

# Reconstruction for Sparse View Tomography of Long Objects Applied to Imaging in the Wood Industry

**Buda Bajić**

Faculty of Technical Sciences  
University of Novi Sad  
Serbia  
buda.bajic@uns.ac.rs

**Johannes A. J. Huber**

Wood Science and Engineering  
Luleå University of Technology  
Sweden  
johannes.huber@ltu.se

**Benedikt Neyses**

Wood Science and Engineering  
Luleå University of Technology  
Sweden  
benedikt.neyses@ltu.se

**Linus Olofsson**

Wood Science and Engineering  
Luleå University of Technology  
Sweden  
linus.olofsson@ltu.se

**Ozan Öktem**

Department of Mathematics  
KTH Royal Institute of Technology  
Sweden  
ozan@kth.se

## Abstract

In the wood industry, logs are commonly quality screened by discrete X-ray scans on a moving conveyor belt from a few source positions. Typically, two-dimensional (2D) slice-wise measurements are obtained by a sequential scanning geometry. Each 2D slice alone does not carry sufficient information for a three-dimensional tomographic reconstruction in which biological features of interest in the log are well preserved. In the present work, we propose a learned iterative reconstruction method based on the Learned Primal-Dual neural network, suited for sequential scanning geometries. Our method accumulates information between neighbouring slices, instead of only accounting for single slices during reconstruction. Our quantitative and qualitative evaluations with as few as five source positions show that our method yields reconstructions of logs that are sufficiently accurate to identify biological features like knots (branches), heartwood and sapwood.

## 1 Introduction

Many industrial applications of tomography involve scanning objects that move on a conveyor belt [7]. A specific setting in this context is the sequential scanning geometry where the acquired tomographic data of the moving object relates to a specific 2D cross section. A common 2D computed tomography (CT) set up consists of multiple fixed sensor-detector (SD) pairs, or of a single SD pair that rotates around the object. In order to minimize equipment costs and to make fast acquisition applicable to real-time industrial needs, industrial CT scanners typically contain either a limited number of fixed SD pairs or a single rotating SD pair which takes a small number of source positions for X-ray emission. This results in only few measurements per 2D slice (sparse view data). Such data may not be sufficient to reconstruct a high-quality tomographic 2D image. Furthermore, if one aims to obtain a full three-dimensional (3D) reconstruction, then information between slices needs to be combined to provide sufficient angular information of the scanned object.

The wood processing industry presents a case where sparse view reconstruction may be valuable. Detailed knowledge of the interior volume of a wooden log and its quality-determining biological

features can increase the yield and the value of the products extracted from a log. Today, this is achieved by full X-ray CT scanners, of which the first has been in operation in a Swedish sawmill since 2017. More common in sawmills are however discrete X-ray scans of logs from a few angles along a conveyor belt due to the lower investment cost compared to a CT scanner. It can be assumed that nearby 2D cross sections (slices) of the log will be similar because the interior structure of the log varies slowly in a direction along the log. This circumstance may enable the use of sparse view reconstruction methods that make use of the self-similarity in the slices.

This study explores an idea of using information among sparsely sampled 2D slices in order to obtain a tomographic image from only few source positions per slice, which is sufficiently accurate to distinguish biological features like knots (branches), heartwood and sapwood. This idea is inspired by dynamic process analysis where certain phenomena evolve in time [11]. Here, in a sequential scanning of a moving object, we assume analogously that 2D slices are evolving along the direction of the movement, i.e. the conveyor belt (a third dimension). More specifically, the goal of this study is to extend the 2D learned primal-dual (LPD) method for tomographic reconstruction by accumulating the information along the third dimension of the object based on the assumption that neighbouring 2D cross sections of the object are similar.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we discuss the tomographic reconstruction task and give an overview of different model and data-driven approaches which address it. Section 3 gives the theoretical foundation for deep learning-based reconstruction methods. Further, it presents the original LPD method and its extension adapted for sequential scanning in an industrial setting proposed in this paper. Next, we present the experimental setup in section 4 and results for the wood industry in section 5. Finally, we conclude in section 6.

## 2 Related work

Tomography refers to a wide range of methods for imaging the interior of an object by probing it from different directions with a penetrating wave or particle. The image that one seeks to recover corresponds in this context to the interior 2D/3D structure of the object being studied. Tomographic image reconstruction is then the task of computationally recovering the image from noisy indirect observations (observed tomographic data).

Image reconstruction in X-ray CT has traditionally relied on the filtered back-projection (FBP) method and variants thereof. These are analytical methods which compute a regularised approximate inverse of the ray transform. Unfortunately, the FBP assumes dense angular sampling and does not provide sufficient reconstruction results under sparse scanning geometries. In addition, it is problem-specific and does not generalize well to different acquisition geometries encoded in the forward/back-projection model.

A natural way to overcome this drawback was to formulate a general class of reconstruction methods that allow to replace the forward operator in a plug-and-play manner. This leads to variational models, where the reconstruction task is formulated as a minimization problem of some cost function that ensures data-consistency and incorporates a regularizer which gives robust reconstructions with desirable properties. The regularizer incorporates *a priori* knowledge about the solution, commonly different sparsity assumptions [17, 8, 6]. Handcrafting a sufficiently descriptive regularizer and ensuring computational feasibility (due to the large-scale numerical computations) are the main challenges related to this iterative model-based method. In addition, selecting an optimal regularization parameter which balances data-consistency and the regularizer is also of critical importance for the performance of the variational-based model.

