**Short Communication**

**Submission to:** ANM

**Title:** A comparison of five partial volume correction methods for Tau and Amyloid PET imaging with \([^{18}F]THK5351\) and \([^{11}C]PIB\)

**Short running title:** 5 partial volume corrections for tau and amyloid PET imaging

**Authors:** (14)
Miho Shidahara\(^1,2\), Benjamin A. Thomas\(^3,4\), Nobuyuki Okamura\(^5\), Masanobu Ibaraki\(^6\), Keisuke Matsubara\(^6\), Senri Oyama\(^1\), Yoichi Ishikawa\(^7\), Shoichi Watanuki\(^2\), Ren Iwata\(^7\), Shozo Furumoto\(^7\), Manabu Tashiro\(^2\), Kazuhiro Yanai\(^8\), Kohsuke Gonda\(^1\) and Hiroshi Watabe\(^9\)

1. Department of Medical Physics, Tohoku University Graduate School of Medicine, Sendai, JAPAN.
2. Division of Cyclotron, Nuclear Medicine, Cyclotron and Radioisotope Center, Tohoku University, Sendai, JAPAN.
4. Institute of Nuclear Medicine, University College London, London, UK.
5. Division of Pharmacology, Faculty of Medicine, Tohoku Medical and Pharmaceutical University, Sendai, JAPAN.
6. Department of Radiology and Nuclear Medicine, Research Institute for Brain and Blood Vessels-Akita, Akita, JAPAN.
7. Division of Radiopharmaceutical Chemistry, Cyclotron and Radioisotope Center, Tohoku University, Sendai, JAPAN.
8. Department of Pharmacology, Tohoku University School of Medicine, Sendai, JAPAN.
9. Division of Radiation Protection and Safety Control, Cyclotron and Radioisotope Center, Tohoku University, Sendai, JAPAN.

**Correspondence to:**
Miho Shidahara ([shidahara@med.tohoku.ac.jp](mailto:shidahara@med.tohoku.ac.jp)), Department of Medical Physics, Tohoku University Graduate School of Medicine, Sendai, JAPAN.

**Word count of the manuscript:**
3189 / 3000 words
Abstract

**Purpose:** To suppress partial volume effect in brain PET, there has been many algorithms proposed. However, each methodology has different property due to its assumption and algorithms. Our aim of this study was to investigate the difference among PVC method for tau and amyloid PET study.

**Method:** We investigated two of the most commonly used partial volume correction (PVC) methods, Müller-Gärtner (MG) and geometric transfer matrix (GTM) and also other three methods for clinical tau and amyloid PET imaging. One healthy control (HC) and one Alzheimer’s disease (AD) PET studies of both $[^{18}F]$THK5351 and $[^{11}C]$PIB were performed using a Eminence STARGATE scanner (Shimadzu Inc., Kyoto, Japan). All PET images were corrected for partial volume effect (PVE) by MG, GTM, Labbé (LABBE), Regional voxel-based (RBV), and Iterative Yang (IY) methods, with segmented or parcellated anatomical information processed by FreeSurfer, derived from individual MR images. PVC results of 5 algorithms were compared with the uncorrected data.

**Results:** In regions of high uptake of $[^{18}F]$THK5351 and $[^{11}C]$PIB, different PVCs demonstrated different SUVRs. The degree of difference between PVE uncorrected and corrected depends on not only PVC algorithm but also type of tracer and subject condition.

**Conclusion:** Presented PVC methods are straight-forward to implement but the corrected images require careful interpretation as different methods result in different levels of recovery.
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Introduction

*In vivo* brain imaging of neurofibrillary tangle (tau) and amyloid β peptide (amyloid) using Positron Emission Tomography (PET) has been recognized as having an important role in the diagnosis of early Alzheimer’s disease (AD) (1). However, the PET image always suffers from partial volume effect (PVE) due to the spatial resolution of PET system, where regional uptake of radiotracer is blurred and its quantification is degraded (2).

To compensate PVE on PET images, there have been many partial volume correction (PVC) methods proposed. For brain PET studies, both the spatial resolution and individual structural images have been utilized for PVC. This is particularly relevant with the development of PET/MRI scanner (3, 4). The classical and popular PVC methods for brain PET which utilize structural information, are Müller-Gärtner (MG) (5) and the geometric transfer matrix (GTM) methods (6). MG is a voxel-based method and assumes that uptake in white matter can be accurately represented by its mean value. GTM is a region-of-interest (ROI) based method and assumes a uniform distribution within each ROIs.

