Published in final edited form as:

Nucl Instrum Methods Phys Res A. 2007 October 1; 580(2): 919–924.

Recent Advances and Future Advances in Time-of-Flight PET

William W. Moses^{a,*}

a Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, 1 Cyclotron Rd., Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

Abstract

Simple theory predicts that the statistical noise variance in PET can be reduced by an order of magnitude by using time-of-flight (TOF) information. This reduction can be obtained by improving the coincidence timing resolution, and so would be achievable in clinical, whole body studies using with PET systems that differ little from existing cameras. The potential impact of this development is large, especially for oncology studies in large patients, where it is sorely needed. TOF PET was extensively studied in the 1980's but died away in the 1990's, as it was impossible to reliably achieve sufficient timing resolution without sacrificing other important PET performance aspects, such as spatial resolution and efficiency. Recent advances in technology (scintillators, photodetectors, and high speed electronics) have renewed interest in TOF PET, which is experiencing a rebirth. However, there is still much to be done, both in instrumentation development and evaluating the true benefits of TOF in modern clinical PET. This paper looks at what has been accomplished and what needs to be done before time-of-flight PET can reach its full potential.

Keywords

Positron Emission Mammography; Breast Cancer; PEM Camera Design and Optimization

1. Introduction

Like most imaging modalities, positron emission tomography (PET) is limited by statistical noise. By accurately measuring the arrival time of the two 511 keV positron annihilation photons in the ring of detectors that surrounds the patient, the location of the positron can be constrained. While this constraint is not tight enough to improve the spatial resolution, it can significantly reduce the statistical noise in the reconstructed images. This technique is known as time-of-flight (TOF) PET.

A number of PET cameras incorporating time-of-flight measurement were built in the 1980's [1–8]. These cameras achieved timing resolution of ~500 ps and demonstrated the anticipated improvement in statistical noise, but their performance was limited by the materials and technologies available at that time. The scintillator used was BaF₂ or CsF. The fast emissions from BaF₂ are in the UV, necessitating quartz-windowed photomultiplier tubes, while CsF must be carefully packaged because is extremely hygroscopic and its light output is so low that it has poor energy resolution and cannot be used for block detectors [9]. Both have worse spatial resolution and detection efficiency than BGO. In addition, TOF PET cameras require additional electronics to perform the time-of-flight measurement, and those electronics had a tendency to “drift” over periods of hours or days. This forced design compromises that made TOF PET

* Corresponding author. Tel.: ++1-510-486-4432; fax: ++1-510-486-4768; e-mail: wwmoses@lbl.gov..

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

camera have overall inferior performance to non-TOF PET cameras, causing development of TOF PET to gradually die out [10].

New technologies and materials have become available in recent years and TOF PET cameras are once again being made. While this new generation of TOF PET cameras has fewer compromises than the previous generation, the ultimate performance has not yet been achieved. This paper looks at both the improvements that enabled the new generation of TOF PET cameras and what needs to be done before time-of-flight PET can reach its full potential.

2. Statistical Noise in PET

In conventional PET, the location of an individual positron is constrained to lie along a line, and tomographic reconstruction algorithms then determine the 3-D source distribution. Even before computed tomography was applied to positron imaging to create what is now known as PET [11,12], it was realized that the three-dimensional location of each positron could be determined by accurately measuring the difference in arrival times of the two annihilation photons [13]. In other words, the position of the positron would be constrained to a point rather than a line, so 3D images could be obtained without a reconstruction algorithm. However, the position along the line is localized to

$$\Delta x = \frac{c}{2} \Delta t \quad (1)$$

where Δx is the position error, c is the speed of light, and Δt is the error in the timing measurement. To get sub-centimeter position resolution, timing resolution of less than 50 ps is necessary, which is impossible to obtain. An achievable timing resolution (500 ps) constrains the positron position to a line segment ~ 7.5 cm long. While constraining the positron position to a line segment 7.5 cm long does not improve the spatial resolution, it does reduce the statistical noise in the reconstructed image if the line segment is shorter than the size of the emission source [14–16]. This multiplicative reduction factor f (corresponding to the reduction in noise variance) is given by

$$f = \frac{D}{\Delta x} = \frac{2D}{c\Delta t} \quad (2)$$

where D is the size of the emission source. For organs the size of the brain ($D \approx 20$ cm), this factor is greater than unity (implying some noise reduction) for timing resolution < 1.3 ns. For whole-body imaging, the object size is larger ($D \approx 35$ cm) and $f > 1$ for timing resolution < 2.3 ns.

