Contrast enhancement for portal images by combination of subtraction and reprojection processes for Compton scattering
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Abstract
For patient setup of the IGRT technique, various imaging systems are currently available. MV portal imaging is performed in identical geometry with the treatment beam so that the portal image provides accurate geometric information. However, MV imaging suffers from poor image contrast due to larger Compton scatter photons. In this work, an original image processing algorithm is proposed to improve and enhance the image contrast without increasing the imaging dose. Scatter estimation was performed in detail by MC simulation based on patient CT data. In the image processing, scatter photons were eliminated and then they were reprojected as primary photons on the assumption that Compton interaction did not take place. To improve the processing efficiency, the dose spread function within the EPID was investigated and implemented on the developed code. Portal images with and without the proposed image processing were evaluated by the image contrast profile. By the subtraction process, the image contrast was improved but the EPID signal was weakened because 15.2% of the signal was eliminated due to the contribution of scatter photons. Hence, these scatter photons were reprojected in the reprojection process. As a result, the tumor, bronchi, mediastinal space and ribs were observed more clearly than in the original image. It was clarified that image processing with the dose spread functions provides stronger contrast enhancement while maintaining a sufficient signal-to-noise ratio. This work shows the feasibility of improving and enhancing the contrast of portal images.
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1 INTRODUCTION
Image-guided radiation therapy (IGRT) employs imaging to maximize geometric accuracy and precision during a treatment session. Various systems, e.g., in-treatment-room computed tomography (CT-on-rails), kilovoltage cone beam CT (kV-CBCT), portal imaging and megavoltage cone beam CT (MV-CBCT) are currently available for the IGRT. CT-on-rails and kV-CBCT can provide superior soft tissue contrast and anatomical information while an additional kV X-ray source and extra detector are required. The coordinates of two isocenters...
of kV imaging and treatment beam must be adjusted carefully for correct patient repositioning. Hence, quality assurance (QA) is more complex than that for MV imaging.\textsuperscript{3,4} MV portal and MV-CBCT imaging can be performed in identical geometry with the treatment beam so that accurate geometric information can be provided.\textsuperscript{5,6} However, MV imaging suffers from poor image contrast due to the lower difference of X-ray attenuation and larger Compton scattering compared with kV imaging.\textsuperscript{7,8}

Scatter correction methods that comprise scatter estimation and compensation have been reported.\textsuperscript{9,10} The beam-scatter-kernel (BSK) superposition approach is the most promising in the scatter estimation method with respect to the computational efficiency.\textsuperscript{11} The BSK is generally obtained using water rather than heterogeneous mediums and consequently it causes over- or underestimation of scatter photons.

In this work, the scatter estimation was performed in detail by Monte Carlo (MC) simulation based on patient CT data. Additionally, an original image processing algorithm was proposed for the scatter compensation. In this process, scatter photons were eliminated and reprojected as primary photons on the electronic portal imaging device (EPID). By the combination of the MC simulation and the proposed image processing, improvement and enhancement of the image contrast were attempted without increasing the imaging dose. To assess the feasibility of the image processing, portal images with and without the scatter compensation were compared.

\section{Methods}

\subsection{The proposed image-processing algorithm}

The original portal image is generated by primary and scatter photons that occur on the EPID. The signal \(P_o\) at the pixel coordinate \((x, y)\) is the sum of the signals by primary photons \(P_p(x, y)\) and scatter photons \(P_s(x, y)\) as follows:

\[ P_o(x, y) = P_p(x, y) + P_s(x, y) \] \hspace{1cm} (1)

To improve the image contrast, scatter photons must be eliminated. It has been reported that the signal of the EPID \(P\) is proportional to absorbed dose \(D\) to the scintillator.\textsuperscript{12,13} The \(P_p(x, y)\) can be estimated using absorbed doses by primary photons \(D_p(x, y)\) and scatter photons \(D_s(x, y)\) as follows:

\[ P_p(x, y) = P_o(x, y) \frac{D_p(x, y)}{D_p(x, y) + D_s(x, y)} \] \hspace{1cm} (2)

\(D_p\) and \(D_s\) can be calculated by using MC simulation in detail. Accordingly, the signal by primary photons \(P_p(x, y)\) is calculated by the subtraction of \(P_s(x, y)\) from \(P_o(x, y)\),

\[ P_p(x, y) = P_o(x, y) - P_s(x, y) \] \hspace{1cm} (3)