The development of data-driven reconstruction methods is motivated by the need to address the above challenges. Data-driven methods are learning an optimal reconstruction from the training data instead of handcrafting it. *Learned reconstruction* is defined as a mapping between the data and image space and it is parametrized by some suitably chosen deep neural network (DNN). The key challenge here is how to choose a DNN in the best way. One natural idea is to select a generic DNN architecture, consisting of fully connected layers. However, when such architectures are applied to CT data, they easily become very large due to the input and output sizes. Another approach is to apply a DNN architecture on a hand-crafted approximate inverse of the forward operator (e.g.

FBP) as an image-to-image *post-processing* operator that is learned from training data. Popular architectures in imaging for this are based on convolutional neural networks (CNNs), like U-Net [13].

A different way to domain adaptation is through *unrolling* [15]. The approach starts with an iterative scheme, such as one designed to minimize data-discrepancy in variational models. The next step is to truncate this scheme and replace the handcrafted updates with (possibly shallow) CNNs (unrolling). The reconstruction method is then a DNN that is formed by stacking these (shallow) CNNs and accompanying them with physics-driven operators, and a forward operator and its adjoint, which are explicitly given (non-learned) [4, Sec. 4.9.1]. An example of this is the LPD method [3] with its variants [19, 18, 21] and variational networks [12].

All data-driven methods are suited exclusively to a 2D or 3D scanning geometry, while none of them specifically targets the industrial sequential 2D scanning geometry, to the best of our knowledge. In this study, we aim to extend the state-of-the-art 2D learned iterative CT image reconstruction LPD method to be applicable to a sequential 2D scanning geometry. This will be achieved by accumulating the information along the third dimension of the object assuming that neighbouring 2D cross sections of the object are similar. A related approach can be found in [20] where a dimension-reduced Kalman Filter [11] is used to accumulate information between consecutive slices. This method is applied in wood log scanning [9]. The main difference between the method presented in [20] and the 2.5D LPD proposed here is that the former is model-driven, while the latter is data-driven.

### 3 Method

First, we provide the mathematical formalization for deep learning-based reconstruction methods. Then we outline the original LPD architecture. Lastly, we describe the proposed 2.5D LPD method, which extends LPD method and is suited for a sequential scanning geometry.

#### 3.1 Mathematical formalization

Tomographic data formation can be defined as

$$y = \mathcal{A}(x) + e, \tag{1}$$

where  $x$  is an  $X$ -valued random variable that generates the true (unknown) image  $x^* \in X$ , the random variable  $e$  models the observation error, and the observed noisy tomographic data  $y \in Y$  is a single sample of a  $Y$ -valued (conditional) random variable ( $y \mid x = x^*$ ). Here,  $\mathcal{A}: X \rightarrow Y$  is the forward operator (ray transform) that models how a signal generates data in absence of noise and observation errors.

The traditional aim in tomographic reconstructions is to recover the entire (posterior) distribution of the  $X$ -valued random variable ( $x \mid y = y$ ). Since this is too demanding in imaging applications, a natural variant is to recover an estimator that summarises the posterior, or alternatively, to sample from it. More formally, a *reconstruction method* can be defined as a parametrized mapping  $\mathcal{R}_\theta: Y \rightarrow X$  which corresponds to a statistical estimator and has a desired property that

$$[\mathcal{A} \circ \mathcal{R}_\theta](y) \approx y \quad \text{for data } y \in Y \text{ and suitable choice of } \theta > 0.$$

*Learned reconstructions*  $\mathcal{R}_\theta$  are typically parameterized by some suitably chosen DNN. Therefore, learning here refers to selecting optimal parameters  $\hat{\theta}$  from the training data. In this case, we assume that we have access to pairs of ground-truth images and the corresponding data. It means that training data  $\mathcal{D}$  are given as i.i.d. samples  $(x^1, y^1), \dots, (x^N, y^N) \in X \times Y$  of  $(x, y)$ . *Supervised training* is performed by minimizing the loss functional

$$L(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} [\mathcal{L}_X(\mathcal{R}_\theta(y), x)] \tag{2}$$

for training dataset  $\mathcal{D}$ . Here  $\mathcal{L}_X: X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  measures how close the obtained reconstruction is to the ground truth, i.e., it quantifies consistency in image space  $X$ . A typical choice for the loss

**Algorithm 1** LPD [3]

---

1: Choose initial primal and dual variables  
 $(x_0, u_0) = \text{init}(y)$ , where  $(x_0, u_0) \in (X^C, Y^C)$

2: **For**  $k = 1, 2, \dots, M$  **do**:

3:   Dual update:  $u_k = u_{k-1} + \Gamma_{\theta_k^d} \left( u_{k-1}, \mathcal{A}(x_{k-1}^{(2)}), y \right)$

4:   Primal update:  $x_k = x_{k-1} + \Lambda_{\theta_k^p} \left( x_{k-1}, \mathcal{A}^*(u_k^{(1)}) \right)$

5: **return**  $x_M^{(1)}$

---

function is the squared  $\ell_2$ -norm  $\mathcal{L}_X(x, x') := \|x - x'\|_2^2$ , resulting in a reconstruction method which approximates the posterior mean. Another option can be to use  $\ell_1$ -loss  $\mathcal{L}_X(x, x') := \|x - x'\|_1$  and this choice can similarly be interpreted as having a learned reconstruction method  $\mathcal{R}_\theta(y)$  approximating the posterior median.

## 3.2 Original LPD method

First we introduce the state-of-the art learned iterative method for CT image reconstruction - Learned Primal-Dual (LPD) [3]. The original LPD method integrates elements of model- and data-driven approaches for solving ill-posed inverse problems. The combination of ideas from classical regularization theory and recent advances in deep learning enables to perform learning while making use of prior information about physical modeling of the inverse problem.

