Published in final edited form as:

Phys Med Biol. 2015 September 21; 60(18): 7359–7385. doi:10.1088/0031-9155/60/18/7359.

Singular value decomposition for photon-processing nuclear imaging systems and applications for reconstruction and computing null functions

Abhinav K. Jha¹, Harrison H. Barrett^{2,3}, Eric C. Frey¹, Eric Clarkson^{2,3}, Luca Caucci², and Matthew A. Kupinski^{2,3}

¹Division of Medical Imaging Physics, Department of Radiology, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA

²Center for Gamma Ray Imaging, Department of Medical Imaging, University of Arizona, Tucson AZ, USA

³College of Optical Sciences, University of Arizona, Tucson AZ, USA

Abstract

Recent advances in technology are enabling a new class of nuclear imaging systems consisting of detectors that use real-time maximum-likelihood (ML) methods to estimate the interaction position, deposited energy, and other attributes of each photon-interaction event and store these attributes in a list format. This class of systems, which we refer to as photon-processing (PP) nuclear imaging systems, can be described by a fundamentally different mathematical imaging operator that allows processing of the continuous-valued photon attributes on a per-photon basis. Unlike conventional photon-counting (PC) systems that bin the data into images, PP systems do not have any binning-related information loss. Mathematically, while PC systems have an infinite-dimensional null space due to dimensionality considerations, PP systems do not necessarily suffer from this issue. Therefore, PP systems have the potential to provide improved performance in comparison to PC systems. To study these advantages, in this paper, we propose a framework to perform the singular-value decomposition (SVD) of the PP imaging operator. We use this framework to perform the SVD of operators that describe a general two-dimensional (2D) planar linear shift-invariant (LSIV) PP system and a hypothetical continuously rotating 2D single-photon emission computed tomography (SPECT) PP system. We then discuss two applications of the SVD framework. The first application is to decompose the object being imaged by the PP imaging system into measurement and null components. We compare these components to the measurement and null components obtained with PC systems. In the process, we also present a procedure to compute the null functions for a PC system. The second application is designing analytical reconstruction algorithms for PP systems. The proposed analytical method exploits the fact that PP systems acquire data in a continuous domain to estimate a continuous object function. The approach is parallelizable and implemented for graphics processing units (GPUs). Further, this approach leverages another important advantage of PP systems, namely the possibility to perform photon-by-photon real-time reconstruction. We demonstrate the application of the approach to perform reconstruction in a simulated 2D SPECT system. The results help to validate and demonstrate the utility of the proposed method and show that PP systems can help overcome the aliasing artifacts that are otherwise intrinsically present in PC systems.

Keywords

Singular-value decomposition; Photon-processing systems; Null functions; Analytic reconstruction; SPECT; List-mode acquisition

1. Introduction

In X-ray and gamma-ray imaging systems, the interaction of a photon with the detector can be described by multiple parameters. For example, consider a single-photon emission computed tomography (SPECT) system that consists of modular scintillation cameras where each camera has a monolithic scintillator and an array of photo-multiplier tubes (PMTs). In this system, for each detected gamma-ray photon, we could use the PMT outputs to estimate the three-dimensional (3-D) coordinates of the position of interaction of the gamma-ray photon within the scintillator and the energy deposited at the interaction site. We could also estimate other information such as some measure of the shape of the region over which the energy is deposited, and parameters related to secondary site interactions. Finally, we could also record the time at which the interaction occurred. We refer to the parameters that describe the interaction event as the attributes (or attribute vector) of the detected photon. One method of storing the photon attributes is to discretize the attribute space into multiple bins, and count and store the number of interaction events for which the attribute lies in the given bin. This leads to a binned image, also referred to as the projection or sinogram image in nuclear imaging systems, which is basically a multi-dimensional histogram of the number of selected events for which the attribute vector lies within a certain range. We refer to systems that store data in this binned image format as photon-counting (PC) systems. Imaging systems that consist of pixellated detectors and output the number of photons that are incident on each pixel also belong to the same category. These PC systems are described by a continuous-to-discrete (CD) operator [1–6]. In PC systems, the precise value of the attribute of each photon is lost due to the binning operation. For example, a photon-interaction event that deposits an energy of 124.3 keV at the interaction site could just be assigned to the energy window corresponding to energy values between, for example, 80–130 keV. This causes a loss in information about this photon attribute value, and two very different photons are treated similarly. Often in PC systems, many of the photon attributes are ignored, since storing them in the binned format requires considerable storage, and processing all these attributes using the PC system operator is complicated. Also, often many photon-interaction events are discarded in the PC systems, such as those where the deposited energy lies below a certain value. Finally, there is a potential for information loss in the process of estimating the attributes.

These sources of information loss are avoided by another class of systems where, for each photon-interaction event, the measured sensor outputs are used to estimate the photon attributes using a real-time maximum-likelihood (ML) technique [7–9]. As we will describe in Sec. 2, it is important that the photon attributes are estimated using an ML technique to minimize the information loss in the estimation process. We then assume that all the attributes are stored at full precision in a list format. Thus, the data are defined over a continuous domain and there is no binning-related information loss. We refer to the stored

data as list-mode (LM) data, although it must be noted that our use of the term list-mode goes beyond conventional usage, primarily because of storing multiple photon attributes, the ML estimation of these attributes and their storage at high precision. For example, conventionally, the list entry contains a simple pixel or centroid estimate for the position of interaction of the photon with the detector [4,7,10]. Finally, we process the stored photon attributes on a per-photon basis. We refer to these systems as photon-processing (PP) systems. Several such systems have been developed for nuclear imaging applications [11–20].

The concept of PP systems, as opposed to PC systems, enables us to define an entirely new and fundamentally different mathematical model of imaging. This mathematical model for a nuclear imaging system is characterized by a linear continuous-to-continuous (CC) LM operator that maps from the space of object functions defined on a continuous domain to the space of LM data functions defined on another continuous domain. Further, this model allows extracting information from the individual continuous-valued photon attributes that have been estimated using an ML technique. An important mathematical difference between the PP and PC systems operators is that the latter maps from an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space to a finite-dimensional Euclidean space, and thus has an infinite-dimensional null space due to dimensionality considerations. Consequently, there is an infinite set of object components that cannot be measured by PC systems [21]. The PP system operator does not necessarily suffer from this issue, as we will elaborate in Sec. 3.1. Consequently, PP systems could provide improved performance in diagnostic and quantitative imaging tasks.

Investigating and quantifying the potential advantages that could be offered by PP systems requires the development of mathematical tools. An excellent tool for analyzing a linear imaging system, such as the PP nuclear imaging system, is singular value decomposition (SVD). SVD can be used to compute the null functions of a linear imaging systems, and thus characterize the object features that are not measured [21]. Similarly, SVD can be used to design algorithms to reconstruct the object function [1,22]. SVD can also be applied to assess image quality in terms of estimation tasks [23]. Further, there is ongoing research on using the singular vectors as channels for mathematical observer models [24]. In addition, SVD can also be used to investigate the noise properties in imaging systems [25]. While SVD of tomographic systems has been a topic of active research [1,26–29], the SVD of the PP system operator has not been previously derived. In this paper, our primary objective is to derive the SVD of the system operator for PP nuclear imaging systems.

We also present the use of the derived SVD for two applications. The first application is to compute the null functions for PP systems and subsequently compare the null functions of PP and PC systems given an object function. Current methods to compute null functions for nuclear imaging systems approximate the system with a discrete-discrete (DD) operator [27, 30]. This assumption leads to an inaccuracy in modeling the system and thus can lead to inaccurate and incomplete representation of the null functions. For example, the current methods compute a finite-dimensional null vector as opposed to a continuous null function. We exploit the CC nature of the LM operator to obtain continuous null functions, instead of finite-dimensional null vectors, for the PP system. The comparison of the null functions of PP and PC systems presents insights into the information loss that occurs due to the null

space that is enforced by dimensionality considerations in PC systems. To perform this comparison appropriately, we designed an approach to obtain continuous null functions with PC systems.

The second presented application of the SVD framework is to design analytic reconstruction algorithms for PP systems. Analytic algorithms can leverage the true potential of PP systems due to their two inherent advantages: the ability to process data defined over a continuous domain to reconstruct continuous object functions and perform photon-by-photon reconstruction. While this is the first investigation to design algorithms for reconstructing object functions from PP systems, previously, methods have been developed to use LM data to reconstruct a discrete object vector [31–37]. However, these methods implicitly assume that the object is voxelized. Since real objects are functions defined on a continuous domain, assumptions that restrict the object to a discrete vector lead to information loss, as we will detail in Sec. 3.2. The analytic algorithm we derive overcomes these issues. Further, the algorithm offers several other advantages as discussed in Sec. 6.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. 2, the LM operator for a nuclear imaging system is defined and the framework for deriving the SVD of this operator is presented. The SVDs for 2D planar and 2D SPECT PP systems are derived. In Sec. 3, we describe two applications of the proposed SVD framework: computing the null functions and designing analytic reconstruction methods. In Sec. 4, we describe the methodology to simulate the PP system for the experiments and an implementation of the reconstruction algorithm on graphics processing units (GPUs). In Sec. 5.1, we present and compare the measurement and null functions obtained with PP and PC systems for different phantom types, including a Shepp-Logan phantom. In Sec. 5.2, the results with the reconstruction algorithm are presented and compared with reconstruction results obtained from PC systems. Finally, in Sec. 6, we summarize the important conclusions of the paper and discuss the results.

