

NOTE

Non-diverging analytical expression for the sensitivity of converging SPECT collimators

To cite this article: Jarno van Roosmalen and Marlies C Goorden 2017 *Phys. Med. Biol.* **62** N228

View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.

Related content


- [Geometrical response of multihole collimators](#)
Andreas Robert Formiconi
- [The geometric transfer function for cone and fan beam collimators](#)
B M W Tsui and G T Gullberg
- [Improved estimation of the detector response function for converging beam collimators](#)
E C Frey, B M W Tsui and G T Gullberg

Recent citations

- [Fast quantitative reconstruction with focusing collimators for liver SPECT](#)
Martijn M. A. Dietze *et al*
- [Comparison of fan beam, slit-slat and multi-pinhole collimators for molecular breast tomosynthesis](#)
Jarno van Roosmalen *et al*

**LIGHTER, LARGER with
SUB-MILLIMETER ACCURACY**

Quantify MRI Geometric
Distortion in **3D**



Q
MRID^{3D}

Note

Non-diverging analytical expression for the sensitivity of converging SPECT collimators

Jarno van Roosmalen and Marlies C Goorden

Section of Radiation, Detection and Medical Imaging, Faculty of Applied Sciences,
Delft University of Technology, Mekelweg 15, 2629 JB Delft, Netherlands

E-mail: j.vanroosmalen@tudelft.nl

Received 1 November 2016, revised 17 February 2017

Accepted for publication 13 March 2017

Published 26 April 2017



CrossMark

Abstract

Accurate analytical expressions for collimator resolution and sensitivity are important tools in the optimization of SPECT systems. However, presently known expressions for the sensitivity of converging collimators either diverge near the focal point or focal line(s), or are only valid on the collimator axis. As a result, these expressions are unsuitable to calculate volumetric sensitivity for e.g. short-focal length collimators that focus inside the object to enhance sensitivity. To also enable collimator optimization for these geometries, we here present non-diverging sensitivity formulas for astigmatic, cone beam and fan beam collimators that are applicable over the full collimator's field-of-view. The sensitivity was calculated by integrating previously derived collimator response functions over the full detector surface. Contrary to common approximations, the varying solid angle subtended by different detector pixels was fully taken into account which results in a closed-form non-diverging formula for the sensitivity. We validated these expressions using ray-tracing simulations of a fan beam and an astigmatic cone beam collimator and found close agreement between the simulations and the sensitivity expression. The largest differences with the simulation were found close to the collimator, where sensitivity depends on the exact placement of holes and septa, while our expression represents an average over all possible placements as is common practice for analytical sensitivity expressions. We checked that average differences between the analytical expression and simulations reduced to less than 1% of the maximum sensitivity when we averaged our simulations over different septa locations. Moreover, we found that our new expression reduced to the traditional diverging formula under certain assumptions. Therefore, the newly derived sensitivity expression

may enable the optimization of converging collimators for a wide range of applications, in particular when the focus is close to, or in, the object of interest.

Keywords: sensitivity, converging collimators, cone beam, fan beam

 Supplementary material for this article is available [online](#)

(Some figures may appear in colour only in the online journal)

1. Introduction

The use of converging collimators in Single Photon Emission Computed Tomography (SPECT) has already been proposed since the 1980s (Jaszczak *et al* 1979, Jaszczak *et al* 1986, Jaszczak *et al* 1988, Tsui *et al* 1986, Gullberg *et al* 1991a, 1991b). Such converging collimators, in which the hole's axes converge to a focal line (fan beam), a focal point (cone beam), or multiple focal lines (astigmatic), are advantageous for increasing photon yield or sensitivity over that of parallel hole collimators if the dimensions of the target object or organ are smaller than those of the gamma detector. Additionally, combinations of different converging collimators, e.g. combined half-cone beam and fan beam collimation have been investigated for high-sensitivity SPECT (Li *et al* 1996, Beekman *et al* 1998, Kamphuis and Beekman 1998, Ter-Antonyan *et al* 2009). Because the sensitivity of converging collimators is highest near the focal line(s) or point, various researchers have proposed to use short focal length cone beam collimators with focus inside the object of interest, e.g. Hawman and Haines (1994), Walrand *et al* (2002), Park *et al* (2003, 2005) and van Roosmalen *et al* (2015). The increased sensitivity due to focusing inside the object may also reduce noise in reconstructed images induced by attenuation as was shown by Kijewski *et al* (1997) and may benefit SPECT systems equipped with transmission sources (SPECT/transmission computed tomography (TCT) systems) by increasing the number of transmission counts. These systems based on fan beam collimators can have transmission line or point sources at the focal line (Kemp *et al* 1995, Beekman *et al* 1998), or use virtual point sources at the focal point of a cone beam collimator (Manglos *et al* 1992, Beekman 2001).

An important tool in SPECT and SPECT/TCT system design is the use of accurate analytical expressions for collimator resolution and sensitivity. However, common expressions for the sensitivity of converging collimators (Metz *et al* 1980, Tsui and Gullberg 1990) inappropriately diverge near the collimator's focus. Moreover, the divergence scales with $1/r^n$, with r being the distance from the focus and $n = 1$ for fan beam and $n = 2$ for cone beam collimators, making the expressions non-integrable around the focus. Thus, when calculating volumetric collimator sensitivity over a region containing the focus, one cannot circumvent the singularity at the focus by taking points just outside of the focus location. This is particularly problematic for designing systems that exploit the increased sensitivity near the focus such as the short-focal-length collimator geometries mentioned above.

