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Abstract—Uncompressed clinical data from modern positron emission tomography (PET) scanners are very large, exceeding 350 million data points. The last decades have seen tremendous advancements in mathematical imaging tools many of which lead to non-smooth optimization problems. Most of these tools have not been translated to clinical PET data, as the algorithms for non-smooth problems do not scale well enough for large data sets. In this work, inspired by big data machine learning applications, we use advanced randomized optimization algorithms to solve the PET reconstruction problem for a very large class of non-smooth priors which includes for example total variation, total generalized variation, directional total variation and many constraints. We show on real PET data (FDG and florbetapir) from a Siemens Biograph mMR that a dozen forward (and back) projections are sufficient for a variety of mathematical models to produce clinically relevant images; thus showing that the proposed algorithm is fast enough to bring these models into routine clinical practice. Moreover, the proposed algorithm is as fast on the unregularized problem as the clinical standard OSEM but—in contrast to OSEM—has provable convergence guarantees, robustness and stability for any subset selection.

Index Terms—positron emission tomography, convex optimization, randomized optimization, non-smooth optimization, total variation, anatomical priors

I. INTRODUCTION

POSITRON EMISSION tomography (PET) is an important clinical imaging technique as it allows monitoring function of the human body by following a radio-active tracer. The image reconstruction process in PET is challenging as the low number of photon counts call for the Poisson noise modeling and the amount of data is excessively large on modern scanners. While most clinical systems still run non-penalized reconstructions, it has been shown that regularization improves noise control and quantification [1] [2]. In addition, recent trends suggests that non-smooth regularizers are beneficial for imaging applications as they allow smooth variations within regions without oversmoothing sharp boundaries [3][10]. Only a few algorithms are capable of combining non-smooth priors and the Poisson noise model, e.g. [9] [11][13].

Modern PET scanners always come with a second anatomical modality such as computed tomography (CT) or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). The non-smooth regularizers can also be used to either incorporate anatomical knowledge from MRI or CT into the reconstruction, e.g. [14][19], or to jointly reconstruct PET and the anatomical CT/MRI image [20][23]. One of the most popular algorithms to solve the resulting non-smooth convex optimization problem is the primal-dual hybrid gradient (PDHG) algorithm [11][24][25]. While this algorithm is flexible enough to solve a variety of non-smooth optimization problems, in every iteration the linear operators that correspond to projection and backprojection have to be fully evaluated. Moreover, in every iteration operations on vectors that have the size of the data have to be evaluated. For modern scanners like the Siemens Biograph mMR with span-1 data format, these vectors contain more than 350 million elements and therefore limiting the applicability of this algorithm (and therefore many non-smooth mathematical regularization models) to state-of-the-art scanners.

A. Contributions

In this work we investigate a randomized variant of PDHG [11][24][25] (named Stochastic PDHG or short SPDHG) where in every iteration only a subset of the data is being used and only operations related to these data need to be evaluated. The numerical examples show that this strategy leads to a significant speed-up. Moreover, we propose and evaluate the use of preconditioners for PDHG for PET image reconstruction. Both forms of acceleration can be used independently or jointly but their combination leads to even faster algorithms.

We show that SPDHG is competitive with OSEM on unregularized reconstruction problems but stable with respect to the choice of the subsets due to its mathematically guaranteed convergence properties. In fact SPDHG converges to the deterministic solution for any proper subset selection. In addition, SPDHG is general enough to allow for a very large class of convex (and potentially non-smooth) regularizers such as total variation, total generalized variation and directional total variation. We show on clinical data from a Siemens Biograph mMR that with this algorithm, these modern mathematical regularization models become feasible to be used in routine clinical imaging.

A few initial findings on randomized reconstruction without preconditioning were published in a conference paper [26].

B. PET Reconstruction via Optimization

The PET reconstruction problem can be formulated as the solution to the optimization problem

$$\min_{u \geq 0} \left\{ D(Ru) + \alpha R(u) \right\}$$

(1)

¹also known as the Chambolle–Pock algorithm
The data term measures the distance of the estimated data order to model non-linear effects such as scatter and randoms.

