Feasible 4D Intervention Guidance: Initial Concept Evaluation

Kuntz J¹, Sawall S², Semmler W¹, Kachelrieß M^{1,2} and Bartling SH^{1,3} 1.German Cancer Research Center (DKFZ), Heidelberg, Germany 2.Friedrich-Alexander-University Erlangen-Nürnberg, Germany 3.University Medical Center, Mannheim, Germany





DEUTSCHES KREBSFORSCHUNGSZENTRUM IN DER HELMHOLTZ-GEMEINSCHAFT

4D Intervention Guidance: Principles

- Today's fluoroscopy is limited to 2D projection images
- Continuous CT acquisition would exceed acceptable dose levels



J. Kuntz

Projective Fluoroscopy

<image>

4D Intervention Guidance



3/5/2012 | Page 2

4D Intervention Guidance: Introduction

• Dose can be distributed to various number of projections



Using constant overall doses:

- Are there optimal scanning parameters?
- How many projections result in the maximum image quality?



Material and Methods

Simulations and phantom measurements were performed using:

- various exposure levels (single, double, four-fold dose)
- various number of projections per reconstruction (9 81 projections)
- various iterative compressed sensing reconstructions (PICCS, ASD-POCS, PrIDICT)
- constant overall dose per reconstruction
- prior image without interventional material was incorporated in all reconstructions



Material and Methods

Automated quality analyses and visual quality assessment was performed:

• Mean squared contingency

$$\frac{\chi^2}{N} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i} \sum_{j} \frac{\left(h_{ij} - \frac{h_i h_j}{n}\right)^2}{\frac{h_i h_j}{n}} \quad h_{i.} = \sum_{j} h_{ij}$$
$$h_{.j} = \sum_{i} h_{ij}$$

Image g	Image f	high	low
high		h_{11}	h_{1j}
low		h_{i1}	\overline{h}_{ij}

Pearson correlation

$$\rho = \frac{\operatorname{Cov}(f,g)}{\sqrt{\operatorname{Var}(f)}\sqrt{\operatorname{Var}(g)}} = \frac{\sigma_{fg}}{\sigma_f \sigma_g} \qquad \sigma_{fg} = \frac{1}{N-1}\sum_{i=1}^N (f_i - \bar{f})(g_i - \bar{g})$$
$$\sigma_f^2 = \frac{1}{N-1}\sum_{i=1}^N (f_i - \bar{f})^2$$
$$\sigma_g^2 = \frac{1}{N-1}\sum_{i=1}^N (g_i - \bar{g})^2$$

Reference



Reconstruction





Results: Visual Assessment of the Image Quality

Simulation results in PICCS reconstructions



• Visually, 14 - 21 projections provide best image quality



Results: Visual Assessment of the Image Quality

Simulation results in ASD-POCS reconstructions



- Visually, image quality is nearly constant between 12 and 41 projections
- In general image quality is slightly poorer than in PICCS reconstructions



Results: Visual Assessment of the Image Quality

Simulation results in PrIDICT reconstructions



- Best image quality using 12 21 projections
- Increasing artifacts using higher projection numbers



Results: Quantitative Analyses of Image Quality

- Automated analyses confirm good image quality using 14 21 projections
- Optimal image quality depends on applied dose

Quality analyses of PICCS reconstructions





Results : Measurements

Measured phantom data reconstructed with the PICCS algorithm



• The phantom measurements confirm our simulation results



Conclusion

- Using constant overall dose, a maximum image quality can be reached in the range of 14 to 21 projections
- Including electronic noise would further decrease image quality using larger projection numbers

Specifications for 4D intervention guidance:

- Continuous rotations
- Rotation speed > 720%
- Short pulse X-ray tube
- Flat-panel detectors
- Readout rates of 30 fps 60 fps
- Exact angular positioning

Continuous 4D acquisition





Conclusion

• This study shows specific requirements for interventional radiology

4D intervention guidance might be possible using

- Today's flat panel detector devices and
- Current CT gantry systems



J. Kuntz







Acknowledgement

Thanks to the CT groups on DKFZ and IMP

This work was supported by

- Siemens Healthcare, AX, Forchheim, Germany
- German Research Foundation (DFG), Grants BA 3546/2-1, KA 1678/6-1