To circumvent the issue of diverging analytical expressions, other methods for determining the sensitivity have been used in optimization studies. For example measurements on physical collimators (Li *et al* 1996, Jaszczak *et al* 1988), extensive Monte Carlo or raytracing simulations (Jaszczak *et al* 1986) can give accurate estimates. However, these methods are computationally expensive, and do thus not allow for quick evaluation of a large number of design parameters, or fast analytical optimization based on the expressions themselves.

θ' is the angle between the z -axis and the vector connecting the point source with the point \mathbf{r}' on the detector as indicated in figure 1. It can thus be written as

$$\cos \theta' = \frac{z + L}{\sqrt{(z + L)^2 + |\mathbf{r}' - \mathbf{r}|^2}}. \quad (2)$$

The collimator aperture function $A(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}, z)$ is determined from the aperture functions of a single hole $a_f(\mathbf{r}'')$ and $a_b(\mathbf{r}'')$ respectively at the front and at the back of the collimator, which are one for lateral positions $\mathbf{r}'' = (x'', y'')$ inside the collimator hole and zero outside of the hole. If one projects the front and back apertures from the source position onto the detector then the size of the overlap between these projections determines the fraction of photons that can pass through the collimator hole. Now the common way to calculate the sensitivity, is to continuously translate a single hole over the detector to arrive at an average sensitivity which does not depend on the exact position of the septa. For the general case of astigmatic collimators with holes on a lattice it was shown that $A(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}, z)$ can be written in the following way (Tsui and Gullberg 1990, Formiconi 1998)

$$A(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}, z) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} a_f(-\boldsymbol{\sigma}) a_b(\mathbf{r}_T(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}, z) - \boldsymbol{\sigma}) d\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \quad (3)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\sigma_x, \sigma_y)$, $\mathbf{r}_T(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}, z) = (x_T(x, x', z), y_T(y, y', z))$ and

$$x_T(x, x', z) = \frac{L(F_x - z)}{(F_x + L)(z + L)} x' - \frac{L}{z + L} x, \quad (4)$$

$$y_T(y, y', z) = \frac{L(F_y - z)}{(F_y + L)(z + L)} y' - \frac{L}{z + L} y. \quad (5)$$

Note that these equations thus average out the details of the exact location of the individual septa and holes (Tsui and Gullberg 1990, Formiconi 1998). Here σ represents a shift of the hole parallel to the detector plane, to average the response over all possible hole locations. Moreover, \mathbf{r}_T represents the vector on the collimator surface between the line from the focus to the point \mathbf{r}' on the detector and the line from the source to \mathbf{r}' (see figure A1 in the appendix for an illustration).

In our derivation we assume rectangular holes (in the discussion we come back to other hole shapes) and one thus has an aperture function $a_f(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = 1$ if $|\sigma_x| < d_x/2$ and $|\sigma_y| < d_y/2$. The collimator's aperture function can then be calculated and it reads

$$A(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}, z) = (d_x - |x_T|)(d_y - |y_T|), \quad (6)$$

for $|x_T| < d_x$ and $|y_T| < d_y$ and 0 otherwise. To determine the sensitivity, the flux has to be integrated over the detector plane. One can show that in order to arrive at a physically meaningful sensitivity, one has to set the proportionality constant $k^{-1} = (d_x + t_x)(d_y + t_y)$ (Tsui and Gullberg 1990). With these definitions, the flux in (1) is fully defined, and the sensitivity is given by

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \int_{-W_x/2}^{W_x/2} \int_{-W_y/2}^{W_y/2} dx' dy' \phi(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}, z) \\ &= \frac{F_x + L}{|F_x - z|} \frac{F_y + L}{|F_y - z|} \frac{1}{L^2 4\pi (d_x + t_x)(d_y + t_y)} \cdot \\ &\quad \int_{\chi_{-1}}^{\chi_1} \int_{\xi_{-1}}^{\xi_1} dx_T dy_T (d_x - |x_T|)(d_y - |y_T|) \cos^3 \theta' \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Here, the integration limits χ_i , χ_i , ξ_i , and ξ_i can be calculated by

$$\chi_i = \min \left\{ \max \left[-d_x, -\frac{L|x|}{L+z} + \frac{1}{2}iW_x \left| \frac{L(F_x - z)}{(F_x + L)(L+z)} \right| \right], d_x \right\}, \quad (8)$$

$$\xi_i = \min \left\{ \max \left[-d_y, -\frac{L|y|}{L+z} + \frac{1}{2}iW_y \left| \frac{L(F_y - z)}{(F_y + L)(L+z)} \right| \right], d_y \right\}. \quad (9)$$

Note that the integration limits are coordinates defined on the front surface of the collimator, where \mathbf{r}_T was defined (see figure A1). The response that is being integrated is for a single moving hole. Therefore, the limits in (8) and (9) are usually from $-d_x$ to d_x (or $-d_y$ to d_y), except when the hole is partly over the edge of the finite detector, then the integration range becomes smaller.

2.2. Conventional diverging expression

Now the usual approach is to approximate θ' with θ (the angle between the z -axis and the line from the focus to \mathbf{r} , see figure 1). This approximation is based on the assumption that the detector response to a point source is narrow, i.e. gamma photons from the source can only reach the detector through a few holes. In this case the $\cos^3 \theta'$ can be approximated by $\cos^3 \theta$ in (7) and taken out of the integral as it is now a constant. Furthermore, in these traditional derivations the finite detector size is not taken into account. Under these assumptions, the integral is straightforward to perform and one finds the usual diverging formula for sensitivity, see Moyer (1974), Jaszczak *et al* (1986) or Formiconi (1998)

$$S_{\text{div}} = \cos^3 \theta \frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{F_x + L}{|F_x - z|} \frac{F_y + L}{|F_y - z|} \frac{d_x^2 d_y^2}{L^2(d_x + t_x)(d_y + t_y)}. \quad (10)$$

Using basic trigonometry one can write $\cos \theta = 1/\sqrt{1 + x^2/(F_x - z)^2 + y^2/(F_y - z)^2}$.

