

# High-Sensitivity PET using Optimised Continuous Cylindrical Shell Nanocomposite and Transparent Ceramic Scintillators

**Keenan Wilson**

School of Electrical and Data Engineering

University of Technology Sydney

A thesis presented for the degree of

*Doctor of Philosophy*

November 25, 2020

# Certificate of Authorship / Originality

I, Keenan Wilson declare that this thesis, is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Doctor of Philosophy, in the School of Electrical and Data Engineering at the University of Technology Sydney.

This thesis is wholly my own work unless otherwise referenced or acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis. This document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic institution.

This research is supported by the Australian Government Research Training Program.

© Copyright 2020 Keenan Wilson

# Abstract

Positron emission tomography (PET) systems typically employ 2D or 3D arrays of discrete monocrystalline rectangular prismatic scintillators, arranged in a ring around the imaging object. As PET systems have evolved towards higher spatial resolution and sensitivity, the number of crystals has increased while the dimensions of the crystals have decreased, leading to ever-increasing costs and complexity - particularly in total-body PET. At the same time, the need for optical isolation between crystals limits packing efficiency and hence achievable sensitivity. The chief alternative to discrete-crystal PET - monolithic scintillators with external photodetector arrays - introduces its own challenges, since producing large, high quality scintillator crystals is expensive and technically challenging.

Two new classes of scintillator have recently emerged as alternatives to monocrystalline scintillators for gamma detection - nanocomposites, which combine scintillating nanoparticles with an organic polymer binder - and transparent ceramics. Both are cheaper and easier to manufacture than monocrystalline scintillators, and can be more easily formed into complex shapes - however, they are also less transparent and, in the case of nanocomposites, less dense. Neither has previously been employed in PET systems to any significant degree.

In this work, a new PET system design is proposed which exploits the properties of these new scintillators. Instead of discrete crystals or flat monolithic slabs, the scintillator is formed into a continuous cylindrical shell, tiled on the inner and outer surfaces with silicon photomultiplier photodetectors. The design aims to achieve high sensitivity and competitive spatial resolution compared to similar discrete-crystal PET systems.

Five nanocomposite and four transparent ceramic scintillators are evaluated, and an optimisation method developed to maximise the probability of locating in-

teractions between 511 keV photons and the scintillator within a given tolerance. A technique for localising the endpoints of the lines of response in a monolithic cylindrical shell is developed and evaluated for the best materials of both types. A coincidence detection method based on deconvolution and spatio-temporal partitioning of photon clusters is developed and evaluated. Finally, a simulated PET scan of several point sources inside the optimised scanner is performed, and images reconstructed using analytic and iterative algorithms; spatial resolution and sensitivity are evaluated.

The promising results obtained in this work establish the feasibility of the proposed design and confirm that the design objectives can be achieved. The design offers a markedly different design envelope to conventional PET, and suggests a new pathway to lower-cost total-body PET.

# Dedication

For my wife, Yukti.

# Acknowledgments

First and foremost I wish to thank my supervisor, Dr. Daniel Franklin at The University of Technology Sydney. It goes without saying that without your guidance and drive this project would not have been possible. I truly appreciate the sheer amount of time, effort and caffeine you have contributed. I want to also thank my co-supervisor, A/Prof Mehran Abolhasan for keeping me on the right track over the years. Special thank you to Dr. Mitra Safavi-Naeini at ANSTO for her many insights and contributions to our work. Thank you to A/Prof Justin Lipman and Dr. Negin Shariati for accommodating me in their lab; it was such a great place to work and I really enjoyed my time there. I want to also show my gratitude to UTS for not only their financial support, but for the structural support within the university, which has carried me to this point. Thank you to Dr. Matt Gaston and ARCLab; without these resources, this work would literally not have been possible. I also greatly appreciated receiving financial support from ANSTO and AINSE for conference funding. My time at UTS would not have been the same without Roumani Alabd. Thank you, not only for your contribution to this work, but also for your friendship. All the best for your own PhD!

On a personal note, I would like to thank my family (Wilsons and Srivastavas) for their love, guidance and especially patience. I especially want to thank my wife, Yukti for her love, never ending support and belief in me.