The Learned Primal-Dual architecture is a domain adapted neural network which is typically trained in a supervised manner (Equation (2)) with  $\ell_2$  loss. The LPD architecture is inspired by the iterative scheme in the primal-dual hybrid gradient (PDHG) algorithm [5]. This architecture incorporates a forward operator into a deep neural network by unrolling a proximal primal-dual optimization scheme and replacing proximal operators with CNNs. More precisely, the LPD architecture is given in Algorithm 1, the number of unrolling iterates is  $M$ ,  $\mathcal{A}^*$  is the adjoint of the forward-operator, while functions  $\Gamma_{\theta_k^d}$  and  $\Lambda_{\theta_k^p}$  correspond to CNNs with different learned parameters but with the same architecture for each unrolled iteration  $k$ . The primal and dual spaces are extended by letting  $C$  be greater than 1, which allows the algorithm to also use preceding iterations and thus have some “memory”, instead of just using the last iteration. Superscripts (1) and (2) denote the first and second channels of the assigned variables. Therefore, the number of input channels of the primal and dual mapping CNNs are respectively  $C+1$  and  $C+2$ , and the number of output channels is  $C$  for both.

In the original LPD paper [3], the method is successfully applied for CT reconstruction with 2D geometries. It has recently been further scaled up [19, 18, 21] for application on 3D geometries in clinical CT scanners.

## 3.3 2.5D LPD reconstruction method

In this work we continue extending the original LPD method with the motivation to make it applicable for industrial use, particularly for the case when 2D sequential scanning is used with only few SD pairs. We first formulate the mathematical problem of reconstructing CT images from data in this scenario and then introduce the new LPD family member tailored for it.

### 3.3.1 Sequential measurement setting

The 2D reconstruction and data spaces are respectively

$$X = \{\text{2D images}\} \quad \text{and} \quad Y = \{\text{2D sinograms}\}.$$

The aim is now to recover a series of 2D cross sections  $x = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \in X^n$  from corresponding series of 2D tomographic data  $y = \{y_i\}_{i=1}^n \in Y^n$  where

$$y_j = \mathcal{A}_j(x_j) + e_j \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Here,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  denotes the number of cross sections/data pairs accounted for (in “memory”),  $x_j \in X$  is the  $j$ :th 2D cross section,  $y_j \in Y$  is the corresponding 2D sparse view tomographic data with  $e_j \in Y$  denoting the (unknown) observation error, and  $\mathcal{A}_j: X \rightarrow Y$  is the forward operator associated with the data  $y_j$ . The latter is essentially the 2D ray transform sampled on some known manifold  $\mathcal{M}_j$  of lines that traverses the object and lie in the same 2D plane as the cross section  $x_j$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{A}_j$  is the ray transform restricted to lines in  $\mathcal{M}_j$ . Note also that the manifold  $\mathcal{M}_j$  varies with  $j = 1, \dots, n$ .

### 3.3.2 2.5D LPD architecture

The main idea for taking into account similarity between neighbouring cross sections is to use the “memory” in the LPD architecture described at the end of section 3.2. The “memory” component allows us to update a single cross section by using several neighbouring preceding cross sections instead of using only the previous estimate of the certain single cross section.

More formally, we define the reconstruction operator  $\mathcal{R}_\theta: Y^n \rightarrow X$  as  $\mathcal{R}_\theta(y) := \hat{x}_n$  where the 2D cross section  $\hat{x}_n \in X$  is given by the following iterative scheme for both the primal and dual variables:

$$\begin{cases} \{u_i\}_{i=1}^n := \Gamma_{\theta_k^d} \left( \{u_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{\mathcal{A}_i(x_i)\}_{i=1}^n, \{y_i\}_{i=1}^n \right) \\ \{x_i\}_{i=1}^n := \Lambda_{\theta_k^p} \left( \{x_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{\mathcal{A}_i^*(u_i)\}_{i=1}^n \right) \end{cases}$$

for  $k = 1, \dots, M$  with  $\theta = (\theta^d, \theta^p) = (\theta_1^d, \dots, \theta_M^d, \theta_1^p, \dots, \theta_M^p)$  and the primal and dual mappings

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\theta_k^d}: Y^n \times Y^n \times Y^n &\rightarrow Y^n \\ \Lambda_{\theta_k^p}: X^n \times X^n &\rightarrow X^n \end{aligned}$$

are CNNs that are not necessarily deep. The primal and dual mapping CNNs have the same architecture but different learned parameters for each unrolled iteration  $k$ , which corresponds to the original LPD. Note that the number of input channels of the primal and dual mapping CNNs are respectively  $3 \times n$  and  $2 \times n$ , and the number of output channels is  $n$  for both. For the implementation details, please refer to 6.

The above iterative scheme outputs a finite sequence  $\{\hat{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n \in X^n$  whose entries correspond to estimates of the 2D cross sections at  $1, 2, \dots, n$ . Hence, in particular we obtain an estimate  $\hat{x}_n \in X$  of the last 2D cross section in that sequence.

### 3.3.3 Training protocol

The training protocol is based on having access to supervised training data  $\mathcal{D}$  of the form  $(x^j, y^j) \in X^n \times Y^n$  for  $j = 1, \dots, N$  where

$$x^j = (x_1^j, \dots, x_n^j) \quad \text{and} \quad y^j = (y_1^j, \dots, y_n^j) \quad \text{with} \quad y_i^j \approx \mathcal{A}_i(x_i^j).$$

Then, the trained 2.5D LPD  $\mathcal{R}_{\hat{\theta}}: Y^n \rightarrow X$  can be given by solving the following learning problem where the hyper-parameter  $\hat{\theta}$  is obtained as

$$\hat{\theta} \in \arg \min_{\theta} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \|\mathcal{R}_\theta(y^j) - x_n^j\|_2^2.$$

Note that minimizing the latest loss function is the same as minimizing the loss functional given by Equation. (2) with  $\ell_2$  loss and expectation being estimated by the arithmetic mean for the given data set  $\mathcal{D}$ .

