

Medical image reconstruction: a brief overview of past milestones and future directions


Jeffrey A. Fessler

University of Michigan

March 7, 2024

At ICASSP 2017, I participated in a panel on “Open Problems in Signal Processing” led by Yonina Eldar and Alfred Hero. Afterwards the editors of the IEEE Signal Processing Magazine asked us to write a “perspectives” column on this topic. I prepared the text below but later found out that equations or citations are not the norm in such columns. Because I had already gone to the trouble to draft this version with citations, I decided to post it on arXiv in case it is useful for others.

Medical image reconstruction is the process of forming interpretable images from the raw data recorded by an imaging system. Image reconstruction is an important example of an inverse problem where one wants to determine the input to a system given the system output. The following diagram illustrates the data flow in an medical imaging system.



Until recently, there have been two primary methods for image reconstruction: analytical and iterative. Analytical methods for image reconstruction use idealized mathematical models for the imaging system. Classical examples are the filtered back-projection method for tomography [1–3] and the inverse Fourier transform used in magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) [4]. Typically these methods consider only the geometry and sampling properties of the imaging system, and ignore the details of the system physics and measurement noise. These reconstruction methods have been used extensively because they require modest computation. Despite the long history of such methods, interesting advances continue to made, particularly for incomplete data [5].

Over the past two decades, image reconstruction has evolved from exclusive use of analytical methods to wider use of iterative or model-based methods that account for the physics of the imaging system and the statistical properties of the measurement noise [6–10]. These properties are captured by a likelihood function $p(y|x)$ and accurate modeling requires thorough understanding of an imaging system. Usually the number of unknown voxel values in x is comparable to the number of measurements in y (or even fewer) so the problems are under-determined or poorly conditioned so maximum-likelihood (ML) methods would propagate excessive noise from the measurements into the reconstructed image \hat{x} . Using priors $p(x)$ or regularizers can overcome this limitation, so most iterative methods used for image reconstruction have been based on maximum a posteriori (MAP) estimation by seeking the maximizer of the posterior $p(x|y)$ or equivalently (by Bayes rule) the sum of the log likelihood and the log prior

$$\hat{x} = \arg \max_x \log p(y|x) + \log p(x). \quad (1)$$

This equation captures most of the research topics in image reconstruction: (i) modeling the system physics and statistics in the likelihood; (ii) developing signal models to serve as priors; (iii) developing faster optimization algorithms; and (iv) assessing the quality of the reconstructed image \hat{x} . The signal processing community has had a particularly important role in developing signal models. Numerous signal models have been explored for image reconstruction over the years, such as Markov random fields and wavelets. The optimization methods used in medical imaging also have much in common with methods used in machine learning and other large-scale problems.

The transition from analytical to iterative methods took place at widely different dates in different modalities. In PET and SPECT, a seminal paper on an expectation maximization (EM) algorithm in the early 1980’s [11, 12] led to over a decade of research before a key acceleration method called ordered subsets (OS) [13] (related to incremental gradients in the optimization field) helped lead to commercial adoption of OS-EM for clinical PET and SPECT in about 1997, using an (unregularized) ML approach. This transition provided a dramatic improvement in image quality because PET data is very noisy so modeling the statistics is crucial. For years the human PET scanners used unregularized ML methods while some animal scanners had a more sophisticated MAP method [14]! Human PET scanners only recently began to provide MAP methods clinically [15] using a modification of a Gaussian MRF prior [16] and a convergent OS algorithm [17].

In X-ray CT, iterative image reconstruction first became available commercially for the CT part of SPECT-CT scanners in about 2010, [18], using a different OS algorithm published a decade earlier [19]. In 2012, the first FDA-approved iterative MAP method targeted at reduced X-ray dose (the primary impetus for iterative methods in CT) became available for clinical CT [20], building on a publication in the signal processing transactions from two decades earlier [21]. This method also uses a modified Gaussian MRF to make it edge-preserving.

