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ABSTRACT. The result of tomographic examination is a series of images of the region under consideration. On these reconstructions a diagnosis is based. Automatic evaluations of these images are rather common in nondestructive testing, in medical analysis this may partially be the case in the future. Typically the two tasks are treated separately. This paper describes an approach where the two steps, the image reconstruction and the image analysis, are combined. This leads to new strategies how to develop fast algorithms. As example we consider the standard problem in X-ray tomography and an edge detection. We calculate a special reconstruction kernel, and we present numerical examples.

1. Introduction

The filtered backprojection is the standard reconstruction method for 2D X—ray tomography. Already Grünbaum [6] observed that this algorithm determines a smoothed version of the searched-for solution. In different fields the calculation of such smoothed versions of the solution is the starting point for developing algorithms, see e.g. [1, 21, 16]. A first unified approach was given in [29], which then was generalized in [24] for the application to linear and also to some nonlinear problems. In [28] this so-called approximate inverse was further generalized to directly
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compute linear functionals of the solution. The calculation of derivatives
for functions of one variable was already mentioned by Eckhardt, [9],
and also, including numerical experiments, in [24].
In this paper we study the problem of determining $Lf$ where $f$ is the
solution of the linear equation $Af = g$. The standard case in reconstruc-
tion problems is that the operator $L$ is the identity, hence we calculate
the solution itself. If we include in the solution step the evaluation of
the reconstruction, then we may enhance this task by incorporating parts
of the evaluation in the reconstruction. An example is edge detection
where smoothed derivatives of the images are calculated and then further
processed. In that case $L$ may be a differential operator, which increases
the degree of the ill-posedness of the whole problem. Other possibilities
are the direct calculation of wavelet coefficients of the solution, as originally
described in Sec. 3.4.3 in [31]. Applications to tomography are
given in [3, 37].
Often, the two procedures are executed independently. If the image
is itself the result of a reconstruction, for example in medical imaging,
one can envisage, that the information from the reconstruction step could
be included into the analysis step, which then should give better results.
As example, for a given picture $f$ we compute partial derivatives
$L_k = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}$, hence the result can be written as

$$L_{k\beta}f = f_{k\beta} = W_{\beta}L_kf$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.1)

for a smoothing operator $W_{\beta}$. If the image $f$ is a reconstruction, say
the solution of

$$Af = g$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.2)

we can write the solution, when filtering is considered, as

$$f_\gamma = E_\gamma f = E_\gamma A^\dagger g$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.3)

where $A^\dagger$ denotes the generalized inverse of $A$. Combining these two
steps we get

$$f_{k\beta\gamma} = W_{\beta}L_kE_\gamma A^\dagger g$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.4)

$$= \Psi_{k\beta\gamma} g.$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.5)

There arise several questions

1. is there an optimal relation between the two smoothing opera-
tors $W_{\beta}$ and $E_\gamma$ ?
2. how to choose the parameters $\beta$ and $\gamma$ ?
3. can this operator $\Psi_{k\beta\gamma}$ be efficiently evaluated ?
Concerning the last question we know that for the reconstruction step
a convolution operator $E_\gamma$ leads to the filtered backprojection method.
Hence we are looking for similar structures in the operator $W_\beta$.

After describing the general approach of developing algorithms for
calculating $Lf$ in Section 2 we present the special case of fan-beam
tomography in Section 3 for the case where $L_k$ is the differentiation
of first order in the $k$-th coordinate direction. We then consider the standard
reconstruction problem; i.e. $L$ the identity, for cone-beam tomography
for a circular scanning geometry.

## 2. Approximate Inverse for Combining Reconstruction and
Analysis

This section is based on [28] where we generalize the method of the
approximate inverse as analyzed in [24]. Let $A : X \rightarrow Y$ be a linear
operator between the Hilbert spaces $X$ and $Y$ and $L : X \rightarrow Z$ be a linear
operator between the Hilbert spaces $X$ and $Z$. As usual we first formulate
the reconstruction part

$$Af = g.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.1)

Next an operation $L$ on the so computed solution $f$ for the image analysis
is performed

$$Lf = LA^\dagger g,$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.2)

where $A^\dagger$ denotes the generalized inverse of $A$. Now we adapt the con-
cept of approximate inverse, first introduced in [29], where we now com-
pute instead of $Lf$ an approximation

$$(Lf)_\gamma = \langle Lf, e_\gamma \rangle$$

with a prescribed mollifier $e_\gamma$. We formulate in the following theorem the
principle of the reconstruction method.