## 4 Evaluation

### 4.1 Log dataset

The Swedish *stem bank* [10] is a comprehensive database comprising several hundred Scots Pine (*Pinus sylvestris* L.) and Norway Spruce (*Picea abies* L. Karst.) trees, established in 1995 at the

Division of Wood Science and Engineering at Luleå University of Technology in Skellefteå in collaboration with AB Trätek. The trees were lengthwise subdivided into logs (between 4-5 m long), resulting in 628 pine and 750 spruce logs, which were characterized by a variety of measurements.

Each log was scanned using a Siemens SOMARIS-ART medical CT scanner using a 5 mm wide fan-beam and a proprietary algorithm (SP9) for reconstruction. Scanning was conducted sequentially on a slice-by-slice basis. Special attention was given to the areas near *knot-whorls*, the regions with the highest density of relevant features from a wood processing perspective. In these specific regions, scans were taken at 10 mm intervals along the length of each log ( $z$ -direction). For the remaining areas, scans were performed at 40 mm intervals. To create complete CT stacks with a consistent lengthwise resolution of 10 mm, the missing slices between the 40 mm intervals were filled by interpolation. The scanner originally provided 512 x 512 pixel images in 12-bit grey scale which were subsequently re-sampled to 256 x 256 pixel 8-bit images using a variable scaling factor depending on the object size in the field of view, in order to save storage space. The pixel size of the final images available today varies therefore between 1.37 mm and 1.76 mm.

## 4.2 Validity of LPD algorithm

For the initial evaluation of 2.5D LPD we used all cross sections from 46 pine log scans in total where slices from 42 log volumes were used for training, one entire log volume was used for validation, and cross sections from three logs were used for testing where each log contains approximately 400 slices. From each slice 2D data was simulated applying a forward operator from ODL [1] with a fan-beam geometry with 360 source positions. The resulting data was further sparsified such that only a few directions were left.

We experimented with the number of source positions to study how small the number of source positions could be made while still yielding a satisfactory reconstructed image. Answering this question is important from the perspective of fast acquisition by preferably cheap industrial CT scanners with a limited number of SD pairs. For the demonstration in this paper, we chose the number of source position being equal to 5, 7, 9, 11, 13 and 15. For the 2.5D LPD method, neighbouring slices are obtained from different source positions. To consider the ideal case, in which two consecutive acquisition geometries have a random angular increment, we uniformly sampled the difference between consecutive sources  $\Delta$  between 0 and 360 degrees. As an example for 5 sources,  $\Delta = 360/5 = 72$  which will result in the sources being located at (0, 72, 144, 216, 288) degrees and at an angular increment (randomly chosen) of 7 degrees, these will be moved to (7, 79, 151, 223, 295) degrees in the next slice.

We evaluated the 2.5D LPD with the number of neighbouring cross sections  $n$  varying from 2 to 9 in order to explore how the number of consecutive slices being taken into account affects the reconstruction quality.

In addition to the strategy where the last slice in a sequence of several consecutive slices is reconstructed by 2.5D LPD, we explored a “middle” strategy where the middle slice is reconstructed instead. The motivation for this strategy is to improve the reconstruction of the beginning of knots, which should benefit from the ability of the method to look ahead a few slices.

Quantitative evaluation (validity) of 2.5D LPD is performed (verified) by measuring closeness of reconstructed and original CT image in terms of peak signal to noise ratio (PSNR) and structural similarity index (SSIM) [25]. The higher PSNR/SSIM is, the closer reconstructed and original CT images are.

## 4.3 Evaluation by knot segmentation

The quality of sawn timber is predominantly affected by knots and their positioning inside the sawn volume. Inside and in the vicinity of knots, the fibre orientations of wood are severely deviating from an otherwise rather mildly varying orientation parallel to the growth direction of the tree, i.e. in *clearwood*. In the regions of deviating fibre orientations the mechanical properties are impaired in comparison to clearwood, e.g. the stiffness and strength of softwoods can be approximately 30-fold weaker in direction across the fibres as compared to along the fibres.

The industrial value of tomographic reconstructions from sparse data needs to be evaluated against its suitability to serve as a base for an automated detection of interesting biological features, and in particular knots. Since part of the log dataset (approximately 10%) has manually annotated knots obtained by humans using the MONAI Label framework [22] (Fig. 1), we decided to evaluate the suitability of the LPD based reconstructions for knot segmentation. For that purpose, we chose a CNN based algorithm, since CNNs have previously been used effectively on CT images for this task [23]. In our study, we employed the MONAI U-Net [22], an enhanced version of the classical U-Net, incorporating residual units and efficient dimension matching [14]. Its implementation details can be found in the appendix to this paper.




Fig. 1: The Swedish *stem bank* dataset.

Five U-Nets for knot segmentation were trained: one based on the full CT reconstruction (Fig. 1, bottom left) and four based on what we deemed the most suitable candidates for LPD-based reconstruction in an industrial setup based on results presented in Sec. 5.1. Those candidates used either 5 source positions (2D LPD 5-pos), and additionally 5 consecutive slices employing the “middle” slice strategy (2.5D LPD 5-pos 5-slices), or 9 source positions (2D LPD 9-pos), and additionally 3 consecutive slices employing the “last” slice strategy (2.5D LPD 9-pos 3-slices). Each of those U-Nets were trained on a set of 42 samples (Set B1, Fig. 1), validated on set of 5 samples (Set B2) and tested on 4 samples (Set B3), where each sample represents a whole log.