However, the entire EPID signal is weakened by the subtraction process. To enhance the image contrast without increasing the imaging dose, we propose a means of reusing the scatter photons that were eliminated by the subtraction process. Eliminated scatter photons are made to reproject from scattering points to the EPID as primary photons on the assumption that Compton interaction did not take place. In consideration of the energy difference between the reprojecting photon \(h_v\) and the scatter photon \(h_{sv}\), the signal by the reprojecting photon \(\Delta P_r\) is estimated by the ratio of absorbed dose by the reprojecting photon \(\Delta D(h_v)\) to that by the scatter photon \(\Delta D(h_{sv})\).

\[ \Delta P_r = \frac{\Delta D(h_v)}{\Delta D(h_{sv})} \Delta P_s. \] \hspace{1cm} (4)

where \(\Delta D(h_{sv})\) and \(\Delta D(h_v)\) are the absorbed dose to the scintillator by a photon with energy \(h_{sv}\) and \(h_v\) respectively. They can be estimated by MC simulation for each photon. \(\Delta P_s\) is the signal by a scatter photon that is calculated as follows:

\[ \Delta P_s = \frac{\Delta D(h_{sv})}{D_{sv}} P_s. \] \hspace{1cm} (5)

Then, the signal \(P_r(x, y)\) by \(n\) reprojecting photons can be calculated by the summation of \(\Delta P_r(x, y)\),

\[ P_r(x, y) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Delta P_r(x, y). \] \hspace{1cm} (6)

Finally, the signal of the contrast enhanced image \(P_c(x, y)\) is obtained by the sum of \(P_p(x, y)\) and \(P_r(x, y)\),

\[ P_c(x, y) = P_p(x, y) + w \times P_r(x, y) \] \hspace{1cm} (7)

where \(w\) is the weight factor for adjustment of the contrast enhancement.

\subsection{Simulation of absorbed dose to Gd\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2}S:Tb by a photon}

Figure 1 shows the geometric arrangement of the EPID (Portal Vision a-S500 on Clinac 21 EX, Varian Medical System) for the simulation. The EPID was modeled in detail according to the design provided by the manufacturer. It is mainly composed of a copper (Cu) plate, terbium-doped gadolinium oxysulfide (Gd\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2}S:Tb) scintillator and amorphous silicon (a-Si) photodiodes. The Cu plate filters lower energy photons and electrons; the Cu plate acts as the photons for the electrons converter when high-energy photons are impinged upon. Then, the scintillator generates fluorescence by electrons from

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{Geometric arrangement of the EPID for the simulation. The EPID is mainly composed of a Cu plate, Gd\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2}S:Tb scintillator and a-Si photodiodes. In the simulation, equally spaced radial bins with \(\Delta r = 0.392\ \text{mm} (1/2\ of\ pixel\ width)\) were arranged, and the absorbed dose to Gd\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2}S:Tb by a photon from the EPID surface was simulated using the DOSRZnrc code.}
\end{figure}
the Cu plate. It is estimated that 99.5% of the total signal is generated within the scintillator.\textsuperscript{13}

Electron trajectories are complicated within the EPID. To that end, the absorbed dose to Gd$_2$O$_2$:Tb by a photon from the EPID surface was simulated using the DOSRZnrc code,\textsuperscript{14} and the dose spread functions of photon energy $h\nu$ and the radial distance from pencil beam $r$, $\Delta D(h\nu, r)$ were obtained. In the simulation, equally spaced radial bins with $\Delta r = 0.392$ mm (1/2 of pixel width) were arranged. The EPID consists of not only the main three layers but also low-density materials, such as air, paper and foamed body. In order to consider the spread of low-energy particles within low-density materials, the cut-off energies of photons and electrons were set to 10 and 521 keV.

2.C | Acquisition of portal image and 3D-CT image

The thorax phantom (N-1 LUNGMAN, Kyoto Kagaku) was modeled as a patient. A water-equivalent 2 cm $\varphi$ sphere was inserted into the right lung as a tumor. The original portal image was acquired with 6 MV therapeutic beam of a linac (Clinac 21EX, Varian Medical System). The thorax phantom was irradiated with 5 monitor units. The source to the distance (SAD) and source to the EPID distance (SDD) were 1000 and 1400 mm, respectively. The field size was set to 40 cm $\times$ 30 cm at the EPID, which has $512 \times 384$ pixels, the pixel size was 0.784 mm $\times$ 0.784 mm and the signals were recorded as a 16-bit integer.

