

GENERALIZED RAY TRACING WITH BASIS FUNCTIONS FOR TOMOGRAPHIC PROJECTIONS

Youssef Haouchat, Philippe Thévenaz, Michael Unser

Biomedical Imaging Group, École polytechnique fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Switzerland

ABSTRACT

This work aims at the precise and efficient computation of the x-ray projection of an image represented by a linear combination of general shifted basis functions that typically overlap. We achieve this with a suitable adaptation of ray tracing, which is one of the most efficient methods to compute line integrals. In our work, the cases in which the image is expressed as a spline are of particular relevance. The proposed implementation is applicable to any projection geometry as it computes the forward and backward operators over a collection of arbitrary lines. We validate our work with experiments in the context of inverse problems for image reconstruction and maximize the image quality for a given resolution of the reconstruction grid.

Index Terms—X-ray, splines, image reconstruction, inverse problems

I. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we propose a highly accurate method to compute the x-ray transform of an image with arbitrary geometry. The accuracy results from the high order of approximation that comes with the representation of data through spline models, combined with the exact computation of the integrals found in x-ray transforms. Our approach turns out to be computationally efficient as well.

I-A. State of the Art

The computation of ray-based operators for the x-ray transform often takes advantage of a ray tracer that performs a line integration. For instance, some of the widely used open-source software packages such as the Astra toolbox [1], the TIGRE toolbox [2], or the Reconstruction Toolkit [3] employ the Siddon algorithm [4] or its accelerated variant [5]. These methods assume that the image is piecewise-constant over the cells delimited by a grid, which corresponds to a pixel-based representation. To avoid blocking artifacts or to make an implicitly smoother description of the image, they also implement interpolation-kernel methods [6] or they exploit GPU-based texture managers. For predefined projection geometries, one can also resort to more advanced methods such as footprint-based [7], distance-driven [8], or convolutional [9] for more precise projection models.

The authors of [10, 11] have studied the impact of a richer representation of the image in the context of x-ray imaging but they do not exploit the computational efficiency of ray tracing as we do in our approach.

I-B. The X-Ray-Transform Operator

Let a line on the plane \mathbb{R}^2 be described parametrically in terms of $y \in \mathbb{R}$ as the set

$$\{t\boldsymbol{\theta} + y\boldsymbol{\theta}^\perp \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid t \in \mathbb{R}\}, \quad (1)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\cos \theta, \sin \theta) \in \mathbb{S}^1(\mathbb{R})$ is the unit vector directing the line that forms an angle $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ with the horizontal axis. The vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}^\perp = (\sin \theta, -\cos \theta) \in \mathbb{S}^1(\mathbb{R})$ is a unit vector, orthogonal to $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, such that $y\boldsymbol{\theta}^\perp$ can be interpreted as the orthogonal shift by y of the ray relative to the origin. In the context of imaging, y is often taken to correspond to the position of a detector.

Then, the x-ray transform [12, 13] of the integrable function $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ corresponds to the collection of all its integrals along such lines. It is expressed in terms of $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\mathcal{P}_\theta\{f\}(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(t\boldsymbol{\theta} + y\boldsymbol{\theta}^\perp) dt. \quad (2)$$

This measurement operator is widely used in tomography to solve inverse problems in modalities such as x-ray scan, positron emission tomography, or cryogenic electron tomography [14, 15]. Every detector is indexed by y , while every ray is indexed by θ and y , as hinted in Figure 1.

The function f in (2) is the model of an image. It is often assumed to consist in the translations of a basis generated from $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ placed on a uniform Cartesian grid. For simplicity, and without loss of generality, we choose the stepsize of the grid to be equal to 1. We also assume f to be compactly supported. Then, we have that

$$f = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \Omega} c_{\mathbf{k}} \varphi(\cdot - \mathbf{k}), \quad (3)$$

where $\Omega = \{1, \dots, N\} \times \{1, \dots, N\}$ with N^2 the number of basis functions needed to represent f , \mathbf{k} is an index on the grid, and $c_{\mathbf{k}}$ is the coefficient of f associated to the




Fig. 1. Projection along a line at a specific angle indexed by θ onto a specific detector indexed by y . In this paper, we consider every projection line independently.

shifted basis function $\varphi(\cdot - \mathbf{k})$. Thus, the x-ray projection of a function f parameterized by its coefficients $(c_{\mathbf{k}})_{\mathbf{k} \in \Omega}$ is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{\theta}\{f\}(y) &= \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \Omega} c_{\mathbf{k}} \mathcal{P}_{\theta}\{\varphi(\cdot - \mathbf{k})\}(y) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \Omega} c_{\mathbf{k}} \mathcal{P}_{\theta}\{\varphi\}(y - \langle \mathbf{k}, \theta^{\perp} \rangle), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

with our concern being the efficient and accurate evaluation of (4) for arbitrary θ and y , given some underlying generator φ .