Keenan Wilson  
Sydney, Australia, 2020.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Research Objectives and Overview . . . . .	5
1.1.1	Additional Research Contributions . . . . .	9
<b>2</b>	<b>Literature Review</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1	Positron Imaging . . . . .	10
2.1.1	Types of Detected Events . . . . .	12
2.1.2	Photon Interactions with Matter . . . . .	14
2.2	PET Radiotracers . . . . .	15
2.2.1	Metabolism . . . . .	16
2.2.2	Blood Flow and Regional Perfusion . . . . .	17
2.2.3	Tumour Proliferation . . . . .	18
2.2.4	Positron Energy . . . . .	18
2.3	PET Detectors . . . . .	19
2.3.1	Detector Properties . . . . .	19
2.3.2	Semiconductor Detectors . . . . .	21
2.3.3	Scintillation Detectors . . . . .	21
2.3.4	Photomultiplier Tube . . . . .	23
2.3.5	Avalanche Photodiode . . . . .	25
2.3.6	Silicon Photomultiplier . . . . .	27
2.3.7	Detector Designs . . . . .	28
2.3.8	Alternative Detector Configurations . . . . .	33
2.3.9	Time-of-Flight PET . . . . .	34
2.4	Scintillation Materials . . . . .	35
2.4.1	Scintillator Properties . . . . .	35

2.4.2	Nanocomposite Scintillators . . . . .	39
2.4.3	Transparent Ceramic Scintillators . . . . .	43
2.5	Image Reconstruction . . . . .	45
2.5.1	Data Storage . . . . .	45
2.5.2	Filtered Backprojection . . . . .	47
2.5.3	Backproject Then Filter . . . . .	49
2.5.4	Types of Filters . . . . .	49
2.5.5	3D Image Reconstruction . . . . .	51
2.5.6	Iterative Image Reconstruction . . . . .	53
2.5.7	The System Matrix . . . . .	54
2.5.8	Iterative Algorithms . . . . .	56
2.5.9	Image Reconstruction Software . . . . .	58
2.6	Conclusion . . . . .	59
<b>3</b>	<b>Monolithic Nanocomposite and Transparent Ceramic Scintillation</b>	
	<b>Detectors for use in Positron Emission Tomography</b>	<b>60</b>
3.1	Introduction . . . . .	60
3.2	Materials and Methods . . . . .	63
3.2.1	Performance Metric and Optimisation Algorithm . . . . .	63
3.2.2	Simulation Parameters . . . . .	65
3.2.3	Detector Geometry . . . . .	65
3.2.4	GATE Parameters . . . . .	66
3.2.5	Nanocomposite Loading . . . . .	67
3.2.6	Scintillation Event Position Determination . . . . .	68
3.2.7	Materials . . . . .	73
3.3	Results and Discussion . . . . .	74
3.3.1	Calculation of the Optimal Scintillator Thickness . . . . .	74
3.3.2	Analysis of Photoelectric vs Compton Interactions . . . . .	75
3.3.3	Spatial error . . . . .	82
3.4	Conclusion . . . . .	91
<b>4</b>	<b>Localisation of the Lines of Response in a Continuous Cylindrical</b>	
	<b>Shell PET Scanner</b>	<b>93</b>



4.1	Introduction . . . . .	93
4.2	Materials and methods . . . . .	95
4.2.1	Materials . . . . .	95
4.2.2	Optimisation of scanner geometry . . . . .	95
4.2.3	Localisation method . . . . .	98
4.2.4	Simulation . . . . .	100
4.3	Results . . . . .	100
4.3.1	GLuGAG:Ce . . . . .	101
4.3.2	LaF <sub>3</sub> :Ce-PS . . . . .	105
4.3.3	Detector Sensitivity and Detection Accuracy . . . . .	105
4.4	Discussion . . . . .	109
4.5	Conclusions and future work . . . . .	111

## **5 Efficient spatio-temporal deconvolution-based pulse pile-up correction for coincidence detection in monolithic-scintillator PET systems** **112**

5.1	Introduction . . . . .	112
5.2	Materials and Methods . . . . .	114
5.2.1	Coincidence Detection Technique . . . . .	114
5.2.2	Impulse Response Generation . . . . .	114
5.2.3	Single, 2-Coincidence and Multiple-Coincidence Detection . .	115
5.2.4	Line of Response Position Estimation . . . . .	118
5.2.5	Geometry . . . . .	121
5.2.6	GATE Simulation Parameters . . . . .	121
5.3	Results . . . . .	122
5.3.1	Algorithm Detection Efficiency . . . . .	122
5.3.2	Detection Efficiency by Interaction Type . . . . .	123
5.4	Discussion . . . . .	123
5.5	Conclusion . . . . .	124

## **6 Design and Simulation of a Brain PET Scanner with a Continuous Cylindrical Shell Monolithic Scintillator** **125**