The 3D-CT data were obtained by the SPECT-CT scanner (Symbia T2, Seimens Healthcare) with the reconstruction matrix $512 \times 512 \times 512$ and voxel size of 0.7 mm $\times$ 0.7 mm $\times$ 1.0 mm.

2.D | Photon sampling and image processing

3D-CT data of the thorax phantom was modeled in EGS5 to investigate photon trajectories in detail.\textsuperscript{15} Figure 2 shows a simplified diagram of the photon sampling. The simulation geometry, e.g., SAD, SDD, and field size, was the same as the MV portal imaging described in 2.C. A 6 MV beam was reproduced according to the energy spectrum. When the photon reached the EPID surface, the coordinates $(x, y)$ and energy $h\nu$ of primary and scatter photons were sampled. Additionally, if it was a scatter photon, the coordinates $(x, y)$ and energy $h\nu$, of the reprojecting photon were sampled on the assumption that the Compton interaction does not take place.

To calculate the absorbed dose $D$ for each pixel, the deposit energy was sampled within $r$ away from the incident point $(x, y)$ according to the dose spread function $\Delta D(h\nu, r)$. Thus, $D_y(x, y)$ and $D_x(x, y)$ for each pixel were calculated by accumulation of the dose spread by scatter and primary photons, respectively. In the subtraction process, $P_x(x, y)$ and $P_y(x, y)$ were obtained according to eqs. (2) and (3). In the reprojection process, signals by a scatter photon $\Delta P_s$ were calculated using $\Delta D(h\nu, r)$ and the signal by the reprojecting photon $\Delta P_r$ was calculated by eq. (4) but $\Delta D(h\nu)/\Delta D(h\nu_s)$ was replaced with $\Delta D(h\nu, r)/\Delta D(h\nu_s, r)$ in consideration of the dose spread. The image processing code was developed using the Qt 5.2.1 toolkit and the code was written in C++.
2.E | Evaluation of portal images with and without the image processing

The portal images with and without the proposed image processing were evaluated by the image contrast profile $C(x, y)$ that was used by Kairn et al. $C(x, y)$ was calculated by the following equation:

$$C(x, y) = \frac{P(x, y) - P_{\text{ref}}}{P_{\text{ref}}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

where $P_{\text{ref}}$ is the mean signal of the reference region that is indicated as a square in Fig. 3(a). The reference region was selected as the homogeneous background in the portal image. $C(x, y)$ was evaluated along the line profile shown in Fig. 3(b).

3 | RESULTS

3.A | Absorbed dose to Gd$_2$O$_2$S:Tb by a photon

Figure 4 shows the absorbed dose to the Gd$_2$O$_2$S:Tb at $r = 0$, $\Delta D(h \nu, 0)$, as a function of photon energy. When $h \nu$ was lower than 0.7 MeV, $\Delta D(h \nu, 0)$ became maximum at $h \nu = 110$ keV and decreased quickly with the decrease in $h \nu$. On the other hand, when $h \nu$ was greater than 0.7 MeV, $\Delta D(h \nu, 0)$ increased slowly with the increase in $h \nu$. This tendency suggests that the Cu plate acted as a
buildup plate and the large number of recoil electrons reached the Gd₂O₂S:Tb.

Figure 5 shows dose spread functions $\Delta D(h\nu, r)$ that normalized to absorbed dose at $r = 0$, $\Delta D(h\nu, 0)$. It was observed that the contribution of the dose spread was increased with the increase in $h\nu$, and this phenomenon was not negligible in MV imaging. The ratio of $\Delta D(h\nu, r)$ to $\Delta D(h\nu, 0)$ was lower than 0.5% when $h\nu$ was lower than 1.0 MeV and $r$ exceeds 2.5 mm. Accordingly, in the image processing code, $\Delta D(h\nu, r)$ calculations were performed in $0.0 \text{ mm} \leq r \leq 2.5 \text{ mm}$.

