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Abstract—Three-dimensional (3D) region of interest (ROI) imaging with C-arm systems provides anatomical information in a predefined 3D target region at a considerably low X-ray dose. A necessary initial step prior to a 3D acquisition is to isocenter the patient with respect to the target to be scanned. To this end, two low-dose fluoroscopic X-ray acquisitions are usually applied from anterior-posterior (AP) and medio-lateral (ML) views. In this paper, we present a patient-bounded extrapolation method that makes use of these non-collimated fluoroscopic images to improve image quality in 3D ROI reconstruction. The algorithm first extracts the 2D patient contours from the AP and ML images. These 2D contours are then combined to estimate a volumetric model of the patient. Forward-projecting the shape of the model at the eventually acquired C-arm rotation views gives the patient boundary information in the projection domain. In this manner, we are in the position to substantially improve image quality by enforcing the extrapolated line profiles to end at the known patient boundaries, derived from the 3D shape model estimate. The proposed method is evaluated on five clinical datasets with different degrees of truncation. The proposed algorithm achieved a relative root mean square error (rRMSE) of 0.7% with respect to non-truncated data, even in the presence of severe truncation, compared to 8.7% from a state-of-the-art heuristic extrapolation.

I. INTRODUCTION

Three-dimensional (3D) C-arm based region of interest (ROI) tomography that provides anatomical information in a predefined target region at considerably low X-ray dose is a valuable tool in interventional radiology for therapy planning and guidance, particularly for neurointerventions. However, ROI imaging leads to laterally truncated projections from which conventional reconstruction algorithms generally yield images with severe truncation artifacts.

A major category of truncation correction methods is based on estimating the missing data using a heuristic extrapolation procedure, such as symmetric mirroring of projection images (Ohnesorge et al. [1]), water cylinder extrapolation (Hsieh et al. [2]), square root extrapolation (Sourbelle et al. [3]) and hybrid extrapolation (Zellerhoff et al. [4]). Although these methods can be carried out without a priori information, they rely on heuristics. The degree of accuracy of these extrapolation estimates highly depends on the level of truncation.

Later, Maltz et al. [5] observed that the thickness of the patient could be estimated by calculating water-equivalent thicknesses, so that the unknown patient boundary can be approximated. However, in practice, the presence of any non-water tissue may result in a substantial over- or underestimation of the actual object thickness.

In contrast, Wiegert et al. [6] and Kolditz et al. [7] suggested that patient size and shape information can be obtained from an a priori low-dose CT scan if available. By forward-projection of this a priori CT volume, the collimated regions in the ROI acquisition can be extended in an accurate manner.

In this paper, we present a patient-bounded extrapolation method that leads to major improvements in the quantitative accuracy of 3D ROI imaging, even in the presence of severely truncated data. The method does not require any additional hardware and can be readily integrated into the existing interventional workflow. It is based on the fact that prior to a 3D scan, low-dose fluoroscopic X-ray acquisitions are generally performed from anterior-posterior (AP) and medio-lateral (ML) views, to isocenter the patient with respect to the target to be scanned; see Fig. 1. The fundamental idea of the proposed method is to estimate a 3D shape model of the patient from these low-dose non-truncated fluoroscopic images and then exploit this patient-specific a priori shape knowledge for the extrapolation of truncated projections.

II. METHOD

First, we estimate the rough 3D patient shape based on two low-dose fluoroscopic projections, using per-slice ellipse fitting. The details are elaborated in the following sections; also see Fig. 2 for notations.