I-C. Contribution

Ray-based methods such as ray tracing are particularly suitable for the handling of arbitrary geometries which may involve irregular contributions of y and θ in (4), thus prohibiting Fourier-based methods in such cases. Their principle (Bresenham's [16] or Siddon's [17, 4, 18] methods) is to cast a ray through a medium composed of simple structures that form a partition of the domain, to compute the intersections between the ray and these structures, and to perform partial integrations over each intersection. Traditional methods correspond to the case when the basis generator φ takes a constant value and has a shape that coincides with the cells of the grid. In that case, $\mathcal{P}_{\theta}\{\varphi\}(y)$ is precisely the length of such intersections, to which ray tracing provides direct access.

In this work, we generalize the ray-tracing algorithm to handle any basis function even if the support overflows cells, which allows us to compute (4) exactly. The challenge is to combine the domain decomposition (a uniform Cartesian grid allowing ray-tracing techniques) with an expansion




Fig. 2. Projected bases $y \mapsto \varphi_{\theta}(y)$. Here, φ is the 3-directional box-spline $\varphi_{\theta}^{\text{box}}$. The curves are indexed by the projection angle $\theta \in [-\pi/4, \pi/4]$.

into basis functions whose support is general and does not coincide with that of the cell [19, 20]. Higher-order basis functions allow us to improve image representations, which ultimately leads to better quality. The contributions of this paper are as follows.

- (1) We propose an efficient variant of ray tracing for the exact computation of the x-ray transform and its adjoint, able to handle overlapping basis functions. The algorithm can handle any projection geometry and computes $\mathcal{P}_{\theta_m}\{f\}(y_m)$ for any set of rays parameterized by $(\theta_m, y_m)_{m \leq M}$.
- (2) We provide explicit expressions of $\mathcal{P}_{\theta}\{\varphi\}(y)$ for specific basis functions, which we take advantage of in our implementation.
- (3) We present experiments of image reconstruction that showcase the benefits of higher-order basis functions.

In the sequel, we rely on the shorthand notation φ_{θ} to denote the x-ray transform at the projection angle θ of the basis generator φ , as shown in Figure 2, with $y \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\varphi_{\theta} : y \mapsto \mathcal{P}_{\theta}\{\varphi\}(y). \quad (5)$$

II. GENERALIZED X-RAY PROJECTIONS

We propose an efficient algorithm to compute the x-ray projection (4) for an arbitrary ray of angle θ and offset y using ray tracing. To streamline the exposition, we defer to Section III-C the derivation of formulas for the x-ray projection $\varphi_{\theta}(y)$ for specific basis functions.

Algorithm 1 Contribution of one basis function to the x-ray


Require: $C, \mathbf{x}_k, \theta, (p, q)$
 \triangleright Image, intersection ray/cell, angle, cell index

 $c = C[p, q]$ \triangleright Coefficient of the basis function

 $\mathbf{o} = (p + \frac{1}{2}, q + \frac{1}{2})$ \triangleright Position of the center

 $t = \langle (\mathbf{o} - \mathbf{x}_k), \boldsymbol{\theta} \rangle$
 $y_k = \sqrt{\|\mathbf{o} - \mathbf{x}_k\|_2^2 - t^2}$ \triangleright Offset relative to the center

return $P = c \times \varphi_\theta(y_k)$ \triangleright Integral contribution


Fig. 3. Relevant quantities in Algorithm 1.

II-A. Ray-Tracing Routine

Our geometric setup is as follows: the coefficients of f in the chosen basis are stored in an image array C and placed on a two-dimensional uniform Cartesian grid in the center of the grid cells, as sketched in Figure 4. This tiling allows us to efficiently compute the intersection points, denoted \mathbf{x}_k , between the ray and the cells. In our implementation, we sequentially compute such intersections with a ray-tracing routine by taking advantage of the computer-graphics library Dr.Jit [21]. Traditional pixel-based approaches output the sum of all the intersection lengths given by $c_k \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|_2$, where c_k is the value of the crossed pixel. This corresponds to the evaluation of (4) with φ being the rectangle function.

II-B. Proposed General Algorithm

In this work, we consider basis functions whose support extends over more than one cell. These generalized bases overlap and require us to revisit the traditional procedure. In order to compute (4) efficiently with overlapping basis functions, we embed the ray tracer in Algorithm 2 that also considers some non-intersected cells. The ray-tracing routine discussed in Section II-A efficiently computes the update “ $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \text{Ray-trace}(\mathbf{x}_k, \theta)$ ”, where the index k refers to the ray-tracing step. At each step k , as we cross an intersected cell, we employ Algorithm 1 (illustrated in Figure 3) to compute the contribution of the basis function centered at this very cell. Then, the key point of our method is to complement this contribution with that of the basis functions centered at neighboring cells.