2.3. Non-diverging expression

The reason that the common sensitivity expressions diverge near the focal point/lines is due to the fact that the assumptions stated in section 2.2 do not hold close to the focal point, as close to the focal point many holes 'see' the source and the response is not narrow, see figure 2. Thus, for these non-narrow responses one cannot approximate θ' with θ and the $\cos^3 \theta'$ term has to be included inside the integral as it varies over the detector. In (2) we already provided an exact expression for $\cos \theta'$ in terms of \mathbf{r} and \mathbf{r}' , which can be substituted in (7).

Moreover, near the focal point or line the finite detector size starts to play a role; when a source is placed in the focal point all holes transmit gamma photons from the source and thus the sensitivity reduces to the solid angle subtended by the detector plane, corrected for the fact that no signal is detected underneath the septa. As the solid angle of a finite detector is usually significantly different from that of an infinite detector, the detector size should play a role for all points in a region around the focus.

Therefore, to arrive at a realistic expression for sensitivity which is also valid near the collimator's focus, we have to evaluate the full integral of (7) without any approximation. In principle, this evaluation consists of performing standard integrals, that can e.g. be found in textbooks like (Gradshteyn and Ryzhik 2014). Note that the integration limits in (7) are




Figure 2. Schematic representation of the holes that contribute to the sensitivity for two different point source locations. Dotted lines illustrate paths that are blocked by the collimator. (a) Point source located away from the focus resulting in a narrow detector response to which only a few holes contribute. (b) Point source located close to the focus having a wide detector response as paths from the source can reach the detector through many holes.

complicated expressions given in (8) and (9), so especially the second integration is quite complex involving many terms. Therefore, the resulting expression becomes very complicated and very lengthy and we had to perform extensive simplification in order to arrive at a tractable form that can be presented in a paper and that other researchers can incorporate into their collimator optimization code. In the supplementary information (stacks.iop.org/PMB/62/N228/mmedia) we provide the results of the first integration and the simplification applied to this intermediate result. The mentioned simplifications consisted of exact algebraic manipulation of the (intermediate) expressions, in order to arrive at a representable formula, but they did not involve any approximations. For example, we identified several frequently occurring sub-expressions which could be replaced by a single variable or function. All algebraic manipulations of expressions were supported by the computer program mathematica (Wolfram Research Inc.). The mathematica file is available in the supplementary information.

2.4. Validation

We validate the results using our raytracing software that we developed and validated with Monte Carlo simulations (Wang *et al* 2017). This raytracing code uses a voxel based model (0.05 mm voxels in this paper) of the collimator, where each voxel consists of either air, or collimator material. The voxel size was chosen to be sufficiently small to accurately model the septa, i.e. a small test gave sensitivity differences of a few percent compared to results with much smaller voxels. The software determines the path length through materials from the source to each of the 36 million detector pixels with a Siddon-like raytracing algorithm. The algorithm follows a ray from source to a detector pixel through the collimator. In every voxel the path length of the ray through the voxel is calculated and multiplied by the linear attenuation coefficient. We use Siddon's efficient algorithm to compute this path length (Siddon 1985). The accumulated probability that the ray is attenuated in the collimator combined with a geometrical factor gives the final probability that a photon emitted from the source is detected at this specific pixel. The geometrical factor is the solid angle of the pixel extended towards the source (i.e. the probability that the pixel would detect gamma photons from the source if no collimator would be present). We modelled the detector with 0.05×0.05 mm

pixels, to accurately describe the exact response of the holes, without suffering from discretization errors.

For testing our expression, modelling of the detector response has been turned off as is common. To validate the collimator response formula, the geometrical response of the collimator was calculated without modelling penetration of gamma rays through the septa. Therefore, this is initially also turned off in our raytracing software to first test for agreement in this ideal case. As in our derivation, holes are assumed to be rectangular in the simulation. We consider two collimators in our validation. The first is a fan beam collimator with $d_x = d_y = 1.4$ mm, $t_x = t_y = 0.2$ mm, $L = 27$ mm, $F_x = 45$ mm. For fan beam collimators, F_y is set to ∞ . The second collimator we use for validation is an astigmatic cone beam collimator with $d_x = 1.4$ mm, $d_y = 1.1$ mm, $t_x = 0.2$ mm, $t_y = 0.3$ mm, $L = 27$ mm, $F_x = 45$ mm and $F_y = 60$ mm. In both cases the detector is assumed to be 300 mm by 300 mm.

It is expected that close to the collimator the sensitivity will strongly depend on the precise location of the septa and holes. However, as it is generally undesirable to have complicated sensitivity expressions containing the exact locations of the septa, we based the analytical derivation on averaging over all possible configurations, as is common to do. To be able to validate the expression against this assumption, we shifted the septa in our voxelized collimator model in 10 steps of 0.16 mm, for both x and y directions for the fan beam example. For the cone beam example we use steps of 0.16 and 0.14 mm for x and y respectively. This results in 100 unique collimator configurations, which were each simulated using our raytracer. The average sensitivity is then reported, as are the results of a single configuration to illustrate the difference.