In MRI, iterative methods were introduced in research labs to quantify relaxation parameters [22], reconstruct data from multiple receive coils [23], or correct for magnetic field inhomogeneities [24], among other considerations. None of these methods have been adopted clinically. However, a key turning point in the field was the introduction of compressed sensing in about 2005 [25–30] and its rapid illustration on real MRI applications in about 2007 [31, 32]. This led to an explosion of research that finally led to FDA approval of compressed sensing MRI products in 2017 by two major MRI vendors [33, 34] with others soon to follow. Combinations of total variation regularization and wavelet sparsifying transforms are used widely in this field.

In all the above examples, over a decade passed between the key publication and commercial availability of the method! New methods typically require too much computation to be practical immediately. The importance of ensuring that new methods lead to comparable or improved diagnoses means that considerable investigation is needed.

All of the above MAP methods available commercially for image reconstruction use relative simple regularizers (priors) defined mathematically such as MRFs and wavelets. The emerging trend in the field is to replace human-defined signal models with signal models that are *learned* from data. For example in X-ray CT, there are numerous CT images already acquired at “normal” X-ray doses, and one can learn signal models such as dictionaries from that training data and then use those signal models later to reconstruct images from low-dose or limited-view data [35, 36]. Another data-driven option is to learn a sparse signal model concurrently with the image reconstruction process, rather than relying on prior training data. This approach is known as blind or adaptive dictionary (or transform) learning [37–39]. These methods are a fairly radical departure from the previous 3+ decades of image reconstruction research where most regularizers were defined using math models and physics, not from data. This evolution provides opportunities for signal processing researchers to explore data-driven signal models to better solve inverse problems, particularly from limited or noisy data. For multi-dimensional data such as spectral CT or dynamic MRI, tensor models are of growing interest [40, 41].

In addition to learning a regularizer, one can “unroll the loop” of an iterative algorithm for image reconstruction and think of the resulting block diagram as a sequence of processing steps akin to a deep neural network and then use data to train more aspects of the processing chain. The earliest such unrolling was probably learned ISTA (LISTA) [42] and recent conferences have seen an explosion of methods of this kind [43]. Neural nets are often trained using stochastic gradient descent of a simple loss function like mean-squared error, but these metrics may not be the most meaningful for medical imaging applications. Training with loss functions related to image quality [44] (and ultimately diagnostic performance) is needed. There are many additional significant challenges. These methods are arguably even more nonlinear than the edge preserving regularization methods used clinically today (in CT for example). Can one characterize the “resolution” and “noise” properties of such methods? What is the best training metric - MSE or diagnostic image quality? What if a patient has significantly different image features than those found in the training data? Will methods trained on, say, diffusion brain MRI scans generalize to T1-weighted cardiac perfusion scans? MRI in particular has so many different types of image contrast that it would seem to require an enormous amount of training data to cover all cases. How well will a method trained for one system configuration (e.g., a certain set of coils in MRI or a certain set of angular views and pitch in CT) generalize to other configurations? Some experts have conjectured that “machine learning will transform radiology significantly within the next five years” [45], but others point out there are significant technical and legal challenges. These questions and more should provide numerous research opportunities for signal processors interested in inverse problems like medical imaging.