The samples used for the training, validation and test sets were from the same logs for all U-Net variants, i.e. one ensemble for the full CT reconstructions, and correspondingly one for each of the four candidate LPD-based reconstructions (denoted with \* in Fig. 1). The ground truth (GT) labels were the same for all cases. The candidate LPD-based reconstructions were inferred from models which were previously trained on the simulated sinograms of the full CT images. These LPD-based reconstruction methods were trained and validated on CT scans from a larger dataset for which no knot labels were available (Set A1 and Set A2 in Fig. 1), and tested on scans from the same set used for the U-Nets, i.e. Set B (logs with knot labels, Fig. 1, right down part).

The segmentation performance on the test sets from each trained U-Net were compared by calculating the Dice score of the knot labels, both in accumulated fashion for each log and in slice-wise fashion to study the development of the Dice score when progression through knot groups. In addition, the contours of the inferred knot labels were compared.

Tab. 1: Average PSNR (of all slices from 3 entire test logs) for 2.5D LPD for varying number source positions and number of consecutive slices.

# src. pos. \ # consec. sl.	2	3	4	5	7	9
5	30.87	31.26	31.01	30.75	30.45	30.82
7	32.41	32.46	31.97	32.08	32.23	32.07
9	32.93	33.34	33.16	32.76	32.99	32.98
11	33.48	33.85	33.87	33.26	33.35	33.50
13	34.47	34.12	34.18	33.54	33.84	33.78
15	34.96	34.84	34.80	34.47	34.60	34.50

Tab. 2: Performance metrics (average for all slices from 3 entire test logs) for different source positions for various reconstruction methods. The number of consecutive slices is 3 for 2.5D LPD in all scenarios presented here.

# src. pos.	5		7		9		11		13		15	
LPD	2D	2.5D	2D	2.5D	2D	2.5D	2D	2.5D	2D	2.5D	2D	2.5D
PSNR	30.21	31.26	31.65	32.46	32.50	33.34	33.37	33.85	33.72	34.12	33.43	34.84
SSIM	0.99	0.90	0.99	0.91	0.99	0.91	0.99	0.91	0.99	0.92	0.99	0.92

## 5 Results and Discussion

### 5.1 Validity of LPD reconstructions

We first evaluated the performance of the 2.5D LPD reconstructions with a varying number of source positions and varying number of consecutive slices. The average PSNR (of all slices from 3 entire test logs) for 2.5D LPD for 5, 7, 9, 11, 13 and 15 source positions and 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 9 consecutive slices are presented in Table 1. As expected, the greater the number of source positions, the greater the average PSNR. However, adding more consecutive slices does not necessarily provide a better quality of the reconstructed images. As can be observed from Table 1, 3 and 2 consecutive slices for most of the considered source positions are providing the best quality of reconstructions measured by PSNR. This result can be explained by the fact that in cases where the number of consecutive slices are greater than 3, the initial and last slices in the sub-volume often do not anymore contain similar information to the neighboring slices. This is due to the relatively large distance between slices, in relation to the size of typical biological features, like knots. We expect a larger number of consecutive slices to be more beneficial for data with more slices per feature, i.e. a higher resolution in the z-direction.

Subsequently, we compared 2.5D LPD with plain 2D LPD for varying numbers of source positions while fixing the number of consecutive slices to 3, which in most cases performed best in the previous evaluation (Table 1). A quantitative comparison is presented in Table 2 and qualitative comparison is given by Fig. 2 and Fig. 3. For all considered numbers of source positions, 2.5D LPD outperformed 2D LPD in terms of PSNR. However, if instead the the corresponding SSIM is compared, then the trend is inverted. The SSIM was computed using a Gaussian window of size  $11 \times 11$  and similar results were obtained with different kernel sizes. Visual inspection of the reconstructed log slices with and without knots (Fig. 2 and 3) clearly shows that 2.5D LPD is superior regarding reconstructing knots and the border between sapwood and heartwood. Since PSNR is more suitable than SSIM to assess pixel value accuracy, it seems to align better with the task at hand, which is the ability to reconstruct small details from sparse input data.

Finally, the two strategies (“last” and “middle”) for the 2.5D LPD reconstruction were compared. Both versions were evaluated for 3 and 5 consecutive slices, i.e. the best performing odd numbers from the previous evaluations (Table 1) to enable the “middle” strategy. Fig. 4 presents the average PSNR of all slices from 3 entire test logs for these evaluations. It can be seen that for 3 consecutive slices there is almost no difference between the “last” and “middle” strategy while for 5 consecutive



slices the “middle” strategy outperforms the “last” strategy. Our interpretation is that in cases where a slice just contains the start of a knot, the “middle” strategy performs better in comparison to “last”. This happens because the “middle” strategy also sees several of the subsequent slices which contain information on the same knot group, and in that way the model can anticipate the appearance of a knot. In contrast, the “last” strategy works in retrospect, i.e. it sees some preceding slices which do not contain information on knots and it is therefore less likely to successfully reconstruct those parts of the images. This is demonstrated in Fig. 5 where one such slice is reconstructed by both strategies and its reconstructions from a different number of source positions are presented alongside with the ground truth slice. The plotted curves for 5 to 7 source positions in Fig. 4 support this finding: for those small numbers of source positions, which are the most interesting in terms of industrial applicability, the “middle” strategy with 5 consecutive slices outperforms the other strategies. Fig. 5 shows that the main benefit of the “middle” strategy lies in the reconstruction of the beginning of a knot group, whereas the “last” strategy delivers clearly worse results. Hence, for 5 and 7 source positions the “middle” instead of the “last” strategy should be preferred, while for more source positions the richer data outweighs any benefits of the “middle” strategy over the “last” strategy. These results motivated our choice of LPD candidates for the evaluation based on knot segmentation in the next section.