Moreover, we investigated if we can use the usual approach of incorporating septal penetration by an effective hole length, $L_e = L - 2/\mu$ (Mather 1957, Moyer 1974). To test how accurate this approximation is, we replace L by L_e in our formulas and include penetration in our raytracing code for the same collimators as described above. We assume tungsten septa with $\mu = 3.39$ mm⁻¹ for 140 keV gamma rays.

2.4.1. Volumetric sensitivity. To see the importance of the new expressions for volumetric sensitivity calculations we test an example loosely based on the brain SPECT system of Park *et al* (2005). We assume a 300 mm by 300 mm detector with a collimator with $L = 24$ mm, $d_x = d_y = 1.1$ mm and $t_x = t_y = 0.16$ mm. The mean sensitivity is calculated for a sphere with a diameter of 200 mm, located 50 mm from the collimator surface (mimicking a 150 mm radius of rotation). We will evaluate the sensitivity for a range of focal lengths from 150 mm (focus in the centre of the sphere) till 400 mm (focus outside sphere).

3. Results

3.1. Analytical expression

After integrating (7) and extensive simplification, we arrived at the following closed-form expression for the sensitivity

$$S = \frac{L^2}{4\pi} \frac{1}{d_x + t_x} \frac{1}{d_y + t_y} \frac{|F_x - z|}{F_x + L} \frac{|F_y - z|}{F_y + L} \sum_{i=-1}^1 \sum_{j=-1}^1 S_{i,j}. \quad (11)$$

The term $S_{i,j}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{i,j} = & (-1)^{i+j}(2 - |i|)(2 - |j|)(i - (1 + i)U(\chi_i))(j - (1 + j)U(\xi_j)) \\
& \left[-\sqrt{1 + b_x^2(i) + b_y^2(j)} + a_x(i)a_y(j) \arctan\left(\frac{b_x(i)b_y(j)}{\sqrt{1 + b_x^2(i) + b_y^2(j)}}\right) \right. \\
& - a_x(i) \ln\left(-b_x(i) + \sqrt{1 + b_x^2(i) + b_y^2(j)}\right) \\
& \left. - a_y(j) \ln\left(-b_y(j) + \sqrt{1 + b_x^2(i) + b_y^2(j)}\right) \right] \quad (12)
\end{aligned}$$

where U denotes the unit step function ($U(x) = 1$ for $x > 0$ and $U(x) = 0$ for $x \leq 0$). Furthermore, the constants a_x, a_y, b_x and b_y read (for $i = -1, 1$ and $j = -1, 1$)

$$a_x(i) = \frac{F_x + L}{F_x - z} \frac{d_x}{L} \text{sign}(\chi_i) + \frac{|x|}{F_x - z}, \quad a_y(j) = \frac{F_y + L}{F_y - z} \frac{d_y}{L} \text{sign}(\xi_j) + \frac{|y|}{F_y - z}, \quad (13)$$

$$b_x(i) = \frac{F_x + L}{F_x - z} \frac{\chi_i}{L} + \frac{|x|}{F_x - z}, \quad b_y(j) = \frac{F_y + L}{F_y - z} \frac{\xi_j}{L} + \frac{|y|}{F_y - z} \quad (14)$$

while for $i = 0$, respectively $j = 0$, we have

$$a_x(0) = b_x(0) = |x|/(F_x - z), \quad a_y(0) = b_y(0) = |y|/(F_y - z). \quad (15)$$

The finite detector size is incorporated in χ_i and ξ_j which were defined previously in (8) and (9). Although this is still a rather complicated expression, it can easily be incorporated in a computer program to quickly calculate the sensitivity for different collimators in e.g. an optimization study.

3.2. Special cases

It is important to show that under the right assumptions the well known and previously published formulas can be recovered. The traditional diverging formula was derived under the assumption that the detector has an infinite size and that $\theta' \approx \theta$ (i.e. the detector response is narrow, see figure 2 and section 2.3). For an infinite detector, $W_x = W_y = \infty$ and this gives $\chi_i = id_x$ and $\xi_j = id_y$. Furthermore, we assume that $|F_x - z| \gg d_x(F_x + L)/L$ and $|F_y - z| \gg d_y(F_y + L)/L$. This corresponds to assuming that the vertical distance from the focal point/line ($|F_x - z|$), is much larger than the back projected size of a hole ($d_x(F_x + L)/L$) along the same vertical axis. First order expansion in $d_x(F_x + L)/(L|F_x - z|)$ and $d_y(F_y + L)/(L|F_y - z|)$ of (11) gives

$$S \approx \frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{F_x + L}{|F_x - z|} \frac{F_y + L}{|F_y - z|} \frac{d_x^2 d_y^2}{L^2(d_x + t_x)(d_y + t_y)} \left(\left(\frac{x}{F_x - z} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{y}{F_y - z} \right)^2 + 1 \right)^{-\frac{3}{2}}. \quad (16)$$

Using the expression for $\cos \theta$, defined in section 2.2 we can rewrite this as (10) (duplicated here for convenience)

$$S_{\text{div}} = \cos^3 \theta \frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{F_x + L}{|F_x - z|} \frac{F_y + L}{|F_y - z|} \frac{d_x^2 d_y^2}{L^2(d_x + t_x)(d_y + t_y)}.$$

