

Review of PET Physics

Timothy Turkington, Ph.D. Radiology and Medical Physics Duke University Durham, North Carolina, USA





Chart of Nuclides

	Half	life											_						-			_						-
	Stabl	.e						22Si	23Si	24Si	25Si	26Si	27Si	28Si	29Si	∞Si	зıSi	32Si	₃₃Si	34Si	35Si	36Si	37Si	38Si	39Si	40Si	⁴¹Si	42Si
	Very short > 100,000 yr						21Å]	22Å]	23Å]	24Å]	25AJ	26Å]	27A]	28A]	29A]	зөді	31A]	32A]	ззд]	34AJ	з5А]	36Å]	37A]	заўј	39A]	40Al		
	> 10 > 100	yr day:	s				19Mg	20Mg	21Mg	22Mg	23Mg	24Mg	25Mg	26Mg	27Mg	28Mg	29Mg	зøМg	зıМg	32Mg	ззМg	34Mg	35Mg	зеМд	37Mg			
	$\rangle 10$	days				17Na	18Na	19Na	²⁰ Na	²¹ Na	²² Na	²³ Na	²⁴ Na	25Na	26Na	27Na	²⁸ Na	29Na	30Na	³¹ Na	³² Na	₃₃Na	34Na	35Na				
)10)1h	ay r			15Ne	16[\Je	17Ne	¹®Ne	¹9Ne	20 <mark>N</mark> e	²¹ Ne	²² Ne	²³ Ne	²⁴Ne	²⁵ Ne	²⁶ Ne	27Ne	²⁸ Ne	²⁹ \/e	³⁰ Ne	³¹ Ne	³² Ne			I			
_) 1 m	in.	in.			15F	16F	17F	18F	19F	20F	21F	22F	23F	24F	25F	26F	27F	28F	29F								
Z	(prc	oton	s)	12()	13()	14()	150	16()	17()	18()	19()	20()	21()	22()	23()	24()	25()	26()										
			10[]	11[]	12N	13M	14[]	15N	16N	17N	18[\]	19[]	20[\]	21N	22N	23N	24[\]											
		8C	۶C	10C	110	120	130	14C	15C	16C	17C	180	19C	200	21	22C												
		7B	≈B	۶B	10B	ыB	12B	ıзB	14B	15B	16B	17B	18B	19B														
		6Be	7Be	8Be	°Be	10Be	11Be	12Be	¹³ Be	¹⁴Be																		
	⁴Li	₅Li	۴Li	7Li	°Li	۶Li	™Li	¹¹Li																				
	зНе	⁴He	₅He	€He	7He	°He	۶Не	¹⁰He																				
۱H	²Н	зH	⁴H	₅H	۶H																							
	1n																											

N (number of neutrons) \rightarrow

Nuclear Data Evaluation Lab.

Korea Atomic Energy Research Institute

Positron Decay

$${}^{A}_{Z}X_{N} \rightarrow {}^{A}_{Z-1}Y_{N+1} + e^{+} + \upsilon$$

Nuclidehalf-lifeC-1120.3 minN-1310 minO-15124 secF-18110 minRb-8275 sec

e.g., ${}^{18}F \rightarrow {}^{18}O + e^+ + v$

Positron Annihilation



Linear attenuation values for lead and water

<u>Material (Eγ)</u>	μ (cm ⁻¹)_	HVT (cm)	TVT (cm)
lead (140 keV)	22.7	0.031	0.10
lead (511 keV)	1.7	0.41	1.35
water (140 keV)	0.15	4.6	15.4
water (511 keV)	0.096	7.2	24.0

Coincidence Event



Projections



Acquisition and Reconstruction



Data Acquisition

Sinogram (raw data) **Reconstructed Image**

PET Background Events

- Scatter
- Randoms

Scattered Coincidence Event

In-Plane

Out-of-Plane

<u>Scatter Fraction S/(S+T)</u> With septa ~10-20% w/o septa ~30-80%

Random Coincidence Event



Correcting Background; Noise Equivalent Counts

$$P_{prompts} = T_{trues} + S_{scatter} + R_{randoms}$$

$$T' = P - S' - R' \quad (Estimation of true events by subtracting S and R estimates)$$

$$\langle T' \rangle = \langle P \rangle + \langle S' \rangle + \langle R' \rangle = P + \begin{vmatrix} 0 \\ R \end{vmatrix} \ge P \ge T \qquad (Variance propagation and Poisson properties. 0) \\ vs. R depends on randoms correction method.)$$

$$SNR \equiv \frac{T'}{\sqrt{\langle T' \rangle}} \approx \frac{T}{\sqrt{P + \begin{vmatrix} 0 \\ R \end{vmatrix}}; NEC = \frac{T^2}{P + \begin{vmatrix} 0 \\ R \end{vmatrix}} = \frac{T'}{P + \begin{vmatrix} 0 \\ R \end{vmatrix}$$

