Radiol., vol.17, no.5, pp.595–602, May 2010.
- [110] M.C. Lee, L. Boroczky, K. Sungur-Stasik, A.D. Cann, A.C. Borczuk, S.M. Kawut, and C.A. Powell, "Computer-aided diagnosis of pulmonary nodules using a two-step approach for feature selection and classifier ensemble construction," Artificial Intelligence in Medicine, vol.50, no.1, pp.43–53, Sept. 2010.
- [111] Y. Kawata, N. Niki, H. Ohmatsu, and N. Moriyama, "Examplebased assisting approach for pulmonary nodule classification in three-dimensional thoracic computed tomography images," Acad. Radiol., vol.10, no.12, pp.1402–1415, Dec. 2003.
- [112] Y. Kawata, N. Niki, H. Ohmatsu, M. Kusumoto, T. Tsuchida, K.

Eguchi, M. Kaneko, and N. Moriyama, "Quantitative classification based on CT histogram analysis of non-small cell lung cancer: correlation with histopathological characteristics and recurrence-free survival," Med. Phys., vol.39, no.2, pp.988–1000, Feb. 2012.

- [113] H. Abe, H. MacMahon, R. Engelmann, Q. Li, J. Shiraishi, S. Katsuragawa, M. Aoyama, T. Ishida, K. Ashizawa, C.E. Metz, and K. Doi, "Computer-aided diagnosis in chest radiography: Results of large-scale observer tests at the 1996-2001 RSNA scientific assemblies," Radiographics, vol.23, no.1, pp.255–265, Jan.-Feb. 2003.
- [114] A. Jemal, T. Murray, E. Ward, A. Samuels, R.C. Tiwari, A. Ghafoor, E.J. Feuer, and M.J. Thun, "Cancer statistics, 2005," CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians, vol.55, no.1, pp.10–30, Jan.-Feb. 2005.
- [115] S.J. Winawer, R.H. Fletcher, L. Miller, F. Godlee, M.H. Stolar, C.D. Mulrow, S.H. Woolf, S.N. Glick, T.G. Ganiats, J.H. Bond, L. Rosen, J.G. Zapka, S.J. Olsen, F.M. Giardiello, J.E. Sisk, R. Van Antwerp, C. Brown-Davis, D.A. Marciniak, and R.J. Mayer, "Colorectal cancer screening: clinical guidelines and rationale," Gastroenterology, vol.112, no.2, pp.594–642, Feb. 1997.
- [116] K. Suzuki and A.H. Dachman, "Computer-aided diagnosis in CT colonography," in Atlas of Virtual Colonoscopy, eds. A.H. Dachman and A. Laghi, pp.163–182, Springer, New York, 2011.
- [117] H. Yoshida and J. Näppi, "Three-dimensional computer-aided diagnosis scheme for detection of colonic polyps," IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging, vol.20, no.12, pp.1261–1274, Dec. 2001.
- [118] R.M. Summers, C.D. Johnson, L.M. Pusanik, J.D. Malley, A.M. Youssef, and J.E. Reed, "Automated polyp detection at CT colonography: Feasibility assessment in a human population," Radiology, vol.219, no.1, pp.51–59, April 2001.
- [119] D.S. Paik, C.F. Beaulieu, G.D. Rubin, B. Acar, R.B. Jeffrey, Jr., J. Yee, J. Dey, and S. Napel, "Surface normal overlap: a computeraided detection algorithm with application to colonic polyps and lung nodules in helical CT," IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging, vol.23, no.6, pp.661–675, June 2004.
- [120] G. Kiss, J. Van Cleynenbreugel, M. Thomeer, P. Suetens, and G. Marchal, "Computer-aided diagnosis in virtual colonography via combination of surface normal and sphere fitting methods," Eur Radiol, vol.12, no.1, pp.77–81, Jan. 2002.
- [121] S.B. Gokturk, C. Tomasi, B. Acar, C.F. Beaulieu, D.S. Paik, R.B. Jeffrey, Jr., J. Yee, and S. Napel, "A statistical 3-D pattern processing method for computer-aided detection of polyps in CT colonography," IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging, vol.20, no.12, pp.1251–1260, Dec. 2001.
- [122] J. Nappi and H. Yoshida, "Automated detection of polyps with CT colonography: Evaluation of volumetric features for reduction of false-positive findings," Acad. Radiol., vol.9, no.4, pp.386–397, April 2002.
- [123] B. Acar, C.F. Beaulieu, S.B. Gokturk, C. Tomasi, D.S. Paik, R.B. Jeffrey, Jr., J. Yee, and S. Napel, "Edge displacement field-based classification for improved detection of polyps in CT colonography," IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging, vol.21, no.12, pp.1461–1467, Dec. 2002.
- [124] A.K. Jerebko, J.D. Malley, M. Franaszek, and R.M. Summers, "Multiple neural network classification scheme for detection of colonic polyps in CT colonography data sets," Academic Radiology, vol.10, no.2, pp.154–160, Feb. 2003.
- [125] A.K. Jerebko, J.D. Malley, M. Franaszek, and R.M. Summers, "Support vector machines committee classification method for computer-aided polyp detection in CT colonography," Academic Radiology, vol.12, no.4, pp.479–486, April 2005.
- [126] Z. Wang, Z. Liang, L. Li, X. Li, B. Li, J. Anderson, and D. Harrington, "Reduction of false positives by internal features for polyp detection in CT-based virtual colonoscopy," Med. Phys., vol.32, no.12, pp.3602–3616, Dec. 2005.
- [127] K. Suzuki, H. Yoshida, J. Nappi, and A.H. Dachman, "Massivetraining artificial neural network (MTANN) for reduction of false

