

Online detector response calculations for high-resolution PET image reconstruction

This article has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text article.

2011 Phys. Med. Biol. 56 4023

(<http://iopscience.iop.org/0031-9155/56/13/018>)

View [the table of contents for this issue](#), or go to the [journal homepage](#) for more

Download details:

IP Address: 171.65.80.217

The article was downloaded on 15/06/2011 at 20:11

Please note that [terms and conditions apply](#).

Online detector response calculations for high-resolution PET image reconstruction

Guillem Prats¹ and Craig Levin²

¹ Department of Radiation Oncology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA

² Departments of Radiology, Physics and Electrical Engineering, and Molecular Imaging Program at Stanford, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA

E-mail: cslevin@stanford.edu

Received 3 January 2011, in final form 19 May 2011

Published 15 June 2011

Online at stacks.iop.org/PMB/56/4023

Abstract

Positron emission tomography systems are best described by a linear shift-varying model. However, image reconstruction often assumes simplified shift-invariant models to the detriment of image quality and quantitative accuracy. We investigated a shift-varying model of the geometrical system response based on an analytical formulation. The model was incorporated within a list-mode, fully 3D iterative reconstruction process in which the system response coefficients are calculated online on a graphics processing unit (GPU). The implementation requires less than 512 Mb of GPU memory and can process two million events per minute (forward and backprojection). For small detector volume elements, the analytical model compared well to reference calculations. Images reconstructed with the shift-varying model achieved higher quality and quantitative accuracy than those that used a simpler shift-invariant model. For an 8 mm sphere in a warm background, the contrast recovery was 95.8% for the shift-varying model versus 85.9% for the shift-invariant model. In addition, the spatial resolution was more uniform across the field-of-view: for an array of 1.75 mm hot spheres in air, the variation in reconstructed sphere size was 0.5 mm RMS for the shift-invariant model, compared to 0.07 mm RMS for the shift-varying model.

(Some figures in this article are in colour only in the electronic version)

1. Introduction

The measurements in positron emission tomography (PET) involve complex physical processes and, as a result, the system response is shift-varying. One of the main reasons for the shift-varying nature of the system response is the parallax effect, which is a confounding issue in PET (Sureau *et al* 2008, Levin 2008). Crystals in PET are long and narrow and they are

oriented facing the center of the field-of-view (FOV). When a photon is emitted near the center of the system, it only sees the narrow dimension of the crystals. However, a photon emitted close to the edge of the FOV sees the full length of the crystal. For this reason, a reconstructed point source appears smaller if placed at the center of a PET scanner than near the edge of the FOV.

The bore of conventional PET system is designed to be much larger than the typical patient to ensure that the spatial resolution remains roughly constant throughout the useful FOV. This constraint inadvertently drives the cost of the system up since more crystal material is needed, and it also results in a decrease of the solid angle coverage and a subsequent degradation of the photon sensitivity. Small-animal PET scanners, on the other hand, have a small bore for high photon sensitivity and, therefore, are subject to parallax errors. A few groups have built systems that combine multiple layers of short detectors for increasing the photon sensitivity while keeping the parallax errors low (Wang *et al* 2006, Spanoudaki *et al* 2007, Gu *et al* 2011b, Vandenbroucke *et al* 2010). In a small-animal system we are developing, 5 mm thick slabs of cadmium-zinc-telluride (CZT) are arranged in a $8 \times 8 \times 8 \text{ cm}^3$ box geometry (Gu *et al* 2011a, Pratz and Levin 2009). The detector volume element (a.k.a. 'detector voxel') is defined as the minimum volume that the cross-strip CZT detector can localize individual photon interactions, which for our detectors is $1 \times 5 \times 1 \text{ mm}^3$. In this design, the cathode electrode pitch determines the photon interaction depth resolution, which is 5 mm. Yet, this level of depth-of-interaction precision is not sufficient to completely remove all parallax errors, because the system response is highly correlated with the LOR orientation—even at the center of the FOV, and some LORs are very oblique with respect to the detector voxel (up to 80° angle). Yet, a box geometry offers high packing fraction, resulting in high photon sensitivity and, thus, higher attainable spatial resolution and signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) (Habte *et al* 2007).

Algorithmic corrections can compensate for spatially varying response, provided that the SNR is adequate. The use of an accurate spatially varying model of the system response within image reconstruction can mitigate non-uniform system resolution blur. The system response can be either measured, simulated or calculated analytically.

In the case of a measured system response, a radioactive point-source is robotically stepped through the scanner FOV (Panin *et al* 2006). The point-spread function (PSF) of the system is measured by acquiring a long scan for every point-source position. This process requires several weeks of acquisition as well as large memory storage. Measuring the PSF is labor intensive and, as a result, Monte Carlo simulations are often performed instead (Herraiz *et al* 2006, Rafecas *et al* 2004). The PSF at a given location is available by simulating a point-source of activity at that location.

Analytical models can also be used to compute the detector response function (Rahmim *et al* 2008, Strul *et al* 2003, Selivanov *et al* 2000, Yamaya *et al* 2005, 2008). The spatial resolution in PET is the convolution of multiple factors (Levin and Hoffman 1999), and therefore there does not exist a perfect analytical model that includes everything. However, it is possible to approximate dominant effects with an analytical model.

For the box-shaped PET system studied in this work, we have assumed that the geometrical response of the detectors dominates over all the other blurring processes. The justification for this approximation is as follows: first, positron range can be factored out of the system matrix. Then, owing to the small diameter of the bore of our system (80 mm), photon acolinearity is a small blurring effect ($\sim 0.2 \text{ mm}$) (Levin and Hoffman 1999). Last, because the system under consideration allows individual interactions to be read out independently, the resolution-degrading effect of inter-crystal scatter is significantly reduced before image reconstruction (Pratz and Levin 2009). The detector response blurring, on the other hand, is on the order of

$W \cos \theta + T \sin \theta$, where W stands for the effective detector voxel width (1 mm for the system studied), T for the thickness of the detector voxel along the radial direction (5 mm) and θ is the photon incidence angle (Sorenson and Phelps 1980).