## 5.2 Knot segmentation performance

Table 3 shows the Dice scores for all segmentation scenarios in this study. The differences between the 2D LPD and 2.5D LPD are small for the same number of source positions. The U-Nets trained on data from 9 source positions provide nearly the same segmentation performance as full CT data, while the performance drops by approximately 15% for U-Nets trained on 5 source positions.

Tab. 3: Mean Dice score for knot segmentation on the validation and test set by the various U-Nets trained on different reconstructions

	trained on:		LPD			
	CT	5 source positions		9 source positions		
		2D	2.5D	5 slices middle	2D	2.5D
<b>val</b>	0.781	0.651		0.675	0.740	0.738
<b>test</b>	0.771	0.679		0.686	0.747	0.729

When evaluating the segmentation performance of the U-Nets on a per-slice basis, the results reveal a more nuanced picture. For each knot group in the logs of the test set, the slice-wise Dice scores were extracted, and to account for the varying number of slices in the knot groups, the axial distance along the knot group was normalised and the scores were interpolated. Fig. 6 shows the mean and the standard deviation of these interpolated scores on a normalised knot group distance. In addition, Fig. 7 shows a sequence of slices through a demonstrative knot group (with normalised distance  $r$ ) in a log of the test set, using the ground truth CT images as a background and the human ground truth (GT) label and inferred label contours superimposed.

Fig. 6a shows that a greater number of source positions yields a higher Dice score for all sections along knot groups, which was expected due to the increasing amount of information. All U-Nets performed well around the middle of a knot group (rows 2-4 Fig. 7) where knot cross sections are sufficiently large and where a large share of the knot tissue remains within the heartwood of the log. In the heartwood, contrast is greater than in sapwood due to the absence of water and therefore better results were expected. Towards the origin and end of a knot group, the scores drop sharply. The U-Nets trained on full CT data and on the 2D LPD appear to underestimate knots close to their origins, i.e. near the pith (first row Fig. 7). The U-Nets trained on 2.5D LPD detected at least the presence of knots in these slices, which can be attributed to the 2.5D LPD accounting for neighbouring slices. Fig. 6a shows that this effect of 2.5D LPD over 2D LPD is more pronounced for variants with 5 source positions than for those with 9 positions. The end of knot groups are located

in the water-rich sapwood (last row Fig. 7) where the lacking contrast makes a distinction of knots from the background difficult.

Fig. 6b shows that the standard deviation in Dice scores increases towards the origin and end of knot groups, which reveals greater inconsistency and uncertainty in the inferred labels in these regions. Apart from the increased difficulty of segmentation, the uncertainty may be related to inconsistent human labelling of the ground truth in these regions. The labelling was conducted by different individuals with different educational backgrounds and thus their labelling in these difficult regions may have yielded insufficient consistency for generalisation in the models. Interestingly, the U-Nets trained on LPD variants based on 9 source positions matched and outperformed the U-Nets trained on full CT data close to the origin and end of knot groups. The models trained on reconstructions with greater levels of detail may have been trying to fit to the “noisy” ground truth labels in these images, while the models trained on reconstructions that can resolve fewer details are less prone to this overfitting and therefore reach higher Dice scores in these region.

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, a new 2.5D LPD reconstruction method for tomographic data has been proposed. It bridges the gap between the original 2D [3] and extended 3D LPD methods [18] suited for 2D and 3D geometries. The proposed method is tailored for the case when the scanning geometry is 2D and an image of an oblong 3D object such as wooden log, which contains biological features, such as sapwood, heartwood, knots, and growth rings, is obtained by sequentially scanning and stacking these 2D slices. The slices are evolving slowly along the third dimension and thus several neighbouring slices contain similar information, which the proposed method takes into account. The quality of the reconstructions is evaluated by measuring PSNR for a varying number X-ray source positions and by performing U-Net-based knot segmentation on the obtained reconstructions. In both types of evaluation, the new method is compared with the original 2D LPD method, which does not take into account the similarity of neighbouring slices while reconstructing the slice of interest.

In terms of PSNR, the 2.5D LPD performed slightly better than the original 2D LPD for all tested numbers of X-ray source positions, which could be confirmed by visual inspection of the reconstructed images. Even with only 5 source positions, the 2.5D LPD provided useful images, in the sense that all relevant features except for the growth rings were reliably reconstructed. Further examining two different strategies of taking into account several subsequent and previous slices at a time (“middle” strategy) instead of only previous slices (“last” strategy), showed that the “middle” strategy is the most beneficial for a low number of source positions, where it compensates for the lacking richness in data.

For the segmentation of knots, which is the most relevant biological feature in this case, U-Nets were trained on full CT data as a benchmark and on LPD-reconstructed data. Overall, the Dice score of the LPD-based segmentations was within 15% of the CT benchmark. All trained U-Nets perform almost equally well in the middle of knot groups, but worse towards the origin and end of knot groups. Due to its ability to take into account several slices at a time, the 2.5D LPD can perform better than the 2D LPD in segmenting the beginning of knots groups, in particular for fewer source positions. This circumstance is specifically interesting regarding industrial applicability, as the beginning of knots is located in the high-value boards that are usually cut from the centre of the logs.