Contour-bounded Slice-wise Ellipse Fitting
To extract the boundaries, we first compute the gradient image of fluoroscopic projections and detect the edges using an empirically pre-set threshold. Suppose $u_{ib}^{AP} = (u_{ib}^{AP}, v_{i}, 1)$, $u_{ib}^{AP}$, $u_{ib}^{ML}$, and $u_{ib}^{ML}$ are the homogeneous coordinates of the segmented left and right boundary points at detector row $v_{i}$ of the 2D fluoroscopic images from AP and ML view. Let $P \in$
$\mathbb{R}^{3\times 4}$ be the projection matrix that maps position $x = [x, y, z]$ in the C-arm coordinate frame to a position $u = [\omega u, \omega v, \omega]$ in the 2D projection plane:

$$u = P \begin{bmatrix} x \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

The matrix $P$ can be decomposed as follows:

$$P = [P_{13} \mid P_{4}] = [AR \mid At] \quad (2)$$

where $R \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times 3}$ denotes the rotation matrix, $t \in \mathbb{R}^3$ denotes the translation vector, and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times 3}$ the intrinsic parameter matrix.

Then, we can compute the direction unit vector $e_{AP}^m, e_{ML}^m$ of the ray that connects the source to the middle point of the two boundaries, i.e., $u_{AP}^m = (u_{AP}^b + u_{AP}^v) / 2$ and $u_{ML}^m = (u_{ML}^b + u_{ML}^v) / 2$, as:

$$e_{AP}^m = \frac{(P_{13})^{-1} u_{AP}^m}{\| (P_{13})^{-1} u_{AP}^m \|}, \quad e_{ML}^m = \frac{(P_{13})^{-1} u_{ML}^m}{\| (P_{13})^{-1} u_{ML}^m \|}, \quad (3)$$

where $P^{-1}$ denotes the pseudo-inverse of the matrix $P$.

Now the ray equations can be expressed as ($t, l \in \mathbb{R}$)

$$l_{AP}^m(t) = s_{AP}^m + te_{AP}^m, \quad \text{and} \quad l_{ML}^m(l) = s_{ML}^m + le_{ML}^m, \quad (4)$$

where $s_{AP}^m$ and $s_{ML}^m$ are source positions at AP and ML views, which can be computed using $s = -P_{13}^{-1} p_d$.

Then, the center of the fitted ellipse $x_0$ is estimated by computing the intersection of the two rays $l_{AP}^m$ and $l_{ML}^m$. Here, we confine to breaking the problem down to a 2D line intersecting based on the approximation that $s_{AP}^m I_x = s_{ML}^m I_z$ and $e_{AP}^m I_x = e_{ML}^m I_z = 0$, where $I_z = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T$. The third component of $x_0$ is given by the corresponding slice position. To obtain the intersection point $x_0$, we establish $s_{AP}^m + te_{AP}^m = s_{ML}^m + le_{ML}^m$ and solve for $t$. Then, substituting $t$ in the first equation of (4) yields:

$$x_0 = s_{AP}^m + \frac{\|(s_{ML}^m - s_{AP}^m) \times e_{ML}^m\|}{\|e_{AP}^m \times e_{ML}^m\|} e_{AP}^m. \quad (5)$$

Now we need to determine the radii $R_x, R_y$ of the ellipse. The line equation of the rays from AP view that connects the patient boundary and source can also be expressed as (e.g. right boundary) $l_{AP}^P(h) = s_{AP}^P + he_{AP}^P$, where $e_{AP}^P$ is computed using $u_{AP}^b$ accordingly. Suppose $x_*$ is the point located on the line $l_{AP}^P$ that satisfies $x_* I_y = x_0 I_y$, i.e., with the same $y$-axis coordinate as $x_0$. Then, the radius along the $x$-axis $R_x$ can be approximated as follows:

$$R_x = (x_* - x_0) I_x \quad (6)$$

where $I_x = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T$ and $I_y = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T$.

In analogy, we can use the boundary from ML view to determine the radius of the ellipse along the $y$-axis $R_y$.

### Patient Boundary Estimation for Arbitrary Angulations

With the estimated ellipse in the volumetric image domain, we can compute the left and right patient boundaries of that ellipse for any given C-arm rotation angle $\lambda$ as follows:

$$x_{lb}^\lambda = x_0 - r e_u, \quad (7)$$

$$x_{rb}^\lambda = x_0 + r e_u, \quad (8)$$

where $r = \sqrt{(R_y \cos \lambda)^2 + (R_x \sin \lambda)^2}$ and $e_u$ denotes the unit vector in detector row direction.