Regardless of how the system response is obtained, its most general and accurate representation is a kernel parameterized by three coordinates in image space and four coordinates in projection space (Alessio *et al* 2006). For practical implementation, the system response model is often simplified. For instance, it can be separated into a generic projection operator and a sinogram blurring kernel (Qi *et al* 1998, Alessio *et al* 2006), provided that the measurements are processed in sinogram format and not in list mode. Alternatively, it can be modelled by an image-based blurring kernel followed by a generic projection operator (Rapisarda *et al* 2010). When the system response is modeled as a kernel varying both in image domain and in projection domain, symmetries and near symmetries can be exploited to simplify implementation (Herraiz *et al* 2006, Panin *et al* 2006).

The work presented in this paper includes five novel contributions. One main novelty is that our physical detector response model is computed on the fly, within fully 3D reconstruction. Although other research groups have also published online implementations (Pratx *et al* 2009, Rahmim *et al* 2005), this new method is considerably more innovative because of the high complexity of the model, which is the product of a 4D transaxial kernel that depends on two image-domain and two projection-domain parameters, and a shift-invariant axial kernel. Computing the model online requires little memory, and the geometry of the PET system can be modified without having to recompute the system matrix.

Secondly, a novel computationally tractable approximation of an existing analytical model (Lecomte *et al* 1984) is proposed for PET systems that have small detection voxels. The main advantage of the new formulation is that it does not require a convolution but only a polynomial evaluation.

Thirdly, because the kernel is applied within projection operations, the method is fully compatible with the list-mode reconstruction format. Because of applications such as TOF PET, dynamic PET and ultra-high resolution, list-mode processing is increasingly popular, and there is a need for compatible model-based image reconstruction methods.

Fourthly, the entire reconstruction—including the online calculation of the system response model—is performed on a graphics processing unit (GPU) which reduces processing time.

Fifthly and last, we demonstrate that resolution recovery is achieved all the way to the edge of the FOV, even for a box-shaped geometry. This is because the system response model is accurate for almost any positions of the LOR endpoints, even for very oblique LORs ($> 80^\circ$).

2. System response model

2.1. Mathematical model for PET

Mathematically, a raw PET dataset consists of a non-negative integer vector $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{N}^P$, which represents the number of prompt coincidence events recorded for all P LORs in the system. A random vector \mathbf{Y} is used to describe the stochastic distribution of these measurements. The components Y_i are independent and follow a Poisson distribution with mean y_i

$$Y_i \sim \text{Poisson}(y_i). \quad (1)$$

The mean number of prompt coincidence events \mathbf{y} on each LOR is well described by a discrete-continuous, linear spatially varying model that relates the discrete vector of measurements \mathbf{m} to the continuous tracer spatial distribution $f(\mathbf{r})$, a 3D function of the spatial variable \mathbf{r} . The




Figure 1. Geometry used for calculating the CDRF. The two detector voxels (blue) can be oriented arbitrarily with respect to each other. The integration is performed over the angle ϕ within the integration cone (light red). The CDRF is calculated at a location \mathbf{r} in the convex hull of the detector voxels (light yellow), offset by q with respect to the LOR axis (dashed line), at a distance s_A and s_B from each detector.

contribution from a point of unit strength located at \mathbf{r} to LOR i is represented by a kernel $h_i(\mathbf{r})$ (Lewitt and Matej 2003). Ignoring scattered and random coincidences and attenuation, the expected measurement y_i on LOR i can be expressed as

$$y_i = \int_{\Omega} f(\mathbf{r})h_i(\mathbf{r}) \, d\mathbf{r}, \quad (2)$$

where Ω is the support of the tracer spatial distribution. Assuming a discrete representation \mathbf{u} of the tracer distribution, (2) can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}, \quad (3)$$

where A is the *system matrix*. The rows of the system matrix are discrete representations of the integration kernel $h_i(\mathbf{r})$.

2.2. Coincident detector response function

In a cylindrical ring system, the response of a pair of detector voxels is symmetrical. We have extended a framework based on coincident detector response functions (CDRF, also referred to as coincident aperture function (Lecomte *et al* 1984)) to include non-ring geometries, such as box or dual-panel geometries. In addition, our design is suitable for system designs that have several layers of detector voxels to measure the depth of interaction (Zhang *et al* 2007, Rafecas *et al* 2004). Last, we have further simplified the geometrical model by assuming a piecewise linear representation for the intrinsic detector response function (IDRF).

For any given LOR i and location \mathbf{r} in the FOV, the CDRF is obtained by summing the response of the detector voxel pair to a pencil beam of oppositely directed photons over the range of all admissible angles ϕ (red area in figure 1). Two rectangular detector voxels, rotated by an angle θ_A and θ_B , respectively, with respect to the LOR axis (horizontal dashed line), can record coincidences for positron annihilations that occur in their convex hull (area shaded in light yellow). Positrons that annihilate outside that area do not contribute to the CDRF because of the coincidence criterion. When an annihilation occurs at a location \mathbf{r} , two anti-colinear photons are emitted at an angle ϕ with respect to the LOR axis (red line in figure 1). The probability that photon A, incident onto the detector with an angle $\theta = \theta_A + \phi$ and an offset x , interacts with detector voxel A is given by the IDRF $g_{\theta}(x)$. In practice, an approximation is used (Lecomte *et al* 1984). Only a small range of photon angles ϕ will result in coincidences (area shaded in light red), especially when the inter-detector distance $s_A + s_B$ is much larger than the detector voxel size. Therefore, ϕ is assumed to be much smaller than θ_A for the purpose of computing the IDRF. This is equivalent to assuming that the detector voxel is irradiated by a beam of parallel photons. This assumption simplifies the calculations




Figure 2. Representation of the detection length $d_{\text{det}}(x, \theta)$ and the attenuation length $d_{\text{atn}}(x, \theta)$ as a function of the offset x and the incident angle θ for an array of adjacent detector voxels. The two functions are piecewise linear and can be evaluated with minimal computation.