The mechanism by which noise is reduced by TOF is as follows. Consider a single point source in the field of view of a PET camera, such as in Figure 1a. When that point source is imaged by collecting N coincident events, one would naively expect that image intensity for that voxel would be N and the statistical noise to be given by counting statistics, and so be equal to $\sqrt{N}$. In this simple case, this estimate is correct.

Now consider what happens when a second point source that provides M coincident events is also placed in the field of view. With conventional PET the fundamental datum is a chord—a line joining the two detector elements that simultaneously observe 511 keV photons. The chord that joins the two point sources will have statistical fluctuations not only from the N counts of the source whose activity we would like to quantify, but also the M counts from the “background” source. In short, the voxels are coupled, and while the reconstruction algorithm can decouple them to form an image with the correct average number of counts in each voxel,

the statistical noise is increased and so is greater than $\sqrt{N}$. As any two voxels are connected by a chord, activity anywhere in the field of view increases the noise for every other voxel.

Reconstruction algorithms that include time-of-flight information can reduce this coupling and so reduce the statistical noise. If the distance between two voxels is greater than the distance that time-of-flight constrains the position to ($c\Delta t/2$), then the voxels essentially become uncoupled. With time-of-flight reconstruction, coincident events contribute only to pixels near (*i.e.*, within a distance consistent with the timing resolution) the target pixel, therefore the statistical fluctuations from the data contribute to a smaller number of image pixels. This concept is illustrated in Figure 1b and is used to derive the variance reduction in Equation 2. While the noise reduction is easily predicted for simple, uniform distributions, the improvement depends on the radioisotope distribution, which is rarely homogeneous. However, Equation 2 provides a convenient approximation, which indicates that the noise variance reduction increases linearly with increasing patient “diameter” and decreasing coincidence timing resolution.

3. Recent and Future Advances

3.1. Scintillators

The key advance that enabled modern TOF PET was the development of new scintillator materials. The first developed was LSO (lutetium orthosilicate or $\text{Lu}_2\text{SiO}_5:\text{Ce}$) scintillator, which was discovered in 1991 [17]. Its properties are shown in Table 1, and it was immediately recognized that these properties are very attractive for PET. It has a very similar attenuation length to BGO but a considerably faster decay time (reducing dead time) and considerably higher light output (making block decoding easier). Several materials have similar chemical composition and scintillation properties as LSO, such as MLS, LGSO, LYSO, and LPS. The high initial rate in Table 1 suggests that LSO should also have excellent timing properties. This prediction is born out in systems optimized for timing, ≤ 225 ps fwhm coincidence timing has been obtained with 511 keV excitation [18,19]. Equally important for PET, LSO does not have the long attenuation length that degraded the performance of BaF_2 - and CsF -based TOF PET cameras. A commercial LYSO-based PET camera with TOF capability (~ 600 ps coincidence timing resolution) has recently been released by Philips.

Another attractive, recently developed scintillator material for TOF is lanthanum bromide doped with 5% cerium [20], and a research TOF PET camera with $4\times 4\times 30$ mm³ crystals arranged in a 84 cm ring diameter and a 25 cm axial extent has recently been built [21]. With prototype detector modules, they have achieved 310–350 ps fwhm coincidence timing resolution, depending on the position [22,23]. Although the tradeoffs when using LaBr_3 are different than those for LSO, Monte Carlo simulations of this design also predict very large improvements in imaging performance [21,24]. Indeed, the preliminary results from the completed camera show significant noise reduction, even though the measured timing resolution for the camera is “only” 475 ps fwhm [25]. With both the LYSO and $\text{LaBr}_3:5\%$ Ce cameras, significant performance improvement is observed experimentally.