2. SVD of PP systems

2.1. The PP system operator

Consider a PP nuclear imaging system imaging a radiotracer distribution. We will denote this radiotracer distribution by the scalar-valued function $f(\mathbf{r})$ where $\mathbf{r}$ is a vector with p components lying in $\mathbb{R}^p$ (usually $p = 2$ or 3). We assume that the function lies in the Hilbert space $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathbb{R}^p)$. This object is viewed over a measurement time τ by the imaging system, which detects the gamma-ray photons emitted by the object using a scintillation camera. In this analysis, we consider only scintillation cameras, but the theory developed here applies equally well to nuclear imaging systems with semiconductor detectors that use ML methods to estimate the photon attributes [18–20]. For each detected photon, the photon attributes, such as the position of interaction of the photon with the detector and the energy deposited in the interaction event, are estimated using an ML technique. Let q denote the number of attributes estimated for each interaction event. For the j^{th} event, the q attributes are grouped into a q -dimensional (q -D) vector, which we denote by $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_j$. Let the number of detected events be denoted by J . The attributes $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_j$ are statistically dependent and the number of events J is a Poisson-distributed random variable. Thus, the LM data consist of the set $\{\hat{\mathbf{A}}_j, j = 1, 2 \dots J\}$

and the random variable J itself. The data can be described as a Poisson point process in attribute space $u(\hat{\mathbf{A}})$ [1,38–41] given by

$$u(\hat{\mathbf{A}}) = \sum_{j=1}^J \delta(\hat{\mathbf{A}} - \hat{\mathbf{A}}_j), \quad (1)$$

where $\delta(\dots)$ denotes the q -D Dirac delta function. For the given object and a fixed acquisition time, taking the mean of the point process over J and $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_j$ gives [39]

$$\bar{u}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}|\mathbf{f}) = \int_{\mathbb{S}_f} d^p r \tau \text{pr}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}|\mathbf{r}) s(\mathbf{r}) f(\mathbf{r}), \quad (2)$$

where $\text{pr}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}|\mathbf{r})$ is the probability distribution function (PDF) for an event that originates with an emission at point $\mathbf{r}$, $s(\mathbf{r})$ is the probability that an event that originated at point $\mathbf{r}$ in the object space will be detected and included in the list of events, and $\mathbb{S}_f$ denotes the support of the functions in object space. Further, let $\mathbb{S}_u$ denote the support of the functions in the LM data space. We assume that $\mathbb{S}_f \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\mathbb{S}_u \subset \mathbb{R}^q$. Since the PP systems have finite object and data support, we also assume that the support sets are both compact sets, which therefore have finite p -dimensional and q -dimensional volume, respectively. Eq. (2) can be written in operator form as

$$\bar{u}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}|\mathbf{f}) = [\mathcal{L}\mathbf{f}](\hat{\mathbf{A}}), \quad (3)$$

where $\mathcal{L}$ denotes the linear LM imaging operator [38]. Note that $\mathcal{L}$ is a linear operator even though the ML estimation step is non-linear. The kernel for the $\mathcal{L}$ operator is given by

$$l(\hat{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{r}) = \tau \text{pr}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}|\mathbf{r}) s(\mathbf{r}). \quad (4)$$

We now investigate whether the $\mathcal{L}$ operator is compact. The importance of compactness will become evident in Sec. 2.2 when we propose the SVD framework. We note that $\mathcal{L}$ is an integral operator that maps from the Hilbert space $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathbb{S}_f)$ to $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathbb{S}_u)$, where both $\mathbb{S}_f$ and $\mathbb{S}_u$ are compact sets. According to the Hilbert-Schmidt condition, the operator will be compact if the kernel satisfies the following condition:

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}_u} d^q \hat{\mathbf{A}} \int_{\mathbb{S}_f} d^p r |l(\hat{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{r})|^2 < \infty \quad (5)$$

Thus, if $l(\hat{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{r}) = \tau s(\mathbf{r}) \text{pr}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}|\mathbf{r})$ satisfies this condition, the $\mathcal{L}$ operator is compact. One case where this condition will be satisfied is if $l(\hat{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{r})$ is bounded [42].

The kernel of the $\mathcal{L}$ operator can be rewritten by marginalizing Eq. (2) over the true attribute vector $\mathbf{A}$ as

$$l(\hat{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{r}) = \tau \int_{s_u} d^q A \text{pr}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}|\mathbf{A}) \text{pr}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{r}) s(\mathbf{r}). \quad (6)$$

Since the function $s(\mathbf{r})$ is the probability that an event that originated at point $\mathbf{r}$ in the object space is detected and included in the list of events, $s(\mathbf{r}) = 1$ for all $\mathbf{r}$.

The attribute vector $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ is estimated optimally using an ML estimation technique. The ML estimator is efficient, i.e. it is unbiased and attains the Cramér-Rao lower bound (CRLB), if an efficient estimator exists. Further, ML estimates are asymptotically efficient and consistent under most conditions [1]. This asymptotic limit is closely approached in scintillation cameras because for each detected gamma-ray photon, a large number of optical photons are emitted and used to estimate the photon attributes [7,43]. Moreover, in this asymptotic limit, the ML estimates have a multivariate normal distribution with mean equal to the true attribute value, and the covariance matrix of the estimates is the inverse of the Fisher information matrix $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A})$ for estimating $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ from the PMT signals, i.e.

$$\text{pr}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}|\mathbf{A}) = \frac{\sqrt{|\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A})|}}{[2\pi]^{q/2}} \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} (\hat{\mathbf{A}} - \mathbf{A})^\dagger \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A}) (\hat{\mathbf{A}} - \mathbf{A}) \right], \quad (7)$$

where $|\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A})|$ denotes the determinant of the Fisher information matrix.

2.2. General framework for SVD of PP system operator

Let $\mathcal{L}^\dagger$ denote the adjoint (backprojection operator) of the LM imaging operator $\mathcal{L}$. A convenient way to derive the SVD of the $\mathcal{L}$ operator is to start by solving the eigenvalue equations for $\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{L}$ or $\mathcal{L} \mathcal{L}^\dagger$ operators [1]. Since the $\mathcal{L}$ operator is compact, the eigenvalue equation for $\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{L}$ is given by

$$[\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{L} \mathbf{w}_n](\mathbf{r}) = \mu_n \mathbf{w}_n(\mathbf{r}), \quad n=1, \dots, \infty \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbf{w}_n(\mathbf{r})$ and μ_n denotes the eigenfunctions and eigenvalues of the $\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{L}$ operator and n denotes the index for these eigenfunctions or eigenvalues [1]. In this paper, we often denote vectors by boldface type. Further, we consider functions to be associated with vectors in the Hilbert space. For example, $\mathbf{w}_n(\mathbf{r})$ is considered to be associated with $\mathbf{w}_n$. The operator $\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{L}$ maps from $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathbb{S}_p)$ to $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathbb{S}_p)$. Further, $\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{L}$ is a Hermitian and nonnegative-definite operator, so that the eigenvalues μ_n are real and nonnegative [1].

The eigenvalues for the $\mathcal{L} \mathcal{L}^\dagger$ operator are the same as for the $\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{L}$ operator. The eigenvalue equation for $\mathcal{L} \mathcal{L}^\dagger$ is given by

$$[\mathcal{L} \mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathbf{v}_n](\hat{\mathbf{A}}) = \mu_n \mathbf{v}_n(\hat{\mathbf{A}}), \quad n=1, \dots, \infty, \quad (9)$$

where $\mathbf{v}_n(\hat{\mathbf{A}})$ denotes the eigenfunctions of the $\mathcal{L} \mathcal{L}^\dagger$ operator. These eigenfunctions can also be obtained from $\mathbf{w}_n$ using the equation

$$v_n(\hat{\mathbf{A}}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_n}} [\mathcal{L} \mathbf{w}_n](\hat{\mathbf{A}}), \quad (10)$$

provided $\mathbf{w}_n$ is not a null vector. Having obtained these eigenvalues and eigenvectors, the singular values, object-space singular functions and data-space singular functions for the $\mathcal{L}$ operator are simply given by $\sqrt{\mu_n}$, $\mathbf{w}_n$ and $\mathbf{v}_n$, respectively. The SVD representation of the $\mathcal{L}$ operator, as defined by its action on a function such as $f(\mathbf{r})$, is given by

$$[\mathcal{L} f](\hat{\mathbf{A}}) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{\mu_n} (\mathbf{w}_n, \mathbf{f}) \mathbf{v}_n, \quad (11)$$

where $(\mathbf{w}_n, \mathbf{f})$ denotes the scalar product of the vectors $\mathbf{w}_n$ and $\mathbf{f}$, and is defined as

$$(\mathbf{w}_n, \mathbf{f}) = \int_{\mathbb{S}_f} d^q r \mathbf{w}_n^*(\mathbf{r}) f(\mathbf{r}). \quad (12)$$

where $\mathbf{w}_n^*(\mathbf{r})$ denotes the complex conjugate of $\mathbf{w}_n(\mathbf{r})$.

In the examples in this paper, to derive the SVD of the $\mathcal{L}$ operator, we will perform the eigenanalysis of the $\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{L}$ operator. Using Eq. (4) and the definition of the adjoint [1], we can show that the expression for the $\mathcal{L}^\dagger$ operator is given by

$$[\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathbf{u}](\mathbf{r}) = \tau \int_{\mathbb{S}_u} d^q \hat{\mathbf{A}} \text{pr}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}|\mathbf{r}) s(\mathbf{r}) \overline{u}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}). \quad (13)$$

With Eqs. (4) and (13), the expression for the $\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{L}$ operator is given by

$$[\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{L} f](\mathbf{r}') = \tau^2 \int_{\mathbb{S}_u} d^q \hat{\mathbf{A}} \int_{\mathbb{S}_f} d^p r s(\mathbf{r}) s(\mathbf{r}') \text{pr}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}|\mathbf{r}') \text{pr}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}|\mathbf{r}) f(\mathbf{r}). \quad (14)$$

The kernel for $\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{L}$ operator, which we denote by $k(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r})$, is given by

$$k(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}) = \tau^2 \int_{\mathbb{S}_u} d^q \hat{\mathbf{A}} s(\mathbf{r}) s(\mathbf{r}') \text{pr}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}|\mathbf{r}) \text{pr}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}|\mathbf{r}'). \quad (15)$$

We thus have a general framework that we can apply to specific PP imaging systems to perform their SVD.

The framework proposed in this section has been developed for realistic PP systems, and thus it is assumed that the systems have finite object and data support. However, in the specific analytical examples that we next consider, the systems will be assumed to have infinite object and data support. This assumption is made mainly for mathematical convenience. Making this assumption requires considering an analogous version of this general framework for a class of non-compact operators.

The applications of the SVD framework presented in this paper will require deriving the pseudoinverse of the $\mathcal{L}$ operator. This pseudoinverse, which we denote by $\mathcal{L}^+$, can be determined from the singular values and the singular vectors of the $\mathcal{L}$ operator [1]. The action of the $\mathcal{L}^+$ operator on a function in the data space, such as $(\hat{\mathbf{A}})$, is given by

$$[\mathcal{L}^+ \bar{\mathbf{u}}](\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_n}} (\mathbf{v}_n, \bar{\mathbf{u}}) \mathbf{w}_n, \quad (16)$$

2.3. A 2-D planar LSIV PP system

Let us consider a planar 2-D LSIV PP imaging system that images a 2-D object, $f(\mathbf{r})$, using a planar 2-D detector. This system approximates a planar nuclear imaging system that images a planar gamma-ray source using a fine-bore parallel-hole collimator onto a scintillation camera. The camera uses a PMT array to sense the scintillation light, where the output of the PMT array is used to estimate the 2D position of interaction of the gamma-ray photon with the scintillator using a ML technique. Further, it is assumed that the resolution blur introduced due to the collimator is negligible compared to the estimation blur. Finally, since this is a LSIV system, it has infinite object and data support.