greatly since $x \mapsto g_{\theta}(x)$ has a compact analytical expression, while $\theta \mapsto g_{\theta}(x)$ does not. An approximation of the CDRF can then be calculated by using

$$h_i(\mathbf{r}) = \int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} g_{\theta_A}(q + s_A \tan \phi) g_{\theta_B}(q - s_B \tan \phi) d\phi, \tag{4}$$

where s_A and s_B are the distances indicated in figure 1. Using the small-angle (SA) approximation for $\tan \phi$, (4) can be further simplified to yield the model used in Lecomte *et al* (1984), which is a scaled convolution:

$$h_i(\mathbf{r}) = \int_I^J g_{\theta_A}(x) g_{\theta_B}((1 + \epsilon)q - \epsilon x) \frac{dx}{s_A}, \tag{5}$$

where $x = q + s_A \phi$ is the new integration variable, $[I, J]$ is the integration domain and $\epsilon = s_B/s_A$ is the ratio of the distances to each detector voxel.

This formulation differs slightly from (Lecomte *et al* 1984). In particular, it can be used for $\epsilon > 1$ and, as a result, it is suitable for non-ring systems where the detector voxels are not arranged symmetrically.

The SA approximation is valid provided that the distance between the two detectors is at least three times greater than the crystal size. For a ring geometry, this condition is always satisfied. For a box geometry with extended FOV, the SA formulation does not yield the exact CDRF near the corners of the box, a limitation of little consequence for small-animal imaging since activity is seldom present in the corners of the FOV.

2.3. Intrinsic detector response function

The IDRF can be calculated by considering the photon linear attenuation in the detector material. Neglecting scatter in the detectors, a photon produces a detectable signal if it interacts with the detector and it is not attenuated by any material along its trajectory. For the calculation of the IDRF, neighboring detectors are considered as attenuating material. For an array of detector voxels, such as the one depicted on figure 2, the probability $g_{\theta}(x)$ that a

photon of initial energy $E_0 = 511$ keV interacts with the highlighted detector voxel, and does not interact with other detectors on its trajectory, is given by the exponential attenuation law

$$g_\theta(x) = (1 - e^{-\mu d_{\text{det}}(x,\theta)}) e^{-\mu d_{\text{atn}}(x,\theta)} \quad (6)$$

where $d_{\text{det}}(x, \theta)$ and $d_{\text{atn}}(x, \theta)$ are the length of the beam path traversing the detector voxel of interest, and attenuating material, respectively (figure 2). In the following, these two quantities will be called detection length and attenuation length, respectively. The linear attenuation coefficient μ includes both Compton and photoelectric attenuation at 511 keV.

The IDRF for a rectangular detector voxel is a piecewise exponential function. The in-plane width and thickness of the detector voxel are denoted by W and T , respectively, and its orientation with respect to the incoming photons beam is represented by the angle θ . The four interval boundaries (or *knots*) for the piecewise exponential IDRF are denoted by (X_l, Y_l) where $Y_l = g_\theta(X_l)$ and $l = 0, \dots, 3$. The X coordinate of the knots can be computed following

$$X_i = \left(\pm \frac{W}{2} \right) \cos(\theta) + \left(\pm \frac{T}{2} \right) \sin(\theta). \quad (7)$$

Let us assume that the knots are sorted such that $X_0 < X_1 < X_2 < X_3$. The knots are located symmetrically around zero: $X_0 = -X_3$ and $X_1 = -X_2$ (figure 2).

The detector voxel efficiency depends on both the detection and attenuation lengths. The detection length $d_{\text{det}}(x, \theta)$ is zero outside the outer knots X_0 and X_3 . Between X_0 and X_1 , $d_{\text{det}}(x, \theta)$ increases linearly. It also decreases linearly down to zero between X_2 and X_3 (figure 2). The detection length reaches a maximum between X_1 and X_2 , and is equal to $\min \left\{ \frac{T}{\cos \theta}, \frac{W}{\sin \theta} \right\}$ on this interval.

In a standard detector array, neighboring detectors can attenuate the photon beam. To derive the IDRF, the amount of detector material that the photon traverses before interacting was derived assuming no curvature in the lateral dimension of the detector array. This assumption is always fully satisfied for a box geometry. For a ring geometry with no inter-detector gaps, given the short range of photons in detector material (≤ 5 mm), this assumption is quite accurate since the curvature on the detectors can be neglected over such small distances. Following this assumption, the attenuation length $d_{\text{atn}}(x, \theta)$ is zero for the two knots that correspond to the front of the detector voxel (X_0 and X_1 in figure 2), and it increases linearly until its peak value $\frac{T}{\cos \theta}$, which it attains either at X_0 or X_3 —depending on the incident angle θ .

For layered detectors that measure photon depth-of-interaction, the inner layers attenuate the photon beam seen by the outer layers. Mechanical structures required to hold the detectors together, support readout electronics, or provide heat dissipation in the detectors can result in additional attenuation. However, this spatially uniform attenuation does not need to be modelled within the forward and backprojections, and is instead automatically corrected during detector normalization.

Figure 3 compares the IDRF for a $1 \times 5 \times 1$ mm³ detector voxel, used in the high-resolution CZT system under development at Stanford, and for a $4 \times 20 \times 4$ mm³ LSO crystal element used in the Siemens Biograph PET system. In addition to being smaller, the CZT detector voxel has a lower linear attenuation coefficient than LSO: At 511 keV, $\mu_{\text{CZT}} = 0.5$ cm⁻¹ compared to $\mu_{\text{LSO}} = 0.869$ cm⁻¹. As a result, the exponential behavior of the IDRF can be reasonably approximated by a linear function for small CZT detector voxels. This approximation, called the small detector voxel (SDV) approximation, is accurate within 2.5% (RMS) provided that the detector voxel thickness and attenuation coefficient satisfy $\mu T \leq 0.5 \cos \theta_{\text{max}}$, where θ_{max} is the largest angle between a detector voxel and a LOR. For the CZT PET system considered in this study, the SDV approximation is accurate for $\theta \leq 60^\circ$.