There have been several reports which state that applying PVC improved image quality of tau and amyloid PET and improved the accuracy and precision of the quantification of tracer uptake (7-16). However, in many cases, the applied PVC method were limited to MG or GTM. Furthermore, Greve et al. reported that different PVC methods (MG, GTM, and Meltzer) result in different conclusions in a FDG cross-sectional aging study of elderly subjects (17). There is a need to perform a comparison study of the popular PVC methods for tau and amyloid PET studies and to explore the possibility of other PVC techniques. In this study, we report 5 methods for tau and amyloid PET images: traditional MG, GTM, and other 3 methods. The methodology was applied to PET images of a single HC and AD subjects having both $^{[18F]}$THK5351 and $^{[11C]}$PIB studies.

Material and Methods

Clinical studies

PET and MR images of 1 HC (81 y.o., Female) and 1 AD (80 y.o., Male) subjects, who had both a $^{[11C]}$PIB and $^{[18F]}$THK5351 PET scan, were used in this study. The PET studies were performed using Eminence STARGATE (Shimadzu Inc., Kyoto, Japan) with 3.5-mm (transaxial) and 5.0 mm (axial) full width at half maximum (FWHM) resolution at 1.0 cm off-center of the field of view. After a 10-min $^{131}$Cs transmission scan, 60- and 70-min dynamic scanning was started immediately after the intravenous administration of 304.9-347.4 MBq $^{[11C]}$PIB and 176.1-178.0 MBq $^{[18F]}$THK5351, respectively. All emission data were reconstructed using 3D-DRAMA
(1 iteration, 128 filter cycle, 30 relaxation factor) (18) with attenuation and scatter corrections (19) and post filter of three dimensional Gaussian (3 mm FWHM). SUV images with 40-60 min time frame images were obtained. All subjects underwent T1-weighted magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) scans using a Signa 1.5-T machine (General Electric Inc., Milwaukee, WI, USA). Image matrix of reconstructed PET and MRI were $128 \times 128 \times 79$ (2.0 $\times$ 2.0 $\times$ 2.6 mm) and $256 \times 256 \times 124$ (0.98 $\times$ 0.98 $\times$ 1.4 mm), respectively.

This study was approved by the Ethics Committee on Clinical Investigations of Tohoku University School of Medicine and was performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. Written informed consent was obtained from all subjects after a complete description of the study had been provided.

**Partial Volume Correction methods**

5 PVC methods, MG (5), GTM (6, 20), Labbé (LABBE) (21), Regional voxel-based (RBV) (22), and Iterative Yang (IY) (3), were performed in this study and are described briefly below. Abbreviations are defined in Table. 1.

The MG (5) is voxel-based method for gray matter regions with the assumption of uniform-tracer uptake in white matter. Basic concept of MG is that uncorrected PET image, $f(x)$, can be decomposed into gray matter and white matter (CSF if necessary) components. PVE correction PET image of gray matter region, $f_{c,gray}(x)$, is estimated by the subtraction from $f(x)$ to smoothed PET image of white matter region and then divided by gray matter fractions in each pixel, as follows.

$$f_{c,gray}(x) = \frac{f(x) - A_{\text{white},f(x)} \cdot p_{\text{white}}(x) \otimes \text{PSF}}{p_{\text{gray}}(x) \otimes \text{PSF}}.$$  (1)

The GTM method (6, 20) is ROI-based method. GTM also utilizes the assumption that PET image can be decomposed into regions where can be regarded as the uniform activity within it. Averaged values of $f(x)$ in the i-th region, $A_{i,f(x)}$, is multiplied with inverse-matrix of $T$ ($A = T \cdot C$) and then corrected values, $C_{i,(f)}$, for every region are obtained as follows.

$$\begin{bmatrix} C_{i,f(1)} \\ \vdots \\ C_{i,f(i)} \\ \vdots \\ C_{N,f(i)} \end{bmatrix} = T^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} A_{1,f(1)} \\ \vdots \\ A_{i,f(i)} \\ \vdots \\ A_{N,f(i)} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (2)$$
where $T$ is the geometric transfer matrix of $t_{ij}$, which represents the contribution of spill-over from $D_i$ into $D_j$.