In this planar system, the photon attributes are the x and y coordinates of the detected event. Let us denote the true and estimated values of these attributes by the 2-D vectors $\mathbf{R}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{R}}$, respectively. The LM data can be described by the point process $u(\mathbf{R})$:

$$u(\hat{\mathbf{R}}) = \sum_{j=1}^J \delta(\hat{\mathbf{R}} - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_j). \quad (17)$$

The model for this planar LSIV system is given by

$$\bar{\mathbf{u}}(\hat{\mathbf{R}}) = \int_{\infty} d^2r f(\mathbf{r}) l(\hat{\mathbf{R}}, r) = [\mathcal{L} f](\hat{\mathbf{R}}). \quad (18)$$

where the subscript ∞ on the integral sign denotes an integral over the infinite object support. To derive the expression for the $\mathcal{L}$ operator, in accordance with Eq. (4), we must determine the expression for $\text{pr}(\mathbf{R}|\hat{\mathbf{r}})$. Since the system is LSIV, the normalized point spread function (PSF) of the imaging system, $h(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{r})$ can be written as $h(\mathbf{R} - \mathbf{r})$, so that

$$\text{pr}(\mathbf{R}|\mathbf{r}) = h(\mathbf{R} - \mathbf{r}). \quad (19)$$

We also assume that $s(\mathbf{r})$ is equal to unity for all $\mathbf{r}$ and that a large number of photons were used to estimate the attributes. Then, using Eq. (7) and further, assuming that the Fisher information matrix corresponding to the estimate of $\hat{\mathbf{R}}$ is independent of $\mathbf{R}$, we can write

$$\text{pr}(\hat{\mathbf{R}}|\mathbf{R}) = \frac{\sqrt{|F|}}{2\pi} \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} (\hat{\mathbf{R}} - \mathbf{R})^\dagger F (\hat{\mathbf{R}} - \mathbf{R}) \right]. \quad (20)$$

We denote $\text{pr}(\mathbf{R}|\hat{\mathbf{R}})$ by $\gamma(\hat{\mathbf{R}} - \mathbf{R})$, where this simplified expression recognizes the fact that $\text{pr}(\mathbf{R}|\hat{\mathbf{R}})$ is a function of $\hat{\mathbf{R}} - \mathbf{R}$. Substituting the expressions from Eqs. (19) and (20) in the equation analogous to Eq. (6) for this system, we get

$$\begin{aligned} l(\hat{\mathbf{R}}, \mathbf{r}) &= \tau \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d^2 R h(\mathbf{R} - \mathbf{r}) \gamma(\hat{\mathbf{R}} - \mathbf{R}) \\ &= \tau \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d^2 R' h(\mathbf{R}') \gamma(\hat{\mathbf{R}} - \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}'), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where in the second step, we have performed a change of variables by replacing $\mathbf{R} - \mathbf{r}$ by $\mathbf{R}'$. We recognize that, given the infinite object support, this is a convolution operation, so we can write

$$l(\hat{\mathbf{R}}, \mathbf{r}) = \tau [h * \gamma](\hat{\mathbf{R}} - \mathbf{r}), \quad (22)$$

where $[f * g](x)$ denotes the convolution of functions $f(x)$ and $g(x)$. Since the kernel for the $\mathcal{L}$ operator is a function of $\hat{\mathbf{R}} - \mathbf{r}$, $\mathcal{L}$ resembles a convolution operator. This operator is not compact since the Hilbert-Schmidt condition is not satisfied with convolution operators. Thus the eigenvalues of the $\mathcal{L}$ operator form a continuous spectrum. The eigenvalue equation for this operator can be written as

$$\mathcal{L} \phi_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} = \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \phi_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}, \quad (23)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ denotes a continuous 2-D index. However, even though the $\mathcal{L}$ operator is not compact, since it is a convolution operator, Fourier theory provides a convenient way to perform the SVD of this operator. It can be shown that the eigenfunctions of $\mathcal{L}$ are the complex exponentials [1]

$$\phi_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}(\mathbf{r}) = \exp(2\pi i \boldsymbol{\rho} \cdot \mathbf{r}). \quad (24)$$

We can show that the corresponding eigenvalues are given by the Fourier transform of the kernel of the $\mathcal{L}$ operator, i.e.

$$\lambda_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} = [\mathcal{F}_2 l](\boldsymbol{\rho}) = \tau H(\boldsymbol{\rho}) \Gamma(\boldsymbol{\rho}), \quad (25)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_2$ denotes the 2-D Fourier transform operator, so that $\mathcal{F}_2\{h(\mathbf{r})\} = H(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ and $\mathcal{F}_2\{\gamma(\mathbf{r})\} = \Gamma(\boldsymbol{\rho})$. In the second step, we substitute the expression for $l(\hat{\mathbf{R}}, \mathbf{r})$ from Eq.(22) and then invoke the convolution theorem. By taking the Fourier transform of the function $\gamma(\mathbf{r})$ (Eq. (20)), we can show that the expression for $\Gamma(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ is given by [1]

$$\Gamma(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = \exp(-2\pi^2 \boldsymbol{\rho}^\dagger \mathbf{F}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\rho}), \quad (26)$$

where $\mathbf{F}$ is a 2×2 matrix. Since $\mathcal{L}$ is a convolution operator, its adjoint is also a convolution operation, with a kernel given by $l^*(\mathbf{r}, \hat{\mathbf{R}})$, where $*$ denotes the complex conjugate. We can easily show that [1]

$$\mathcal{L}^\dagger \phi_\rho = \lambda_\rho^* \phi_\rho. \quad (27)$$

Using Eqs. (23) and (27), we obtain

$$[\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{L} \phi_\rho](\mathbf{r}) = |\lambda_\rho|^2 \phi_\rho(\mathbf{r}). \quad (28)$$

Thus, the eigenfunctions and eigenvalues of $\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{L}$ are the complex exponentials $\phi_\rho(\mathbf{r})$ and $|\lambda_\rho|^2$, respectively. By analogy to Eq. (8), the object-space singular functions, which we denote by $w_\rho(\mathbf{r})$, are equal to $\phi_\rho(\mathbf{r})$, so that

$$w_\rho(\mathbf{r}) = \exp(2\pi i \boldsymbol{\rho} \cdot \mathbf{r}), \quad (29)$$

and the corresponding singular values for these singular functions are

$$\sqrt{\mu_\rho} = |\lambda_\rho| = \tau |H(\boldsymbol{\rho})| \Gamma(\boldsymbol{\rho}). \quad (30)$$

Inserting the expressions from Eq. (29) and (30) into Eq. (10), we obtain the expression for the singular functions in image space as

$$v_\rho(\hat{\mathbf{R}}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_\rho}} [\mathcal{L} w_\rho](\hat{\mathbf{R}}) = \frac{H(\boldsymbol{\rho})}{|H(\boldsymbol{\rho})|} \exp(2\pi i \boldsymbol{\rho} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{R}}). \quad (31)$$

Thus, using Eqs. (29)–(31), we obtain the singular values and singular functions for this imaging system. To derive the pseudoinverse for this operator, we substitute the expressions from Eqs. (29)–(31) in **the continuous analog of** Eq. (16). This yields

$$[\mathcal{L}^+ \bar{\mathbf{u}}](\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_\infty d^2 \rho \frac{1}{H(\boldsymbol{\rho})} \exp(2\pi^2 \boldsymbol{\rho}^\dagger \mathbf{F}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\rho}) \exp\{2\pi i \boldsymbol{\rho} \cdot (\mathbf{r} - \hat{\mathbf{R}})\} \bar{\mathbf{u}}(\hat{\mathbf{R}}), \quad (32)$$

where we have inserted the expression for $\Gamma(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ from Eq. (26). Note that Eqs. (31) and (32) are only applicable for ρ values where $H(\rho) \neq 0$. An easy way to overcome this limitation is by replacing $H(\rho)$ by $H(\rho) + \varepsilon$, where ε is a very small number.

2.4. A 2D tomographic PP imaging system

Consider a continuously rotating 2-D SPECT imaging system with an infinite object support where the object and photon propagation is in the x - y plane, as shown in Fig. 1. The SPECT

imaging system consists of a parallel-hole collimator with holes on a regular grid, followed by a 1-D detector. The system continuously rotates about the z axis over an angular range of π radians, acquiring data at angles θ , where θ denotes the angle that the detector makes with the x -axis. We assume that the parallel-hole collimator accepts photons only normal to the detector surface. Also, we ignore attenuation and scatter in this analysis. Finally, it is also assumed that both the object and data support are infinite. For each LM event, the coordinate of the position of interaction of the gamma-ray photon with the scintillation crystal is estimated and recorded. We denote the estimated position of interaction by $\hat{p}$, and its corresponding true value by p . The angular orientation of the detector, θ , is also recorded. Thus, the j^{th} attribute vector for this system is given by $\hat{A}_j = (p_j, \hat{\theta}_j)$, and the LM process corresponding to the data acquired by this system is given by

$$u(\hat{p}, \theta) = \sum_{j=1}^J \delta(\hat{p} - \hat{p}_j) \delta(\theta - \theta_j). \quad (33)$$

The mathematical description for this imaging system is given by

$$\bar{u}(\hat{p}, \theta) = \int_{\infty} d^2 r f(\mathbf{r}) l(\hat{p}, \theta, \mathbf{r}) = \mathcal{L} \mathbf{f}. \quad (34)$$

To derive the expression for the $\mathcal{L}$ operator for this system, in accordance with Eq. (4), we have to determine the expression for $\text{pr}(p, \hat{\theta} | \mathbf{r})$. Using marginal probabilities, we can write $\text{pr}(p, \hat{\theta} | \mathbf{r})$ as

$$\text{pr}(\hat{p}, \theta | \mathbf{r}) = \text{pr}(\theta | \mathbf{r}) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dp \text{pr}(\hat{p} | p, \theta, \mathbf{r}) \text{pr}(p | \theta, \mathbf{r}). \quad (35)$$