Figure 3. Comparison of the IDRf for a $1 \times 5 \times 1 \text{ mm}^3$ CZT detector voxels and a $4 \times 20 \times 4 \text{ mm}^3$ LSO crystal. Two different incident angles are shown (30° and 60°). The IDRf is shown with (red) and without (black) attenuation from surrounding detector voxels. For the small CZT detector voxel, the IDRf is well approximated by a piecewise linear function.

Linearizing the IDRf has the advantage of facilitating the computation of the CDRF by the scaled convolution method (5). Furthermore, due to symmetries, the linearized IDRf can be represented by only four floating-points numbers (X_0 , X_1 , Y_1 , and Y_2) which reduces the storage requirements.

2.4. Fast calculation of the CDRF

In general, convolutions are computed either numerically or analytically. An analytical expression was derived for the CDRF based on the the SDV approximation. This approach requires little computation and memory, thus enabling the CDRF coefficients to be computed fast, when needed, within the reconstruction.

Let us consider a pair of detector voxels, denoted A and B, and a point \mathbf{r} where the CDRF is to be evaluated. For each detector voxel, the IDRf $g_{\theta_d}^d(x)$ is approximated by a linear function over each interval $[X_l^d, X_{l+1}^d]$ where $l \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ and $d \in \{A, B\}$ identifies the detector voxel. We can further express the IDRf as the sum of three linear functions

$$g_{\theta_d}^d(x) = k_1^d(x) + k_2^d(x) + k_3^d(x) \quad (8)$$

where

$$k_l^d(x) = \begin{cases} a_l^d x + b_l^d, & X_l^d < x < X_{l+1}^d \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

and a_l^d and b_l^d are the coefficients of the linear function.

Using these notations, the CDRF can be decomposed into the sum of nine elementary convolutions

$$h_i(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{s_A} \sum_{l=1}^3 \sum_{m=1}^3 K_{l,m}(q) \quad (10)$$

where

$$K_{l,m}(q) = \int_{I_{l,m}}^{J_{l,m}} k_l^A(x) k_m^B((1+\epsilon)q - \epsilon x) dx$$

can be further expressed as

$$K_{l,m}(q) = -\frac{1}{3} a_l^A a_m^B \epsilon (J_{l,m}^3 - I_{l,m}^3) + \frac{1}{2} [a_l^A a_m^B (1+\epsilon)q + a_l^A b_m^B - \epsilon b_l^A a_m^B] (J_{l,m}^2 - I_{l,m}^2) + [b_l^A a_m^B (1+\epsilon)q + b_l^A b_m^B] (J_{l,m} - I_{l,m}) \quad (11)$$

with integration bounds $I_{l,m}$ and $J_{l,m}$ computed using

$$I_{l,m} = \max \left\{ X_l^A, \frac{(1+\epsilon)q - X_{m+1}^B}{\epsilon} \right\} \quad (12)$$

and

$$J_{l,m} = \min \left\{ X_{l+1}^A, \frac{(1+\epsilon)q - X_m^B}{\epsilon} \right\}. \quad (13)$$

Figure 4 shows a section through the CDRF of a sample LOR, as well as its decomposition into nine elementary convolutions $K_{l,m}(q)$. All the components of the CDRF do not contribute equally. In particular, a fast approximation (not implemented in this paper) can be achieved by neglecting the kernels that have the smallest contribution to the overall CDRF, i.e. $K_{1,1}(q)$, $K_{3,3}(q)$, $K_{1,3}(q)$, and $K_{3,1}(q)$, represented by a dashed line in figure 4.

The SDV approach, by favoring arithmetic calculation over memory access, has high arithmetic intensity. Furthermore, only eight floating point values need to be stored for each LOR (four for each of the two IDRFs). Therefore, this approach is efficient on GPUs because these processors devote far more transistors to arithmetic operations than to memory caching.

3. Evaluation

3.1. GPU implementation

The approach presented in the previous section was applied to generate an accurate system matrix, on a GPU, within the reconstruction. Because it relies on GPU computation rather than memory access, it provides a fast alternative to storing the full detector response model. In addition, it is advantageous in cases where the PET system geometry is different for every scan (for example a dual-panel breast cancer PET system with variable detector separation).

The model based on the analytical CDRF was implemented for a box-shaped small-animal PET system with small CZT detector voxels (Pratz and Levin 2009). Owing to the large number of LORs in that system (more than 10 billion), reconstruction was performed in list mode using a fully 3D ordered-subsets expectation-maximization (OSEM) algorithm. The




Figure 4. The CDRF (*black*) can be accurately decomposed into the sum of nine functions (*red*) that are calculated analytically using (11). Four of the kernels (*dashed lines*) only contribute marginally to the CDRF.




Figure 5. Schematics of the computation architecture used for calculating the CDRF. The complete process is divided into three stages, one running on the CPU, one in the vertex shaders and one in the fragment shaders of the GPU.

system matrix coefficients were calculated on the fly. In order to accelerate the computation, we used the GPU to perform the line projections and the kernel evaluation.

The GPU implementation relies on an existing line projection library (Pratx *et al* 2009). In this library, the voxels contained inside a cylinder of radius η , centered on the LOR axis and called the tube of response (TOR), participate in the forward and backprojections. For each voxel inside the cylinder, a GPU function is called to calculate the projection kernel value. In this work, the procedure outlined in section 2.4 is called for each voxel in the TOR.

The calculation of the CDRF is split into three stages (figure 5). The first stage, performed on the CPU, consists in calculating a piecewise linear approximation of both IDRFs for all the LORs in the current subset. Each IDRF, stored using only four floating-point coefficients (X_0, X_1, Y_1 and Y_2), is copied to a 2D texture in the GPU video memory. In the second stage, which takes place in the GPU parallel vertex shaders, the IDRFs are reformulated according to (9), and the linear coefficients a_i^d and b_i^d are calculated for every LOR. These coefficients




Figure 6. Depiction of phantoms used for measuring the effect of shift-varying system response models. (a) The sphere phantom consists of four sphere patterns, placed in the central plane of the box-shaped CZT system with sphere separation equal to twice the sphere diameters listed. (b) The contrast phantom consists of a 2.5 cm radius, 6 cm long cylinder filled with a warm solution of activity, in which are placed five hot spheres, the activity in which is ten times more concentrated than the background.

are streamed to the fragment shaders, where, as a third stage, the projection kernel is evaluated for every voxel within the TOR following (10).