positives in computer-aided detection of polyps: Suppression of rectal tubes," Med. Phys., vol.33, no.10, pp.3814–3824, Oct. 2006.

- [128] J. Li, R. Van Uitert, J. Yao, N. Petrick, M. Franaszek, A. Huang, and R.M. Summers, "Wavelet method for CT colonography computer-aided polyp detection," Med. Phys., vol.35, no.8, pp.3527–3538, Aug. 2008.
- [129] S. Wang, J. Yao, and R.M. Summers, "Improved classifier for computer-aided polyp detection in CT colonography by nonlinear dimensionality reduction," Med. Phys., vol.35, no.4, pp.1377– 1386, April 2008.
- [130] J. Yao, J. Li, and R.M. Summers, "Employing topographical height map in colonic polyp measurement and false positive reduction," Pattern Recognit., vol.42, no.6, pp.1029–1040, 2009.
- [131] T. Doshi, D. Rusinak, R.A. Halvorsen, D.C. Rockey, K. Suzuki, and A.H. Dachman, "CT colonography: False-negative interpretations," Radiology, vol.244, no.1, pp.165–173, July 2007.
- [132] D.C. Rockey, E. Paulson, D. Niedzwiecki, W. Davis, H.B. Bosworth, L. Sanders, J. Yee, J. Henderson, P. Hatten, S. Burdick, A. Sanyal, D.T. Rubin, M. Sterling, G. Akerkar, M.S. Bhutani, K. Binmoeller, J. Garvie, E.J. Bini, K. McQuaid, W.L. Foster, W.M. Thompson, A. Dachman, and R. Halvorsen, "Analysis of air contrast barium enema, computed tomographic colonography, and colonoscopy: Prospective comparison," Lancet, vol.365, no.9456, pp.305–311, Jan. 2005.
- [133] H. Zhu, Z. Liang, P.J. Pickhardt, M.A. Barish, J. You, Y. Fan, H. Lu, E.J. Posniak, R.J. Richards, and H.L. Cohen, "Increasing computer-aided detection specificity by projection features for CT colonography," Med. Phys., vol.37, no.4, pp.1468–1481, April 2010.
- [134] S. Wang, J. Yao, N. Petrick, and R.M. Summers, "Combining statistical and geometric features for colonic polyp detection in CTC based on multiple kernel learning," Int. J. Computational Intelligence and Applications, vol.9, no.1, pp.1–15, Jan. 2010.



Kenji Suzuki received his Ph.D. degree in information engineering from Nagoya University in 2001. From 1993 to 2001, he worked at Hitachi Medical Corporation, and then Aichi Prefectural University as faculty. In 2001, he joined Department of Radiology at University of Chicago. Since 2006, he has been Assistant Professor of Radiology, Medical Physics, and Cancer Research Center there. He has published more than 230 papers (including 90 peerreviewed journal papers). He has an h-index

of 26. He is inventor/co-inventor on 30 patents. He published 9 books and 18 book chapters, and edited 6 journal special issues. He was awarded/co-awarded more than 42 grants totaling \$8.6M. He has been serving as the Editor-in-Chief and an Associate Editor of 23 leading international journals. He had supervised/co-supervised more than 45 graduate/undergraduate students, 6 postdocs/computer scientists and 12 visiting professors/scholars. He has received 32 awards for his research and teaching.