The probability of the position of interaction p given a particular value of the detector angle θ and object location $\mathbf{r}$ is simply the delta function $\delta(p - \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\hat{\theta}})$, where $\mathbf{n}_{\hat{\theta}}$ is the unit vector parallel to the detector face when the detector is aligned at the angle θ . Thus

$$\text{pr}(p | \theta, \mathbf{r}) = \delta(p - \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\hat{\theta}}). \quad (36)$$

The attribute p is estimated with an ML approach using a large number of scintillation photons. Thus, using Eq. (7), and denoting the CRLB on the estimate of p by σ_p^2 , we can write

$$\text{pr}(\hat{p} | p, \theta, \mathbf{r}) = \text{pr}(\hat{p} | p) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_p} \exp \left[-\frac{(\hat{p} - p)^2}{2\sigma_p^2} \right]. \quad (37)$$

Further, due to the isotropic emission of photons, the angle of emission of photons is a uniformly distributed random variable. Since the detector rotates with uniform angular velocity over a range of π radians, when a photon is detected, the recorded angular

orientation of the detector θ will also be uniformly distributed between 0 and π radians. Thus,

$$\text{pr}(\theta|\mathbf{r}) = \text{pr}(\theta) = \frac{1}{\pi} 1_{[0,\pi]}(\theta). \quad (38)$$

where $1_{[\alpha,\beta]}(\theta)$ denotes the indicator function, and is defined as follows:

$$1_{[\alpha,\beta]}(\theta) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \alpha \leq \theta \leq \beta. \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (39)$$

Under the assumption that $s(\mathbf{r})$ is unity for all values of $\mathbf{r}$, using Eqs. (4), (35)–(38), we can show that the kernel of the LM operator $\mathcal{L}$ is given by

$$l(\hat{p}, \theta, \mathbf{r}) = \frac{\tau}{\pi} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_p} \exp \left[-\frac{(\hat{p} - \mathbf{r} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_\theta)^2}{2\sigma_p^2} \right] 1_{[0,\pi]}(\theta). \quad (40)$$

Therefore, using Eq. (15), we can show that the kernel $k(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r})$ for the $\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{L}$ operator is given by

$$k(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}) = \left[\frac{\tau}{\pi} \right]^2 \frac{1}{2\pi\sigma_p^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\hat{p} \int_0^\pi d\theta \exp \left[-\frac{(\hat{p} - \mathbf{r}' \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_\theta)^2}{2\sigma_p^2} - \frac{(\hat{p} - \mathbf{r} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_\theta)^2}{2\sigma_p^2} \right]. \quad (41)$$

We perform a change of variables by replacing $\hat{p} - \mathbf{r} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_\theta$ by q . Simplifying further, we obtain

$$k(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}) = \left[\frac{\tau}{\pi} \right]^2 \frac{1}{2\pi\sigma_p^2} \int_0^\pi d\theta \exp \left[-\frac{\{-(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_\theta\}^2}{4\sigma_p^2} \right] \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dq \exp \left[-\frac{\left\{ q - \frac{-(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_\theta}{2} \right\}^2}{\sigma_p^2} \right]. \quad (42)$$

Evaluating the integral over q yields

$$k(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}) = \left[\frac{\tau}{\pi} \right]^2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_p} \int_0^\pi d\theta \exp \left[-\frac{\{-(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_\theta\}^2}{4\sigma_p^2} \right]. \quad (43)$$

We see that $k(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r})$, which is the kernel of the $\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{L}$ operator, is a function of $\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'$, so that we can define $k(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') = k(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$. Thus, with the system having an infinite object and data support, $\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{L}$ resembles a convolution operator and the eigenanalysis of this operator can be performed via Fourier analysis. The eigenfunctions of $\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{L}$ are the complex exponentials given by

$$w_{\rho}(\mathbf{r}) = \exp(2\pi i \boldsymbol{\rho} \cdot \mathbf{r}). \quad (44)$$

The corresponding eigenvalues for these eigenfunctions are determined by computing the Fourier transform of the convolution kernel of the $\mathcal{L}^{\dagger}\mathcal{L}$ operator (Eq. (43)). Denoting the Fourier transform of $k(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ at frequency $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ by $K(\boldsymbol{\rho})$, we obtain

$$K(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = \left[\frac{\tau}{\pi} \right]^2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_p} \int_0^{\pi} d\theta \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d^2\mathbf{r} \exp \left[\frac{-(\mathbf{r} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_{\theta})^2}{4\sigma_p^2} \right] \exp(-2\pi i \boldsymbol{\rho} \cdot \mathbf{r}). \quad (45)$$

Let the unit vector perpendicular to $\mathbf{n}_{\hat{\theta}}$ be denoted by $\mathbf{n}_{\perp, \theta}$ as shown in Fig. 1. Expressing the vectors $\mathbf{r}$ and $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ in terms of the basis vectors $\mathbf{n}_{\hat{\theta}}$ and $\mathbf{n}_{\perp, \theta}$ as $\mathbf{r} = r_1(\theta)\mathbf{n}_{\hat{\theta}} + r_2(\theta)\mathbf{n}_{\perp, \theta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\rho} = \rho_1(\theta)\mathbf{n}_{\hat{\theta}} + \rho_2(\theta)\mathbf{n}_{\perp, \theta}$ respectively, we can rewrite the above equation as

$$\begin{aligned} K(\boldsymbol{\rho}) &= \left[\frac{\tau}{\pi} \right]^2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_p} \times \int_0^{\pi} d\theta \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dr_1(\theta) \exp \left[-\frac{r_1^2(\theta)}{4\sigma_p^2} \right] \exp[-2\pi i \rho_1(\theta)r_1(\theta)] \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dr_2(\theta) \exp(-2\pi i \rho_2(\theta)r_2(\theta)) \\ &= \left[\frac{\tau}{\pi} \right]^2 \int_0^{\pi} d\theta \exp(-4\pi^2 \sigma_p^2 \rho_1^2(\theta)) \delta(\rho_2(\theta)). \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

To evaluate the integral over θ , we first express the vector $\boldsymbol{\rho}(\mathbf{r})$ in terms of its polar coordinates as $(|\boldsymbol{\rho}|, \phi_{\rho})$. The angle between $\mathbf{n}_{\hat{\theta}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ is thus $\theta - \phi_{\rho}$, so that

$$\rho_1(\theta) = |\boldsymbol{\rho}| \cos(\theta - \phi_{\rho}), \quad (47a)$$

$$\rho_2(\theta) = |\boldsymbol{\rho}| \sin(\theta - \phi_{\rho}). \quad (47b)$$

We note that the argument of the delta function $\delta[\rho_2(\theta)]$ in Eq. (46) is itself another function. Consider a function $\delta[g(x)]$, where $g(x)$ is a function that vanishes at $x = x_n$, $n = 1, 2, \dots, N$. This function can be written as [1]

$$\delta[g(x)] = \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{\delta(x - x_n)}{|g'(x_n)|}, \quad (48)$$

where $g'(x_n)$ denotes the derivative of the function $g(x)$ evaluated at $x = x_n$. From Eq. (47b), we see that the function $\rho_2(\theta)$ vanishes when $\theta = \phi_{\rho}$, i.e. when $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ is parallel to $\mathbf{n}_{\hat{\theta}}$. Thus, using the identity in Eq. (48), $\delta[\rho_2(\theta)]$ can be written as

$$\delta[\rho_2(\theta)] = \delta[|\boldsymbol{\rho}| \sin(\theta - \phi_{\rho})] = \frac{\delta(\theta - \phi_{\rho})}{|\boldsymbol{\rho}|} \quad (49)$$

Substituting this expression and the expression for $\rho_1(\theta)$ from Eq. (47a) in Eq. (46), we obtain

$$K(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = \left[\frac{\pi}{\rho}\right]^2 \int_0^\pi d\theta \exp[-4\pi^2 \sigma_p^2 |\boldsymbol{\rho}|^2 \cos^2(\theta - \phi_\rho)] \frac{\delta(\theta - \phi_\rho)}{|\boldsymbol{\rho}|} \\ = \frac{1}{|\boldsymbol{\rho}|} \left[\frac{\pi}{\rho}\right]^2 \exp(-4\pi^2 \sigma_p^2 \rho^2) \quad (50)$$

where we have used the sifting property of the delta function. Also, we have defined ρ such that $\boldsymbol{\rho} = |\rho| \hat{\mathbf{n}}_\theta$ where the absolute value sign is needed if we allow ρ to be signed, so that $\rho = \pm|\boldsymbol{\rho}|$. Using Eq. (10), we can show that the singular vectors for the $\mathcal{L}$ operator in data space are given by

$$v_\rho(\hat{p}, \theta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{K(\boldsymbol{\rho})}} [\mathcal{L} \mathbf{w}_\rho](\hat{p}, \theta) \\ = \exp(2\pi^2 \sigma_p^2 \rho^2) \sqrt{|\rho|} \int_\infty d^2 \mathbf{r} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma_p} \exp\left[-\frac{(\hat{p} - \mathbf{r} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_\theta)^2}{2\sigma_p^2}\right] \exp(2\pi i \boldsymbol{\rho} \cdot \mathbf{r}), \quad (51)$$

where we have used Eqs. (34), (40), (44) and (50) to evaluate $[\mathcal{L} \mathbf{w}](p, \theta)$. Expressing the vectors $\mathbf{r}$ and $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ in terms of the basis vectors $\hat{\mathbf{n}}_\theta$ and $\hat{\mathbf{n}}_{\perp, \theta}$ as previously, and simplifying the resulting expression, we obtain

$$v_\rho(\hat{p}, \theta) = \sqrt{|\rho|} \exp(2\pi i \hat{p} \rho_1(\theta)) \exp[2\pi^2 \sigma_p^2 (\rho^2 - \rho_1^2(\theta))] \delta(\rho_2(\theta)). \quad (52)$$