S and R refer to scattered and random events on LORs that subtend the imaged object.

More background \rightarrow *more statistical image noise.*

NEC Examples

$$NEC = \frac{T}{\left(1 + S/T + R/T\right)}$$

Prompts	Trues	Scatter	SF	NEC	
100	100	0	0	100	
200	100	100	0.5	50	
400	200	200	0.5	100	

Image Noise and Lesion Detection





OS-EM



600s300s150s75s38s19s10s

Multiple Rings, 2D – 3D

For *n* detector rings:



Time Of Flight PET: The influence of background



<u>How strong is source A?</u> Detectors measure counts $C_A + C_B$. S.D. of measurement is $\sqrt{C_A + C_B}$ SNR = $C_A / \sqrt{C_A + C_B}$

The influence ofeven more backgroundABCDEF

D2

SNR of measurement of A?

D1

 $SNR = C_A / \sqrt{C_A + C_B + C_C + C_D + L}$

If all N sources are equal,

 $SNR = C_A / \sqrt{NC_A}$



Can distinguish between counts originating in segment T_1 and counts originating in segment T_2 .

If all N sources are equal,

 $SNR = C_A / \sqrt{nC_A}$

where *n* is the number of sources within zone T_1 .

SNR improvement of sqrt(N/n); similar to counting longer by N/n.

Time-of-Flight PET





Fillable, Tapering Phantom with 1 cm lesions





240 s

Clinical Example 2 non-TOF TOF



68 kg male

Attenuated Event



Coincidence Attenuation



$$P_{C} = P_{1}P_{2}$$
$$= e^{-\mu \cdot d_{1}}e^{-\mu \cdot d_{2}}$$
$$= e^{-\mu \cdot (d_{1} + d_{2})}$$

Annihilation radiation emitted along a particular line of response has the same attenuation probability, regardless of where it originated on the line.

Attenuation losses - PET and SPECT

Events surviving attenuation in cylinder



cylinder radius (cm)

Fraction Emitted from cylinder

Obese Patient



Technologist Size Variations



 $m_b \sim 2.5 m_a$

AC

NAC

x-ray CT

Attenuation Effects







Calculated Attenuation Correction



 $I = I_0 e^{-\mu d}$

Transmission Attenuation Measurement



Using CT image for AC



Attenuation Correction Accuracy

- CT-based attenuation correction is performed on almost all PET studies.
- Is it being done well?

. . .

- Is the CT accurate (e.g., water = 0)?
- Is the CT accurate under all relevant conditions?
- Is the translation between CT# and 511 keV µ appropriate?
- Patient motion between CT and PET?

Attenuation Correction



Photons emitted along this line will be attenuated by a factor that can be determined from the corresponding CT scan.

Attenuation Correction



The biggest source of error in PET AC is patient motion between the CT and the PET scans. This particular PET photon

trajectory will be undercorrected. The intensity on this side of the body will be artificially low.

Spatial Resolution

$$R_{sys} = \sqrt{R_{det}^2 + R_{acol}^2 + R_{range}^2 + b^2}$$

 R_{det} = resolution of detectors ($\leq d$) R_{acol} = resolution from photon acollinearity (=0.0022D) R_{range} = resolution from positron range b = block effect

Depth of Interaction Uncertainty



- Uncertainty in the origin of radiation when measured obliquely in a detector.
- Resolution in radial direction worsens with increasing radius.
- High stopping power helps: Interactions more likely in front of detector
- Some high resolution systems sacrifice sensitivity by shortening detectors (to mitigate DOI effects.)
- Some systems (HRRT) use two layers of detectors to lessen effect. Others propose a measurement of the DOI.