It is also of interest to consider sensitivity at the focal point of a cone beam collimator. This is done by first setting $x = y = 0$, and $F_y = F_x$ and then taking the limit $z \rightarrow F_x$. Setting $x = y = 0$ means the first term with $|x|$ and $|y|$ respectively in χ_i and ξ_i drops, and the second term drops out of $a_x(i)$, $a_y(j)$, $b_x(i)$ and $b_y(j)$ in (13), (14) and $a_x(0) = a_y(0) = b_x(0) = b_y(0) = 0$. The $a_x(i)$, $a_y(j)$, $b_x(i)$ and $b_y(j)$ terms diverge for $i, j \neq 0$ in the limit $F_x - z \rightarrow 0$, but the divergence is cancelled by the $|F_x - z|$ from the pre-factor in (11). All the terms with either $i = 0$ or $j = 0$ are 0 in (12), leaving us with 4 equal terms that add up to

$$S_{\text{foc}} = \frac{d_x d_y}{\pi(d_x + t_x)(d_y + t_y)} \arctan \left(\frac{W_x W_y}{2(F_x + L) \sqrt{4(F_x + L)^2 + W_x^2 + W_y^2}} \right), \quad (17)$$

which is just the solid angle of the detector corrected for the presence of septa (see (29) from Accorsi and Metzler (2006)). Note that for an infinite detector the arctan term becomes $\arctan(\infty) = \pi/2$ and so the sensitivity reduces to $d_x d_y / (2(d_x + t_x)(d_y + t_y))$ which in the limit of septal thickness going to 0, reduces to 1/2 as expected for a single infinite detector.

3.3. Validation by raytracing

In figures 3 and 4 we compared the sensitivity given by (11) with raytracing simulations for the fan beam and cone beam example respectively. As explained in section 2.4, in our raytracing simulation we generated 100 different collimator configurations in which the location of the septa and holes was slightly different. These figures show the sensitivity averaged over these 100 configurations (black squares) and the sensitivity of one of these configurations (red crosses). The single configuration chosen is the one where a septum touches the collimator axis (one side of septum at $x = 0$, $y = 0$). As a reference we also plotted the conventional diverging expression provided in (10) and we showed the results of the earlier derived on-axis formula from Accorsi and Metzler (2006) for the on-axis plots.

Figures 3(a) and 4(a) show the sensitivity profiles along the collimator axis (i.e. $x = 0$ and $y = 0$ mm), where the earlier expression derived by Accorsi *et al* should also be valid. We indeed find very close agreement among S from (11), the ray-tracing simulation average over different septa locations and Accorsi's expression. We reported all differences between the analytical expressions and the simulations (averaged over the plotted profiles) as percentages of the maximum sensitivity obtained with that collimator in the simulation. For the fan beam collimator, the average and the maximum absolute difference between (11) and the averaged raytracing simulation are 0.5% and 4.3% respectively, as tabulated in table 1. For the cone beam collimator, the average absolute difference between (11) and the averaged raytracer result is 0.7% of the maximum. The expression from Accorsi and Metzler (2006) was only derived on the collimator axis, where it agrees very well with (11). For both collimators the relative difference is everywhere less than 1/10 000th. The divergence of the traditional expression at the focal line is also clear from the image. In fact we see that in a region of 8 mm at either side of the focus, the error of (10) is more than 5%. This corresponds with the condition found in section 3.2 for the divergent formula to be valid, i.e. $|F_x - z| \gg d_x(F_x + L)/L = 3.7$ mm.

In figures 3(b) and 4(b)–(d), we plotted sensitivity obtained from the same expressions but now along lines off the collimator axis ($x = 8$ mm and $y = 0$ mm, $x = 0$ mm and $y = 8$ mm, and




Figure 3. Comparison of analytically calculated sensitivity S (cyan solid line) for fan beam collimator with raytracing simulations. Simulation results for one particular position of the septa (red crosses) and an average over 100 different septa positions (black squares) are provided. Sensitivity given by the traditional diverging formula (black solid line) and a previously derived on-axis non-diverging formula of Accorsi and Metzler (2006) (green circles) are shown as well. (a) For $x = 0$ mm and $y = 0$ mm, (b) idem for sensitivity at $x = 8$ mm, $y = 0$ mm.

$x = y = 8$ mm respectively). Note that for the fan beam collimator in total only two images are shown due to symmetry considerations. As the cone beam collimator is astigmatic, no symmetry is expected. Along the off-axis lines in figures 3(b) and 4(d) (note that in figures 4(b) and 4(c) there is still a diverging point), the traditional sensitivity formula does not diverge and is better able to describe the sensitivity than on-axis. Like in the on-axis case, we found close agreement between our sensitivity expression and the averaged raytracing results for all cases, see table 1.

From figure 3(b) it is clear that there are significant differences between the sensitivity of a single fixed collimator set-up and the average over 100 configurations. This is most pronounced close to the collimator, i.e. $z < 35$ mm in figure 3(b). This confirmed that the precise location of the septa can have a clear influence on the sensitivity especially close to the collimator as one might expect. We can see from table 1 that for the fan beam collimator the maximum difference increased from 0.5% for the average over 100 configurations to 4.4% for a single configuration for the off axis line. For the cone beam example (see figure 4), the difference is less.

3.4. Septa penetration

As mentioned, in our derivation penetration of collimator septa was not considered as it was neither in the traditional derivation. Usually penetration is then included by replacing the collimator length L by an effective collimator length that depends on the attenuation coefficient of the collimator material at the gamma photon's energy (see section 2.4). For an initial analysis of the effect of penetration, we reran the raytracing simulation to include modelling of septa penetration. We calculated the difference between the raytracing simulation and the expression using either the physical length L , or the effective length L_e in (11).