The data fidelity measures the match of the estimated image with the data and the regularizer $\alpha R(u)$ penalizes features that are not desirable in the solution. In other words the regularizer can be used to avoid that the estimated image fits the data too closely which is needed due to noise. The data fidelity is (up to constants independent of $u$) the negative log-likelihood of the multi-variate Poisson distribution

$$D(y) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} y_i + r_i - b_i + b_i \log \left( \frac{b_i}{y_i + r_i} \right),$$

with expected value being the sum of the projected image $y$ and the estimated background activity $r$. The latter is needed in order to model non-linear effects such as scatter and randoms. The data term measures the distance of the estimated data $Ru + r$ to the measured data $b$ in the sense that $D(Ru) \geq 0$ and $D(Ru) = 0$ if and only if $Ru + r = b$.

**C. Motivating Example: OSEM**

If there is no regularizer, i.e. $\alpha R = 0$, the most common algorithm to solve the optimization is the maximum likelihood expectation maximization algorithm (MLEM) which is given by

$$u^{k+1} = \frac{u^k}{R^T1} R^T \left( \frac{b}{Ru^k + r} \right),$$

then this algorithm became known as ordered subsets expectation maximization (OSEM) [28]. While this change of the update equation reduces the computational burden by $1/m$ it is in general not guaranteed to converge to a solution of (1), illustrated in Figures 1a and 1b. A convergent version of OSEM, called convergent OSEM (COSEM), has been developed [29]. While it comes with mathematical convergence guarantees it is much slower than OSEM (see Figure 1a) and therefore never became popular for the reconstruction of clinical PET data.

MLEM has been extended to include smooth [30] and certain non-smooth [31] prior information, however, conceptually both algorithms intrinsically struggle with the ordered subset acceleration. Also other algorithms have been “accelerated” based on the ordered subset idea, e.g. [31], but inherit its intrinsic instability. See [32] for a numerical comparison and [1] [2] for a validation on clinical PET data.

For differentiable priors, a surrogate based technique allows for stable subset acceleration [33-35]. In this work we propose an algorithm that is provably convergent and thus stable and robust (see Figures 1b and 1d). It is flexible enough to be applicable to a large variety of convex and non-smooth priors and as efficient as OSEM-type algorithms (see Figures 1a and 1c).

**II. MATHEMATICAL MODEL**

**A. Non-Smooth PET Reconstruction with Subsets**

As outlined above, PET reconstruction can be formulated in terms of the optimization problem (1). Computationally, it
is convenient to rewrite (and solve) the optimization problem (1) in terms of subsets. Therefore, let \( \{ S_i \} \) be a partition of \([M]\), in the sense that \( \bigcup_{i=1}^{m} S_i = [M] \), where we used the notation \([M] := \{1, \ldots, M\}\). It is not necessary to assume that \( S_i \cap S_j = \emptyset \) for \( i \neq j \). For notational simplicity we will restrict ourselves to the latter case. We define

\[
D_i(y) := \sum_{j \in S_i} \varphi_j(y_j)
\]

with the distance function for every data point given by

\[
\varphi(y) := \begin{cases} 
    g + r - b + b \log \left( \frac{b}{y + r} \right) & \text{if } y + r > 0 \\
    \infty & \text{else}
\end{cases},
\]

where we omitted the index \( j \) at \( \varphi \), \( y \), \( r \) and \( b \) for readability. Algorithms from convex optimization require the problem to be defined over an entire vector space which we satisfy by extending \( \varphi \) to \( \infty \) for non-positive estimated data \( y + r \). The data and the background are photon counts and therefore have a natural non-negativity constraint. To cover the case of vanishing data, it is standard to define \( 0 \log 0 := 0 \).

We model the non-negativity constraint for the image \( u \) with the indicator function \( \iota_+ \), which is defined as

\[
\iota_+(u) = \begin{cases} 
    0 & \text{if } u \geq 0 \\
    \infty & \text{else}
\end{cases}.
\]

Thus, we end up with the unconstrained optimization problem

**Problem 1** (PET Reconstruction with Subsets).

\[
u^R \in \arg \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{m} D_i(R_i u) + \alpha R(u) + \iota_+(u) \right\}.
\]

We would like to stress that solving problem (7) is equivalent to solving the original problem (1) for any choice of subsets. In fact, the subset selection becomes a reconstruction parameter that may be varied to speed up the reconstruction procedure.

Often, our prior assumptions involve linear operators, too. One of the most prominent examples of this is the total variation \( R(u) = TV(u) = \| \nabla u \|_{2,1} \), where we take the 2-norm locally, i.e., at every voxel we take the 2-norm of the spatial gradient, and the 1-norm globally, i.e., we sum over all voxels. Similarly, we use the directional total variation \( R(u) = dTV(u) = \| D \nabla u \|_{2,1} \) to incorporate a-priori knowledge about the solution given by some anatomical prior image, see [16][18][36] for details.