Then, we forward-project these voxel positions to 2D projection plane using Eq. (1), also cf. Fig. 2:

$$u_{lb}^\lambda = P^\lambda \begin{bmatrix} x_{lb}^\lambda \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad u_{rb}^\lambda = P^\lambda \begin{bmatrix} x_{rb}^\lambda \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (9)$$

The estimated patient left and right boundaries at the detector row $v_i$ and rotation angle $\lambda$, i.e., $(u_{lb}^\lambda, v_i)$ and $(u_{rb}^\lambda, v_i)$, can be easily obtained with $u_{lb}^\lambda = u_{lb}^\lambda I_x/u_{lb}^\lambda I_z$ and $u_{rb}^\lambda = u_{rb}^\lambda I_x/u_{rb}^\lambda I_z$. 

---

**Fig. 2:** Illustration of the patient-bounded extrapolation scheme. (Left) Contour-bounded slice-wise ellipse fitting. (Right) Forward-projection of the boundaries of the previously estimated patient shape model at a given C-arm rotation view provides the patient boundary in the projection domain.

**Fig. 3:** Visualization of the actual patient shape extracted from a non-collimated 3D reconstruction (left) and the 3D volumetric model estimated from two orthogonal projections with different ellipses in each slice (right).
Bounded ROI Projection Profile Extrapolation

Based on the estimated patient boundaries in the ROI scan projection data, we are in the position to apply any extrapolation technique and adapting it according to the restriction that the extrapolated profile must end at the known patient boundaries. In this paper, we adapt the water cylinder approach of Hsieh et al. [2] by extending or compressing the initial extrapolated lines to fulfill this restriction. Let \( g(\lambda, u, v) \) be the projection data at the detector coordinates \((u, v)\) acquired at angle \(\lambda\). Then, the extrapolation function is given by

\[
\tilde{g}_{\text{wat}}(\lambda, u, v) = 2\mu \sqrt{R^2 - \xi^2 (u - u_w)^2} \tag{10}
\]

where \(\mu\) is the water attenuation coefficient, \(u_w\) is the location of the fitted cylinder with respect to the detector row and \(R\) is the radius. The parameters \(u_w\) and \(R\) are determined as described in [2].

In contrast to the formulation by Hsieh et al., in Eq. (10) we introduce \(\xi\) that serves as a scaling factor to stretch or shrink the extrapolated profiles, which is computed as

\[
\xi^2 = \frac{R}{u_b - u_w}, \tag{11}
\]

where \(u_b\) indicates the left or right boundary \((u_{lb} \text{ or } u_{rb})\) we obtained in the previous section.

Bounded Square Root Function Extrapolation

As an alternative, we also investigate the square root function extrapolation that was proposed by Sourbelle et al. [3]. The extrapolation function is given as

\[
\tilde{g}_{\text{sqr}}(\lambda, u, v) = \sqrt{a \cdot u^2 + b \cdot u + c}. \tag{12}
\]

To determine the parameters \(a, b, \text{ and } c\), the following continuity equations are used:

\[
\begin{align*}
g(\lambda, u_t, v) &= \sqrt{a \cdot u_t^2 + b \cdot u_t + c}, \tag{13} \\
g'(\lambda, u_t, v) &= \frac{b + 2a \cdot u_t}{2g(\lambda, u_t, v)}. \tag{14}
\end{align*}
\]

where \(u_t\) denotes the truncated projection edge and \(g'(\lambda, u_t, v)\) is the mean slope value over a small region.

We integrate the patient boundary information into (12) such that the extrapolated profile ends at \(u_b\):

\[
g(\lambda, u_b, v) = \sqrt{a \cdot u_b^2 + b \cdot u_b + c} = 0. \tag{15}
\]

Thus, the three parameters \(a, b, \text{ and } c\) can be determined using these three equations. Note that for both patient bounded extrapolation schemes, we apply a cosine-based smooth weighting on the transition region.