3.2. CDRF accuracy

Three ways of computing the CDRF were compared. The first method, based on numerical integration (NI), generated coincidence events by randomly sampling the detector voxels using a uniform distribution. Each randomly generated coincidence event was weighted by its probability of occurrence, computed based on photon linear attenuation. An estimate of the CDRF was obtained by combining many simulated coincidence events according to their respective probability weights. The second method, based on the SA approximation, sampled the exact IDRFs using 200 samples, based on (6), and performed a numerical convolution according to the SA approximation (5). The third method combined the SA and SDV approximations to calculate the CDRF analytically, according to (10).

3.3. CDRF-based reconstruction

The Monte Carlo package GRAY (Olcott *et al* 2006) was used to simulate the acquisition of two phantoms with the CZT-based PET system. To keep the simulation as realistic as possible, the output from GRAY was used to position each photon event. Due to the low photo-fraction of the CZT material, incoming photon events often interact multiple times in the detectors. Such photon events were positioned at the estimated location of the first interaction and binned to the nearest $1 \times 5 \times 1 \text{ mm}^3$ bin (Pratz and Levin 2009). Consistent with measurements (Levin 2008, Gu *et al* 2011a), we modeled the energy resolution by adding Gaussian noise with FWHM $3\% \times \sqrt{511/E}$, where E is the energy of the single interaction in keV.

The sphere phantom (figure 6(a)) was used to research the effects of accurate system modeling on image resolution. The phantom was composed of four quadrants of spheres in air, all in the central axial plane, placed all the way to the edge of the $8 \times 8 \times 8 \text{ cm}^3$ transaxial FOV. The spheres were 1, 1.25, 1.5, and 1.75 mm in diameter. Their centers were placed twice their diameters apart. The phantom had a total of 29.6 MBq (800 μCi) and 5 s of acquisition were simulated, yielding 27.2 million coincident events.

The contrast phantom (figure 6(b)) was used to assess the quantitative contrast recovery (CR). The phantom was composed of a 2.5 cm radius, 6 cm long cylinder, filled with a warm solution of activity, in which five hot spheres were placed. The spheres were centered on the central axial plane and their diameters were 1, 1.5, 2, 4, and 8 mm. The activity was ten times more concentrated in the hot spheres than in the warm background. The phantom also had a total of 29.6 MBq (800 μ Ci) and 5 s of acquisition were simulated, yielding 14.6 million coincident events.

Both phantoms were reconstructed with the same list-mode OSEM algorithm, using an image voxel size of 0.5 mm. Coincidence events acquired from the sphere phantom and contrast phantom were partitioned in 10 and two subsets, respectively. Within the reconstruction, the projection kernel was either a shift-invariant 1 mm FWHM Gaussian kernel, or a shift-varying model based on the analytical CDRF. The shift-invariant Gaussian model was parameterized by the distance from the voxel to the LOR. To compute the transaxial component of the shift-varying model, the 3D coordinates of the voxel and detectors were projected onto a 2D transaxial plane. A 1 mm shift-invariant Gaussian kernel was used in the axial direction.

Geometric variations in the system's photon sensitivity and photon attenuation over different LORs are included in the computation of the sensitivity map. Geometric photon detection efficiency was measured by simulating a normalization phantom, consisting of a uniformly radioactive cube of water occupying the entire FOV with 800 μ Ci of total activity. The sensitivity map, computed by backprojecting all LORs with a weighting factor, requires a daunting effort for a system with more than 33 billion LORs. Instead, a smaller set of 100 million LORs, chosen in a Monte Carlo fashion, were backprojected to form the sensitivity image (Qi 2006).

Image analysis was performed on the reconstructed images to evaluate the performance of the image reconstruction. For the sphere phantom, the reconstructed sphere FWHM was measured by fitting a sum of Gaussians to 1D profiles through the reconstructed image. The 1 mm spheres were considered too small relative to the voxel size for a reliable measure of their FWHM, and were not included in this analysis.

For the contrast phantom, the CR was measured in the reconstructed image as a function of iteration number. The mean reconstructed activity was measured in the hot spheres using spherical regions-of-interest (ROIs). These 3D ROIs were drawn in a fully automated manner using the known physical position and diameter of the spheres: voxels included in a ROI were those whose center was less than one radius away from the sphere center. The background activity was evaluated by averaging the reconstructed intensity in two 22 mm high, 26.5 mm diameter cylindrical ROIs, placed 5 mm away from the central axial plane. The noise was approximated by the spatial standard deviation in the background ROI, normalized by the mean background intensity.

4. Results

4.1. Coincident detector response function

For a LOR normal to the detector voxel (figure 7, *first row*), the detector response is a trapezoid except at the center where it is a triangle. The three methods for computing the CDRF are in good agreement. The NI approach is indeed more noisy since it relies on the simulation of a limited number of discrete events. Normal LORs, not being subject to parallax errors, provide the highest resolution in the system. For these LORs, the FWHM of the CDRF at the center is equal to half of the detector voxel size (0.5 mm).




Figure 7. CDRF for three LORs of the box-shaped CZT system under study, depicted in the inset of each plot. The CDRFs shown correspond to profiles taken perpendicular to the LOR axis, in the direction of the back arrow. *Top row:* Normal LOR connecting two $1 \times 5 \times 1 \text{ mm}^3$ CZT detector voxels. The profiles through the CDRF at three locations (noted A,B and C in inset) are shown for three CDRF calculation methods: numerical integration (NI), small-angle approximation (SA) and a combination of the SA and small detector voxel approximation (SA+SDV). *Middle row:* CDRF for a 45° oblique LOR going through the center of the FOV, with both detector voxels oriented vertically. *Bottom row:* CDRF for a very oblique LOR. The leftmost detector voxel, oriented horizontally, forms a 9° angle with the LOR while the rightmost detector voxel, oriented vertically, forms an 81° angle with the LOR.