Solving problem (7) is challenging, even when the involved variables are small and matrix-vector products are easy to compute. The difficulty arises due its non-regularity. The data term \( D_i \) is not finite everywhere and while it is differentiable on its effective domain \( \text{dom}(D_i) := \{ y \mid D_i(y) < \infty \} \), the gradient is not globally Lipschitz continuous. In addition, further non-smoothness comes from the constraint \( \iota_+ \) and the prior \( R \) may be non-smooth as well. All of this being said, in PET reconstruction, the variable sizes are actually very large and matrix-vector products expensive to compute.

To apply optimization algorithms to solve (7), we reformulate it as a generic optimization problem of the form

**Problem 2** (Generic Optimization Problem).

\[
x^R \in \arg \min_{x \in X} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(A_i x) + g(x) \right\}.
\]

For instance, for unregularized reconstructions, i.e., \( \alpha R = 0 \), we may make the association

\[
n = m, \quad g = \iota_+, \quad f_i = D_i, \quad A_i = R_i
\]

and reconstructions regularized by the total variation, i.e., \( R(u) = \| \nabla u \|_{2,1} \), can be achieved by

\[
n = m + 1, \quad g = \iota_+, \quad f_i = D_i, i \in [m], \quad f_n = \alpha \| \cdot \|_{2,1}
\]

\[
A_i = R_i, i \in [m], \quad A_n = \nabla.
\]

**B. Optimization with Saddle-Point Problems**

Instead of solving problem (3) directly, it is more efficient to reformulate the minimization problem as a saddle point problem making use of the convex conjugate of a functional, see e.g. [37].

**Definition 1** (Convex Conjugate). Let \( f : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty := \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\} \) be a functional with extended real values. Then we define the convex conjugate of \( f \) as \( f^* : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty \) with

\[
f^*(y) = \sup_x \{ \langle y, x \rangle - f(x) \}.
\]

For convex, proper and lower semi-continuous (lsc) functionals \( f \) we have that \( f^{**} = f \), see e.g. [37], and thus

\[
f(x) = \sup_y \{ \langle x, y \rangle - f^*(y) \}.
\]

Then, with \( Y = \prod_{i=1}^{n} Y_i \), problem (8) is equivalent to

**Problem 3** (Generic Saddle Point Problem).

\[
\min_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \langle A_i x, y_i \rangle - f_i^*(y_i) + g(x) \right\}.
\]

**Example 1.** The convex conjugate of the PET distance function is given by \( D_i^*(y) = \sum_{j \in S_i} \varphi_j^*(y_j) \) with

\[
\varphi_j^*(y) = \begin{cases} 
    -yr - b \log(1 - y), & \text{if } y \leq 1 \\
    \infty & \text{else}
\end{cases},
\]

where we omitted the index \( j \) at \( \varphi \), \( y \), \( b \) and \( r \) for readability and define \(-b \log(b) := \infty \) for \( b > 0 \).

As some (or all) of the \( f_i \) and \( g \) in (8) are non-smooth, we make use of the proximity operator of these. Our definition varies slightly from the usual definition as we allow the step size parameter to be matrix-valued. For a symmetric and positive definite matrix \( S \), we define the weighted norm \( \| x \|_S := \| S^{-1/2} x \|_2^2 = \langle S x, x \rangle \).

**Definition 2** (Proximal Operator). Let \( S \) be a symmetric and positive definite matrix. Then we define the proximal operator of \( f \) with metric (or step size) \( S \) as

\[
\text{prox}_S^f(z) := \arg \min_z \{ \| z - x \|_S + f(z) \}.
\]

From here on, \( S \) and \( T \) will always be diagonal, symmetric and positive definite matrices.
Algorithm 1 Stochastic Primal-Dual Hybrid Gradient (SPDHG) to solve (10). Default values given in brackets.