We thus obtain the SVD of the $\mathcal{L}$ operator for this system. To compute the pseudoinverse, we substitute the expressions obtained in Eqs. (44), (50) and (52) in the continuous analog of Eq. (16). This yields

$$[\mathcal{L}^+ \bar{\mathbf{u}}](\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\pi}{\tau} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d^2 \rho \exp(2\pi i \boldsymbol{\rho} \cdot \mathbf{r}) |\rho| \exp[2\pi^2 \sigma_p^2 \{2\rho^2 - \rho_1^2(\theta)\}] \exp\{-2\pi i \hat{p} \rho_1(\theta)\} \delta(\rho_2(\theta)) \bar{u}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}) \\ = \frac{\pi}{\tau} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\rho_1(\theta) \exp\{2\pi i \rho_1(\theta) r_1(\theta)\} \exp(-2\pi i \hat{p} \rho_1(\theta)) \times \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\rho_2(\theta) |\rho| \exp[2\pi^2 \sigma_p^2 (2\rho^2 - \rho_1^2(\theta))] \delta(\rho_2(\theta)) \bar{u}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}) \quad (53) \\ = \frac{\pi}{\tau} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\rho |\rho| \exp[2\pi i \rho \{r_1(\theta) - \hat{p}\}] \exp(2\pi^2 \sigma_p^2 \rho^2) \bar{u}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}).$$

where in the third step, we have used the sifting property of the delta function and the fact that the function $\delta_2(\theta)$ vanishes when $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ is parallel to $\hat{\mathbf{n}}_\theta$

3. Applications of the SVD framework

3.1. Computing the null functions

Given a linear imaging system, such as the PC nuclear imaging system (characterized by the system operator $\mathcal{H}$), any object function $f(\mathbf{r})$ being imaged through this system can be decomposed into two orthogonal components, $f_{\text{meas}}(\mathbf{r})$ and $f_{\text{null}}(\mathbf{r})$, such that

$$f(\mathbf{r}) = f_{\text{meas}}(\mathbf{r}) + f_{\text{null}}(\mathbf{r}) \quad (54)$$

and

$$\mathcal{H} f_{\text{null}}(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{0}. \quad (55)$$

Thus, when an object $f(\mathbf{r})$ is imaged through a linear imaging system, the null component $f_{\text{null}}(\mathbf{r})$ is not imaged, and cannot be retrieved even from the noise-free data. Any object consisting of only these null components will be invisible to the system, and is termed a null function, invisible object, or ghost object of the imaging system [21]. Any real object function contains null components for most imaging systems. Thus the knowledge of the null functions can quantify the components of an object that cannot be intrinsically measured by the imaging system.

Consider a PC system that images an object $f(\mathbf{r})$ lying in an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space, where $\mathbf{r}$ is a vector with p components lying in $\mathbb{R}^p$. The PC system records the number of counts in a finite number of bins, say M , so that the acquired image $\mathbf{g}$ is an M -dimensional vector lying in the Euclidean vector space $\mathbb{E}^M$. The PC system operator $\mathcal{H}$ thus maps from the set of functions lying in the infinite-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathbb{R}^p)$ to the set of vectors lying in the finite-dimensional vector space $\mathbb{E}^M$. This mapping has an infinite-dimensional null space due to dimensionality considerations. Thus, there is an infinite set of null functions f_{null} , such that $\mathcal{H}f_{\text{null}} = 0$. Alternatively, there is an infinite set of object features that cannot be measured by the PC systems. The presence of these null functions could cause an infinite bias in a parameter estimated from the image data. For example, it is well known that the value inside a voxel, or any binary region of interest (ROI) that abruptly demarcates the signal from the background, is fundamentally not estimable using PC systems since such an ROI consists of high-frequency features, which almost always lie in the null space of PC systems [44].

In contrast, consider a PP system imaging the same object $f(\mathbf{r})$. The PP system estimates q attributes per detected photon, where these attributes lie in a continuous space. Thus, the PP system operator $\mathcal{L}$, as discussed in Sec. 2.1, maps from the set of functions $f(\mathbf{r})$ that lie in $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathbb{R}^p)$ to the set of functions that lie in $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathbb{R}^q)$. While this system could have a null space, if $q > p$, the null space is not demanded by dimensionality considerations. Thus it is possible that PP systems could potentially measure a larger set of object features and provide a platform to overcome several issues in estimability that are otherwise present in PC systems.

We can compute the null functions from the pseudoinverse of the imaging system operator. Considering an object $f(\mathbf{r})$ being measured by a PP system described by the system operator $\mathcal{L}$, the measured component of this object is given by [1]

$$f_{\text{meas}}(\mathbf{r}) = [\mathcal{L}^+ \bar{u}](\mathbf{r}). \quad (56)$$

Thus, using Eq. (54), the null component of this system is given by

$$f_{\text{null}}(\mathbf{r}) = f(\mathbf{r}) - f_{\text{meas}}(\mathbf{r}) \quad (57)$$

Using the expressions derived in Eqs. (32) and (53), we can obtain the null functions for the 2D planar and 2D SPECT PP imaging systems, respectively.

In this paper, we will compare the null functions for the 2D PP SPECT system and the corresponding PC system. The PC system bins the position of interaction and the angular orientation attribute into a certain number of bins. To ensure a fair comparison, we must estimate the continuous null functions for this PC system. For this purpose, we have derived a method to determine the discrete-continuous pseudoinverse of the PC system operator in the absence of the estimation blur. The procedure to compute the pseudoinverse is presented in the Appendix. The continuous null functions for PC systems are computed from the pseudoinverse using equations analogous to Eq. (56) and (57) for PC systems.

3.2. Designing an analytic reconstruction algorithm

While there has not been previous research on reconstruction with PP systems, there are quite a few methods available to reconstruct with LM data [31–37]. However, these methods assume that the object is a discrete vector, and, since objects are continuous functions, this can lead to information loss. For example, let us consider an object function $f(\mathbf{r})$ that lies in the infinite-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathbb{R}^p)$. The general form of a linear approximation to this object function in a discrete basis is given by

$$f_a(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{n=1}^N \alpha_n \psi_n(\mathbf{r}), \quad (58)$$

where the subscript a denotes approximate and $\{\psi_n(\mathbf{r}), n = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$ denote a convenient set of expansion functions. Thus, under this representation, the object is approximated by the vector $\mathbf{a} = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n\}$, which lies in the finite-dimensional Euclidean space $\mathbb{E}^N$. Existing reconstruction algorithms for LM data assume that the object is represented as this discrete vector $\mathbf{a}$, and estimate the elements of this vector. Thus, the solution obtained with these algorithms is an estimate of $\mathbf{a}$, which only provides an approximation to the object function $f(\mathbf{r})$. Further, parameters of the object estimated from the coefficients $\mathbf{a}$ can potentially be biased due to the null functions of the expansion functions ψ_n with respect to the imaging system [44].

These sources of information loss can be avoided by not making the assumption that the object is a discrete vector and estimating a continuous object function from the LM data. In this context, PP systems present us with the advantage that they yield data defined on a continuous domain. Thus an analytical technique could be designed that estimates a continuous object function from the continuous LM data by exploiting the CC formalism of the LM operator. One such possible technique is to apply the CC pseudoinverse of the LM operator on the noisy LM data, i.e.

$$\hat{f}(\mathbf{r}) = [\mathcal{L}^+ \mathbf{u}](\mathbf{r}). \quad (59)$$

This approach yields a minimum-norm least squares estimate of the continuous object function [1]. Note that since the LM operator relates the LM data to the continuous object function, this approach does not assume that the object is a discrete vector. In the noise-free case, it can be shown that $\hat{f}_{\text{free}}(\mathbf{r}) = [\mathcal{L}^+ \mathbf{u}](\mathbf{r})$. Since the $\mathcal{L}$ operator is linear, Eq. (59) will

lead to the noise-free solution in a mean sense, i.e. $\langle \hat{f}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_{u|f} = \hat{f}_{\text{free}}(\mathbf{r})$, where $\langle \dots \rangle$ denotes the mean of the quantity inside the parenthesis. Considering the 2D SPECT system as described in Sec. 2.4 and substituting the expression for the pseudoinverse for the LM operator for this system (Eq. (53)) in Eq. (59), an estimate for the object function $\hat{f}(\mathbf{r})$ is given by

$$\hat{f}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\pi}{\tau} \int_0^\pi d\theta \int_{-\infty}^\infty d\hat{p} \int_{-\infty}^\infty d\rho |\rho| \exp[2\pi i \rho(\mathbf{r} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_\theta - \hat{p})] \exp(2\pi^2 \sigma_p^2 \rho^2) u(\hat{p}, \theta), \quad (60)$$

where we have replaced $r_1(\theta)$ by $\mathbf{r} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_\theta$. Substituting the expression for $u(p, \theta)$ from Eq. (33), and using the sifting property of the delta function, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}(\mathbf{r}) &= \frac{\pi}{\tau} \sum_{j=1}^J \int_{-\infty}^\infty d\rho |\rho| \exp[2\pi i \rho(\mathbf{r} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_{\theta_j} - \hat{p}_j)] \exp(2\pi^2 \sigma_p^2 \rho^2) \\ &= \frac{\pi}{\tau} \sum_{j=1}^J [\mathcal{F}^{-1}\{|\rho| \exp(2\pi^2 \sigma_p^2 \rho^2)\}](\mathbf{r} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_{\theta_j} - \hat{p}_j), \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

where $\mathcal{F}^{-1}$ denotes the 1-D inverse Fourier transform operator. While the above expression does yield an estimate of the object function, the solution is very sensitive to noise. The noise components at the high frequency are amplified because the value of the reciprocal of the Gaussian function, i.e. $\exp(2\pi^2 \sigma_p^2 \rho^2)$, increases rapidly with frequency. To resolve this issue, we require a filter that can suppress the effect of noise at high frequencies; we use a Metz filter for this purpose [45]. The Fourier transform of the estimation blur, i.e. the Gaussian function, is the modulation transfer function (MTF) of the imaging system, i.e.

$$\text{MTF}(\rho) = \exp(-2\pi^2 \sigma_p^2 \rho^2). \quad (62)$$

The Metz filter is given by

$$M(\rho) = \frac{1}{\text{MTF}(\rho)} [1 - (1 - \text{MTF}(\rho)^2)^X]. \quad (63)$$

This filter is made up of two terms, the inverse of the MTF, and a low-pass filter that suppresses the effect of noise at high frequencies. The magnitude of X determines when the low-pass filter begins to dominate. The expression for the estimate of the object function after incorporating this filter is given by

$$\hat{f}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\pi}{\tau} \sum_{j=1}^J \mathcal{F}^{-1}\{|\rho| M(\rho)\}(\mathbf{r} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_{\theta_j} - \hat{p}_j). \quad (64)$$

Thus, the reconstruction is equivalent to filtering each LM event, shifting the filtered output by a value equal to the position of interaction of the LM event and back-projecting the result into object space at an angle given by the angular orientation at which the LM data was acquired. This algorithm is not guaranteed to yield positive values for $\hat{f}(\mathbf{r})$. Since the activity distribution is non-negative valued for all $\mathbf{r}$, we apply a positivity constraint on the estimated

object function. An analytical reconstruction algorithm is thus obtained for the 2D SPECT system. A similar analytic reconstruction algorithm can be derived for the 2D planar LSIV system.