The observed segmentation behaviour of the trained U-Nets suggests that the quality of the ground truth labelling requires substantial improvements, and it raises the question whether the start of knots could be modelled in a different way, taking into account knowledge about the natural growth behaviour of knots in trees. The former is currently addressed by the creation of a comprehensive dataset with logs CT-scanned in both the wet and dry state, which provides much better contrast in the sapwood region of a log, while the latter is planned to be explored in coming iterations of the presented algorithms.

From an industrial perspective, the performance of the 2.5D LPD method in particular is promising, because the ability to obtain 3D volume information about the interior of a tree with discrete X-ray equipment can open the door for increased value extraction to a greater number of existing

sawmills. Today, this is only possible for sawmills with full CT scanning equipment. To make the presented findings even more interesting for the wood industry, a further reduction in required X-ray source positions may be required. Future studies should investigate the effects of adding log rotation to the X-ray image acquisition, which should increase the amount of information, while reducing the number of X-ray source positions. In addition, joint reconstruction and segmentation of logs should be investigated [2] and compared to the sequential approach presented herein.

## Appendix

### LPD implementation details

The LPD methods (2D and 2.5D) were implemented in Python using PyTorch [16] for neural network layers and training. The image and projection spaces were implemented with ODL [1] using ASTRA [24] as a back-end for evaluating the ray transform and its adjoint. The PyTorch implementation of the original LPD network which is used in the comparative study of the present paper has exactly the same structure and hyper-parameters as in the original work [3]. In particular, we used  $M = 10$  unrolled iterations and  $C = 5$  memory channels for both primal and dual variables.

For the newly proposed 2.5D LPD, we also used  $M = 10$  unrolled iterations, while the number of memory channels for both primal and dual variables depended on the number  $n$  of consecutive 2D cross sections one seeks to account for, which varied between 2 till 9, c.f. section 5.1. For both the original LPD and the new 2.5D LPD, a three-layer CNN was applied in both the image and projection domain at each unrolled iteration, i.e.  $\Lambda_{\theta_k^p}$  and  $\Gamma_{\theta_k^d}$  had two hidden convolutional layers with 32 filters and one convolutional output layer, all using a kernel size of  $7 \times 7$ . The activation functions after the hidden layers were implemented as Parametric Rectified Linear Units (PReLU). Training was performed for  $10^5$  iterations using an initial learning rate set to  $10^{-5}$  with cosine annealing decay. All experiments were executed on a single NVIDIA RTX A6000 GPU with 49 140 MiB available memory.

### U-Net implementation details

The implemented MONAI U-Net [22] architecture features encode-decode paths with skip connections, where strided convolutions in the encode path and strided transpose convolutions in the decode path occur at the start of each block, in contrast to typical U-Net implementations where these down- and upsampling operations occur after each block. Padding and strides are optimised to ensure even division or multiplication of output sizes relative to input dimensions. We employed a three-dimensional U-Net architecture, operating on images padded to a size of  $256 \times 256 \times 512$  pixels. The model was configured with a single input channel and two output channels, for segmentation of a single target label representing knots, along with the background. Structurally, the network comprised five levels of encoding and decoding, featuring channel depths set to [16, 32, 64, 128, 256], and uniform strides of 2 at each level. The architecture was enhanced with two residual units, and batch normalisation was applied for feature normalisation.

Training was performed in batches of two under 800 epochs and using random rotations around the log axis and random flipping of the cross-sectional image axes, all with a probability of 0.2. A combined loss function was used, equally weighting Dice and Cross Entropy loss and not counting the Dice score of the background label. The final U-Net model weights were only saved if scoring on the independent validation set (5 samples) improved after a training epoch.

## Acknowledgment

The authors thank for the support from the CT WOOD research programme in Skellefteå, Sweden, which is generously supported by the Swedish sawmilling industry. The research is partially funded by the Swedish Energy Agency, Vinnova and Formas via the strategic innovation programme RE:Source.