In the standard ring geometry, the resolution is optimal at the center of the system because all the LORs that pass through that point are normal to the detector voxels. In a box-shaped geometry, there is no such ‘sweet spot’. Hence, LORs with degraded resolution traverse the center of the system. As an example, for a 45° angle LOR (figure 7, *second row*), the blurring kernel FWHM is equal to 1.8 mm at the LOR center, more than three times the value for a normal LOR. For a 45° LOR, both the SA and the SA+SDV approximations provide accurate CDRF models compared to the reference NI method. Due to detector penetration, the coincident response is asymmetric.

For a very oblique LOR, which forms a 9° angle with the leftmost detector and an 81° angle with the rightmost one (figure 7, *third row*), spatial resolution is good in the proximity of the leftmost detector (profile A), but it degrades quickly when approaching the rightmost detector (profiles B and C). In addition, the quality of both analytical models is inferior for




Figure 8. Sphere phantom (figure 6(a)), reconstructed on the GPU with five iterations of list-mode 3D-OSEM with 10 subsets and (a) a shift-invariant Gaussian kernel or (b) an accurate model of the system response based on the analytical CDRF.

short and very oblique LORs. For such LORs, the SA approximation deviates from the true distribution because the angle ϕ (see figure 1) can no longer be assumed to be small. The additional SDV approximation results in further deviation: due to the very oblique angle of the LOR, the IDRF is not well approximated by a piecewise linear function.

4.2. Spatial resolution

The image of the sphere resolution phantom reconstructed using a shift-invariant model has non-uniform resolution due to parallax errors (figure 8(a)). Radial blurring is noticeable at the edge of the FOV due to the larger effective detector voxel area seen by oblique LORs. In contrast, the image reconstructed using a shift-varying model based on the analytical CDRF shows fewer signs of resolution degradation near the edge of the FOV (figure 8(b)).

This is further confirmed by measuring the reconstructed sphere FWHM along horizontal profiles as a function of sphere position (figure 9). All the reconstructed spheres (1.75, 1.5 and 1.25 mm) are significantly smaller when an accurate shift-varying model is used. In addition, the spatial resolution is uniform throughout the entire FOV, as evidenced by the uniform reconstructed sphere FWHM.

4.3. Contrast recovery

Figure 10 shows the reconstructed contrast phantom after reconstruction with a shift-invariant Gaussian kernel and the system response model based on the CDRF. In both cases, reconstruction was performed by running 50 iterations of list-mode OSEM with two subsets, using 0.5 mm voxels. The image reconstructed with the shift-varying model shows less pixel-to-pixel variability, both in the background and in the lesions. Contrast is also noticeably higher.

Figure 11 compares the contrast—noise trade-off for reconstructing the contrast phantom with list-mode OSEM, using shift-varying and shift-invariant kernels. Because high-frequency components are only recovered in the late iterations, premature termination of the OSEM iterations was used as implicit regularization to produce the trade-off curve. For all five




Figure 9. Reconstructed sphere size (FWHM in mm) as a function of sphere position, for two projection models (shift varying and shift invariant), measured by fitting a Gaussian mixture with offset to 1D profiles through the reconstructed images (figure 8). (a) 1.75 mm spheres; (b) 1.5 mm spheres; and (c) 1.25 mm spheres.




Figure 10. Contrast phantom, reconstructed with 50 iterations of list-mode 3D-OSEM with two subsets, using (a) a shift-invariant Gaussian kernel and (b) a shift-varying model based on the CDRF.

spheres, the use of a more accurate model improves the trade-off between contrast and noise. More specifically, at any given iteration number, the CR is higher and the noise is lower for the shift-varying reconstruction, except for the 1 mm sphere which could not be resolved with either method. For the 8 mm sphere, close to full CR is observed (95.7% at convergence). In addition, the background variability is lower for the shift-varying reconstruction (figure 11).

4.4. Processing time

The reconstruction time was measured for the simple Gaussian shift-invariant and accurate shift-varying model in table 1. Both measurements were made for the hot sphere phantom dataset, using a GeForce 285 GTX (NVIDIA, Santa Clara, CA). The image size was $160 \times 160 \times 160$. Consistent with (Pratz *et al* 2009), the Gaussian kernel width was 1 mm, much narrower than the average width of the shift-varying kernel based on the CDRF. Hence, the TOR cut-off parameter η was set to 3.5 voxels—eight times the standard deviation of the Gaussian kernel—for the shift-invariant projections, and to 5.5 voxels for the shift-varying projections—larger than the maximum CDRF kernel width. As a result, the reconstruction




Figure 11. Contrast recovery (CR) plotted as a function of noise for varying iteration numbers (datapoints) and sphere sizes. The curves are shown for the five sphere sizes (*black*: 8 mm, *red*: 4 mm, *magenta*: 2 mm, *blue*: 1.5 mm, and *cyan*: 1 mm) and for two types of reconstruction: accurate projection model (*diamond*) or shift-invariant Gaussian model (*circle*).

Table 1. Reconstruction time.

Projection model	Recon. time
Shift-invariant Gaussian kernel (Pratx <i>et al</i> 2009)	3.0
Shift-varying kernel (CDRF)	29.9

Seconds per million events processed (forward and backprojection).

with accurate, shift-varying model was ten times slower than the simpler method based on the shift-invariant Gaussian kernel (table 1).

If no subject-specific attenuation correction is used, the same sensitivity image can be used for multiple reconstructions. In our experiments, attenuation correction was applied, and the sensitivity image was computed prior to reconstruction by backprojecting 100 million LORs, which took 25 and 2.5 min for the shift-varying and shift-invariant implementations, respectively.

It should be noted that the results reported in table 1 for the shift-invariant kernel are better than those reported in Pratx *et al* (2009), since the value reported in this section was obtained on a newer computer equipped with a more powerful GPU.