\textbf{Input:} iterates $x(=0), y(=0)$, step parameters $S = \{S_i\}$, $T$

1: $\bar{z} = \bar{x} = A^T y (\approx 0)$
2: for $k = 1, \ldots$ do
3: \hspace{1em} $x = \text{prox}_{\rho/\|A_i\|}^S (x - T \bar{z})$
4: \hspace{1em} Select $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ at random with probability $p_i$
5: \hspace{1em} $y_i^+ = \text{prox}_{\sigma_i/\|A_i\|}^{S_i}(y_i + S_i A_i x)$
6: \hspace{1em} $\Delta z = A^T (y_i^+ - y_i)$
7: \hspace{1em} $y_i = y_i^+$
8: \hspace{1em} $\bar{z} = z + \left(1 + \frac{1}{p_i}\right) \Delta z$
9: \hspace{1em} $z = z + \Delta z$

Example 2. The proximity operator of the non-negativity constraint (6) is given component-wise by

\[ \text{prox}^T_{\rho}(x) = \max(x, 0). \]

Example 3. Let $S_i = \text{diag}(\sigma_i)_{i \in S_i}$. The proximal operator of the convex conjugate of the PET distance (11) can be computed component-wise as $\text{prox}_{\rho/\|A_i\|}^{S_i}(y_i) = \text{prox}_{\sigma_i/\|A_i\|}^{S_i}(y_i)$. For each component, the proximal operator is given by

\[ \text{prox}_{\sigma_i}^{S_i}(y) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ w + 1 - \left( \frac{w + 1 - 4 \sigma b}{w - 1/2} \right) \right], \]

where we again omitted the indices $j$ for readability and denoted $w = y + \sigma v$.

### III. ALGORITHM

An algorithm that solves (10) and therefore the PET reconstruction problem (8) for a very large class of regularizers is the SPDHG, originally proposed and analytically studied in [38]. It is summarized in Algorithm 1. It consists of very simple operations involving only basic linear algebra, matrix-vector multiplications and the evaluations of proximal operators.

A. Convergence

SPDHG is guaranteed to converge for any $f_i$ and $g$ which are convex, proper and lsc. We know state a very general convergence result which can be easily derived from the results proven in [38]. For more details and convergence rates we refer the reader to [38].

Theorem 1 (Convergence). Assume that the sampling is proper, i.e., the probability $p_i$ for an index $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ to be sampled is positive. Let the step length parameters $T = \min_{i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}} T_i$, $S_i$ be chosen such that for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$

\[ \left\| S_i^{1/2} A_i T_i^{1/2} \right\|^2 < p_i \]  \hspace{1em} (12)

holds. Then for any initialization, the iterates $(x, y)$ of SPDHG (algorithm 7) converge to a saddle point of (10) (in an expected Bregman sense).

For illustration purposes, we summarize a special case of SPDHG with uniform sampling for the simpler unregularized problem in Algorithm 2

Algorithm 2 SPDHG+ for unregularized reconstruction and used to compute the results in Figure 1

\textbf{Output:} reconstructed image $x$

1: $x = 1, y = 0, \bar{z} = z = 0$
2: $S_i = \text{diag}(1/R_i, 1), i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$
3: $T = \min_{i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}} \text{diag}(1/(n R_i^2))$
4: for $k = 1, \ldots$ do
5: \hspace{1em} $x = \max(x - T \bar{z}, 0)$
6: \hspace{1em} Select $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ uniformly at random
7: \hspace{1em} $w = y_i + S_i (R_i x + r_i)$
8: \hspace{1em} $y_i^+ = \frac{1}{2} \left[ w + 1 - \left( \frac{(w - 1)^2 + 4 \sigma b_i}{2} \right)^{1/2} \right]$
9: \hspace{1em} $\Delta z = R_i^2 (y_i^+ - y_i)$
10: \hspace{1em} $y_i = y_i^+$
11: \hspace{1em} $\bar{z} = z + (m + 1) \Delta z$
12: \hspace{1em} $z = z + \Delta z$

Remark 1 (Computational Efficiency). Each iteration of Algorithm 2 is computationally efficient as only projections and backprojections corresponding to the randomly selected subset $i$ of the data are required. However, the algorithm maintains the whole backprojected dual variable $z = R_i^T y = \sum_{i=1}^{m} R_i^2 y_i$ and in each iteration updates the primal variable with it.

Remark 2 (Memory Requirements). The memory requirement of Algorithm 2 is higher compared to OSEM or gradient descent but still reasonably low. It requires memory equivalent to two images $z, \bar{z}$ and up to twice the binned sinogram data $(y, y^+)$ in addition to the necessary memory consumption (output image, sinogram data, background).