Block Detector (GE, Siemens)





Photomultiplier(s)

Scintillation Crystals
PET Ring with Block Detectors



Curved Plate Pixelated Camera (Philips)



Image Reconstruction

Image Reconstruction Methods



Detection Process

$$m_i = b_i + \sum_{j=1}^{npix} p_{ij} \lambda_j$$

i = projection line (line of response) j = source pixel $\lambda_j = \text{radioactivity at voxel } j$ $p_{ij} = \text{probability of emission from } j$ being measure in i $b_i = \text{background contributing to } i$ $m_i = \text{expected counts on projection } i$



Extended Distribution Example





Maximum Likelihood Expectation Maximization (ML-EM)



$$m_i = b_i + \sum_{j=1}^{npix} p_{ij} \lambda_j$$

 $\lambda_j^{(n)}$ is the estimated activity in voxel *j* at iteration *n*.

Extended Distribution Example













10

What is **p**?

$$m_i = b_i + \sum_{j=1}^{npix} p_{ij} \lambda_j$$

Increasing levels of complexity:

- 1) **p** is 1's and 0's very sparse
- 2) **p** is fractional values, depending on how column intersects with voxel still pretty sparse
- 3) **p** includes attenuation (lower values) still pretty sparse
- 4) **p** includes resolution effects (collimator blurring, etc) somewhat sparse
- 5) **p** includes background not sparse at all



Compensations/Corrections

Putting physical effects into **p** allows the reconstruction to compensate for those effects.

For example, including attenuation in the model leads to attenuation correction in the final image. Putting system blurring (imperfect spatial resolution) can improve the final image resolution (and/or noise).

ML-EM Characteristics

- Not Fast
- Non-negative pixel values can lead to biases
- Noise is greatest in areas of high activity
- Can compensate for physical effects
- Allows image reconstruction from limited projections.

Ordered Subsets Expectation Maximization (OS-EM)

Hudson HM, Larkin RS . IEEE Trans Med Imag 13:601-609, 1994.

$$\lambda_{j}^{(n+1)} = \frac{1}{\substack{nbin\\\sum}_{i=1}^{nbin}} \sum_{i=1}^{nbin} \frac{p_{ij}\lambda_{j}^{(n)}}{b_{i} + \sum_{k=1}^{nvox}p_{ik}\lambda_{k}^{(n)}} m_{i}$$

Instead of processing all projection for each image update, projections are divided into subsets, and the image is updated after processing each subset.

OS-EM 10 subsets



Results – 4:1 Hot Spheres



Regularized Reon (Q.Clear)

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{k \in N_{j}} w_{j} w_{k} \frac{(x_{j} - x_{k})^{2}}{(x_{j} - x_{k}) + \gamma |x_{j} - x_{k}|}$$

Regularized Recon ("Q.Clear")



Image Quantitation

What is Image Quantitation?

- Generally Deriving numbers from images
- Volume measurement
- Motion measurements (e.g., ejection fraction)
- Distributions of radiotracers, and, under the right circumstances, the underlying physiological processes.

What Factors Affect Quantitation of Radionuclide Distributions?

- Successful calibration of scanning system (counts/s to activity)
- Accurate corrections for
 - attenuation
 - scatter
 - randoms
 - dead time (the bigger the effect, the more accurate the correction must be)
- Quantitative reconstruction algorithm
- Resolution effects (degradation of small structures)
- ROI (Region Of Interest) Analysis

Standardized Uptake Value (SUV)

 The SUV radioactivity concentration (what the scanner measures) normalized to injected dose and body mass:

$$SUV = \frac{radioactivity \ concentration}{injected \ dose/body \ mass}$$

- This can also be thought of as the local concentration divided by the body mean concentration
- Dimensions are mass/volume (e.g. g/ml). Since this is the body (mostly water; 1ml=1g), it is *almost* dimensionless.
- This is sometimes referred to as a semi-quantitative measure (compared to kinetic modeling.)