While these two materials have enabled modern TOF PET, significant improvements in scintillator material properties are still possible. There are also some newly discovered materials that are quite promising for TOF PET. These materials are $\text{LaBr}_3:\text{Ce}$ with cerium concentrations other than 5% [26], CeBr_3 [27], and $\text{LuI}_3:\text{Ce}$ [28]. These new scintillator materials are truly astounding. All of them have light output that is at least 150% that of NaI:Tl , energy resolution (at 662 keV) that is better than 4% fwhm, and timing resolution that is better than barium fluoride. $\text{LaBr}_3:30\%\text{Ce}$ achieves timing resolution that is a factor of two better than that of BaF_2 (69 ps for a single crystal, implying 100 ps fwhm coincidence timing) [26, 29]. However, $\text{LuI}_3:\text{Ce}$ stands out even among these remarkable new materials. It has a light

output of 100,000 photons/MeV (2.6 times that of NaI:Tl), energy resolution of 4% fwhm (2.5 times better than LSO), and coincidence timing resolution of 125 ps fwhm (better than BaF₂)!

The choice of scintillator material affects the PET camera performance in many ways, and almost always involves tradeoffs. Good energy resolution reduces background from Compton scatter in the patient. The photoelectric fraction and attenuation length affect the coincidence efficiency. A material with relatively low photoelectric fraction is unlikely to have both annihilation photons deposit >350 keV in the camera, thus reducing the coincidence efficiency. Reference [41] simulates an 82 cm diameter PET camera made with three attenuation length deep crystals of each of the materials in Table 1. While LuI₃ has an efficiency that is 81% of LSO, the efficiency for LaBr₃ and CeBr₃ is 47% of LSO and LaCl₃ is 40% of LSO. The spatial resolution (particularly radial elongation) is also degraded by low photoelectric fraction and long attenuation length. Reference [41] predicts the fwhm of the point spread function as a function of the distance from the center of the tomograph ring. BGO, LSO, LuAP, LuYAP, and GSO give the smallest fwhm for all positions. The fwhm at 25 cm from the center for LuI₃ is about 50% worse than the best scintillators. RbGd₂Br₇, LaBr₃, and BaF₂ have a factor of two worse spatial resolution at 25 cm than the best scintillators. Finally, LaCl₃ and NaI have resolutions that are 2.5 times worse than the best scintillators.

Despite the promising new materials, the ideal scintillator has not yet been discovered. TOF PET would benefit enormously from new scintillators that combine high light output and short decay time (to obtain excellent timing resolution), high density and effective atomic number (to obtain excellent spatial resolution and efficiency), and good linearity (to obtain excellent energy resolution).

1.2. Photomultiplier Tubes

As the fast emissions from BaF₂ are in the ultraviolet, TOF PET cameras in the 1980's required (expensive) quartz-windowed photomultiplier tubes and optical glues (to couple the scintillator to the photomultiplier tube) with poor mechanical properties. The new scintillators emit in the 400 nm range, allowing the use of (inexpensive) borosilicate glass-windowed PMTs. There has also been steady progress in PMTs over the past few decades. The general timing properties (especially the transit time jitter) of inexpensive, 25 mm diameter PMTs that also have the required energy resolution and stability have improved dramatically.

However, more improvements are necessary. Many of the PMTs that are used in commercial PET cameras have transit times that vary significantly across the face of the PMT [42]. In addition, the mean transit time varies from PMT to "identical" PMT. As most PET cameras use "block" detector modules that share light among multiple (usually four) PMTs, methods are needed to remove or correct for transit time differences between photomultiplier tubes.

1.3. Electronics

The electronics available in the 1980's severely handicapped TOF PET. At that time, a fast personal computer had a clock speed of about 8 MHz, digital electronics operating in the GHz range were virtually unheard of, as were custom application specific integrated circuits (ASICs). The timing circuitry was predominantly analog and tended to drift with both time and temperature. Thus, while 500 ps resolution could be obtained immediately after calibration, the camera rapidly went out of calibration and the timing resolution degraded. Digital logic operating in the GHz range is now routine, ASICs are commonplace, and the timing stability is outstanding. These improvements have also enabled the resurgence of TOF PET.