The LABBE (21) is also a ROI-based method. LABBE also utilizes the assumption that PET image can be decomposed into regions where can be regarded as the uniform activity within it. Sets of PET value at each voxel, $[f(x_1), f(x_2), \ldots, f(x_M)]$, is multiplied with inverse-matrix of $T$ ($f = T \cdot C$) and then corrected values, $C_{i,j}$, for every region are obtained as follows,

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
  C_{1,f(x)} \\
  \vdots \\
  C_{N,f(x)}
\end{bmatrix}
= T^{-1}
\begin{bmatrix}
  f(x_1) \\
  \vdots \\
  f(x_M)
\end{bmatrix},
$$

(3)

Where $T$ is the matrix calculated by $PSF \otimes p_i(x)$ and $M$ is the total pixel number.

The RBV (22) is an extension of the GTM and the voxel-wise correction of Yang et al. (23). Basic concept of RBV is to multiply uncorrected PET image $f(x)$ with PVE correction factor in each voxel. The factor is derived from the ratio between synthetic PET image, consists of PVE corrected ROI values by GTM, and smoothed synthetic PET image as follows,

$$
f_c(x) = f(x) \left[ \frac{f_s(x)}{f_s(x) \otimes PSF} \right].
$$

(4)

The Iterative Yang (IY) (3) is similar with RBV but a further adaptation of the Yang method (23). This process is iterated several times with iteration number $k$ (where iteration number was set to 5 in this study). PVE correction factor for IY is derived from the ratio between synthetic PET image, consists of ROI value of $k$-th corrected $f_c^k(x)$ and smoothed synthetic PET image as follows,

$$
\begin{align*}
  f_c^0(x) &= f(x) \\
  f_c^{k+1}(x) &= f(x) \left[ \frac{f_s^k(x)}{f_s^k(x) \otimes PSF} \right] \\
  f_s^k(x) &= \sum_{i=1}^N [C_{i,f(x)} \cdot p_i(x)]
\end{align*}
$$

(5)

Data Processing and Analysis
The subject MR image was parcellated using the FreeSurfer software package (surfer.nmr.mgh.harvard.edu) version 5.1 (24-27). FreeSurfer extracts cortical surface meshes from the structural MR and assigns anatomical labels based on probabilistic data derived from a manually labeled training set. All processing using FreeSurfer was performed without any manual intervention by the user, except for the hippocampus of the AD subject. The hippocampi of the AD subject was manually re-drawn and carefully checked by a physician because FreeSurfer overestimated volume of atrophied thin hippocampi by including enlarged ventricles. The detailed parcellation produced by FreeSurfer was then mapped into 50 regions. The assignment of these regions is shown in supplementary table 1.

PVC images after MG, GTM, LABBE, RBV, and IY correction were implemented using the PETPVC toolbox (https://github.com/UCL/PETPVC) (28) and were applied assuming a resolution of 5 mm FWHM. 10 iterations were performed for IY. Both uncorrected and PVC images with $^{[18]}$FTHK5351 and $^{[11]}$CPIB were normalized with averaged ROI value in cerebellar grey matter to generate SUVR images. Through ROI analysis, we evaluated the effect of the different 5 PVC algorithms.

**Results**

**Figure 1** and 2 shows the uncorrected and 2 voxel-based PVC SUVR images of 1 AD and 1 HC with $^{[18]}$FTHK5351 and $^{[11]}$CPIB, respectively. After PVCs of the AD subject by RBV and MG, hippocampal SUVR of $^{[18]}$FTHK5351 (**Figure 1** upper) and cortical the SUVR of $^{[11]}$CPIB (**Figure 2** upper) were visually increased compared with the uncorrected. **Figure 3** shows SUVR values of uncorrected PET images, 3 voxel-based and 2 ROI-based PVC results of the HC and AD subjects, for both tracers. **Figure 4** also shows %difference of SUVR for 5 PVCs against the uncorrected. For AD subject, the amount of recovery by RBV and IY were almost the same, similar with that of GTM, but different from those of MG and LABBE (e.g. hippocampus of AD in $^{[18]}$FTHK5351 and frontal of AD in $^{[11]}$CPIB) (**Figure 4A** and 4B). For HC subject, MG showed small increase of tracer uptake compared with other 4 methods (**Figure 4C** and 4D).