**Theorem 2.1.** Let $e_\gamma$ be a suitably chosen mollifier and $\psi_\gamma$ be the
solution of the auxiliary problem

$$A^*\psi_\gamma(x,\cdot) = L^*e_\gamma(x,\cdot).$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.3)

Then the smoothed version of the image analysis operation is directly
computed from the given data $g$ as

$$(Lf)_\gamma(x) = \langle g, \psi_\gamma(x,\cdot) \rangle$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.4)

**Proof.** We write the smoothed version of the image analysis part as

$$(Lf)_\gamma(x) = \langle Lf, e_\gamma(x,\cdot) \rangle$$
Now we use the adjoint operator of $L$ and the auxiliary problem to continue

$$(Lf)_\gamma(x) = \langle f, L^* e_\gamma(x, \cdot) \rangle = \langle f, A^* \psi_\gamma(x, \cdot) \rangle = \langle g, \psi_\gamma(x, \cdot) \rangle$$

where in the last step we have used the original equation $Af = g$. □

**Definition 2.2.** The operator $S_\gamma : Y \to Z$ defined as

$$S_\gamma g(x) = \langle g, \psi_\gamma(x, \cdot) \rangle$$

(2.5)

is called the *approximate inverse* of $A$ to compute an approximation of $Lf$ and $\psi_\gamma$ is called the *reconstruction kernel*.

If we know the reconstruction kernel for computing $f$, then we can solve the above problem for computing $Lf$ in the following way.

**Theorem 2.3.** Let $\tilde{\psi}_\gamma$ be the sufficiently smooth reconstruction kernel for computing $f$, then the reconstruction kernel $\psi_\gamma$ for approximating $Lf$ can be determined as

$$\psi_\gamma = LW_\beta \tilde{\psi}_\gamma$$

(2.6)

where $LW_\beta$ acts on the first variable of $\tilde{\psi}_\gamma$.

**Proof.** The approximation of $Lf$ is here computed as the application of $L$ on $f_\gamma(x) = \langle g, \psi_\gamma(x, \cdot) \rangle$. Interchanging the application of $L$ and the integration, for sufficiently smooth $\tilde{\psi}_\gamma$, gives the result. □

It is shown in [28] that $S_\gamma$ is a regularization for computing $Lf$ if the smoothness of $e_\gamma$ is adapted to the smoothing of $A$ and the inverse of $L$ in the following sense

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0, g^\varepsilon \to g} S_\gamma(e_\varepsilon, g^\varepsilon) g^\varepsilon = LA^\dagger g$$

(2.7)

if $g^\varepsilon$ is in the range of $LA^\dagger$.

The computational efficiency of the approximate inverse heavily depends on the use of invariances. We consider again the reconstruction problem in tomography. If we chose for each reconstruction point $x$ a special mollifier, namely $e_\gamma(x, \cdot)$, then the reconstruction kernel also depends on $x$, the number of values to store is then the number of reconstruction points times the number of data. If we use invariances, for example translation and rotational invariances of the Radon transform and we use these invariances to produce the mollifier we can reduce this
number of values to compute and store to just the number of views per
direction. The mathematical basis for this can be found in [24]. Here we
cite the corresponding result for the combination of reconstruction and
image analysis from [28].

**THEOREM 2.4.** Let $A : X \to Y$ and $L : X \to Z$ be the two
operators as above. Let

$$
T_1 : Z \to Z \\
T_2 : X \to X \\
T_3 : Y \to Y
$$

be linear operators with

$$
L^* T_1 = T_2 L^* \\
T_2 A^* = A^* T_3
$$

(2.8) (2.9)

and let $\Psi_\gamma$ be the solution of the auxiliary problem for a general mollifier $E_\gamma$

$$
A^* \Psi_\gamma = L^* E_\gamma .
$$

(2.10)

Then the solution for the special mollifier $e_\gamma = T_1 E_\gamma$

(2.11)

is

$$
\psi_\gamma = T_3 \Psi_\gamma
$$

(2.12)

As a consequence we observe that the solution for a special mollifier fulfilling the condition $e_\gamma = T_1 E_\gamma$ can be found as

$$
\langle f, e_\gamma \rangle = \langle g, T_3 \Psi_\gamma \rangle .
$$

If for example the operators $A$ and $L$ are of convolution type and if we
chose the mollifier $e_\gamma$ also of convolution type, then the mappings $T_k$
are all of translation type, which means that also the final reconstruction
formula is of convolution type.