However, more improvements are necessary. One of the critical parts is an ASIC implementation of a constant fraction discriminator (CFD), or some other circuit that converts the analog pulse from the PMT into a digital timing pulse with high accuracy. A true CFD uses an analog delay line with frequency response of ~ 10 GHz, and these are difficult to incorporate into an ASIC. Non-delay line CFD ASICs have been developed [32,43,44], but it is not clear that these have the requisite timing accuracy. In addition, such an ASIC needs to include a high precision TDC and the rest of the electronic circuitry needed for a PET camera (gain adjustment, energy windowing, crystal identification, event formatting, test pulsing, etc.).

1.4. Detector Module Design

The shape of the scintillator crystal influences the achievable timing resolution. The exceptional numbers presented in Table 1 are generally obtained with small, flat scintillator crystals with the largest face coupled to the PMT. This geometry reduces the path length between the origin of the scintillation light and the photodetector and also maximizes the light collection efficiency. Conventional PET detector modules, on the other hand, have long, thin crystals whose smallest face is coupled to the PMT. In addition, the scintillation light is spread by a light guide, which increases the path length of the scintillation photons. This degrades the timing resolution. Current detector modules have not been optimized for timing resolution (at least not the sub-ns resolution needed by TOF PET), and additional effort is needed to develop geometries optimized for TOF PET.

1.5. Photodetectors

Timing resolution scales like the square root of the number of photons that are detected. One-to-one scintillator crystal to photodetector coupling generally increases the light collection efficiency (often by a factor of almost two) compared to a block detector design. Current photomultiplier tubes have quantum efficiencies of 25%–30%. Thus, inexpensive photodetectors that are compact, pixellated, and have fast rise time, low transit time jitter, and high QE (close to 100%) could improve the timing resolution by a factor of approximately two. There are several promising new photodetector technologies, notably SiPM-type devices, that show potential for providing this.

1.6. Reconstruction Algorithms

Time of flight reconstruction algorithms presently take more than an hour on Beowulf-type clusters and so must be sped up. Algorithms for correcting for Compton scatter and random events in time of flight cameras are also needed.

Finally, evaluating the benefits of time of flight is difficult. While estimates of variance reduction using filtered backprojection in uniform objects are relatively easy to obtain, the convergence properties of three dimensional iterative algorithms (which are the clinical standard today) make even this assessment difficult. In addition, we need methods for evaluating the TOF benefit in heterogeneous objects (such as patients) with varying amounts of scatter and random background. Most importantly, the clinical effectiveness must be evaluated. While it is relatively easy to quantitatively measure the improvement in signal to noise ratio in a simple phantom (*e.g.*, a uniform cylinder with a central hot spot), it is much more difficult to quantitatively predict how the noise reduction affects diagnostic accuracy, especially as the noise reduction will depend on the activity distribution in the patient, and so has considerable variation.

4. Conclusions

Time-of-flight PET offers a significant reduction in statistical variance. Simple estimates predict a factor of ~ 5 variance reduction for realistic clinical imaging situations (35 cm diameter

and 500 ps fwhm timing resolution). Such systems were developed in the 1980's, but failed because of deficiencies in the technologies available at that time. In the subsequent two decades, improvements photomultiplier tubes, electronics, and especially scintillators have become available and have lead to a recent rebirth in TOF PET. However, further developments in all of these technologies will further improve the effectiveness of this technique.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by the Director, Office of Science, Office of Biological and Environmental Research, Medical Science Division of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH11231, and in part by the National Institutes of Health, National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering under grant No. R33-EB001928.