Figure 4. Comparison of analytically calculated sensitivity S (cyan solid line) for astigmatic cone beam collimator with raytracing simulations. Simulation results for one particular position of the septa (red crosses), and an average over 100 different septa positions (black squares) are provided, as is the sensitivity given by the traditional diverging formula (black solid line). For on-axis results a previously derived on-axis non-diverging formula of Accorsi and Metzler (2006) (green circles) is shown. (a) For $x = 0$ and $y = 0$, (b) idem for sensitivity at $x = 8$ mm, $y = 0$ mm, (c) idem for $x = 0$ mm, $y = 8$ mm (d) idem for $x = 8$ mm, $y = 8$ mm.

From the results in table 2, we see that using an effective length reduces the differences between the averaged raytracing simulations and the analytical expression, but the differences are still larger than for the case without penetration (see table 2). For example the mean difference in the on-axis sensitivity of the fan beam collimator improves from 1.5% to 0.9% when L_e is used instead of L , while without penetration modelling in the raytracer the difference is 0.5%.

3.4.1. Volumetric sensitivity. To analyse the conditions for which the old diverging formula is still a good approximation for calculating volumetric sensitivity, we looked at an example for volumetric sensitivity as described in section 2.4.1. The sensitivity was calculated on a grid with voxel size of 1 mm, and then averaged over a spherical volume-of-interest (VOI) with diameter of 200 mm. The results are listed in table 3. If the focal point is in the centre of the VOI (focal length 150 mm), the diverging expression does

Table 1. Mean/Max (over $z = 0$ to $z = 80$ mm) absolute differences for sensitivity expressions (S from (11), S_{div} from (10), and the previously derived non-diverging expression from Accorsi and Metzler (2006)) compared to raytracing simulation, and expressed as percentage of maximum sensitivity along each line in the simulation.

Mean/Max difference (%)	S		S_{div}		Accorsi <i>et al</i>	
	Fixed septa	Averaged over septa	Fixed septa	Averaged over septa	Fixed septa	Averaged over septa
Location (mm)						
Fan beam						
$x = 0, y = 0$	1.4/4.3	0.5/4.3	∞/∞	∞/∞	1.4/4.3	0.5/4.3
$x = 8, y = 0$	0.6/4.4	0.1/0.5	0.7/3.5	0.3/4.1	N/A	N/A
Cone beam						
$x = 0, y = 0$	0.9/6.0	0.7/5.6	∞/∞	∞/∞	0.9/6.0	0.7/5.6
$x = 8, y = 0$	0.4/5.5	0.3/5.4	∞/∞	∞/∞	N/A	N/A
$x = 0, y = 8$	0.3/3.4	0.2/3.7	∞/∞	∞/∞	N/A	N/A
$x = 8, y = 8$	0.1/1.1	0.1/0.4	0.4/3.4	0.4/3.4	N/A	N/A

Table 2. Mean/Max (over $z = 0$ to $z = 80$ mm) absolute difference between raytracing simulation with modelling of septa penetration and either (11) with the actual collimator length L or (11) with L replaced by the effective collimator length L_e expressed as percentage of maximum sensitivity along each line in the simulation.

Mean/Max difference (%)	S with L		S with L_e	
	Fixed septa	Averaged over septa	Fixed septa	Averaged over septa
Location (mm)				
Fan beam				
$x = 0, y = 0$	2.5/6.5	1.5/3.8	2.0/4.7	0.9/3.3
$x = 8, y = 0$	1.1/4.0	0.7/1.0	0.9/3.8	0.4/0.7
Cone beam				
$x = 0, y = 0$	2.8/8.1	2.6/7.8	2.3/6.5	2.0/6.2
$x = 8, y = 0$	1.2/4.7	1.1/4.8	1.0/3.6	0.9/3.6
$x = 0, y = 8$	1.3/5.3	1.2/5.3	1.0/4.1	1.0/4.1
$x = 8, y = 8$	0.4/1.0	0.5/1.0	0.3/0.8	0.3/0.7

Table 3. Volumetric (average) sensitivity for a brain SPECT cone beam example (see section 2.4.1). Comparing (11), with the traditional diverging formula (10).

Focal length (mm)	Sensitivity from (11) (%)	Sensitivity from (10) (%)	Difference (%)
150	0.048	∞	∞
200	0.057	∞	∞
250	0.062	0.160	158
300	0.063	0.100	60
350	0.061	0.075	24
400	0.057	0.062	9.8

not produce a finite answer. On the other hand, when the focal point is outside the VOI, i.e. the focal length is larger than 250 mm, there is no singularity in the VOI and a finite answer is produced also with the traditional diverging expression. However, it is clear from table 3 that although the traditional formula produces a finite answer, it can still be significantly off when the focus is outside the volume, e.g. for a focal length of 350 mm, which is 100 mm beyond the VOI, we still find an error of 24% in the average sensitivity in the VOI.

4. Discussion

We derived a non-diverging expression for the sensitivity of converging collimators which is valid over the whole field-of-view, contrary to earlier derived expressions. Our expression shows good agreement with raytracing simulation data. We showed that it agrees well (mean difference from 0.1% to 0.7% and max difference from 0.4 to 5.6%) with a raytracing simulation that was averaged over different configurations (different exact locations of the septa). Note that our sensitivity formula does not depend on the exact placement of the septa and from its derivation it is clear that it corresponds to a sensitivity averaged over different septa locations. As shown in figures 3, 4 and table 1, the sensitivity can be significantly influenced by the exact location of the septa and holes when the source is placed close to the collimator; for a source right above a hole more photons are detected than when the source is just above a septum. This is true not only for cone and fan beam, but also for the parallel hole collimators. One could in principle derive a formula in which the exact location of the septa is contained but this would become very complicated. Therefore, all analytical sensitivity expressions represent an average over slightly different geometries. One should however be aware that in the case an exact collimator response is required (e.g. in iterative image reconstruction) the exact septa/hole location may need to be considered (Formiconi 1998).