Remark 3 (Sampling). SPDHG allows any kind of random selection as long as the draws are independent and the probability that block $i$ is being selected with positive probability $p_i > 0$. We will investigate two choices of sampling in the numerical section of this paper. A more thorough numerical and theoretical investigation will be subject of future work.

B. Step Sizes and Preconditioning

We will now discuss two different choices of step sizes under which SPDHG is guaranteed to converge.

Theorem 2 (Step Size Parameters). Let $\rho < 1$. Then, condition (12) of Theorem 7 is satisfied by

\[ S_i = \frac{\rho}{\|A_i\|} I, \quad T_i = \frac{\rho p_i}{\|A_i\|} I. \]  \hspace{1em} (13)

Moreover, if $A_i$ has only non-negative elements, then condition (12) is also satisfied by

\[ S_i = \text{diag} \left( \frac{\rho}{\|A_i\|} \right), \quad T_i = \text{diag} \left( \frac{\rho p_i}{\|A_i\|} \right). \]  \hspace{1em} (14)

An example of preconditioned step sizes (14) is shown in Figure 2.

Remark 4. If $n = 1$ and $p_i = 1$, then the step sizes (13) can be identified with the scalar step sizes $\sigma_i = \rho/\|A_i\|$ and $\tau = \rho/\|A_i\|$ which are commonly chosen for PDHG.
Remark 5. Note that the non-negativity condition holds for the PET forward operator (and any other ray tracing based operator). Moreover, the step size $T$ in (14) resembles the sensitivities used in the update of MLEM (2) and OSEM (3). In addition, a similar preconditioning is performed for the dual variable in the data space.

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS

The numerical experiments use the open-source package ODL [39] which allows for efficient algorithm prototyping in Python. The projection and backprojections are computed with CUDA through the open-source package NiftyPET [40] and is accessible via Python. The Python code and one data set will be made accessible upon acceptance of this manuscript.

A. Data

We validate the numerical performance of the proposed algorithm on two clinical PET data sets which we refer to as FDG and florbetapir. The two separate PET brain datasets each use a distinct radiotracer: $^{18}$FFDG for epilepsy and $^{18}$Fflorbetapir for the neuroscience sub-study Insight’46 of the Medical Research Council National Survey of Health and Development [41]. The epileptic patient was injected with 250 MBq of FDG, one hour before the 15-minute PET acquisition. The neuroscience volunteer was injected with 370 MBq of florbetapir and scanned dynamically for one hour, starting at the injection time. The last ten minutes were used as a measurement of amyloid deposition, which for the participant was negative.

B. Results for Total Variation

In this section we analyze the impact of various choices within SPDHG on its performance, from randomness over sampling to preconditioning. The test case is total variation regularization as in (9).

1) Randomness: Figure 3a shows the effect of randomness where we compare the deterministic PDHG to SPDHG with uniform sampling and scalar step sizes (13) for two different number of subsets. The horizontal axis reflects the number of projections in each algorithm, we call one full projection for the whole data one “epoch”. Here and in the following dashed lines represent deterministic and solid lines randomized algorithms. We can easily see that both random variants are faster than then deterministic PDHG. Moreover, the randomized SPDHG becomes faster by choosing a larger number of subsets.

2) Sampling: The effect of different choices of sampling is shown in Figure 3b. We compare two different samplings: uniform sampling and balanced sampling. The uniform sampling chooses all indices $i \in [n]$ with equal probability $p_i = 1/n$. In contrast, for balanced sampling we choose with uniform probability either data or regularization. If we choose data, then we select a subset again randomly with uniform probability. Thus, the probability for each subset of the data to be selected is $p_i = 1/(2m)$, $i \in [m]$ and for the regularization to be selected $p_n = 1/2$.

We make two observations. First, balanced sampling is always faster than uniform sampling. This shows the importance of updating the dual variable associated to the regularizer. Second, for either sampling choosing a larger number of subsets again improves the performance.

3) Preconditioning: As shown in Theorem 2, the step size parameters $T$ and $S_i$ can be chosen either as scalars (13) or as vectors (14), the latter can be seen as a form of preconditioning. Results are shown in Figure 3c where we see that preconditioning may accelerate the convergence of either the deterministic PDHG or the randomized SPDHG. Moreover, combining randomization and preconditioning yields an even faster algorithm.
Preconditioning can be used with and without randomization. The preconditioned algorithms are much faster than without preconditioning.