3. Fan - Beam Tomography and Edge Detection

The mathematical model of computerized tomography in two dimen-
sions, for the parallel geometry, is the Radon transform, see e.g. [35]. It
is defined as

$$
R f(\theta, s) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} f(x) \delta(s - \langle x, \theta \rangle) dx
$$

where $\theta \in S^1$ is a unit vector and $s \in \mathbb{R}$. In the following we summarize
a few results. The central slice theorem, or projection theorem is nothing
but the formal application of the adjoint operator for fixed direction $\theta$ on $\exp(is\sigma)$

$$\overline{R}f(\theta, \sigma) = (2\pi)^{1/2} \hat{f}(\sigma \theta) .$$  

(3.1)

The Radon transform of a derivative is

$$R \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} f(\theta, s) = \theta_k \frac{\partial}{\partial s} Rf(\theta, s)$$

(3.2)

see e.g. [35], and generalizations for higher derivatives. The inversion formula for the two – dimensional Radon transform is

$$R^{-1} = \frac{1}{4\pi} R^* \mathbf{I}^{-1}$$

(3.3)

where $R^*$ is the adjoint operator from $L^2$ to $L^2$ known as backprojection

$$R^* g(x) = \int \hat{g}(\theta, \langle x, \theta \rangle) d\theta$$

and the Riesz potential $\mathbf{I}^{-1}$ is defined with the Fourier transform

$$\hat{\mathbf{I}^{-1}}g(\theta, \sigma) = |\sigma| \hat{g}(\theta, \sigma)$$

where the Fourier transform acts on the second variable.

The following invariances are well established for the Radon transform. Consider for $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ the shift operators $T^x_2 f(y) = f(y - x)$ and $T^y_3 g(\theta, s) = g(\theta, s - \langle x, \theta \rangle)$ then

$$RT^x_2 = T^{(x, \theta)}_3 R .$$

(3.4)

Another couple of intertwining operators is found by rotation. Let $U$ be a unitary $2 \times 2$ matrix and $D^U_2 f(y) = f(Uy)$, then

$$RD^U_2 = D^U_3 R$$

(3.5)

where $D^U_3 g(\theta, s) = g(U\theta, s)$. With $(TR)^* = R^* T^*$ we get the relations used in Theorem 2.4. These two invariances lead for a mollifier of convolution type and independent of the directions; i.e., $e_\gamma(x, y) = E_\gamma(\|x - y\|)$, to a reconstruction kernel for determining $f$ of convolution type, independent of the direction, namely $\psi_\gamma(x; \theta, s) = \Psi_\gamma(s - \langle x\theta \rangle)$.

**Theorem 3.1.** Let the mollifier $e_\gamma$ be given as

$$e_\gamma(x, y) = E_\gamma(\|x - y\|) .$$

(3.6)

Then the reconstruction kernel for finding $f$ is given as

$$\psi_\gamma(x; \theta, s) = \Psi_\gamma(s - \langle x\theta \rangle)$$

(3.7)

where $\Psi_\gamma(s)$ is determined as

$$\Psi_\gamma = \frac{1}{4\pi} I^{-1} \mathbf{R} E_\gamma .$$

(3.8)
PROOF. We start with the auxiliary problem and use the inversion formula for \( R \)

\[
R^* \psi_\gamma = e_\gamma \\
= R^{-1} Re_\gamma \\
= \frac{1}{4\pi} R^* I^{-1} Re_\gamma
\]

hence we get

\[
\psi_\gamma = \frac{1}{4\pi} I^{-1} Re_\gamma
\]

\( \Box \)

In order to find a reconstruction kernel for approximating \( L_k f \) where \( L_k = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^k} \) we use Theorem 2.3.

**Theorem 3.2.** If we denote the reconstruction kernel for approximating \( f \) by \( \psi_\gamma \), then the reconstruction kernel for approximating \( L_k f \) is given as

\[
\psi_{k\gamma}(x; \theta, s) = -\tilde{W}_\beta(\theta_k \tilde{\psi}_\gamma'(s - \langle x, \theta \rangle))
\]

(3.9)

where \( \tilde{W}_\beta \) is the smoothing operator with \( \tilde{W}_\beta L = LW_\beta \) and \( \theta_k \) is the \( k \)-th component of \( \theta \).