In our derivation, penetration of collimator septa is neglected. Including septal penetration into the collimator's response function would make the derivation tremendously more complex and we are not aware of any sensitivity calculation into which this is fully taken into account, even not for the simpler case of parallel hole collimators. The common way to include penetration is to replace the actual physical collimator length by an effective hole length as we have also done.

In the derivation the only approximations made are the averaging step over the septa positions, and the mentioned neglected septal penetration. No other approximations were used as we evaluated the integral fully. The fact that on the collimator axis the numerical agreement is within 1/10 000th of the separately derived and differently formulated expression from Accorsi and Metzler (2006), and the fact that in special cases it reduces to other previously known formulas makes us confident that we didn't make any mistakes in our calculation. Therefore, we believe the remaining differences between our expression and the raytracing simulations can be explained by discretization errors in the simulation. Firstly, the collimator volume in our raytracer is represented with finite voxels. Especially for thin septa, the continuous septa are challenging to accurately represent with cubic voxels. In our simulations we assume a voxel size of 0.05 mm while septa had a thickness of 0.2 and 0.3 mm. Smaller voxels would lead to prohibitively large collimator volumes, as the collimator volumes used in this paper took already 19 GiB to store. Secondly, the detector is modelled with finite

pixels, which can be partially covered by septa while the raytracer only traces to the centre of a pixel. Lastly the averaging over the different septa locations was done using 100 configurations. Although, one expects the effect on sensitivity to be relatively smooth as function of the septa locations, and 10 samples in each direction should suffice, a small error is introduced here as well.

The traditional sensitivity formula for parallel hole collimators, on which the first fan and cone beam expressions are based, contain a factor describing effects of different hole shapes and patterns. This factor is usually denoted with k or K (Anger 1967, Cherry *et al* 2003). The traditional diverging expressions for converging collimators include the same factor. In their paper about the non-diverging axial formula for converging collimators, Accorsi and Metzler (2006) provide a more extensive description of the effect of hole shape and they derived additional correction factors that can be used to convert sensitivity formulas of square holes to other hole shapes, such as round or hexagonal holes. Such factors can also be included in our expressions although it is besides the scope of this paper to test their accuracy.

In literature, different definitions of the parameters for converging hole collimators can be found. We decided to keep the hole area constant at the object side of the collimator as is commonly done (Accorsi and Metzler 2006, Tsui and Gullberg 1990), while others like (Formiconi 1998) kept the bore width (the distance between septa measured perpendicular to each hole's axis) constant at the object side of the collimator, thereby making the areas of the holes at the collimator surface larger towards the collimator edges, as in the edges in the x and y directions.

Note that precise manufacturing of converging collimators is a difficult process which has caused constraints in collimator design, as for example thin septa are very hard to produce. In recent years new technologies like 3D printing have emerged that allow more challenging designs to be manufactured (Pato *et al* 2015, Van Audenhaege *et al* 2015) that may better exploit the advantages of strongly focusing collimators. Therefore, a new look at the possibilities of converging collimators might be worthwhile and correct sensitivity expressions for such collimators are then desirable.

5. Conclusions

We derived a new expression for the sensitivity of converging collimators. Contrary to known sensitivity formulas, our formula is valid over the full field-of-view and does not diverge near the focus. It can thus be applied to accurately determine sensitivity near the focus of converging collimators.

Acknowledgment

This work is supported by the Dutch Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) under the VIDI grant 12371 Focused imaging of tumors.

Appendix




Figure A1. Schematic overview of the definition of $\mathbf{r}_T = (x_T, y_T)$. Illustrated are dashed lines from the source to the current integration point x' , from the focus to the current integration point x' , the distance between these two lines on the collimator surface x_T . While this illustration is in two dimensions, y_T can be illustrated likewise.

References

- Accorsi R and Metzler S D 2006 Non-diverging analytic expression for the on-axis sensitivity of converging collimators: analytic derivation *Phys. Med. Biol.* **51** 5675–96
- Anger H O 1967 *Instrumentation in Nuclear Medicine* vol 1, ed G J Hine (New York: Academic) ch 19, pp 485–552
- Beekman F J 2001 Apparatus for making tomographic images *US Patent* 6,324,258
- Beekman F J, Kamphuis C, Hutton B F and van Rijk P P 1998 Half-fanbeam collimators combined with scanning point sources for simultaneous emission-transmission imaging *J. Nucl. Med.* **39** 1996–2003
- Cherry S R, Sorenson J A and Phelps M E 2003 *Physics in Nuclear Medicine* 3rd edn (Philadelphia, PA: Saunders)
- Formiconi A R 1998 Geometrical response of multihole collimators *Phys. Med. Biol.* **43** 3359–79
- Goorden M C, Rentmeester M C M and Beekman F J 2008 Theoretical analysis of multi-pinhole brain spect *IEEE Nuclear Science Symp. Conf. Record* pp 4036–8
- Gradshteyn I and Ryzhik I 2014 *Table of Integrals, Series, and Products* (Amsterdam: Elsevier)
- Gullberg G T, Christian P E, Zeng G S L, Datz F L and Morgan H T 1991a Cone beam tomography of the heart using single-photon emission-computed tomography *Investigative Radiol.* **26** 681–8
- Gullberg G T, Zeng G, Christian P E, Tsui B and Morgan H T 1991b Single photon emission computed tomography of the heart using cone beam geometry and noncircular detector rotation *Prog. Clin. Biol. Res.* **363** 123–38
- Gunter D L 2004 *Emission Tomography: the Fundamentals of PET and SPECT* ed M N Wernick and J N Aarsvold (New York: Academic) pp 153–68
- Hawman P C and Haines E J 1994 The cardiofocal collimator: a variable-focus collimator for cardiac spect *Phys. Med. Biol.* **39** 439