4. Methods

In order to compute the null functions and study the performance of the proposed reconstruction method, we performed several experiments. In this section, we describe the methods to perform the experiments. For the experiments, we used the 2D SPECT system described in Sec. 2.4.

4.1. Simulating the PP system

4.1.1. Generating noise-free data—We had to generate both noise-free and noisy data from the PP and PC systems for the experiments. To obtain the noise-free data $(p, \hat{\theta})$ from the 2D PP SPECT system, in accordance with Eq. (3), we must apply the CC operator $\mathcal{L}$, whose kernel is given by Eq. (40), on an object function $f(\mathbf{r})$. An appropriate method to generate this noise-free data is to consider an object function that can be expressed analytically, and then use it to derive a mathematical expression for $(p, \hat{\theta})$. From Eq. (40), the analytic derivation of $(p, \hat{\theta})$ consists of two steps: (a) Take the Radon transform of the object, and (b) Convolve the computed Radon transform with a 1D Gaussian kernel of variance σ_p^2 to model the estimation blur. We chose the Shepp-Logan phantom [46] as the continuous object function, since it could be expressed analytically and we could mathematically derive an expression for the Radon transform for this object function. As mentioned previously, the derived pseudoinverse of the PC system operator did not account for the process of estimating the photon attributes. Thus, to ensure a fair comparison, we ignored the estimation blur in both the PP and PC systems.

Since the simulation was on a digital platform, we were restricted to calculate the value of $(p, \hat{\theta})$ only at a finite set of values for p and θ . We chose these values to be finely spaced, so that the computed values would replicate the data obtained over an almost continuous domain. In our experiments, the detector length and the angular range of the detector were 2 units and π radians, respectively. We evaluated the values of $(p, \hat{\theta})$ for 512 equally spaced values of both p and θ .

To investigate the null functions of PP and PC systems for an object function with many high frequency features, we also considered another object function that consisted of several horizontal and vertical edges. This object function, as presented in Fig. 3a, consisted of 2D rect functions of different sizes, and the difference of two 2D rect functions that resulted in a rectangular border with no activity in the interior. The Radon transform of the continuous version of this object was difficult to compute. Thus, this object was instead defined as a discrete vector over a very finely spaced grid. Note that due to the shape of this object, it could be represented accurately, without any approximations, in this grid. Next, the Radon transform was numerically computed for finely spaced values of p and θ . The rest of the procedure to obtain the noise-free data was the same as for the Shepp-Logan phantom.

4.1.2. Generating noisy data—To generate the noisy data from the PP system, we first determined the number of LM events by sampling a Poisson distribution with a mean given by the total activity in the object. The object function was again chosen to be the Shepp-Logan phantom. Since we ignored attenuation and scatter in this analysis, the probability of detection at each angle was constant. Thus, for the j^{th} LM event, the angular orientation of the detector θ_j was determined by sampling a uniform distribution of angle values between 0 and π radians. To determine the position of interaction p_j of this LM event, we used the Radon transform to analytically determine the projection data from the continuous object function at the projection angle θ_j . We treated this projection data as the probability density function (PDF) of p_j , and sampled this PDF to determine p_j . To perform this step numerically, the projection data were computed for 512 equally spaced values of the position of interaction, yielding a binned representation of the PDF of p_j , i.e. a histogram, of p_j . Then, using the inverse-transform sampling scheme [47], we sampled this histogram to determine the bin to which p_j would belong. Uniformly sampling a location within this bin yielded p_j . Note that p_j was a continuous random variable, and not binned in any way, even though we generated it on a computer. To account for estimation blur, we then sampled another Gaussian distribution with mean equal to the true position of interaction, and variance equal to the variance of the estimation blur. We thus obtained the estimated position of interaction $\hat{p}_j$ for the LM event. This yielded the noisy PP system data.

4.2. Implementation of the reconstruction algorithm

In this section, we describe the GPU-based implementation of the reconstruction algorithm derived in Sec. 3.2 for the 2D SPECT system. The proposed algorithm (Eq. (64)) estimates the continuous object function at any location. However, in our implementation, for display purposes, we evaluated the reconstructed object over a discrete pixel grid, where the size of the pixel could be arbitrarily small. We discretized the 2-D reconstructed object space into pixels. For the i^{th} pixel, we computed the value of $f(\mathbf{r})$ at the center of the pixel. Thus, denoting the center of the i^{th} pixel by the vector $\mathbf{r}_i$ and using Eq. (64), for each pixel we computed

$$\hat{f}(\mathbf{r}_i) = \frac{\pi}{\tau} \sum_{j=1}^J [\mathcal{F}^{-1}\{|\rho|M(\rho)\}(\mathbf{r}_i \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_{\theta_j} - \hat{p}_j)]. \quad (65)$$

This reconstruction scheme is parallelizable since we could evaluate the value of $\hat{f}(\mathbf{r}_i)$ independently for all the pixels. We developed reconstruction code that was executed on a 2.1 GHz Intel Xeon E5-2620 system containing one NVIDIA Tesla K40m GPU card. The software was developed in C, and we used the Compute Unified Device Architecture (CUDA) C programming language [48,49] to program the GPU hardware. The software first reads the input LM data and stores them in array format. The inverse Fourier transform of the function $|\rho|M(\rho)$ is next evaluated and stored in another array. Both these arrays are then transferred to the global memory of the GPU. We then invoke the CUDA kernels in parallel for each pixel, where in each CUDA kernel, the value of $f(\mathbf{r})$ at the center of the particular pixel is computed using Eq. (65). The computed output image is then transferred back to the

main memory of the system. Finally, we apply a positivity constraint by setting the activity values of all the image pixels that have negative activity values to zero.

The proposed reconstruction algorithm has one regularization parameter, the order of the Metz filter X . To determine a suitable value for this parameter, we visually analyzed the reconstruction results for several values of X . We observed that $X = 1.5$ yielded results with good visual image quality. On increasing the filter order, the resolution of the reconstructed images was lowered, while choosing a lower value of X made the reconstructions look noisy. Based on this empirical study, we chose the value of X to be 1.5.

4.3. Reconstruction approach for PC systems

The main objective of the experiments was to study the performance of the proposed reconstruction method for systems with finite object support, as is the case with real imaging systems. However, we also performed few comparisons of the reconstruction results obtained with PP systems that use the proposed reconstruction algorithm and PC systems that use an analogous reconstruction approach. The comparisons were meant to study whether PP systems can help overcome the artifacts that are introduced due to the binning of attributes in PC systems.

The considered PC system binned the position and angular orientation attributes of the PP system into 128 spatial and 16 projection bins, respectively. The reason for choosing a lower number of projection bins was to visually demonstrate the artifacts that arise due to binning in PC systems, and investigate if PP systems can help overcome these artifacts. For the PC system, we used the filtered back-projection (FBP) algorithm to reconstruct the object. The FBP algorithm was chosen since it is often used to reconstruct object vectors with PC systems. Further, it is similar, and in many ways analogous to the proposed reconstruction approach for PP systems, since both the approaches are non-iterative and designed for 2D SPECT systems with ideal parallel-hole collimators. The FBP method was implemented in conjunction with the Metz filter [45], where we chose the filter order to be 1.5, again based on empirical observations.

We note that neither the SVD-based reconstruction algorithm nor the FBP algorithm were optimized using objective evaluation methods. Further, in the experiments, we did not perform an objective evaluation study of these algorithms. The experiments are mainly to give the reader a subjective idea of the performance of the SVD-based algorithm for PP systems and visually compare it with an empirically optimized FBP algorithm for PC systems. Thus, from these experiments, we do not draw any definitive conclusions comparing the proposed SVD-based algorithm and the FBP algorithm.

5. Results

5.1. Null functions with PP and PC systems

The computed null functions for the Shepp-Logan phantom with the PP and PC systems using the approach mentioned in Sec. 3.1 are shown in Fig. 2. It is observed the PP system is able to measure a larger number of features in comparison to the PC system. For example,

the edges lie in the null space for the PC systems, but are present in the measurement space of the PP systems.

We also computed the null functions for the phantom presented in Fig. 3a for the PP and PC SPECT system. The results, as presented in Fig. 3, again show that the high-frequency features, i.e. the edges, lie in the null space of the PC systems but are measured by the PP systems. This observation is best demonstrated by the presence of the thin-edge rectangular ring in the measurement space of the PP system and null space of the PC system.

5.2. Performance of the reconstruction algorithm

5.2.1. Varying the number of LM events—We first studied the performance of the proposed reconstruction algorithm as a function of the number of LM events. We varied the number of LM events from 1 million to 100 million. The standard deviation of the blur in the position estimate, σ_p , was set to half of the width of the position bin in the PC system. The results from this experiment are presented in Fig. 4. It is observed that for a low number of LM events, the reconstructed images have noise artifacts. As the number of LM events increase, the artifacts decreased and the reconstructed images have good visual quality. It is also visually observed that the object reconstructed with PP systems measure more object features and have lesser aliasing artifacts compared to those reconstructed with PC systems for all the count levels. Thus, even in the presence of noise, PP systems offer improved performance compared to the considered PC system. To demonstrate this further, we also plotted the linear profile of the true object function and the images reconstructed using the PP and PC systems. The linear profiles show that images reconstructed from the PP systems have better resolution than those reconstructed from the PC system at all count levels. The reconstruction result with 100 million events especially helps to demonstrate that given a large number of events, excellent resolution can be achieved with PP systems. Further, this resolution could never be possible with PC systems due to their intrinsic limitation of an infinite-dimensional null space that would lead to aliasing artifacts.

5.2.2. Varying the standard deviation of the estimation blur—In the next experiment, the standard deviation of the estimation blur was varied from 0.1 to 2 times the size of the position bin in the analogous PC system. We fixed the number of LM events to 5 million. The results presented in Fig. 5 show that on increasing the standard deviation of the blur, the resolution of the reconstructed object function degrades for both the PP and PC systems. Visually, the proposed reconstruction algorithm for the PP system yields images with lesser artifacts compared to the FBP-based reconstruction algorithm for PC systems. The improved performance with the PP systems again shows that PP systems can help overcome the effects of angular aliasing even with noisy data.