**Example 3.3.** In the following we relate the regularization parameter \( \gamma \) with the cut-off frequency \( b \) via

\[
b = 1/\gamma.
\]

For the smoothing of the reconstruction part we use the mollifier known from the Shepp - Logan kernel with

\[
\tilde{E}_b \ast f = (2\pi) \hat{e}_b f
\]

where

\[
\hat{e}_b(\xi) = (2\pi)^{-1} \text{sinc} \left( \frac{\pi}{2b} \chi_{[-b,b]}(\|\xi\|) \right)
\]

(3.10)

and where \( \chi_{[-b,b]} \) is the characteristic function of the interval \([-b,b] \); i.e., it is 1 for values between \(-b \) and \( b \) and 0 otherwise. This corresponds to the reconstruction kernel

\[
w_b(s) = \frac{b^2}{2\pi^3} \frac{\pi/2 - (bs) \sin(bs)}{\pi^2/4 - (bs)^2}.
\]

(3.11)

For the differentiation part we choose

\[
\tilde{W}_\beta f = (2\pi) \hat{e}_\beta^2 f
\]
with
\[
\hat{e}^2_{\beta}(\xi) = (2\pi)^{-1} \text{sinc} \left( \frac{\|\xi\|\pi}{\beta} \right)
\]  
(3.12)
leading to a combined mollifier of the form
\[
E_{\beta\gamma} = e^1_{\gamma} * e^2_{\beta}
\]
with
\[
\hat{E}_{\beta\gamma}(\xi) = (2\pi)^{-1} \text{sinc} \left( \frac{\|\xi\|\pi}{2\gamma} \right) \text{sinc} \left( \frac{\|\xi\|\pi}{\beta} \right) \chi_{[-\gamma,\gamma]}(\|\xi\|)
\]
which is of convolution type. With the convolution theorem for Fourier transforms and the projection theorem for the Radon transform we get
\[
\psi_{k;\beta}(x; \theta, s) = \theta_k \psi_{\beta}(s - \langle x, \theta \rangle)
\]
(3.13)
where
\[
\psi_{\beta} = \frac{1}{2\beta} \left( w_b(s + \beta) - w_b(s - \beta) \right)
\]
(3.14)
where \(w_b\) is the kernel known from the Shepp-Logan filter, see (3.11). For
\[
b = \beta = \frac{\pi}{h}
\]
(3.15)
where \(h\) denotes the distance of the detector elements, the filter for approximating \(L_k f\) at the detector points \(s_\ell = \ell h\) is
\[
\psi_{k,\pi/h}(s_\ell) = \theta_k \frac{1}{\pi^2 h^3} \frac{8\ell}{(3 + 4\ell^2)^2 - 64\ell^2}, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}.
\]
(3.16)
The divergent beam transform or X–ray transform in two dimensions also delivers line integrals, the difference to the 2D Radon transform is the parametrization. For the X–ray transform one uses the source position \(a \in \Gamma\) and the direction \(\theta\) of the ray
\[
\hat{D} f(a, \theta) = \int_0^\infty f(a + t\theta) dt.
\]
(3.17)
If the source is moved on a circle with radius \(r\) around the object, then one can represent the source positions as \(a = r \omega(\alpha)\) where \(\omega(\alpha) = (\cos \alpha, \sin \alpha)^T\). If we parametrize the direction \(\theta = \theta(\beta)\) by the angle between the line connecting source and center and the ray by the angle \(\beta\) where \(\beta = 0\) means the ray from the source through 0, then there is the following relation between 2D X–ray transform and 2D Radon transform
\[
\hat{D} f(r \omega(\alpha), \theta(\beta)) = R f(\omega(\alpha + \beta + \pi/2), r \sin \beta).
\]
(3.18)
Formally the two transforms are related by an operator where for \( V = [0, 2\pi] \times [-\arcsin 1/r, \arcsin 1/r] \) the operator \( U \) is defined as
\[
U: L_2(Z) \to L_2(V, r \sin \beta)
\]
with
\[
Ug(r\omega(\alpha), \theta(\beta)) = g(\omega(\alpha + \beta - \pi/2), r \sin \beta)
\]  
(3.19)

It is an easy exercise to show that \( U \) is a unitary operator, hence \( U^*U = I \).