5. Discussion

The benefits of using a more accurate, shift-varying model are clear and have already been demonstrated elsewhere (Rahmim *et al* 2008, Strul *et al* 2003, Selivanov *et al* 2000, Herraiz *et al* 2006, Alessio *et al* 2006, 2010, Yamaya *et al* 2005). For the CZT system we are developing, we have shown that a system response model based solely on the detector response brings four main improvements. First, the reconstructed spatial resolution is more uniform across the FOV (figures 8 and 9). By incorporating accurate shift-varying information in the

system matrix, the spatially variant blur present in the projections does not propagate to the reconstructed image. In particular, uniform spatial resolution is achieved all the way to the edge of the FOV, which suggests that four or more mice can be scanned concurrently in an 8 cm FOV system, such as the CZT system under construction, or, alternatively, the bore of the PET system can be made smaller for high photon sensitivity, even perhaps touching the animal.

Secondly, the smaller measured size of the spheres reconstructed with a shift-varying model suggests that the spatial resolution is globally higher (figure 9) and hence being recovered. Thirdly, the reconstructed images are more quantitatively accurate, as evidenced by the better CR (figure 11), thanks to more accurate models of the photon detection process, and reduced partial volume effects (PVE). For instance, for the 8 mm diameter sphere, which is large enough not to be affected by PVE, the CR after 20 iterations is 95.8% for the shift-varying model versus 85.9% for the shift-invariant Gaussian projection. Fourthly, the noise is globally lower at a fixed contrast or iteration number (figure 11) because using a more accurate system matrix in the reconstruction reduces the amount of inconsistency between the different measurements.

Due to PVE, lower CR is generally achieved for smaller spheres (figure 11), with one exception: the 1.5 mm diameter sphere showed higher CR than the 2 mm one. CR should be interpreted with care for lesions of different size: for small ROIs, voxel quantization at the ROI boundary can substantially affect the computed CR. The ROIs for the 1.5 and 2 mm spheres were comprised of 12 and 36 voxels, respectively. Furthermore, locally correlated statistical noise can also affect the contrast of small ROIs. However, differences observed between shift-varying and invariant reconstructions are less affected by such biases because they are measured for the same ROI and the same statistical realization.

Because the ML estimate is nonlinear, the reconstructed sphere size (figure 9) should be analyzed with care and should not be interpreted in terms of modulation transfer function. It is however an interesting figure of merit to study since it defines the ability of the reconstruction algorithm to distinguish small lesions that are close to each other. It should be further noted that the smaller size of the reconstructed spheres compared to their original diameter is an expected phenomenon: The FWHM of a perfect sphere blurred with a Gaussian kernel can be either smaller or larger than the original sphere diameter. We have empirically observed that the reconstructed sphere FWHM is a non-monotonical convex function of the blurring kernel FWHM (Prax 2010). Hence, smaller reconstructed spheres might indicate either higher or lower spatial resolution. In practice, the relationship is monotonical provided that the blurring kernels are wide enough. For the 1.75 mm spheres used in this study, this condition requires the system blur to be greater than 0.5 mm (Prax 2010).

The total reconstruction time is ten times larger when the shift-varying model is used (table 1). This is due to two factors: an increase in the number of voxels processed, and an increase in the computation required to evaluate the shift-varying kernel. For the shift-invariant Gaussian kernel, 7×7 voxels participate within each slice, compared to 11×11 voxels for the broad tube used for modeling the CDRF. In addition, each participating voxel requires the evaluation of nine different kernel functions that are added together. Overall, list-mode reconstruction with shift-varying system response model has much higher computational requirements than similar methods based on sinograms. In sinogram mode, cross-talk between different LORs can be modeled efficiently by a simple convolution, whereas, in list mode, it has to be modeled in image domain, using a broad TOR for each LOR.

The system response model can be implemented in many different ways. In this work, we have chosen not to store any information but rather to compute the coefficients of the system matrix on the fly. As a consequence, this approach is useful when the PET geometry needs to

be adjusted to the patient morphology. It is also a scalable technique which uses a constant amount of computing resources, independent of the number of LORs in the system.

A shift-varying model can also be stored in memory; however, there exists a trade-off between the accuracy of the representation and the amount of memory used. Our approach, based on linearizing the IDRF, is accurate for the majority of the LORs (figure 7) and uses little memory. In addition, the computation of the kernel on the GPU is partially hidden by the latency of reading the voxel values from GPU memory.

The model presented in this work is based on a scaled convolution that only depends on the in-plane dimensions, i.e. it assumes that both detectors lie in the same axial plane. Unlike 2D PET systems, in which all LORs are co-planar, modern PET systems acquire additional oblique LORs to improve the photon sensitivity. A complete system response model would include the ring difference as a parameter, resulting in a non-separable 6D function, which would entail a considerable increase in computation. In an effort to make fully 3D image reconstruction computationally tractable, our system response model ignores the ring difference; furthermore, it assumes that blur along the axial direction can be described by a separable shift-invariant Gaussian kernel. Hence, in place of a non-separable 6D kernel, we model the system response as the product of a non-separable 4D kernel by a 1D Gaussian kernel. Reducing the dimensionality of the system response model is common for achieving practical reconstruction times in 3D PET (Qi *et al* 1998, Alessio *et al* 2006, Herraiz *et al* 2006, Alessio *et al* 2010).

6. Conclusion

A method for modeling and calculating an approximate model of the detector response was developed for an ultra-high resolution CZT PET system with small detector voxels. We showed that such a model could be calculated on-the-fly and incorporated within GPU-based list-mode iterative reconstruction. Doing so resulted in superior image quality, quantitative accuracy and resolution uniformity compared to standard reconstruction based on a shift-invariant model. The framework is flexible and can be readily applied to a wide array of PET systems that use small detector voxels (for which the piecewise linear approximation holds), with or without depth-of-interaction capabilities.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) under grants R01-CA119056, R01-CA120474, and R01-CA119056-S1 (ARRA), and by a fellowship from the Stanford Bio-X program.