References

1. Ter-Pogossian, MM.; Ficke, DC.; Yamamoto, M.; Hood, JT. Design characteristics and preliminary testing of Super-PETT I, a positron emission tomograph utilizing photon time-of-flight information (TOF PET). Proceedings of The Workshop on Time of Flight Tomography; St. Louis, MO. 1982. p. 37-41.
2. Ter-Pogossian MM, Ficke DC, Yamamoto M, Hood JT. Super PETTI: A positron emission tomograph utilizing photon time-of-flight information. IEEE Trans Med Img 1982;MI-1:179-187.
3. Mullani, NA.; Wong, WH.; Hartz, RK.; Yerian, K.; Philippe, EA., et al. Design of TOFPET: a high resolution time-of-flight positron camera. Proceedings of The Workshop on Time of Flight Tomography; St. Louis, MO. 1982. p. 31-36.
4. Gariod, R.; Allemand, R.; Cormoreche, E.; Laval, M.; Moszynski, M. The LETI positron tomograph architecture and time of flight improvements. Proceedings of The Workshop on Time of Flight Tomography; St. Louis, MO. 1982. p. 25-29.
5. Wong WH, Mullani NA, Phillipe EA, Hartz R, Gould KL. Image improvement and design optimization of the time-of-flight PET. J Nucl Med 1983;24:52-60. [PubMed: 6600276]
6. Lewellen TK, Bice AN, Harrison RL, Pencke MD, Link JM. Performance measurements of the SP3000/UW time-of-flight positron emission tomograph. IEEE Trans Nucl Sci 1988;NS-35:665-669.
7. Mazoyer B, Trebossen R, Schoukroun C, Verrey B, Syrota A, et al. Physical characteristics of TTV03, a new high spatial resolution time-of-flight positron tomograph. IEEE Trans Nucl Sci 1990;NS-37:778-782.
8. Ter-Pogossian MM, Ficke DC, Beecher DE, Hoffmann GR, Bergmann SR. The Super PET 3000-E - a PET scanner designed for high count rate cardiac applications. J Comput Assist Tomogr 1994;18:661-669. [PubMed: 8040459]
9. Casey ME, Nutt R. A multicrystal two dimensional BGO detector system for positron emission tomography. IEEE Trans Nucl Sci 1986;NS-33:460-463.
10. Lewellen TK. Time-of-Flight PET. Semin Nucl Med 1998;28:268-275. [PubMed: 9704367]
11. Robertson, JS.; Marr, RB.; Rosenblum, M.; Radeka, V.; Yamamoto, YL. 32-Crystal positron transverse section detector. In: Freedman, GS., editor. Tomographic Imaging in Nuclear Medicine. New York: Society of Nuclear Medicine Press; 1973.
12. Ter-Pogossian MM, Phelps ME, Hoffman EJ, Mullani N. A positron emission transaxial tomograph for nuclear imaging (PETT). Radiology 1975;114:89-96. [PubMed: 1208874]
13. Anger HO. Survey of radioisotope cameras. ISA Transactions 1966;5:311-334.
14. Campagnolo, RE.; Garderet, P.; Vacher, J. Tomographie par emetteurs positrons avec mesure de temp de vol. Communication an Colloque National sur le Traitement du Signal; Nice, France. 1979.
15. Snyder DL, Thomas LJ, Ter-Pogossian MM. A mathematical model for positron-emission tomography systems having time-of-flight measurements. IEEE Trans Nucl Sci 1981;NS-28:3575-3583.
16. Tomitani T. Image reconstruction and noise evaluation in photon time-of-flight assisted positron emission tomography. IEEE Trans Nucl Sci 1981;NS-28:4582-4589.
17. Melcher CL, Schweitzer JS. Cerium-doped lutetium orthosilicate: a fast, efficient new scintillator. IEEE Trans Nucl Sci 1992;NS-39:502-505.