**Lemma 3.4.** Let \( X, Y_1, Y_2 \) be Hilbert spaces, \( A: X \to Y_1, B: X \to Y_2 \) linear operators and \( U: Y_1 \to Y_2 \) be unitary with \( B = UA \).

Then the reconstruction kernel for approximating \( Lf \) where \( f \) solves \( Bf = g \) is given as
\[
\Phi_\gamma = U\psi_\gamma
\]  
(3.20)

where \( \psi_\gamma \) is the reconstruction kernel for approximating \( Lf \) where \( f \) solves \( Af = g \).

**Proof.** If \( \psi_\gamma \) solves \( A^*\psi_\gamma = L^*e_\gamma \) then we get, because of the fact that \( U \) is unitary
\[
B^*\Phi_\gamma = A^*U^*U\psi_\gamma = A^*\psi_\gamma = L^*e_\gamma
\]
which completes the proof. \( \square \)

As a consequence it is now straightforward to calculate reconstruction kernels for the fan – beam problem. We make the usual approximations in order to have the cut – off frequency independent of the reconstruction point, see e.g. [35], to get the approximate inversion formula with \( \psi_{\beta b} \) and \( \beta = b = \pi/h \) as
\[
\left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_k} \right)(x) = \frac{r(r-1)^2}{4} \int_0^{2\pi} |a - x|^{-2} \\
\int_{-\arcsin 1/r}^{\arcsin 1/r} \psi_{\beta/h}((r-1)\sin(\beta - \eta)/2)\omega_k(\alpha + \beta - \pi/2) \\
\times g(\alpha, \beta) \cos \beta d\beta d\alpha
\]
where \( \omega_k \) is the \( k \)-th component of \( \omega \) and \( \eta = \arcsin \left( \frac{\frac{x-a}{|x-a|}}{a} \right) \).

In order to test the algorithm we choose the well – known Shepp – Logan phantom, where we use the densities originally given by Shepp – Logan; i.e., the skull has the value 2 and the brain has the value 1 ( in contrast to many authors, where these values are lowered by 1 leading to a brain consisting of air, as in the outside of the skull ). The objects inside the brain differ by 1% up to 3% to the surrounding tissue.
The number of data are $p = 800$ source positions and $q = 1024$ rays per view. The reconstruction is computed on a $1025 \times 1025$ grid.

Figure 1 shows the result of the here derived algorithm where to the data 5% noise was added. We observe that even the height of the jumps is correctly computed within the numerical approximation of the derivatives.

Then we added to the data 5% noise.

The artefacts outside the object can easily be removed by implementing the support theorem for the Radon transform stating that the object vanishes on lines parallel to $\theta$ not meeting the support of the data, see [2].

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.4\textwidth]{fig1a}
\includegraphics[width=0.4\textwidth]{fig1b}
\caption{Reconstruction with the here presented algorithm for the derivative with respect to $x_1$ (left) and $x_2$ (right)}
\end{figure}

Figure 2 shows the result when we reconstructed in the classical way and then a smoothed derivative is applied.
As consequence we note that it pays off to combine the two steps of image reconstruction and image analysis wherever possible.

4. Inversion Formula for the 3D Cone Beam Transform

In the following we consider the X-ray reconstruction problem in three dimensions when the data are measured by firing an X-ray tube emitting rays to a 2D detector. The movement of the combination source – detector determines the different scanning geometries. In many real-world applications the source is moved on a circle around the object. From a mathematical point of view this has the disadvantage that the data are incomplete, the condition of Tuy-Kirillov is not fulfilled. We base our considerations on the assumption that this condition is satisfied, the reconstruction from real data nevertheless is then from the above described circular scanning geometry, because other data are not available to us so far.