3.B | Evaluation of portal image with and without the proposed image processing

Figure 6 shows the portal image of the thorax phantom by scatter photons only ($P_s$ image) and Fig. 7 shows the signal profile along the solid line at the $P_s$ image. The signal by scatter photons was increased near the center of the image. For the 6 MV X-ray beam, it was clarified that 15.2% of whole EPID signal was generated by scatter photons. Primary photons were mainly scattered in bone structures and the mediastinal space, then the contribution of scattered photons became larger in the center of the EPID. Figure 8 shows the portal image of the thorax phantom by reprojecting photons only ($P_r$ image) and Fig. 9 shows the signal profile along the solid line at the $P_r$ image. The convex profile by scatter photons indicated in Fig. 7 was corrected and the thorax structures could be observed by reprojecting photons.

Figure 10 shows a comparison between the original portal image ($P_o$ image) and the contrast enhanced image ($P_c$ image) that has the weight factor $w = 1.0$. Two images were displayed with the same window width, and gray levels were adjusted to be the same at the coordinates ($x = 257, y = 26$) where the spinous process was observed. As a result, the thorax structures, e.g., the tumor, bronchi, mediastinal space and ribs were observed more clearly in the $P_c$ than in the $P_o$ image. Figure 11 shows a comparison of contrast profiles between $P_o$, $P_p$ and $P_c$ images. The image contrast of the $P_c$ image was superior to other images.

4 | DISCUSSION

Compton interaction becomes dominant above 30 keV for soft tissues and above 60 keV for bone. Within the thorax phantom, most
of the interaction was Compton scattering for the 6 MV X-ray beam. By the MC simulation, it was calculated that 15.2% of the EPID signal was generated by scatter photons. Therefore, it is confirmed that image processing against scatter photons is required for MV imaging.

The proposed image processing was performed by the combination of the subtraction and the reprojection processes. The number of scatter photons increased as the density of the structure increased. Even with the weight factor $w$ being 0, namely without the reprojection process, the image contrast was improved. On the other hand, the EPID signal was weakened because 15.2% of the signal was eliminated as the contribution of scatter photons by the subtraction process. Hence, these scatter photons were reprojected as primary photons in the reprojection process. Consequently, it was clarified that scatter photons were utilized as primary photons for more contrast enhancement without increasing the imaging dose.

The proposed image processing includes the photon sampling process using the MC simulation. Thus, the signal-to-noise ratio increased. Even with the weight factor $w$ being 0, namely without the reprojection process, the image contrast was improved. On the other hand, the EPID signal was weakened because 15.2% of the signal was eliminated as the contribution of scatter photons by the subtraction process. Hence, these scatter photons were reprojected as primary photons in the reprojection process. Consequently, it was clarified that scatter photons were utilized as primary photons for more contrast enhancement without increasing the imaging dose.

The proposed image processing includes the photon sampling process using the MC simulation. Thus, the signal-to-noise ratio increased. Even with the weight factor $w$ being 0, namely without the reprojection process, the image contrast was improved. On the other hand, the EPID signal was weakened because 15.2% of the signal was eliminated as the contribution of scatter photons by the subtraction process. Hence, these scatter photons were reprojected as primary photons in the reprojection process. Consequently, it was clarified that scatter photons were utilized as primary photons for more contrast enhancement without increasing the imaging dose.
Fig. 15. Pelvis phantom images with/without the proposed image processing. Two images were displayed with the same window width, and gray levels were adjusted to be the same at the coordinates ($x = 256, y = 20$) between vertebral bodies. The contrast enhanced image with sufficient SNR was obtained when the number history was $1.0 \times 10^{10}$. Although the density, location and volume of structures within the pelvis are different from that within the thorax, it was confirmed that contrast enhanced images can be obtained with same weight factor. Therefore, the proposed image processing might be available for major treatment sites with the weight factor $w = 1.0$ and at least $1.5 \times 10^{10}$ histories.

Further works, e.g., speedup of the image processing using the graphics processing units (GPU) based MC simulation, investigation of optimal parameters considering patient’s size and image registration adapting temporal changes in anatomy, are necessary to raise the possibilities and reduce the limitations of the proposed image processing.

5 Conclusion

Original image processing was proposed to improve and enhance the contrast of portal images. In the image processing, a combination of the subtraction and reprojection processes was performed using the photon sampling data. To improve the processing efficiency, the dose spread functions within the EPID were investigated and implemented on the developed code. In the contrast enhanced image, the structures were observed more clearly than in the original portal image. Consequently, this work demonstrates the feasibility of improving and enhancing the contrast of portal images.
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