### Noise and dose reduction for Lung/Shoulder CT scan

Julian Liu Clinton Green Andrew Wainwright Sarah E Darlington Matilda Nyekiova\*

Buckinghamshire Healthcare NHS Trust \* Royal Berkshire Hospital

# The problems

- Siemens Somatom Defination AS 64
- Caredose and CarekV
- Topogram tube top/lateral

Topogram	Caredose	CarekV	kV	mAs	Ref	CTDI
Тор	On	On	80	33	507	0.6L
Lateral	On	On	100	87	180	3.36L





# The problems

- The difference in image quality/noise level
- If the image quality improvable
- The spatial resolution

Topogram	Caredose	CarekV	kV	mAs	Ref	CTDI
Тор	On	On	80	33	507	0.6L
Lateral	On	On	100	87	180	3.36L





## Methods

Noise detection and isolation

- Convoluting the projection with Haar base functions
- Using the views with lower level of noise to set up threshold in the highest frequency component
- Removing the detected noise in the highest frequency component
- Reconstructing the projection using the amended highest frequency component

- Siemens AS 64
- A 2L drink bottle
- Sequential (axial) scanning protocols making the analysis more reliable
- Lower dose or lowest dose parameters comparing to the Caredose/kV selections

Mask for regions of interest

- ROIs of water in central area (1-3)
- ROIs of air in central area (4,5)
- ROIs of air in peripheral area (6-21)

HRCT, 1mm x 2, Phantom axis in Z direction

Topogram	Caredose	CarekV	kV	mAs	Ref	CTDI
Тор	On	Off	120	20	110	1.26L
Lateral	On	Off	120	20	110	1.26L
Тор	On	On	80	33	507	0.6L
Lateral	On	On	80	28	507	0.52L
Тор	Off	Off	120	110	Reference	7.21L
Тор	Off	Off	80	20	Lowest	0.35L
	(TTT)					

HRCT, 1mm x 2, Phantom axis in X direction

Topogram	Caredose	CarekV	kV	mAs	Ref	CTDI
Тор	On	Off	120	20	110	1.26L
Lateral	On	Off	120	57	110	3.83L
Тор	On	On	80	33	507	0.6L
Lateral	On	On	100	87	180	3.36L
Lateral	Off	Off	120	110	Reference	7.21L
Lateral	Off	Off	100	20	Lowest	0.74L





Applying noise reduction to the scans with the parameters as follows

kV	mAs	CTDI
80	33	0.6L
80	20	0.35L

#### Comparison with

kV	mAs	CTDI
120	110	7.21L
120	20	1.26L
100	87	3.36L
100	20	0.74L



80 kV 33 mAs



100 kV 87 mAs



120 kV 110 mAs







80 kV 20 mAs

100 kV 20 mAs

120 kV 20 mAs



The noise levels in the regions of interest





#### The noise levels in the regions of interest





#### The noise levels in the regions of interest





### **Results-Resolution of 33** mAs























### Results-Resolution of 20 mAs



# Discussion

Factors for noise reduction

- The percentage of noise level reduction
- The level of misclassification
- The computational load

Ideally 100% noise reduction and zero misclassification but limited by the accuracy of the noise description

Balancing the factors

## Conclusions

Original	No. repeat	NL similar to	Dose reduction	Resolution lost	Noise level
80 kV 33 mAs	1	120 kV 20 mAs	52.38%	hardly	acceptable
80 kV 20 mAs	1	80 kV 33 mAs	41.67%	hardly	average
80 kV 33 mAs	2	100 kV 87 mAs	82.14%	Not significant	good
80 kV 20 mAs	2	100 kV 20 mAs	72.22%	Not significant	acceptable



### **Results-Resolution of 33** mAs





















## Conclusions

- The noise level of 80 kV, 33 mAs + noise reduction x 2 =the noise level of 100 kV, 87 mAs
- With acceptable spatial resolution lost

Topogram	Caredose	CarekV	kV	mAs	Ref	CTDI
Тор	On	On	80	33	507	0.6L
Lat	On	On	100	87	180	3.36L





## Conclusions

### **Computational features**

For noise reduction, each slice taking less than 0.5 second using MATLAB on a Dell Laptop Intel(R) Core(TM) i7 CPU Q720 @ 1.60 GHz 1.60 GHz (3 year old)

### Work in the future

The lost resolution could be retrievable with acceptable computational load

## Acknowledgement

#### The support from

Dr Pramjeet Singh Mr Joseph Farwell

And

**Siemens Healthcare** 

### Thanks for the attention