6. Discussions and Conclusions

In this paper, we derived the SVD of the LM operator that describes PP nuclear imaging systems. We derived the SVD for two PP systems: a planar LSIV system, and a 2-D SPECT system. We then used this SVD to compute the null functions for PP nuclear imaging systems. We also derived a technique to compute the null functions for PC SPECT systems. We showed that for the Shepp-Logan phantom and a phantom consisting of several high-

frequency edges, the PP system had a smaller set of null functions in comparison to an analogous PC system.

We also designed an SVD-based reconstruction algorithm for PP systems and developed GPU-based code to implement this algorithm for the 2D PP SPECT imaging system. The algorithm was applied to reconstruct a continuous Shepp-Logan phantom object imaged by a simulated 2-D SPECT system with finite object support. The proposed algorithm reconstructed images with good visual quality for these systems. We also compared the reconstruction results to results obtained using an FBP-based reconstruction algorithm with PC systems. The results demonstrated that in conjunction with the SVD-based approach, PP systems provide a platform to overcome the effects arising due to binning in PC systems even with noisy data.

In a PP system, we can also reconstruct the object on an event-by-event basis as the data is being acquired [37]. The proposed reconstruction method can be easily implemented for this purpose. Motivated by this possibility, we have also developed another GPU-based implementation that processes LM data on an event-by-event basis. The execution time for this implementation is slightly longer, since the kernel is invoked for every LM event. For example, if the acquired data consists of about 10 million LM events and we reconstruct the object on a 128×128 pixel grid, processing all the LM events together using the first implementation takes about 11 seconds, but processing them on an event-by-event basis takes about 80 seconds. Thus, if we were to reconstruct the object using all the LM data at once, the implementation that processes all the events together is preferable. For applications that require real-time reconstruction, the event-by-event algorithm could be used.

In our analysis, we evaluated the SVD for a continuously rotating 2D SPECT system with infinite object support. We can also use the proposed techniques to derive the SVD of a 2D SPECT system that has infinite object support and acquires data at discrete angles [50]. However, the expression for the pseudoinverse computed using the SVD contains a mathematically undefined term. This could be because of the infinite object support, which leads to an infinite number of solutions for the reconstructed object. Limiting the analysis to an object with finite support might make the problem more tractable and we have made some initial investigations on this case [40, 50].

The proposed analytic reconstruction method has several other applications apart from those mentioned in the introduction. The method offers a way to compare information-retrieval algorithms without being affected by the limitations of simulation studies, such as discretization and numerical precision. It also offer insights on the information content and information-retrieval capacity from the PP system data, which can help improve the design of the imaging system and the algorithm. For example, if the interest is in estimating a certain parameter from the data, then instead of applying the estimation algorithm on the reconstructed discrete object, we could instead directly apply it on the analytical reconstructed continuous object, and obtain a more accurate expression for the estimator. Also, the method can also provide insights into data sufficiency and sampling conditions. Further, an iterative algorithms often require significantly greater computation compared to

one-step analytic methods. Thus, the proposed analytic algorithm could be especially useful when fast reconstructions are required, as in adaptive SPECT systems [16].

The theoretical formalism that we have proposed can be extended to account for blur arising due to finite spatial resolution of the detector. The effective blur in that case can be expressed as a convolution of the estimation and PSF-related blurs. If the blur arising due to the finite spatial resolution of the detector is another Gaussian kernel, then we can express the blur due to the finite spatial resolution and estimation statistics as another Gaussian function with a variance equal to the sum of the variances of the two individual blurs. Also, while the proposed technique is for PP systems that perform ML estimation of the attributes, the technique could be adapted for systems that do not use an ML estimation procedure, if we can determine the PDF of the estimated attributes. If we cannot determine the PDF, a useful approximation results by assuming that the estimated value of the attribute is the same as the true value. In this case $\text{pr}(\hat{A}|A)$ simply becomes a delta function, given by $\delta(\hat{A}-A)$, and all the above-derived formulas are valid in the limit of the variance of the estimated attribute tending to 0. There are many advantages to storing and processing data acquired in LM format even if the ML processing step is not involved, as described in Barrett et al. [41], and the proposed method provides an avenue to reconstruct the object functions directly from the LM data for such systems.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering of the National Institutes of Health under grant numbers R01-EB000803, P41-EB002035, R01-EB016231 and EB013558.

References

1. Barrett, HH.; Myers, KJ. Foundations of Image Science. Wiley; 2004.
2. Taguchi K, Iwanczyk JS. Vision 20/20: Single photon counting x-ray detectors in medical imaging. Med Phys. Oct.2013 40(10):100901. [PubMed: 24089889]
3. Madsen MT. Recent Advances in SPECT Imaging. J Nucl Med. 2007; 48(4):661–672. [PubMed: 17401106]
4. Peterson TE, Furenlid LR. SPECT detectors: the Anger Camera and beyond. Phys Med Biol. Sep; 2011 56(17):R145–182. [PubMed: 21828904]
5. Barrett HH, Myers KJ, Hoeschen C, Kupinski MA, Little MP. Task-based measures of image quality and their relation to radiation dose and patient risk. Phys Med Biol. 2015; 60(2):R1. [PubMed: 25564960]
6. Barrett HH, Myers KJ, Caucchi L. Radiance and photon noise: imaging in geometrical optics, physical optics, quantum optics, and radiology. Proc SPIE. 2014; 9193:919302–17.
7. Barrett HH, Hunter WC, Miller BW, Moore SK, Chen Y, Furenlid LR. Maximum-likelihood methods for processing signals from gamma-ray detectors. IEEE Trans Nucl Sci. Jun.2009 56(3): 725. [PubMed: 20107527]
8. Hesterman JY, Caucchi L, Kupinski MA, Barrett HH, Furenlid LR. Maximum-likelihood estimation with a contracting-grid search algorithm. IEEE Trans Nucl Sci. Jun; 2010 57(3):1077–84. [PubMed: 20824155]
9. Furenlid LR, Hesterman JY, Barrett HH. Real-time data acquisition and maximum-likelihood estimation for gamma cameras. IEEE NPSS Real Time Conf. Jun.2005
10. Anger HO. Scintillation camera. Rev Sci Instrum. 1958; 29:27–33.

11. Furenlid LR, Wilson DW, Chen YC, Kim H, Pietraski PJ, Crawford MJ, Barrett HH. FastSPECT II: A second-generation high-resolution dynamic SPECT imager. *IEEE Trans Nucl Sci.* Jun.2004 51:631–635. [PubMed: 20877439]
12. Miller BW, Gregory SJ, Fuller ES, Barrett HH, Barber HB, Furenlid LR. The iQID camera: An ionizing-radiation quantum imaging detector. *Nucl Inst Meth in Phys Res Sec A.* 2014; 767(0): 146–152.
13. Miller BW, Barrett HH, Furenlid LR, Barber HB, Hunter RJ. Recent advances in BazookaSPECT: Real-time data processing and the development of a gamma-ray microscope. *Nucl Instrum Meth Phys Res A.* Jun; 2008 591(1):272–275.
14. Miller BW, Barber HB, Furenlid LR, Moore SK, Barrett HH. Progress in BazookaSPECT. *Proc SPIE.* 2009; 7450
15. Miller BW, Furenlid LR, Moore SK, Barber HB, Nagarkar VV, Barrett HH. System integration of FastSPECT III, a dedicated SPECT rodent-brain imager based on BazookaSPECT detector technology. *IEEE Nuclear Science Symp Conf Rec.* Nov.2009 :4004–08.
16. Furenlid LR, Moore JW, Freed M, Kupinski MA, Clarkson E, Liu Z, Wilson DW, Woolfenden JM, Barrett HH. Adaptive small-animal SPECT/CT. *IEEE Intl Symp on Biomedical Imaging.* May.2008 :1407–1410.
17. Moore S, Barrett H, Furenlid L. ModPET - A compact PET system employing modular gamma cameras, maximum-likelihood event-parameter estimation, and list-mode ML-EM reconstruction. *J Nucl Med Meeting Abstracts.* 2012; 53:491.
18. Marks DG, Barber HB, Barrett HH, Tueller J, Woolfenden JM. Improving performance of a CdZnTe imaging array by mapping the detector with gamma rays. *Nucl Inst and Meth in Phys Res Sec A.* 1999; 428(1):102–112.
19. Eskin, J. PhD thesis. University of Arizona; Tucson, AZ, USA: 1997. Semiconductor gamma-ray imaging detectors for nuclear medicine.
20. Eskin, J.; Barrett, HH.; Barber, HB.; Marks, D. Signal-processing method for gamma-ray semiconductor sensor. Oct. 1998
21. Barrett HH, Aarsvold JN, Roney TJ. Null functions and eigenfunctions: tools for the analysis of imaging systems. *Prog Clin Biol Res.* 1991; 363:211–226. [PubMed: 1988975]
22. Gullberg GT, Zeng GL. A reconstruction algorithm using singular value decomposition of a discrete representation of the exponential radon transform using natural pixels. *IEEE Trans Nucl Sci.* Dec.1994 41:2812–2819.
23. Paxman RG, Barrett HH, Smith WE, Milster TD. Image reconstruction from coded data: II. Code design. *J Opt Soc Am A.* Apr; 1985 2(4):501–509. [PubMed: 3872931]
24. Park S, Witten JM, Myers KJ. Singular vectors of a linear imaging system as efficient channels for the Bayesian ideal observer. *IEEE Trans Med Imaging.* May; 2009 28(5):657–668. [PubMed: 19272990]
25. Kadrmas DJ, Frey EC, Tsui BM. An SVD investigation of modeling scatter in multiple energy windows for improved SPECT images. *IEEE Trans Nucl Sci.* Aug; 1996 43(3):2275–2284. [PubMed: 20186285]
26. Davison ME, Grunbaum FA. Tomographic reconstruction with arbitrary directions. *Comm Pure Appl Math.* 1981; 34(1):77–119.
27. Zeng GL, Gullberg GT. An SVD study of truncated transmission data in SPECT. *IEEE Trans Nucl Sci.* Feb; 1997 44(1):107–111.
28. Aarsvold JN, Barrett HH. Symmetries of single-slice multiple-pinhole tomographs. *IEEE Nucl Sci Symp Conf Rec.* Nov.1996 3:1673–1677.
29. Clarkson E, Palit R, Kupinski MA. SVD for imaging systems with discrete rotational symmetry. *Opt Express.* Nov; 2010 18(24):25306–25320. [PubMed: 21164879]
30. Wilson D, Barrett H. Decomposition of images and objects into measurement and null components. *Opt Express.* Mar; 1998 2(6):254–260. [PubMed: 19377608]
31. Bouwens L, Van de Walle R, Gifford H, King M, Lemahieu I, Dierckx RA. LMIRA: list-mode iterative reconstruction algorithm for SPECT. *IEEE Trans Nucl Sc.* Aug; 2001 48(4):1364–1370.
32. Parra L, Barrett HH. List-mode likelihood: EM algorithm and image quality estimation demonstrated on 2-D PET. *IEEE Trans Med Imaging.* Apr.1998 17:228–235. [PubMed: 9688154]