References

- [1] A. M. Cormack. Representation of a function by its line integrals, with some radiological applications. *J. Appl. Phys.*, 34(9):2722–7, September 1963.
- [2] L. A. Shepp and B. F. Logan. The Fourier reconstruction of a head section. *IEEE Trans. Nuc. Sci.*, 21(3):21–43, June 1974.
- [3] J. A. Fessler. Fundamentals of CT reconstruction in 2D and 3D. In Anders Brahme, editor, *Comprehensive Biomedical Physics, Vol. 2: X-Ray and Ultrasound Imaging*, pages 263–95. Elsevier, Netherlands, 2014.
- [4] G. A. Wright. Magnetic resonance imaging. *IEEE Sig. Proc. Mag.*, 14(1):56–66, January 1997.
- [5] R. Clackdoyle and M. Defrise. Tomographic reconstruction in the 21st century. *IEEE Sig. Proc. Mag.*, 27(4):60–80, July 2010.
- [6] J. M. Ollinger and J. A. Fessler. Positron emission tomography. *IEEE Sig. Proc. Mag.*, 14(1):43–55, January 1997.
- [7] R. M. Lewitt and S. Matej. Overview of methods for image reconstruction from projections in emission computed tomography. *Proc. IEEE*, 91(10):1588–611, October 2003.
- [8] J. Qi and R. M. Leahy. Iterative reconstruction techniques in emission computed tomography. *Phys. Med. Biol.*, 51(15):R541–78, August 2006.
- [9] J. A. Fessler. Model-based image reconstruction for MRI. *IEEE Sig. Proc. Mag.*, 27(4):81–9, July 2010. Invited submission to special issue on medical imaging.
- [10] J. Nuyts, B. De Man, J. A. Fessler, W. Zbijewski, and F. J. Beekman. Modelling the physics in iterative reconstruction for transmission computed tomography. *Phys. Med. Biol.*, 58(12):R63–96, June 2013.
- [11] L. A. Shepp and Y. Vardi. Maximum likelihood reconstruction for emission tomography. *IEEE Trans. Med. Imag.*, 1(2):113–22, October 1982.
- [12] K. Lange and R. Carson. EM reconstruction algorithms for emission and transmission tomography. *J. Comp. Assisted Tomo.*, 8(2):306–16, April 1984.
- [13] H. M. Hudson and R. S. Larkin. Accelerated image reconstruction using ordered subsets of projection data. *IEEE Trans. Med. Imag.*, 13(4):601–9, December 1994.
- [14] J. Qi, R. M. Leahy, S. R. Cherry, A. Chatziioannou, and T. H. Farquhar. High resolution 3D Bayesian image reconstruction using the microPET small-animal scanner. *Phys. Med. Biol.*, 43(4):1001–14, April 1998.
- [15] S. Ahn, S. G. Ross, E. Asma, J. Miao, X. Jin, L. Cheng, S. D. Wollenweber, and R. M. Manjeshwar. Quantitative comparison of OSEM and penalized likelihood image reconstruction using relative difference penalties for clinical PET. *Phys. Med. Biol.*, 60(15):5733–52, August 2015.
- [16] J. Nuyts, D. Beque, P. Dupont, and L. Mortelmans. A concave prior penalizing relative differences for maximum-a-posteriori reconstruction in emission tomography. *IEEE Trans. Nuc. Sci.*, 49(1-1):56–60, February 2002.
- [17] S. Ahn and J. A. Fessler. Globally convergent image reconstruction for emission tomography using relaxed ordered subsets algorithms. *IEEE Trans. Med. Imag.*, 22(5):613–26, May 2003.
- [18] E. Hansis, J. Bredno, D. Sowards-Emmerd, and L. Shao. Iterative reconstruction for circular cone-beam CT with an offset flat-panel detector. In *Proc. IEEE Nuc. Sci. Symp. Med. Im. Conf.*, pages 2228–31, 2010.
- [19] H. Erdoğan and J. A. Fessler. Ordered subsets algorithms for transmission tomography. *Phys. Med. Biol.*, 44(11):2835–51, November 1999.
- [20] J-B. Thibault, K. Sauer, C. Bouman, and J. Hsieh. A three-dimensional statistical approach to improved image quality for multi-slice helical CT. *Med. Phys.*, 34(11):4526–44, November 2007.