4) Performance of Proposed Algorithm: Based on the previous three examples, we propose to combine randomization, balanced sampling and preconditioning, which we refer to as SPDHG+. Figure 3d shows the visual performance of PDHG and SPDHG+. In contrast to the deterministic PDHG, the proposed SPDHG+ yields a clinically relevant image after only 10 epochs.

C. Further Numerical Results

1) Anisotropic Total Variation: Anisotropic total variation decouples the penalization of the derivatives. The mathematical model is similar to the isotropic TV model \( f_n \), the only difference being the norm how the total variation is measured: \( f_n = \alpha \| \cdot \|_{1,1} \). It can be seen in Figure 4 for florbetapir that with randomization and preconditioning only a few epochs are needed to reconstruct clinically relevant images.

2) Directional Total Variation: Anatomical information from a co-registered MRI is available on combined PET-MR scanners. The structural information of the anatomy can be utilized by the directional total variation regularization, see [16-18, 36] for details. Thus, the only difference is \( A_n = D \nabla \). A numerical example is shown in Figure 5 for the data set florbetapir.

3) Total Generalized Variation: More sophisticated regularization can be achieved by the total generalized variation (TGV) \( TGV_{\alpha_0, \alpha_1} \), which can balance first and second order regularization and achieves edge-preserved reconstruction while avoiding the stair-casing artifact. We can solve the TGV regularized PET reconstruction problem by solving problem (8) with the assignment \( x = (u, w) \) and

\[
A_n = \begin{cases} (\nabla, -I), & n = m-1 \\
(0, E), & n = 1 \end{cases}
\]

where \( E \) is a symmetrized gradient operator, see [6, 10] for more details.

The numerical results shown in Figure 6 are in line with the previous findings indicating that randomization and preconditioning can significantly speed up the reconstruction. However, we notice a significant increase in performance by increasing the number of subsets from 21 to 252.

4) Comparison of Mathematical Models: We conclude this section by a comparison of various methods on both data.
Fig. 6. TGV regularized reconstruction for the FDG data. Only a few epochs are needed to reconstruct clinically relevant images with randomization and preconditioning. This is visible for both the actual images $u$ and for the reconstructed vector field $w$.

Fig. 7a. Comparison of several reconstruction approaches for the FDG data. All approaches have about the same computational cost.

sets in Figures 7a and 7b. While we leave the detailed visual comparisons to the reader, we would like to note that all these images use the same number of forward operator evaluations so have basically the same computational cost.

V. DISCUSSION

The extensive numerical experiments all consistently confirm that randomization and preconditioning both speed up the reconstruction. These trends were irrespective of the data set and the regularization model used. The convergence speed in our work was abstractly defined by a solution of the underlying mathematical optimization model approximated with way too many iterations than would be feasible in routine clinical practice. This strategy was chosen intentionally as we did not want to target a specific clinical use case. After these successful initial trials, in the future we will collaborate with medical researchers and clinicians to focus on specific use cases where each use case defines its own metric of what images we wish to reconstruct.

The focus of this contribution was to improve the reconstruction for non-smooth priors to allow the use of regularization functionals like total variation and its descendants like total generalized variation and directional total variation. However, as long as the proximal operators are simple to evaluate, the proposed randomized and preconditioned algorithm can be applied to any other model, too. It would be of huge interest to compare this algorithm to convergent subset accelerated algorithms like BSREM [33, 34], TRIOT [35] and OS-SPS [34].

We highlighted the improvements from choosing different distributions for subset selection by comparing “uniform” and “balanced sampling”. Further improvements are expected by optimizing the probability selection of this algorithm. This can either be an optimal distribution that is constant along the iterations or even developing over the course of the iterations.

Moreover, the algorithm does not exploit any special structure of our optimization problem like smoothness or strong convexity. It is likely that exploiting these properties will lead to additional speed-up. However, as these properties for the PET data term depend on the acquired data, it is unlikely that a straightforward approach will be sufficient and a tailored solution will be necessary.

VI. CONCLUSION

We have shown that using randomization and preconditioning can dramatically speed up the convergence of an iterative reconstruction algorithm. The speed up was so large that many mathematical imaging models are now feasible to be used in
daily clinical routine. While this observations was consistent among two data sets with different tracers, more studies are needed to confirm the consistent benefit of this reconstruction strategy. In any case, this algorithmic advancement has the potential to hugely impact the PET reconstruction landscape as advanced mathematical models can now be combined with efficient and convergent subset acceleration.
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