33. Reader AJ, Zaidi H. Advances in PET image reconstruction. *PET Clinics*. 2007; 2(2):173–190.
34. Defrise M, Casey ME, Michel C, Conti M. Fourier rebinning of time-of-flight PET data. *Phys Med Biol*. 2005; 50(12):2749. [PubMed: 15930600]
35. Khurd P, Gindi G. A globally convergent regularized ordered-subset EM algorithm for list-mode reconstruction. *IEEE Trans Nuc Sci*. 2004; 51:719–725.
36. Reader AJ, Ally S, Bakatselos F, Manavaki R, Walledge RJ, Jeavons AP, Julyan PJ, Sha Z, Hastings DL, Zweit J. One-pass list-mode EM algorithm for high-resolution 3-D PET image reconstruction into large arrays. *IEEE Trans Nuc Sci*. 2002; 49(3):693–699.
37. Schretter C. Event-by-event image reconstruction from list-mode PET data. *IEEE Trans Img Proc*. Jan; 2009 18(1):117–124.
38. Lehovich, A. PhD thesis. College of Optical Sciences, University of Arizona; Tucson, AZ, USA: 2005. List mode SPECT Reconstruction using Empirical Likelihood.
39. Caucci L, Barrett HH. Objective assessment of image quality. V. Photon-counting detectors and list-mode data. *J Opt Soc Am A*. Jun; 2012 29(6):1003–1016.
40. Jha, AK. PhD thesis. College of Optical Sciences, University of Arizona; Tucson, AZ, USA: 2013. Retrieving information from scattered photons in medical imaging.
41. Barrett HH, White T, Parra LC. List-mode likelihood. *J Opt Soc Am A*. Nov.1997 14:2914–2923.
42. Halmos, PR.; Sunder, VS. Bounded integral operators on L2 spaces. Springer-Verlag; 1978.
43. Caucci L, Hunter WC, Furenlid LR, Barrett HH. List-mode MLEM image reconstruction from 3D ML position estimates. *IEEE Nucl Sci Symp Conf Rec*. 2010:2643–2647.
44. Kupinski MK, Clarkson EW, Barrett HH. Scanning linear estimation: improvements over region of interest (ROI) methods. *Phys Med Biol*. Mar; 2013 58(5):1283–1301. [PubMed: 23384998]
45. King MA, Schwinger RB, Doherty PW, Penney BC. Two-dimensional filtering of SPECT images using the Metz and Wiener filters. *J Nucl Med*. Nov; 1984 25(11):1234–1240. [PubMed: 6333497]
46. Shepp LA, Logan BF. The Fourier reconstruction of a head section. *IEEE Trans Nucl Sci*. 1974; 21:21–43.
47. Papoulis, A.; Pillai, SU. Probability, Random Variables and Stochastic Processes. 4. Tata McGraw-Hill; 2002.
48. NVIDIA CUDA C programming guide, 2012. Version 4.2.
49. Jha AK, Kupinski MA, Barrett HH, Clarkson E, Hartman JH. Three-dimensional Neumann-series approach to model light transport in nonuniform media. *J Opt Soc Am A*. Sep; 2012 29(9):1885–1899.
50. Jha AK, Barrett HH, Clarkson E, Caucci L, Kupinski MA. Analytic methods for list-mode reconstruction. *Fully Three-Dimensional Image Reconstruction in Radiology and Nuclear Medicine*. 2013

Appendix

Consider the continuously rotating 2D SPECT system described in Sec. 2.4, which, following the data acquisition process, bins the position and angular coordinates into a finite number of bins. This system is described by a continuous-discrete (CD) operator, which we denote by $\mathcal{H}$. To find the pseudo-inverse of this operator, denoted by $\mathcal{H}^+$, we begin with the identity [1]

$$\mathcal{H}^+ = \mathcal{H}^\dagger [\mathcal{H} \mathcal{H}^\dagger]^\dagger. \quad (66)$$

If $f(\mathbf{r})$ were to denote the object, then the radiance measured at a distance p from the detector center when the detector is aligned at an angle θ , which we denote by $\chi(\theta, p)$, is given by the Radon transform of the function $f(\mathbf{r})$, i.e.

$$\chi(p, \theta) = [\mathcal{R}f](p, \theta) = \int_{\infty} f(\mathbf{r}) \delta(p - \mathbf{r} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_{\theta}), \quad (67)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{n}}_{\theta}$ denotes a unit vector parallel to the detector surface when the detector is aligned at the angle θ , and where $\mathcal{R}$ denotes the Radon operator. Let the $(m, k)^{\text{th}}$ measurement be obtained by binning the spatial and angular coordinates from $p_m - \Delta p$ to p_m and $\theta_k - \Delta\theta$ to θ_k , respectively. We denote this measurement by $g_{m,k}$, where m and k index the binned position and angular orientation, respectively. Denoting the binning operator by $\mathcal{D}$, the output of the tomographic system is given by

$$\begin{aligned} g_{m,k} &= [\mathcal{H}f]_{m,k} = [\mathcal{D}\mathcal{R}f]_{m,k} = \int_{\theta_k - \Delta\theta}^{\theta_k} d\theta \int_{p_m - \Delta p}^{p_m} dp \int_{\infty} d^2r f(\mathbf{r}) \delta(p - \mathbf{r} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_{\theta}) \\ &= \int_{\theta_k - \Delta\theta}^{\theta_k} d\theta \int_{\infty} dp \int_{\infty} d^2r f(\mathbf{r}) \delta(p - \mathbf{r} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_{\theta}) [u(p - p_m) - u(p - p_m + \Delta p)], \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

where $u(x)$ denotes the Heaviside step function. Further using the sifting property of the delta function,

$$g_{m,k} = \int_{\theta_k - \Delta\theta}^{\theta_k} d\theta \int_{\infty} d^2r f(\mathbf{r}) [u(\mathbf{r} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_{\theta} - p_m) - u(\mathbf{r} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_{\theta} - p_m + \Delta p)]. \quad (69)$$

To obtain an expression for the $\mathcal{H}$ operator, we write it as

$$\mathcal{H}^{\dagger} = \mathcal{R}^{\dagger} \mathcal{D}^{\dagger}, \quad (70)$$

where $\mathcal{R}^{\dagger}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}$ denote the adjoint of the Radon and binning operators, respectively. The adjoint of the Radon transform is given by

$$[\mathcal{R}^{\dagger}\chi](\mathbf{r}) = \int_0^{\pi} d\theta \chi(\mathbf{r} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_{\theta}, \theta). \quad (71)$$

Likewise, the adjoint of the binning operator is given by

$$[\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}g](p, \theta) = \sum_{m,k} [u(\theta - \theta_k) - u(\theta - \theta_k + \Delta\theta)] [u(p - p_m) - u(p - p_m + \Delta p)]. \quad (72)$$

Using Eqs. (70)–(72), we obtain

$$[\mathcal{H}^{\dagger}g](\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{m,k} \int_{\theta_k - \Delta\theta}^{\theta_k} d\theta \{u(\mathbf{r} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_{\theta} - p_m) - u(\mathbf{r} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_{\theta} - p_m + \Delta p)\} g_{mk}. \quad (73)$$

Thus, using Eqs. (69) and (73), we get the $\{(m, k), (m', k')\}$ element of $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}^{\dagger}$ to be

$$\begin{aligned}
& [\mathcal{H} \mathcal{H}^\dagger]_{(m,k),(m',k')} \\
&= \int_{\theta_{k'} - \Delta\theta}^{\theta_{k'}} d\theta' \int_{\theta_k - \Delta\theta}^{\theta_k} d\theta \int_{\infty} d^2r [u(\mathbf{r} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_{\theta'} - p_{m'}) - u(\mathbf{r} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_{\theta'} - p_{m'} + \Delta p)] \\
&\quad \times [u(\mathbf{r} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_{\theta} - p_m) - u(\mathbf{r} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_{\theta} - p_m + \Delta p)].
\end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

We assume that the system has a circular object support and evaluate the integral over $\mathbf{r}$ only within this object support. The integrand over $\mathbf{r}$ represents the intersection of two strips of width p each, which have one of their sides normal to the detector aligned at angle θ and θ' , respectively. Thus, when this intersection is completely within the object support, then denoting the width of the detector pixel by ε , the expression for the intersecting area is given by $\varepsilon^2/(\sin(\theta - \theta'))$ when $\theta \neq \theta'$. When $\theta = \theta'$, then if $m = m'$, then this area is approximately given by $2\varepsilon \sqrt{R^2 - p_m^2}$, and if $m \neq m'$, then the strips do not overlap. We evaluate the integral over θ and θ' numerically, and thus compute the elements of $\mathcal{H} \mathcal{H}^\dagger$. Since this matrix is square, we can find the inverse of this matrix. Further, using Eq. (73) in Eq. (66), we can obtain the discrete-continuous pseudoinverse of the $\mathcal{H}$ operator.

Figure 1. A schematic illustrating the various mathematical notations for the considered 2-D SPECT system.

Figure 2.

(a) The object function. The (b) measurement and (c) null component for this object with the PP system. The (d) measurement and (e) null components with the PC system.

Figure 3.

(a) The object function. The (b) measurement and (c) null components for this object for the PP system. The (d) measurement and (e) null component with the PC system.

Figure 4.

Reconstruction of the Shepp-Logan phantom using the proposed SVD-based reconstruction method for a PP SPECT system using (a) 1 million (b) 5 million and (c) 100 million counts. (d–f) The reconstruction with the PC system for the same number of counts. A comparison of the linear profile of the reconstructed images is shown in Figs. (g)–(i).

Figure 5. Reconstruction of the Shepp-Logan phantom using the proposed SVD-based reconstruction method for a PP SPECT system with an estimation blur of (a) 0.5 (b) 1 and (c) 2 times the size of the detector bin width of the PC system. (d–f) The reconstruction with the PC system using the FBP-based approach with similar settings.