18. Moses WW, Ullisch M. Factors influencing timing resolution in a commercial LSO PET camera. *IEEE Trans Nucl Sci* 2006;NS-53:1–8.
19. Moszynski, M.; Kapusta, M.; Nassalski, A.; Szczesniak, T.; Wolski, D., et al. New prospects for time-of-flight PET with LSO scintillators. In: Yu, B., editor. *Proceedings of The IEEE 2005 Nuclear Science Symposium*; San Juan, Puerto Rico. 2005. p. J3-18.
20. van Loef EVD, Dorenbos P, van Eijk CWE, Kramer K, Gudel HU. High-energy-resolution scintillator: Ce^{3+} activated LaBr_3 . *Appl Phys Lett* 2001;79:1573–1575.
21. Surti, S.; Karp, JS.; Popescu, LM.; Daube-Witherspoon, ME.; Werner, M. Investigation of image quality and NEC in a TOF-capable PET scanner. In: Siebert, A., editor. *Proceedings of The IEEE 2004 Nuclear Science Symposium*; Rome, Italy. 2004. p. M10-276
22. Kuhn A, Surti S, Karp JS, Raby PS, Shah KS, et al. Design of a lanthanum bromide detector for time-of-flight PET. *IEEE Trans Nucl Sci* 2004;NS-51:2550–2557.
23. Kuhn, A.; Surti, S.; Karp, JS.; Muehlelehner, G.; Newcomer, FM., et al. Performance assessment of pixellated LaBr_3 detector modules for TOF PET. In: Siebert, A., editor. *Proceedings of The IEEE 2004 Nuclear Science Symposium*; Rome, Italy. 2004. p. M9-59.
24. Surti S, Karp JS, Muehlelehner G. Image quality assessment of LaBr_3 -based whole-body 3D PET scanners: a Monte Carlo evaluation. *Phys Med Biol* 2004;19:4593–4610. [PubMed: 15552419]
25. Karp, JS.; Kuhn, A.; Perkins, AE.; Surti, S.; Werner, ME., et al. Characterization of a time-of-flight PET scanner based on lanthanum bromide. In: Yu, B., editor. *Proceedings of The IEEE 2005 Nuclear Science Symposium*; San Juan, Puerto Rico. 2005. p. M4-8.
26. Glodo J, Moses WW, Higgins W, van Loef EVD, Wong P, et al. Effects of cerium concentration on scintillation properties of $\text{LaBr}_3\text{:Ce}$. *IEEE Trans Nucl Sci* 2004;NS-52:1805–1808.
27. Shah KS, Glodo J, Higgins W, van Loef EVD, Moses WW, et al. CeBr_3 scintillators for gamma ray spectroscopy. *IEEE Trans Nucl Sci* 2004;NS-52:3157–3159.
28. Shah KS, Glodo J, Klugerman M, Higgins W, Gupta T, et al. $\text{LuI}_3\text{:Ce}$ -a new scintillator for gamma ray spectroscopy. *IEEE Trans Nucl Sci* 2004;NS-51:2302–2305.
29. Kuhn, A.; Surti, S.; Shah, KS.; Karp, JS. Investigation of LaBr_3 detector timing resolution. In: Yu, B., editor. *Proceedings of The IEEE 2005 Nuclear Science Symposium*; San Juan, Puerto Rico. 2005. p. M7-122.
30. Moszynski M, Ludziejewski T, Wolski D, Klamra W, Avdejcikov VV. Timing properties of BGO scintillator. *Nucl Instr Meth* 1981;A 188:403–409.
31. Derenzo SE, Huesman RH, Cahoon JL, Geyer AB, Moses WW, et al. A positron tomograph with 600 BGO crystals and 2.6 mm resolution. *IEEE Trans Nucl Sci* 1988;NS-35:659–664.
32. Binkley, DM. PhD Thesis. University of Tennessee; Knoxville: 1992. Development and analysis of non-delay-line constant fraction discriminator circuits, including a fully-monolithic CMOS implementation.
33. Bialkowski J, Moszynski M, Wolski D, Klamra W. Remarks on constant fraction discriminators applied for BaF_2 crystals. *Nucl Instr Meth* 1989;A-281:657–659.
34. Ziegler SI, Ostertag H, Kuebler WK, Lorenz WJ, Otten EW. Effects of scintillation light collection on the time resolution of a time-of-flight detector for annihilation quanta. *IEEE Trans Nucl Sci* 1990;NS-37:574–579.
35. Ishii K, Watanuki S, Orihara H, Itoh M, Matsuzawa T. Improvement of time resolution in a TOF PET system with the use of BaF_2 crystals. *Nucl Instr Meth* 1986;A-253:128–134.
36. Moszynski M, Allemand R, Laval M, Odru R, Vacher J. Recent progress in fast timing with CsF scintillators in application to time-of-flight positron tomography in medicine. *Nucl Instr Meth* 1983;205:239–249.
37. Moszynski M, Ludziejewski T, Wolski D, Klamra W, Avdejcikov VV. Timing properties of GSO, LSO and other Ce doped scintillators. *Nucl Instr Meth* 1996;A 372:51–58.
38. Conti, M.; Bendriem, B.; Casey, M.; Chen, M.; Kehren, F., et al. Implementation of time-of-flight on CPS HiRez PET scanner. In: Siebert, A., editor. *Proceedings of The IEEE 2004 Nuclear Science Symposium*; Rome, Italy. 2004. p. M3-1.
39. Moszynski M, Wolski D, Ludziejewski T, Kapusta M, Lempicki A, et al. Properties of the new LuAP:Ce scintillator. *Nucl Instr Meth* 1997;A-385:123–131.