- [21] K. Sauer and C. Bouman. Bayesian estimation of transmission tomograms using segmentation based optimization. *IEEE Trans. Nuc. Sci.*, 39(4):1144–52, August 1992.
- [22] M. I. Miller, T. J. Schaewe, C. S. Bosch, and J. J. H. Ackerman. Model-based maximum-likelihood estimation for phase- and frequency-encoded magnetic-resonance-imaging data. *J. Mag. Res. B*, 107(3):210–21, June 1995.
- [23] K. P. Pruessmann, M. Weiger, P. Börnert, and P. Boesiger. Advances in sensitivity encoding with arbitrary k-space trajectories. *Mag. Res. Med.*, 46(4):638–51, October 2001.
- [24] B. P. Sutton, D. C. Noll, and J. A. Fessler. Fast, iterative image reconstruction for MRI in the presence of field inhomogeneities. *IEEE Trans. Med. Imag.*, 22(2):178–88, February 2003.
- [25] E. Candès and J. K. Romberg. Signal recovery from random projections. In *Proc. SPIE 5674 Computational Imaging III*, pages 76–86, 2005.
- [26] E. J. Candès, J. Romberg, and T. Tao. Robust uncertainty principles: exact signal reconstruction from highly incomplete frequency information. *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, 52(2):489–509, February 2006.
- [27] D. L. Donoho. Compressed sensing. *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, 52(4):1289–1306, April 2006.
- [28] R. G. Baraniuk. Compressive sensing. *IEEE Sig. Proc. Mag.*, 24(4):118–21, 2007.
- [29] E. J. Candes and M. B. Wakin. An introduction to compressive sampling. *IEEE Sig. Proc. Mag.*, 25(2):21–30, March 2008.
- [30] J. Romberg. Imaging via compressive sampling. *IEEE Sig. Proc. Mag.*, 25(2):14–20, March 2008.
- [31] M. Lustig, D. Donoho, and J. M. Pauly. Sparse MRI: The application of compressed sensing for rapid MR imaging. *Mag. Res. Med.*, 58(6):1182–95, December 2007.
- [32] M. Lustig, D. L. Donoho, J. M. Santos, and J. M. Pauly. Compressed sensing MRI. *IEEE Sig. Proc. Mag.*, 25(2):72–82, March 2008.
- [33] FDA. 510k premarket notification of HyperSense (GE Medical Systems), 2017. <https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfpmn/pmn.cfm?ID=K162722>.
- [34] FDA. 510k premarket notification of Compressed Sensing Cardiac Cine (Siemens), 2017. https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf16/K163312.pdf.
- [35] Y. Lu, J. Zhao, and G. Wang. Few-view image reconstruction with dual dictionaries. *Phys. Med. Biol.*, 57(1):173–90, January 2012.
- [36] Q. Xu, H. Yu, X. Mou, L. Zhang, J. Hsieh, and G. Wang. Low-dose X-ray CT reconstruction via dictionary learning. *IEEE Trans. Med. Imag.*, 31(9):1682–97, September 2012.
- [37] S. Ravishanker and Y. Bresler. MR image reconstruction from highly undersampled k-space data by dictionary learning. *IEEE Trans. Med. Imag.*, 30(5):1028–41, May 2011.
- [38] S. Ravishanker and Y. Bresler. Efficient blind compressed sensing using sparsifying transforms with convergence guarantees and application to MRI. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 8(4):2519–57, 2015.
- [39] S. Ravishanker and Y. Bresler. Data-driven learning of a union of sparsifying transforms model for blind compressed sensing. *IEEE Trans. Computational Imaging*, 2(3):294–309, September 2016.
- [40] Y. Yu, J. Jin, F. Liu, and S. Crozier. Multidimensional compressed sensing MRI using tensor decomposition-based sparsifying transform. *PLoS One*, 9(6):e98441, 2014.
- [41] Y. Zhang, X. Mou, G. Wang, and H. Yu. Tensor-based dictionary learning for spectral CT reconstruction. *IEEE Trans. Med. Imag.*, 36(1):142–54, January 2017.

- [42] K. Gregor and Y. LeCun. Learning fast approximations of sparse coding. In *Proc. Intl. Conf. Mach. Learn*, 2010.
- [43] G. Wang. A perspective on deep imaging. *IEEE Access*, 4:8914–24, November 2016.
- [44] H. Zhao, O. Gallo, I. Frosio, and . Kautz. Loss functions for image restoration with neural networks. *IEEE Trans. Computational Imaging*, 3(1):47–57, March 2017.
- [45] G. Wang, M. Kalra, and C. G. Orton. Machine learning will transform radiology significantly within the next five years. *Med. Phys.*, 44(6):2041–4, June 2017.