## References

- [1] J. Adler, H. Kohr, and O. Öktem. Operator discretization library (ODL), 2017.
- [2] Jonas Adler, Sebastian Lutz, Olivier Verdier, Carola-Bibiane Schönlieb, and Ozan Öktem. Task adapted reconstruction for inverse problems. *Inverse Problems*, 38(7):075006, 2022.
- [3] Jonas Adler and Ozan Öktem. Learned primal-dual reconstruction. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, 37(6):1322–1332, 2018.
- [4] Simon Arridge, Peter Maass, Ozan Öktem, and Carola-Bibiane Schönlieb. Solving inverse problems using data-driven models. *Acta Numerica*, 28:1–174, 2019.
- [5] Antonin Chambolle and Thomas Pock. A First-Order Primal-Dual Algorithm for Convex Problems with Applications to Imaging. *Journal of mathematical imaging and vision*, 40(1):120–145, 2011.
- [6] Ingrid Daubechies, Michel Defrise, and Christine De Mol. An iterative thresholding algorithm for linear inverse problems with a sparsity constraint. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics: A Journal Issued by the Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences*, 57(11):1413–1457, 2004.
- [7] Leonardo De Chiffre, Simone Carmignato, J-P Kruth, Robert Schmitt, and Albert Weckenmann. Industrial applications of computed tomography. *CIRP annals*, 63(2):655–677, 2014.
- [8] David L Donoho. Compressed sensing. *IEEE Transactions on information theory*, 52(4):1289–1306, 2006.
- [9] T. Gergeľ, T. Bucha, M. Gejdoš, and Z. Vyhňáliková. Computed tomography log scanning – high technology for forestry and forest based industry. *Central European Forestry Journal*, 65:51–59, 2019.
- [10] Stig Grundberg, A. Grönlund, and U. Grönlund. The Swedish Stem Bank – A database for different silvicultural and wood properties. Technical report, Luleå University of Technology, Skellefteå, Sweden, 1995.
- [11] Janne Hakkarainen, Zenith Purisha, Antti Solonen, and Samuli Siltanen. Undersampled dynamic X-ray tomography with dimension reduction Kalman filter. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Imaging*, 5(3):492–501, 2019.
- [12] Kerstin Hammernik, Teresa Klatzer, Erich Kobler, Michael P Recht, Daniel K Sodickson, Thomas Pock, and Florian Knoll. Learning a variational network for reconstruction of accelerated MRI data. *Magnetic resonance in medicine*, 79(6):3055–3071, 2018.
- [13] Kyong Hwan Jin, Michael T McCann, Emmanuel Froustey, and Michael Unser. Deep convolutional neural network for inverse problems in imaging. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 26(9):4509–4522, 2017.
- [14] Eric Kerfoot, James Clough, Ilkay Oksuz, Jack Lee, Andrew P. King, and Julia A. Schnabel. Left-Ventricle Quantification Using Residual U-Net. In Mihaela Pop, Maxime Sermesant, Jichao Zhao, Shuo Li, Kristin McLeod, Alistair Young, Kawal Rhode, and Tommaso Mansi, editors, *Statistical Atlases and Computational Models of the Heart. Atrial Segmentation and LV Quantification Challenges*, pages 371–380, Cham, 2019. Springer International Publishing.
- [15] Vishal Monga, Yuelong Li, and Yonina C. Eldar. Algorithm unrolling: Interpretable, efficient deep learning for signal and image processing. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 38(2):18–44, 2021.

- 
- [16] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Soumith Chintala, Gregory Chanan, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Zeming Lin, Alban Desmaison, Luca Antiga, and Adam Lerer. Automatic differentiation in PyTorch. In *31st Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS 2017)*, Long Beach, CA, USA, 2017.
- [17] Leonid I Rudin, Stanley Osher, and Emad Fatemi. Nonlinear total variation based noise removal algorithms. *Physica D: nonlinear phenomena*, 60(1-4):259–268, 1992.
- [18] Jevgenija Rudzusika, Buda Bajić, Thomas Koehler, and Ozan Öktem. 3D helical CT Reconstruction with a Memory Efficient Learned Primal-Dual Architecture. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2205, 2022.
- [19] Jevgenija Rudzusika, Buda Bajić, Ozan Öktem, Carola-Bibiane Schönlieb, and Christian Etmann. Invertible Learned Primal-Dual. In *NeurIPS 2021 Workshop on Deep Learning and Inverse Problems*, 2021.
- [20] Sebastian Springer, Aldo Glielmo, Angelina Senchukova, Tomi Kauppi, Jarkko Suuronen, Lassi Roininen, Heikki Haario, and Andreas Hauptmann. Reconstruction and segmentation from sparse sequential X-ray measurements of wood logs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.09595*, 2022.
- [21] Junqi Tang, Subhadip Mukherjee, and Carola-Bibiane Schönlieb. Stochastic primal-dual deep unrolling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.10093*, 2021.
- [22] The MONAI Consortium. Project MONAI, December 2020.
- [23] Enrico Ursella, Federico Giudiceandrea, and Marco Boschetti. A Fast and Continuous CT scanner for the optimization of logs in a sawmill. In *8th Conference on Industrial Computed Tomography (iCT) 2018*, volume 23, Wels, Austria, February 2018. e-Journal of Nondestructive Testing.
- [24] Wim Van Aarle, Willem Jan Palenstijn, Jeroen Cant, Eline Janssens, Folkert Bleichrodt, Andrei Dabravolski, Jan De Beenhouwer, K Joost Batenburg, and Jan Sijbers. Fast and flexible X-ray tomography using the ASTRA toolbox. *Optics express*, 24(22):25129–25147, 2016.
- [25] Zhou Wang, Alan C Bovik, Hamid R Sheikh, and Eero P Simoncelli. Image quality assessment: from error visibility to structural similarity. *IEEE transactions on image processing*, 13(4):600–612, 2004.




Fig. 2: Reconstructions of a log slice with knots, using 3 consecutive slices and varying number of source positions.




Fig. 3: Reconstructions of a log slice without knots, using 3 consecutive slices and varying number of source positions.




Fig. 4: Average PSNR (of all slices from 3 entire test logs) for 2.5D LPD for different number of consecutive slices and different number of source positions per slice. “Last” and “middle” corresponds to two different strategies where last and middle slice is being reconstructed.






Fig. 5: Reconstructions of log using 5 consecutive slices and different number of source positions - sample where knots start appearing. “Last” and “middle” corresponds to two different strategies where last and middle slice is being reconstructed.




Fig. 6: Test set mean slice-wise dice scores (a) along a normalised distance  $r$  from the start to the end of knot groups and the corresponding standard deviations of the scores (b), for the human labels (GT), the CT trained U-Net (CT) and the four LPD trained U-Nets (2.5D 9-pos 3-slices, 2D 9-pos, 2.5D 5-pos 5-slices, and 2D 5-pos respectively).




Fig. 7: Segmentation contours of a knot group in the test sample 002753 by humans (GT), the CT trained U-Net (CT) and the four LPD trained U-Nets (2.5D 9-pos 3-slices, 2D 9-pos, 2.5D 5-pos 5-slices, and 2D 5-pos respectively).