A first theoretical presentation of the reconstruction kernel was given by Finch [13]. The use of invariance properties was a first step towards practical implementations, see [26]. See also the often used algorithm of Feldkamp et al. [12] and the contribution of Defrise and Clack [7]. A unified approach to those papers is contained in [39]. The approach of Katsevich [19] differs from ours in that he avoids the Crofton symbol by restricting the back projection to a range dependent on the reconstruction point $x$. 
4.1. Mathematical model. We denote with \( a \in \Gamma \) the source position, where \( \Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \) is a curve, and \( \theta \in S^2 \) is the direction of the ray. Then the cone-beam transform of a function \( f \in L_2(\mathbb{R}) \) is defined as

\[
Df(a, \theta) = \int_0^\infty f(a + t\theta) \, dt. \quad (4.1)
\]

The adjoint operator as mapping from \( L_2(\mathbb{R}^3) \rightarrow L_2(\Gamma \times S^2) \) is given as

\[
D^*g(x) = \int_\Gamma \|x - a\|^{-2} g\left( a, \frac{x - a}{\|x - a\|} \right) \, da. \quad (4.2)
\]

Most attempts to find inversion formulae are based on the Formula of Grangeat, first published in Grangeat’s PhD thesis [14], see also [15]:

\[
\left. \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \mathbf{R} f(\omega, s) \right|_{s = \langle a, \omega \rangle} = - \int_{S^2} Df(a, \theta) \delta' (\langle \theta, \omega \rangle) \, d\theta. \quad (4.3)
\]

Our starting point is now the inversion formula for the 3D Radon transform

\[
f(x) = - \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \int_{S^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial s^2} \mathbf{R} f(\omega, s) \bigg|_{s = \langle x, \omega \rangle} \, d\omega, \quad (4.4)
\]

that we rewrite as

\[
f(x) = \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \int_{S^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \mathbf{R} f(\omega, s) \delta' (s - \langle x, \omega \rangle) \, ds \, d\omega. \quad (4.5)
\]

We assume in the following that the Tuy - Kirillov condition is fulfilled. Then we can change the variables as follows: By \( n(\omega, s) \) we denote the Crofton symbol, i.e. the number of source points \( a \in \Gamma \) such that \( \langle a, \omega \rangle = s \):

\[
n(\omega, s) = \# \{ a \in \Gamma : \langle a, \omega \rangle = s \}.
\]
Setting \( m = 1/n \), we get

\[
\begin{align*}
f(x) &= \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \int_{S^2} \int_{\Gamma} (Rf)'(\omega, \langle a, \omega \rangle) \delta'(\langle a - x, \omega \rangle) \times |\langle \dot{a}, \omega \rangle| m(\omega, \langle a, \omega \rangle) \, da \, d\omega \\
&= -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \int_{S^2} \int_{\Gamma} \int_{S^2} Df(a, \theta) \delta'(\langle \theta, \omega \rangle) \, d\theta \\
&\quad \times \delta'(\langle a - x, \omega \rangle) |\langle \dot{a}, \omega \rangle| m(\omega, \langle a, \omega \rangle) \, da \, d\omega \\
&= +\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \int_{\Gamma} \frac{1}{||x - a||^2} \int_{S^2} \int_{S^2} Df(a, \theta) \delta'(\langle \theta, \omega \rangle) \, d\theta \\
&\quad \times \delta'(\frac{x - a}{||x - a||}, \omega) |\langle \dot{a}, \omega \rangle| m(\omega, \langle a, \omega \rangle) \, da \, d\omega
\end{align*}
\]

where we used that \( \delta' \) is homogeneous of degree \(-2\) and that \( \delta'(-s) = -\delta'(s) \). We now introduce the operator

\[
T_1 g(\omega) = \int_{S^2} g(\theta) \delta'(\langle \theta, \omega \rangle) \, d\theta,
\]

acting on the second variable of a function \( g(a, \omega) \) as

\[
T_{1,a} g(\omega) = T_1 g(a, \omega),
\]

and the multiplication operator

\[
M_{\Gamma} h(a, \theta) = |\langle \dot{a}, \omega \rangle| m(\omega, \langle a, \omega \rangle) h(\omega)
\]

and state the following result, see also [27].

**Theorem 4.1.** Let the condition of Tuy-Kirillov be fulfilled. Then the inversion formula for the cone beam transform is given as

\[
f = \frac{1}{8\pi^2} D^*T_1 M_{\Gamma} T_1 Df
\]

with the adjoint operator \( D^* \) of the cone beam transform and \( T_1 \) and \( M_{\Gamma} \) as defined above.

Note that both \( D^* \) and \( M_{\Gamma} \) depend on the scanning curve \( \Gamma \), whereas \( T_1 \) only depends on the specific point \( a \) of the scanning curve.