6.1	Introduction . . . . .	125
-----	------------------------	-----

6.2	Materials and Methods . . . . .	127
6.2.1	Simulation Parameters . . . . .	127
6.2.2	Image Reconstruction . . . . .	127
6.2.3	Image Correction . . . . .	129
6.3	Results . . . . .	134
6.3.1	Image Reconstruction . . . . .	134
6.3.2	Spatial Resolution Measurements . . . . .	134
6.4	Discussion . . . . .	142
6.5	Conclusion . . . . .	145
<b>7</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>146</b>
7.1	Summary . . . . .	147
7.2	Recommendations & Future Work . . . . .	150
7.3	Concluding Remarks . . . . .	152
<b>A</b>	<b>Code Documentation</b>	<b>173</b>
A.1	Nanocomposite & Transparent Ceramic Optimal Thickness Code . . .	173
A.1.1	Code Availability . . . . .	173
A.1.2	Software Requirements . . . . .	173
A.1.3	GATE Code - How to Run . . . . .	173
A.1.4	MATLAB Code - How to Run . . . . .	175
A.2	Continuous Cylindrical Shell PET Code . . . . .	176
A.2.1	Code Availability . . . . .	176
A.2.2	Software Requirements . . . . .	176
A.2.3	GATE Code - How to Run . . . . .	177
A.2.4	MATLAB Code - How to Run . . . . .	179
A.2.5	STIR Code - How to Run . . . . .	185

# List of Figures

2.1	Positron annihilation. . . . .	11
2.2	Types of detected events: true, random, scatter and multiple. . . . .	13
2.3	Compton angular probability distribution. . . . .	15
2.4	Scintillation energy states. . . . .	23
2.5	Operation of a photomultiplier tube (PMT). . . . .	24
2.6	Operation of a avalanche photodiode (APD) . . . . .	26
2.7	Scintillation detector designs featuring depth encoding. . . . .	31
2.8	Time-of-flight PET . . . . .	35
2.9	Scintillator pulse shape. . . . .	37
2.10	Calculated optical and gamma photon attenuation lengths in nanocom- posite materials. . . . .	42
2.11	Construction of a sinogram from projection data. . . . .	46
2.12	Filter functions used for 2D Filtered Back-Projection. . . . .	50
2.13	Iterative image reconstruction: the system matrix. . . . .	55
2.14	Iterative reconstruction algorithm flow diagram. . . . .	57
3.1	Simulated photoelectric interaction captured in GATE. . . . .	66
3.2	Nanocomposite scintillator loading factor determination. . . . .	69
3.3	Position of interaction estimation: scintillation photon maps. . . . .	70
3.3	Position of interaction estimation (continued): analytic model fitting. . . . .	71
3.4	Geometry of the photon distribution parametric model. . . . .	72
3.5	Percentage of events detected as a function of scintillator thicknesses: nanocomposite materials - Gd <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> PVT & LaBr <sub>3</sub> :Ce PS. . . . .	76
3.5	Percentage of events detected as a function of scintillator thicknesses (continued): nanocomposite materials - LaF <sub>3</sub> :Ce OA & LaF <sub>3</sub> :Ce PS. . . . .	77

3.5	Percentage of events detected as a function of scintillator thicknesses (continued): nanocomposite materials - YAG:Ce PS. . . . .	78
3.6	Percentage of events detected as a function of scintillator thicknesses: transparent ceramic materials - GAGG:Ce & GLuGAG:Ce . . . . .	79
3.6	Percentage of events detected as a function of scintillator thicknesses (continued): transparent ceramic materials - GYGAG:Ce & LuAG:Pr	80
3.7	Estimated position of interaction error ( $\Delta X$ & $\Delta Y$ ) as a function of scintillator depth (LaF <sub>3</sub> :Ce-PS) . . . . .	86
3.7	Estimated position of interaction error ( $\Delta Z$ & total error) as a func- tion of scintillator depth (LaF <sub>3</sub> :Ce-PS)(continued) . . . . .	87
3.8	Estimated position of interaction error ( $\Delta X$ & $\Delta Y$ ) as a function of scintillator depth (GLuGAG:Ce) . . . . .	88
3.8	Estimated position of interaction error ( $\Delta Z$ & total error) as a func- tion of scintillator depth (GLuGAG:Ce)(continued) . . . . .	89
4.1	Geometry of the simulated cylindrical shell scanner . . . . .	97
4.2	GLuGAG:Ce: endpoint errors (R and Z) vs depth of penetration. . .	102
4.2	GLuGAG:Ce: endpoint errors ( $\theta$ and total error) vs depth of pene- tration. . . . .	103
4.2	GLuGAG:Ce: LOR error vs depth of interaction. . . . .	104
4.3	LaF <sub>3</sub> :Ce-PS: endpoint errors (R and Z) vs depth of penetration. . . .	106
4.3	LaF <sub>3</sub> :Ce-PS: endpoint errors ( $\theta$ and total error) vs depth of penetration.	107
4.3	GLuGAG:Ce: LOR error vs depth of interaction. . . . .	108
5.1	Generated impulse responses for five discrete radial bins. . . . .	116
5.2	Coincidence detection: spatial event sorting . . . . .	118
5.3	Coincidence detection by pulse deconvolution. . . . .	119
5.4	Line of response generation . . . . .	120
6.1	Random, normalisation and attenuation corrections in projection and image space. . . . .	132
6.2	2D analytic image reconstruction of three 3 MBq <sup>18</sup> F sources encap- sulated in cylindrical water phantoms, using STIR's FBP2D algorithm.	135