References

- Alessio A, Kinahan P and Lewellen T 2006 Modeling and incorporation of system response functions in 3-D whole body PET *IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging* **25** 828–37
- Alessio A, Stearns C, Tong S, Ross S, Kohlmyer S, Ganin A and Kinahan P 2010 Application and evaluation of a measured spatially variant system model for PET image reconstruction *IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging* **29** 938–49
- Gu Y, Matteson J L, Skelton R T, Deal A C, Stephan E A, Duttweiler F, Gasaway T M and Levin C S 2011a Study of a high-resolution, 3D positioning cadmium zinc telluride detector for PET *Phys. Med. Biol.* **56** 1563–84
- Gu Y, Prax G, Lau F W Y and Levin C S 2011b Effects of multiple-interaction photon events in a high-resolution PET system that uses 3-D positioning detectors *Med. Phys.* **37** 5494–508
- Habte F, Foudray A M K, Olcott P D and Levin C S 2007 Effects of system geometry and other physical factors on photon sensitivity of high-resolution positron emission tomography *Phys. Med. Biol.* **52** 3753–72

- Herraiz J L, Espana S, Vaquero J J, Desco M and Udias J M 2006 FIRST: fast iterative reconstruction software for (PET) tomography *Phys. Med. Biol.* **51** 4547–65
- Lecomte R, Schmitt D and Lamoureux G 1984 Geometry study of a high resolution PET detection system using small detectors *IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci.* **31** 556–61
- Levin C S 2008 New imaging technologies to enhance the molecular sensitivity of positron emission tomography *Proc. IEEE* **96** 439–67
- Levin C S and Hoffman E J 1999 Calculation of positron range and its effect on the fundamental limit of positron emission tomography system spatial resolution *Phys. Med. Biol.* **44** 781–99
- Lewitt R M and Matej S 2003 Overview of methods for image reconstruction from projections in emission computed tomography *Proc. IEEE* **91** 1588–611
- Olcott P, Buss S, Levin C, Prax G and Sramek C 2006 GRAY: high energy photon ray tracer for PET applications *IEEE Nucl. Sci. Symp. Conf. Rec.* pp 2011–5
- Panin V Y, Kehren F, Michel C and Casey M E 2006 Fully 3D PET reconstruction with system matrix derived from point source measurements *IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging* **25** 907–21
- Prax G 2010 Image reconstruction in high-resolution PET: GPU-accelerated strategies for improving image quality and accuracy *PhD thesis* Stanford University
- Prax G, Chinn G, Olcott P and Levin C 2009 Accurate and shift-varying line projections for iterative reconstruction using the GPU *IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging* **28** 415–22
- Prax G and Levin C S 2009 Bayesian reconstruction of photon interaction sequences for high-resolution pet detectors *Phys. Med. Biol.* **54** 5073–94
- Qi J 2006 Calculation of the sensitivity image in list-mode reconstruction for PET *IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci.* **53** 2746–51
- Qi J, Leahy R M, Cherry S R, Chatzioannou A and Farquhar T H 1998 High-resolution 3D Bayesian image reconstruction using the microPET small-animal scanner *Phys. Med. Biol.* **43** 1001–13
- Rafecas M, Mosler B, Dietz M, Pogl M, Stamatakis A, McElroy D and Ziegler S 2004 Use of a Monte Carlo-based probability matrix for 3-D iterative reconstruction of MADPET II data *IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci.* **51** 2597–605
- Rahmim A, Cheng J C, Blinder S, Camborde M L and Sossi V 2005 Statistical dynamic image reconstruction in state-of-the-art high-resolution PET *Phys. Med. Biol.* **50** 4887–912
- Rahmim A, Tang J, Lodge M A, Lashkari S, Ay M R, Lautamaki R, Tsui B M W and Bengel F M 2008 Analytic system matrix resolution modeling in PET: an application to Rb-82 cardiac imaging *Phys. Med. Biol.* **53** 5947–65
- Rapisarda E, Bettinardi V, Thielemans K and Gilardi M C 2010 Image-based point spread function implementation in a fully 3D OSEM reconstruction algorithm for PET *Phys. Med. Biol.* **55** 4131
- Selivanov V, Picard Y, Cadorette J, Rodrigue S and Lecomte R 2000 Detector response models for statistical iterative image reconstruction in high resolution PET *IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci.* **47** 1168–75
- Sorenson J A and Phelps M E 1980 *Physics in Nuclear Medicine* (New York: Grune & Stratton)
- Spanoudaki V, Torres-Espallardo I, Rafecas M and Ziegler S 2007 Performance evaluation of MADPET II, a small animal dual layer LSO-APD PET scanner with individual detector read out and depth of interaction information *J. Nucl. Med. Meeting Abstracts* **48** 39
- Strul D, Slates R B, Dahlbom M, Cherry S R and Marsden P K 2003 An improved analytical detector response function model for multilayer small-diameter PET scanners *Phys. Med. Biol.* **48** 979–94
- Sureau F C, Reader A J, Comtat C, Leroy C, Ribeiro M J, Buvat I and Trebossen R 2008 Impact of image-space resolution modeling for studies with the high-resolution research tomograph *J. Nucl. Med.* **49** 1000–8
- Vandenbroucke A, Foudray A M, Olcott P D and Levin C S 2010 Performance characterization of a new high resolution PET scintillation detector *Phys. Med. Bio.* **55** 5895–911
- Wang Y, Seidel J, Tsui B M W, Vaquero J J and Pomper M G 2006 Performance evaluation of the GE Healthcare eXplore Vista dual-ring small-animal PET scanner *J. Nucl. Med.* **47** 1891–900
- Yamaya T *et al* 2005 Transaxial system models for jPET-D4 image reconstruction *Phys. Med. Biol.* **50** 5339–55
- Yamaya T, Yoshida E, Obi T, Ito H, Yoshikawa K and Murayama H 2008 First human brain imaging by the jPET-D4 prototype with a pre-computed system matrix *IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci.* **55** 2482–92
- Zhang J, Foudray A, Olcott P, Farrell R, Shah K and Levin C 2007 Performance characterization of a novel thin position-sensitive avalanche photodiode for 1 mm resolution positron emission tomography *IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci.* **54** 415–21