Sphere Size vs. Spatial Resolution

Sphere diameters:

"Full Recovery": When at least some pixels in a region retain full intensity

"Recovery coefficient": Ratio between measured and actual values (due to resolution effects only) $RC \le 1$

Sphere diameter \geq 3X FWHM resolution \rightarrow full recovery (for 3D blurring) (Not so bad if non-spherical, or non-3D blurring



"1", 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 pixels

3D Sensitivity vs. axial FOV



Sens \propto (FOV)²

GE Discovery IQ



Solid State Photodetectors

Avalanche Photodiodes

- Compact, work in B field
- Siemens PET/MR
- SSPM, SiPM, etc.
 - Compact, work in B field, excellent timing
 - GE PET/MR, Philips PET/CT (Vereos)

Image Quality vs. Size



Patient Size

NEMA NU-2 Performance Tests

- Spatial Resolution
- Sensitivity
- Count Rate and Scatter Fraction
- Image Quality

PET Performance - Sensitivity



Five Concentric 70 cm long aluminum tubes surrounding source

Scanner Axis



Why long line source? Whole body sensitivity.

Sensitivity - 3D, r=0





Results generated from scan with NU2-2001 3D Sens RO sleeve 5

Scatter Fraction and Count Rate



Scatter Fraction

- S/(S+T) --- low is good
- reflects energy resolution and geometry
- Method:
 - Axial low-intensity line source in phantom
 - Mask out LORs not subtending phantom
 - Line source makes sinusoid in each slice's sinogram
 - Pixels off the sinusoid measure background (scatter and random)
 - At very low rates, no randoms.



Spatial Resolution

- Small (< 1 mm) point sources placed in several locations within FOV
- Scan, reconstruct with very small (< 1/10 expected FWHM) pixels.
- Measure FWHM of resulting profiles in all three directions

Generally, pixels should be 1/3 the expected FWHM or smaller, for any NM application. Combination of recon FOV and image matrix.



Results for 1 cm source

Trans FWHM:	5.11617 (mm)
Trans FWTM:	10.0089 (mm)
Axial FWHM:	5.03312 (mm)
Axial FWTM:	10.7149 (mm)

Results for 10 cm source

Radial FWHM:	5.91931 (mm)
Radial FWTM:	12.9862 (mm)
Tang. FWHM:	6.72302 (mm)
Tang. FWTM:	32.1492 (mm)
Axial FWHM:	5.99356 (mm)
Axial FWTM:	11.4418 (mm)

Which count-based PET metric is the best predictor of image quality?

- 0% 1. Total counts (prompts)
- ^{19%} 2. True counts
- 0% 3. Random counts
- 71% 4. Noise-equivalent counts (NEC)
- **5.** Scatter fraction

Which count-based PET metric is the best predictor of image quality?

4. Noise-equivalent counts (NEC)

Cherry, Sorenson, and Phelps "Physics in Nuclear Medicine"

Why is photon attenuation a large effect in PET (compared to SPECT)?

1. There's no way to correct it.

- ^{81%} 2. Both photons must be detected.
- ^{5%} 3. The photon energy is high.
- ^{0%} 4. The photon energy is low.
- **5**. Timing resolution is imperfect.

Why is photon attenuation a large effect in PET (compared to SPECT)??

2. Both photons must be detected

Cherry, Sorenson, and Phelps "Physics in Nuclear Medicine"
What factor is essential to localizing the PET annihilation locations?

14%	1. The 511 keV γ energy.
0%	2. The F-18 half-life.
64%	3. The anti-parallel γ paths.
18%	 The scanner sensitivity.
5%	5. The electron mass.

What factor is essential to localizing the PET annihilation locations?

3. The anti-parallel γ paths

Cherry, Sorenson, and Phelps "Physics in Nuclear Medicine"

What effect does increasing iterations in ML-EM image reconstruction have?

- ^{0%} 1. Increased patient comfort.
- 0% 2. Less CPU time.
- 5% 3. Lower resolution.
- 76% 4. Increased noise.
- 19% **5.** Shorter scan time.

What effect does increasing iterations in ML-EM image reconstruction have?

4. Increased noise.

Cherry, Sorenson, and Phelps "Physics in Nuclear Medicine"

Which of the following is directly measured in current NEMA NU-2 PET tests?

- 82% 1. Spatial resolution.
- ^{14%} 2. Timing resolution.
- 0% 3. Energy resolution.
- ^{5%} 4. PET-CT alignment accuracy.
- 5. Image reconstruction speed.

Which of the following is directly measured in current NEMA NU-2 PET tests?

1. Spatial Resolution.

"Performance Measurements of Positron Emission Tomographs (PETs)", NEMA-NU2 2012, National Electrical Manufacturer's Association Thank you.