The above theorem allows for computing reconstruction kernels. To this end we have to solve the equation

\[
D^*\psi_\gamma = e_\gamma,
\]

in order to write the solution of \( Df = g \) as

\[
f(x) = \langle g, \psi_\gamma(x, \cdot) \rangle_\gamma.
\]
In the case of exact inversion, \( e_\gamma \) is the delta distribution, in the case of an approximate inversion formula, it is an approximation of this distribution.

From the above we see that
\[
D^{-1} = \frac{1}{8\pi^2} D^* T_1 M^* T_1
\]
and we can write
\[
D^* \psi_\gamma = e_\gamma = \frac{1}{8\pi^2} D^* T_1 M^* T_1 D e_\gamma,
\]
hence
\[
\psi_\gamma = \frac{1}{8\pi^2} T_1 M^* T_1 D e_\gamma. \tag{4.8}
\]

5. Computing the reconstruction kernel

In the following, we will use (4.8) to derive an analytic formula for the reconstruction kernel in 3D. We use the Gaussian
\[
e_\gamma(x, y) = (2\pi)^{-3/2} \frac{1}{\gamma^3} e^{-\frac{\|x-y\|^2}{2\gamma^2}} \tag{5.1}
\]
as mollifier (which we write as \( e_x(y) \)) and get
\[
T_1 D e_\gamma(a, \omega, x) = \frac{(2\pi)^{-1/2}}{\gamma^3} e^{-\frac{1}{2\gamma^2} \langle a-x, \omega \rangle^2} (a-x, \omega). \tag{5.2}
\]

**Proof.** Following [8, p. 69], we have
\[
\int_{S^2} [Df](a, \theta) \delta'(\langle \theta, \omega \rangle) \, d\theta = -\int_{\omega^\perp} \langle [\nabla f](a, \omega + y), \omega \rangle \, dy.
\]

For the Gaussian, this means
\[
[T_1 D e_x](a, \omega) = -\int_{\omega^\perp} \langle [\nabla_y e_x](y), \omega \rangle \, dy
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{\gamma^2} \left( \int_{\omega^\perp} e(\|y-x\|)(y-x) \, dy, \omega \right)
\]
\[
= \frac{(2\pi)^{-3/2}}{\gamma^5} \int_{\omega^\perp} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\gamma^2} \|y+z\|^2\right)(y+z) \, dy.
\]

We introduce a rotated coordinate system, such that \( \omega \) is one of the directions. As we only integrate over \( \omega^\perp \), the integral reduces to an integration over \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) and yields the mentioned result. \( \square \)

For the multiplication operator \( M_1 \), we need the inverse of the Crofton symbol, \( m \). For the specific case of a circular scanning geometry, we set \( n = 2 \) and hence \( m = 1/2 \). Applying the operator \( T_1 \) to the function in (5.2) yields the following result.

For the multiplication operator \( M_1 \), we need the inverse of the Crofton symbol, \( m \). For the specific case of a circular scanning geometry, we set \( n = 2 \) and hence \( m = 1/2 \). Applying the operator \( T_1 \) to the function in (5.2) yields the following result.
THEOREM 5.1. Let the scanning curve $\Gamma$ be a circle with radius $R$ and the density function $f$ fulfills $\text{supp } f \subset r \cdot S^2$, $r < R$. If the direction vector $\theta \in S^2$ does not lie parallel to the vector $x - a$, the reconstruction kernel $\psi$ can be written as

$$\psi_\gamma(a, \theta, x) = \frac{-C}{2\pi} \left[ \frac{p_3}{p_4} \left\{ \langle \dot{a}, \theta \rangle - 2\alpha \langle a - x, \theta \rangle p_3 \right\} \right]$$

$$\times \int_0^1 e^{p_1[p_2 t^2 - 1]} dt + p_4 \langle a - x, \theta \rangle e^{p_1[p_2 - 1]} \right],$$

where

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{2\gamma^2}, \quad C = (2\pi)^{-3/2} \frac{1}{\gamma^3}$$

$$p_1 = \alpha \|a - x - (a - x, \theta) \theta\|^2$$

$$p_2 = \|\dot{a} - (a - x, \theta) \theta, \dot{a} - (a - x, \theta) \theta\|^2$$

$$p_3 = \langle a - x - (a - x, \theta) \theta, \dot{a} - (a - x, \theta) \theta\rangle$$

$$p_4 = \|\dot{a} - (a - x, \theta) \theta\|. \quad (5.3)$$

If $\theta$ lies parallel to $x - a$, then the kernel can be calculated as

$$\psi_\gamma(a, \theta, x) = \frac{-C}{2\pi} \|\dot{a} - (a - x, \theta) \theta\|^2 \langle a - x, \theta \rangle. \quad (5.4)$$