- Jaszczak R J, Chang L T and Murphy P H 1979 Single photon emission computed tomography using multi-slice fan beam collimators *IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci.* **26** 610–8
- Jaszczak R J, Floyd C E, Manglos S H, Greer K L and Coleman R E 1986 Cone beam collimation for single photon-emission computed-tomography—analysis, simulation, and image-reconstruction using filtered backprojection *Med. Phys.* **13** 484–9
- Jaszczak R J, Greer K L and Coleman R E 1988 Spect using a specially designed cone beam collimator *J. Nucl. Med.* **29** 1398–405
- Kamphuis C and Beekman F J 1998 The use of offset cone-beam collimators in a dual head system for combined emission transmission brain spect: a feasibility study *IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci.* **45** 1250–4
- Kemp B J, Prato F S, Nicholson R L and Reese L 1995 Transmission computed tomography imaging of the head with a spect system and a collimated line source *J. Nucl. Med.* **36** 328–35
- Kijewski M F, Miller S P and Moore S C 1997 Nonuniform collimator sensitivity: improved precision for quantitative spect *J. Nucl. Med.* **38** 151–6
- Li J, Jaszczak R J, Van Mullekom A, Scarfone C, Greer K L and Coleman R E 1996 Half-cone beam collimation for triple-camera spect systems *J. Nucl. Med.* **37** 498–502
- Lowe D, Truman A, Kwok H and Bergman A 2002 Optimisation of the design of round-hole parallel collimators for ultra-compact nuclear medicine imaging *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. A* **488** 428–40
- Manglos S H, Bassano D A, Thomas F D and Grossman Z D 1992 Imaging of the human torso using cone-beam transmission ct implemented on a rotating gamma camera *J. Nucl. Med.* **33** 150–6
- Mather R L 1957 Gamma-ray collimator penetration and scattering effects *J. Appl. Phys.* **28** 1200–7
- Metz C E, Atkins F B and Beck R N 1980 The geometric transfer function component for scintillation camera collimators with straight parallel holes *Phys. Med. Biol.* **25** 1059
- Moyer R A 1974 A low-energy multihole converging collimator compared with a pinhole collimator *J. Nucl. Med.* **15** 59–64
- Park M A, Kijewski M F and Moore S C 2003 Evaluation of ultra-short focusing cone-beam collimators for spect brain imaging *Nuclear Science Symp. Conf. Record* vol 3 (IEEE) pp 1865–7
- Park M A, Moore S C and Kijewski M F 2005 Brain spect with short focal-length cone-beam collimation *Med. Phys.* **32** 2236–44
- Pato L R V, Vandenberghe S, Zedda T and Holen R V 2015 Parallel-hole collimator concept for stationary spect imaging *Phys. Med. Biol.* **60** 8791
- Rentmeester M C, van der Have F and Beekman F J 2007 Optimizing multi-pinhole spect geometries using an analytical model *Phys. Med. Biol.* **52** 2567–81
- Siddon R L 1985 Fast calculation of the exact radiological path for a three-dimensional ct array *Med. Phys.* **12** 252–5
- Ter-Antonyan R, Jaszczak R J, Greer K L, Bowsher J E, Metzler S D and Coleman R E 2009 Combination of converging collimators for high-sensitivity brain spect *J. Nucl. Med.* **50** 1548–56
- Tsui B M, Gullberg G T, Edgerton E R, Gilland D R, Perry J R and McCartney W H 1986 Design and clinical utility of a fan beam collimator for spect imaging of the head *J. Nucl. Med.* **27** 810–9
- Tsui B M W and Gullberg G T 1990 The geometric transfer-function for cone and fan beam collimators *Phys. Med. Biol.* **35** 81–93
- Van Audenhaege K, Van Holen R, Vandenberghe S, Vanhove C, Metzler S D and Moore S C 2015 Review of spect collimator selection, optimization, and fabrication for clinical and preclinical imaging *Med. Phys.* **42** 4796–813
- van Roosmalen J, Goorden M C and Beekman F J 2015 Optimization of a high resolution focussed molecular breast tomosynthesis device *Nuclear Science Symp. and Medical Imaging Conf.*
- Walrand S, van Dulmen A, van Rossem H and Pauwels S 2002 Acquisition of linograms in spet: implementation and benefits *Eur. J. Nucl. Med. Mol. Imaging* **29** 1188–97
- Wang B, van Roosmalen J, Pit L, van Schie M, Beekman F J and Goorden M C 2017 Voxelized ray-tracing simulation dedicated to multi-pinhole molecular breast tomosynthesis *Biomed. Phys. Eng. Express* submitted
- Weinmann A L, Hruska C B and O'Connor M K 2009 Design of optimal collimation for dedicated molecular breast imaging systems *Med. Phys.* **36** 845–56