

Massively Parallel GPU-friendly Algorithms for PET

Szirmay-Kalos László, <u>http://cg.iit.bme.hu</u>, Budapest, University of Technology and Economics



(GP)GPU: CUDA (OpenCL)



- Massively parallel: #threads > 10⁴
- Independence: synchronization and write collisions should be avoided
- SIMD: conditional statements are not welcome
- Coalesced memory access

PET physics



Mediso nanoScan PET AnyScan PET

000

AMedito





Maximum-likelihood reconstruction



$$\widetilde{y}_1 = A_{11}x_1 + A_{12}x_2 + A_{13}x_3 + A_{14}x_4$$

Expected number of hits:

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{x}$$

Maximize the probability of

the measurement data **y**:

$$\mathbf{x} = \arg \max \Pr{\{\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{\widetilde{y}}(\mathbf{x})\}}$$

Iterative solution



Computational challenges

- Numbers of LORs and voxels: hundred millions!
- System matrix A: 10¹⁶ elements (PetaBytes)
 - Probability that a positron of a voxel is detected by a LOR
 - Patient dependent
 - Not sparse if accurate simulation is needed
 - Do not store, estimate on-the-fly
- Matrix elements are high dimensional integrals
 - Monte Carlo quadrature
 - Reuse of computation
 - High performance (parallel) computational platform
- Minimize the effect of estimation error

Numerical integration





Effect of stratification









Direct physical simulation Input driven, scattering type algorithm

- Thread = photon
- Photons scatter different number of times
- The same detector is hit: write collision
- Random memory access
- Cannot mimic the detectors



GPU friendly approach Output driven, gathering type

- Thread = importon
- SIMD: grouping importons
- No write collision: LOR-driven
- Cannot mimic the source



Multiple Importance Sampling



Direct gamma photon contribution



5D Integration

- Accuracy for given sample number
- Cost of a sample

Output- or LOR-driven sampling



Pros:

- Gathering
- Thread coherence
- Texture coherence
- Uniform on detectors
- Low-cost samples due to reuse

<u>Cons:</u>

Cannot mimick activity

Input or voxel-driven sampling



Pros:

Can mimick activity

<u>Cons:</u>

- Write collisions
- Less coherence



Multiple Importance Sampling



Input-driven scattered photon transport

- Monte Carlo simulation:
 - Free path
 - Absorption?
 - Scattering direction







Ray marching



- Complexity grows with the resolution
- Slow in high resolution low density media

Mix virtual particles to obtain a density that can be solved analytically





4096³ effective resolution 64 billion sample points

Output-driven single-scattered photon transport with reuse



- 1. Scattering points
- 2. Ray marching between scattering points and detectors

3. Combination

Multiple Importance Sampling



Detector response



Problem: The domain is 4 dimensional.



Quasi-Monte Carlo filtering



 $\int L(X-x)w(x)dx$



Detector Scattering Compensation



without

Back projection





Backprojection with unbiased forward projection



Reduce bias and outliers

• Averaging iteration:

$$\widetilde{y}_{L}^{(n)} = (1 - \tau_{n}) \widetilde{y}_{L}^{(n-1)} + \tau_{n} \widehat{y}_{L} \qquad \tau_{n} = \lambda / n$$

• Metropolis iteration: Ignore outliers randomly

Acceptance with probability $a_L = \min\{\hat{y}_L / \tilde{y}_L^{(n)}, 1\}$





Recons

432² × 654 res 1.3 mm voxels







Conclusions

- GPU is an effective tool for computing tens of thousands of parallel threads having no conditionals and collisions.
- The problem must be interpreted and solved to keep this requirement in mind.
- Randomization (Monte Carlo) can help structure the problem in this way.