6.3	3D analytic image reconstruction of three 3 MBq $^{18}\text{F}$ sources encapsulated in cylindrical water phantoms, using STIR's FBP3DRP algorithm. . . . .	136
6.4	3D iterative image reconstruction of three 3 MBq $^{18}\text{F}$ sources encapsulated in cylindrical water phantoms, using STIR's OSMAPOS algorithm. . . . .	137
6.5	Intensity profile of the FBP2D-reconstructed image along the X axis.	138
6.6	Intensity profile of the FBP2D-reconstructed image along the Y and Z axes. . . . .	139
6.7	Intensity profile of the FBP3DRP-reconstructed image along the X axis. . . . .	140
6.8	Intensity profile of the FBP3DRP-reconstructed image along the Y and Z axes. . . . .	141
6.9	Intensity profile of the OSEM-reconstructed image along the X axis. .	142
6.10	Intensity profile of the OSEM-reconstructed image along the Y and Z axes. . . . .	143

# List of Tables

2.1	PET radioisotopes. . . . .	16
2.2	A comparison of typical photodetector properties. . . . .	29
2.3	Single crystal scintillation materials. . . . .	36
2.4	Physical and optical properties of nanocomposite scintillators. . . . .	40
2.5	Physical and optical properties of transparent ceramic scintillators. . . . .	44
3.1	Summary of nanocomposite loading factors (by % volume) used in GATE simulations. . . . .	69
3.2	Summary of optimal scintillator thickness and detection probability for nanocomposite and transparent ceramic materials. . . . .	78
3.3	Distribution of photoelectric and Compton-scattered interactions for a 1 cm thick scintillator slab. . . . .	83
3.4	Distribution of photoelectric and Compton-scattered interactions for a 2 cm thick scintillator slab. . . . .	83
3.5	Distribution of photoelectric and Compton-scattered interactions for a scintillator slab equal to the HVL. . . . .	84
3.6	Distribution of photoelectric and Compton-scattered interactions for a scintillator slab equal to the optimal thickness. . . . .	84
3.7	Mean and median errors in the estimation of the point of interaction within scintillators of 1 cm thickness. . . . .	85
3.8	Mean and median errors in the estimation of the point of interaction within scintillators of 2 cm thickness. . . . .	90
3.9	Mean and median errors in the estimation of the point of interaction within scintillators of thickness equal to the HVL. . . . .	90

3.10	Mean and median errors in the estimation of the point of interaction within scintillators with thickness equal to the optimum. . . . .	91
4.1	Properties of scintillator materials used in the cylindrical shell PET scanner. . . . .	95
4.2	Scanner dimensions and expected detection efficiency . . . . .	96
4.3	GLuGAG:Ce error statistics summary . . . . .	101
4.4	LaF <sub>3</sub> :Ce-PS error statistics summary . . . . .	105
4.5	Fractions of decays yielding usable LORs and accuracy of detected endpoints. . . . .	109
5.1	True, random and missed detections as a percentage of the total number of decays. . . . .	122
5.2	Detection type and probability of occurrence. . . . .	123
6.1	STIR parameters. . . . .	130
6.2	Full width at half maximum (FWHM) of the intensity profiles at zero degrees in the transverse plane ( $x$ -axis of the system). . . . .	138
6.3	Full width at half maximum (FWHM) of the intensity profiles at 90 degrees in the transverse plane ( $y$ -axis of the system). . . . .	140
6.4	Full width at half maximum (FWHM) of the intensity profiles at 90 degrees in the coronal plane ( $z$ -axis of the system). . . . .	140