40. Shah KS, Glodo J, Klugerman M, Moses WW, Derenzo SE, et al. LaBr₃:Ce scintillators for gamma ray spectroscopy. IEEE Trans Nucl Sci 2003;NS-50:2410–2413.
41. Moses WW, Shah KS. Potential for RbGd₂Br₇:Ce, LaCl₃:Ce, LaBr₃:Ce, and LuI₃:Ce in nuclear medical imaging. Nucl Instr Meth 2005;A-537:317–320.
42. Aykac M, Bauer F, Williams CW, Loope M, Schmand M. Timing performance of Hi-Rez detector for time-of-flight (TOF) PET. IEEE Trans Nucl Sci 2006;NS-53:1084–1089.
43. Swann BK, Rochelle JM, Binkley DM, Puckett BS, Blalock BJ, et al. A custom mixed signal CMOS integrated circuit for high performance PET tomograph front-end applications. IEEE Trans Nucl Sci 2003;NS-50:909–914.
44. Binkley DM, Simpson ML, Rochelle JM. A monolithic, 2 μ m CMOS constant-fraction discriminator for moderate time resolution systems. IEEE Trans Nucl Sci 1991;38:1754–1759.

Figure 1. Mechanism of time-of-flight noise reduction. a) In conventional PET, the fundamental measurement is the number of counts in a crystal-crystal pair, so the measurement of the activity in one voxel is coupled with the measurement of activity in all other voxels. b) In time-of-flight PET, timing information can be used to remove the coupling between voxels that are separated by more than the TOF measurement distance.

Comparison of scintillation properties for scintillators that have been used for PET as well as newly developed scintillator materials appropriate for TOF PET. When possible, timing resolution is quoted both for laboratory systems optimized for timing (“lab”) and for PET cameras (“PET”). Those materials above the heavy line are in reasonable scale commercial production, while those below are not yet commercially available. The number in parentheses in the coincidence timing resolution column is the expected timing for a pair of scintillator crystals of that material, based on measurements of single crystals in coincidence with BaF2 scintillator.

Scintillator Material	Luminosity (photons/MeV)	Decay Time (ns)	Initial Rate (photon/ns/MeV)	Coincidence Timing Resolution w/BaF ₂	Energy Res. (%)	Atten. Len. (cm)
BGO (Bi ₄ Ge ₃ O ₁₂)	700 7,500 8,200 total	60 300	12 25 37 total	3 ns (lab) [30] 6 ns (PET) [31,32]	12%	1.1
BaF ₂	1,800 10,000 11,800 total	0.8 630	2250 16 2266 total	<200 ps (lab) [33,34] 500 ps (PET) [10,35]	10%	2.3
CsF	2,500	2.9	862	400 ps (lab) [36] 500 ps (PET) [2,4]	20%	2.7
GSO (Gd ₂ SiO ₅ :Ce)	10,000	43 fall 14.4 rise	232	965 ps (lab) [37]	9%	1.5
LSO (Lu ₂ SiO ₅ :Ce)	25,000	37	676	225 ps (lab) [18] 1.2 ns (PET) [38]	10%	1.2
LuAP (LuAlO ₃ :Ce)	5,800 2,500 1,200 9,500 total	11 28 835	524 104 1 629 total	360 ps (lab) [39]	8%	1.1
LaCl ₃ :Ce	50,000	20	2500	(218 ps)	3%	2.9
LaBr ₃ :5%Ce	60,000	15	4000	260 ps (lab) [40] 315 ps (PET) [2,3]	3%	2.2
LaBr ₃ :10%Ce	56,000	16	3500	(103 ps)	3%	2.2
LaBr ₃ :20%Ce	55,000	17	3235	(94 ps)	3%	2.2
LaBr ₃ :30%Ce	55,000	18	3056	(69 ps)	3%	2.2
CeBr ₃	68,000	17	4000	(129 ps)	3%	2.2
LuI ₃ :Ce	100,000	23	4348	(125 ps)	4%	1.8