III. Evaluation

A. Experiment Setup

Five clinical datasets of the patients’ head (data courtesy of St. Luke’s Episcopal Hospital, Houston, TX, USA) were used to evaluate the proposed method. The datasets were acquired on a C-arm system with 496 projection images \((1240 \times 960\) px) at the resolution of 0.308 mm/px. Even though a practical implementation would involve the extraction of the patient boundaries from low-dose fluoroscopic data, for proof of concept we here confined to extract the boundaries from two projections \((\lambda = -90^\circ \text{ and } \lambda = 0^\circ)\) of a non-collimated 3D scan. All datasets were virtually cropped to a medium field of view (FOV) and a small FOV and were reconstructed onto a volume of \(512^3\) with an isotropic voxel size of \(0.4\) mm\(^3\).
Table I: Quantitative evaluation of truncation corrections for different FOVs. Note that the given RMSE, rRMSE and CC are the average over all five datasets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Medium FOV</th>
<th>Small FOV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RMSE</td>
<td>96.4 HU</td>
<td>30.6 HU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rRMSE</td>
<td>2.21 %</td>
<td>0.71 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>0.995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An example of the estimated ellipse model compared to the actual patient shape extracted from reconstruction is shown in Fig. 3. Figure 4 shows the comparison of the heuristic and proposed extrapolation in a severe truncation case. Reconstruction results from the dataset 1, 2, and 3 are presented in Fig. 5-7, respectively. The quantitative evaluation is summarized in Table I. We can see that the proposed method improves the image quality substantially, particularly for severely truncated data. This is due to the fact that non-bounded heuristic extrapolation can not accurately fit the data outside an ROI, while the proposed method yields a much better approximation; see Fig. 4. The reconstructions also show that the proposed method is robust to both severe truncation and off-centered ROIs. Quantitative accuracy is improved considerably: the average RMSE reached 43.8 HU in severe truncation, compared to 391.8 HU from the heuristic method. A relative error of less than 1% was achieved, yielding an error reduction by a factor of 8 compared the heuristic method.

B. Results

An example of the estimated ellipse model compared to the actual patient shape extracted from reconstruction is shown in Fig. 3. Figure 4 shows the comparison of the heuristic and proposed extrapolation in a severe truncation case. Reconstruction results from the dataset 1, 2, and 3 are presented in Fig. 5-7, respectively. The quantitative evaluation is summarized in Table I. We can see that the proposed method improves the image quality substantially, particularly for severely truncated data. This is due to the fact that non-bounded heuristic extrapolation can not accurately fit the data outside an ROI, while the proposed method yields a much better approximation; see Fig. 4. The reconstructions also show that the proposed method is robust to both severe truncation and off-centered ROIs. Quantitative accuracy is improved considerably: the average RMSE reached 43.8 HU in severe truncation, compared to 391.8 HU from the heuristic method. A relative error of less than 1% was achieved, yielding an error reduction by a factor of 8 compared the heuristic method.

IV. Discussion

The method we proposed in this paper leads to a major improvement in image quality for 3D C-arm based ROI imaging. It involves no additional radiation when using the fluoroscopic images, as they are acquired anyway during the patient isocentering process. The model estimation can be readily integrated into the existing interventional workflow without additional hardware. Furthermore, it is well-suited for neurointerventions since: 1) The ellipse is a good model for the head; 2) the low-dose fluoroscopic images are usually non-collimated and cover the entire object of interest. Regarding computation times, both slice-wise ellipse fitting and patient boundary estimation are computationally inexpensive since only the boundary points are involved with small vector/matrix multiplications. Due to their very low radiation dose, a sparse set of fluoroscopic images can be further acquired from different views. In this manner, the detailed patient shape could be estimated using some parametric models such as B-splines.
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