Theorem 5.1 provides a means for fast computations of reconstruction kernels, eliminating the need for pre-computed kernels. The calculation of the kernel took approximately 6.6 seconds on a x86 desktop system with a 3 GHz CPU, the discrete kernel has $513^2$ elements.

REMARK 5.2. The circle used in theorem 5.1 does not fulfill the Tuy-Kirillov condition, hence the theorem only provides an approximative solution. With respect to the 3D Radon transform, this leads to hollow projections. In the 2D case, uniqueness is preserved, in 3D this is subject of future research. With respect to the long object problem, one additionally faces truncated projections which means that other scanning geometries, like helices are to be preferred.

6. Implementation

6.1. Invariances. As mentioned, using the approximate inverse (AI), invariances of the operator can be used to shorten the calculation of the reconstruction kernel. Using our explicit formula for $\psi$, we easily see the following:
(1) The reconstruction kernel depends only via $a - x$ on $x$, i.e. only the relative vector between $a$ and $x$ is important.

(2) For the point $x = 0$, we have

$$\psi_{\gamma}(Va, \theta, x = 0) = \psi_{\gamma}(a, V^T \theta, x = 0)$$

for every rotation matrix $V$.

The second invariance is only true for the point $x = 0$. A first step towards a fast and easy computation of a reconstruction kernel was taken by Dietz in his PhD thesis, see [8]. But whereas he used a reconstruction kernel for the 3D Radon transform and subsequently calculated a numerical kernel for the ray transform, we use equation (4.8) to derive an analytical formula for the reconstruction for the X-ray transform. Using this formula, we can overcome the need for a pre-computed kernel, which gives us more flexibility.

For the approximate invariance, we define $U_x^T$ to be the rotation matrix that rotates $\frac{a - x}{\|a - x\|}$ onto $a/R$, i.e.

$$U_x^T \frac{a - x}{\|a - x\|} = \frac{a}{R}.$$

For real world measurement setups, $U_x$ will be so "close" to the identity matrix that we can then assume $U_x \hat{a} = \hat{a}$. The reason for that is that the radius of the sphere in which we reconstruct is (much) smaller than the radius of the source curve. Then, instead of calculating the reconstruction kernel for different values of $x$, we calculate it only for $x = 0$ and scale it by a factor of $\frac{R^2}{\|a - x\|^2}$, see [8]

$$\psi(a, \theta, x) \approx \frac{R^2}{\|a - x\|^2} \psi(a, U_x^T \theta, x = 0).$$

Tying these invariances together, we see that we only need to compute the kernel once for one value of $a$ and the different ray directions $\theta$. The different reconstruction points $x$ are taken into account by the simple scaling factor above.

6.2. Computational complexity. With the invariances detailed in subsection 6.1 we can implement the approximate inverse with the very same complexity as the FDK algorithm:

(1) Generate the filter matrix and calculate its Fourier transform (once!).

(2) For each source point $a$

(a) Calculate the Fourier transform of the data matrix (that is, the matrix with the measured data).
(b) Multiply both matrices element-wise and calculate the inverse Fourier transform of the resulting matrix.

(3) Use these matrices for the back projection.

The only different part is the computation of the kernel 3D-matrix. As mentioned after theorem 5.1, the kernel computation takes only a few seconds, so this part is negligible. Thus, the two algorithms are on par with respect to their computational requirements.

In the following, we present reconstructions from real data, kindly provided by Fraunhofer IZFP, Saarbrücken.

FIGURE 3: Physical phantom consisting of metal
7. Conclusion

We have presented an exact inversion formula and derived a suitable numerical inversion formula from it for the circular scanning geometry. The numerical implementation is fast enough to no longer rely on a pre-computed kernel. Instead, the kernel can be computed as part of the measurement. As such, our method has the same numerical complexity as the Feldkamp algorithm. However, the approximate inverse has both a better resolution and a lower noise level.
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