**Discussion**

In the present study, we compared five partial volume correction methods for tau and amyloid PET imaging. Subjects undergoing tau and amyloid PET imaging are often expected to have brain atrophy, with or without physiological change in the region. It is difficult to accurately quantify tracer uptake in atrophic regions due to PVE. PVC for tau and amyloid PET imaging is expected to compensate PVE for more accurate quantification of tracer uptake, and is therefore essential.
for these applications (10).

However, the present results suggest that most PVC techniques can produce different amounts of recovery in each region, subject condition, and tracer, even though RBV and IY showed the same results. In particular, MG showed different amount of recovery between subject conditions. Thomas et al previously investigated the quantification of PVCs (RBV, MG, modified MG, deconvolution approach Van-Cittered) on $^{[1]}$CPIB human mimicked brain Phantom with two conditions, HC and AD (22). Notably, after PVC of MG, overestimation of $^{[1]}$CPIB uptake in the hippocampal region of an AD phantom was observed, even though that of a HC phantom was not (22). We also observed a similar tendency with this correction technique. This indicates that tracer uptake in the hippocampal region after MG PVC may lead to a misinterpretation of pathological change.

Limitation of the study is only two subjects involved, therefore, it is difficult to conclude directionality of what PVC would be better. In this paper, we showed the potential that different PVC may cause different quantitative values and distributions. PVC is sensitive to errors in image processing, for example of mis-segmentation of, and mis-co-registration to, an anatomical image, and appropriate setting of the estimated PSF for corrections. Not only algorithms but also these sources of error propagation need to be considered carefully to increase potential usage of PVC-corrected PET images. These are out of scope of this report but in order to compare and optimize the algorithm of PVC, further simulation and clinical studies with sufficient number of the subject would be necessary and this will be our future work.

**Conclusion**
PVC is essential processing when studying populations that are likely to have atrophy. However, in regions of high uptake of $^{[18]}$FTHK5351 and $^{[1]}$CPIB, different PVCs demonstrated different SUVRs. The degree of difference between PVE uncorrected and corrected data depends on not only PVC algorithm but also subject/patient disease. Presented PVC methods are straight-forward to implement but careful interpretation of the results is necessary.

**Figure and Table legends**
**Figure 1.** Uncorrected and two PVC SUVR images for single HC and AD subject with $^{[18]}$FTHK5351

**Figure 2.** Uncorrected and 2 PVC SUVR images for single HC and AD subject with $^{[1]}$CPIB
Figure 3. ROI comparison of uncorrected and PVC SUVRs for a HC and AD subject with $[^{18}\text{F}]$THK5351 and $[^{11}\text{C}]$PIB.

Figure 4. %Difference between uncorrected and PVC SUVRs for a HC and AD subject with $[^{18}\text{F}]$THK5351 and $[^{11}\text{C}]$PIB.

Table 1. Definitions and abbreviations for PVC processing
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Table 1. Definitions and abbreviations for PVC processing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$f(x)$</td>
<td>uncorrected PET image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_c(x)$</td>
<td>PVE corrected PET image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_s(x)$</td>
<td>synthetic PET image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_i(x)$</td>
<td>anatomical probability of $i$-th region at location $x$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>the total number of regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{i,f(x)}$</td>
<td>Averaged value of $f(x)$ at $i$-th region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{i,f(x)}$</td>
<td>PVE corrected value for $f(x)$ at $i$-th region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_i$</td>
<td>Volume of $i$-th region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$PSF$</td>
<td>Point spread function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$⊗$</td>
<td>Operation of three-dimensional convolution integral.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Uncorrected and 2 PVC SUVR images for single HC and AD subject with $^{18}$F[THK5351]
Figure 2. Fig. 2 Uncorrected and 2 PVC SUVR images for single HC and AD subject with $[^{11}]$CPIB.
Figure 3. ROI comparison of uncorrected and PVC SUVRs for a HC and AD subject with $^{18}$FTHK5351 and $^{11}$CPIB.
Figure 4. %Difference between uncorrected and PVC SUVRs for a HC and AD subject with 

\[{}^{18}\text{F} \text{THK5351 and } {}^{11}\text{C} \text{PIB}\].
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Figure 4. %Difference between uncorrected and PVC SUVRs for a HC and AD subject with 

\[{}^{18}\text{F} \text{THK5351 and } {}^{11}\text{C} \text{PIB}\].
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