ACCSCIENCE PUBLISHING

CORRECTION

DOI: 10.36922/aih.corr092926

Published online: September 29, 2026

Correction

Xu Y, Huang S, Zhao S, Zhang Y, Huang Z. The development of neural networks with intra- and inter-block dense connections for improved liver tumor segmentation. *Artif Intell Health.* 2025;2(2):60-72. doi: 10.36922/aih.5001

Following publication, the Editorial Office identified that several numerical results reported in the Abstract and Conclusion were not sufficiently described in the main text. After clarification by the authors and review by the Editor-in-Chief, the following corrections have been made.

1. Section 3.1. Datasets and evaluation metrics

Original text:

"During the training phase, three adjacent slices of size 224 × 224 were randomly cropped from raw CT volumes to train our I²-DenseFCN."

Corrected text:

"During training, random cropping was employed for data augmentation. Specifically, crop centers were randomly sampled from the annotated liver and tumor regions, and three adjacent slices were cropped at the same location to form a 224 × 224 × 3 training sample. This strategy yielded a total of 25,755 training samples, including 11,100 samples centered on liver pixels and 14,655 samples centered on tumor pixels."

Justification:

"This revision clarifies how the 25,755 training samples reported in the Abstract were generated, including the random cropping strategy, the use of adjacent slices, and the numbers of liver-centered and tumor-centered samples."

2. Section 3.4. Comparison with other methods on LiTS

Original text:

"Despite not utilizing extensive postprocessing operations, the proposed method achieved a Dice per case score of 71.3% for lesion segmentation through parameter tuning, hence outperforming other methods."

Corrected text:

"Despite not utilizing extensive postprocessing operations, the proposed method achieved a Dice per case score of 71.3% for lesion segmentation through parameter tuning, hence outperforming

other methods. Compared with the individual methods listed in Table 4, our method achieved an average absolute improvement of 5.9% in Dice score, calculated by averaging the performance differences between our method and each comparison method."

Justification:

"The reported 5.9% difference was calculated from the data presented in Table 4 of the manuscript."

3. Section 3.5. Comparison with other methods on 3DIRCADb

Original text:

"To compare with the state-of-the-art method 2D DenseUNet, we reproduced its lesion segmentation result on the 3DIRCADb dataset, as these results were not provided in Li *et al*.[29]. Our method still outperforms 2D DenseUNet on the 3DIRCADb dataset."

Corrected text:

"Specifically, our method achieved an average absolute improvement of 6.0% in Lesion Dice score, calculated by averaging the performance differences between our method and the three comparison methods."

Justification:

"The three comparison methods refer specifically to UNet [39], Cascaded UNets [16], and ResNet [30]. These methods and their corresponding references are clearly identified in the main text and Table 5."

4. Conclusion

Original text:

"Our method achieved an average improvement of 5.9% in Dice score and 6% in Lesion Dice score compared to previous methods, demonstrating the effectiveness of our approach in segmenting multi-scale tumors and more accurately delineating tumor boundaries."

Corrected text:

"Our method achieved average absolute improvements of 5.9% in Dice score and 6.0% in Lesion Dice score compared with the evaluated previous methods, demonstrating the effectiveness of our approach in segmenting multi-scale tumors and more accurately delineating tumor boundaries."

Justification:

"This revision ensures that the wording in the Conclusion is consistent with the calculation methods described in Sections 3.4 and 3.5 and clearly distinguishes absolute percentage-point improvements from relative percentage improvements."

The authors confirm that the corrections are based on the original study, including the data and analyses performed at the time of the original research. No new experiments were conducted and no new data were generated in connection with this correction. These changes do not affect the results, interpretations, or overall conclusions of the published article.

The authors apologize for any lack of clarity in the original version, and the Editorial Office has updated the published article accordingly.