We illustrate our approach in Figure 4. While we evaluate the contribution of the basis functions centered at the cells that are crossed by the ray (shaded, identified via the ray-tracing routine), we also evaluate the contribution of the surrounding neighbors centered at the cells that are not crossed but still contribute to the line integral (hatched). The number of neighbors to evaluate on the left and right

Algorithm 2 X-ray projection with basis functions via ray tracing.

Require: C, θ, \mathbf{x}_0
 \triangleright Image, angle, first intersection point of ray tracing

while ray tracing is ongoing **do**
 $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \text{Ray-trace}(\mathbf{x}_k, \theta)$ \triangleright Ray-tracing update

 $(p, q) = \left\lfloor \frac{\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{x}_{k+1}}{2} \right\rfloor$ \triangleright Indices of crossed cell

 $P \leftarrow P + \text{Algorithm 1}(C, \mathbf{x}_k, \theta, (p, q))$
if $x_{k+1,1} \neq p$ **and** $x_{k,1} \neq p$ **then**
 $(p_L, q_L) = (p - 1, q)$ \triangleright Indices of left cell

 $P \leftarrow P + \text{Algorithm 1}(C, \mathbf{x}_k, \theta, (p_L, q_L))$
end if
if $x_{k+1,1} \neq p + 1$ **and** $x_{k,1} \neq p + 1$ **then**
 $(p_R, q_R) = (p + 1, q)$ \triangleright Indices of right cell

 $P \leftarrow P + \text{Algorithm 1}(C, \mathbf{x}_k, \theta, (p_R, q_R))$
end if
 $k \leftarrow k + 1$
end while
return $\mathcal{P}_\theta\{f\}(y) = P$

side at each step of ray tracing is $\lceil \sqrt{2}R - 1 \rceil$ according to Lemma 1, which is 1 in this case. Two indices of basis functions are emphasized in Figure 4: \mathbf{k}_1 , which corresponds to a basis function that contributes to the line integral; and \mathbf{k}_2 , which corresponds to a basis function that does not.

In the specific case where φ is a rectangle function that matches the shape of a cell, there is no neighbor to consider and we recover the output of Siddon’s algorithm with ours.




Fig. 4. Ray tracing when the basis generator has a support included in a disk of size R .

In Algorithm 2, we only take into account the case where $|\sin \theta| > 1/\sqrt{2}$ as in Figure 4, namely, the “mainly vertical” rays where the left- and right-side neighbors are considered. For “mainly horizontal” rays ($|\cos \theta| \geq 1/\sqrt{2}$), upper and lower neighbors are the ones that must be considered. This case distinction on the value of θ is also part of the traditional ray-tracing algorithms.

Algorithm 2 only includes the case where we consider immediate neighbors, but we have also implemented a version of the approach that is extended to larger basis functions by considering additional neighbors. Lemma 1 provides the number of neighbors to consider when one can bound the shape of the support by either a disk or an octagon. The computational cost of the algorithm depends on this number of neighbors, as discussed in Section IV-C.

Lemma 1. *Let $\varphi \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be a compactly supported basis generator. Let $f = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}} \varphi(\cdot - \mathbf{k})$ and consider a line integral along a “mainly vertical” (horizontal, respectively) line. The basis functions that contribute to this line integral are among those whose centers lie within the grid cells that are at most K horizontal (vertical, respectively) neighbors away from the intersected cells.*

(1) *If the support of φ is included in a disk of radius R , then*

$$K = \lceil \sqrt{2}R - 1 \rceil. \quad (6)$$

(2) *If the support of φ is included in an octagonal shape of girth L as is Figure 9, then*

$$K = \lfloor L/2 \rfloor. \quad (7)$$




Fig. 5. Conditions for neighbors evaluation: one does not evaluate the contribution of the left- (right-, respectively) neighbor coefficient for the dotted (dashed, respectively) ray.

The proof of Lemma 1 is provided in Appendix A.

In Algorithm 2 and its variants with additional neighbors, immediate neighbors must be evaluated under a specific condition. Indeed, let (p, q) be the index of the crossed cell and $\mathbf{x}_k = (x_{k,1}, x_{k,2})$ the entry line-cell intersection point at iteration k of ray tracing. The determination of the contribution is as follows.

- If (i) $x_{k,1}$ equals p or (ii) $x_{k+1,1}$ equals p , then the left neighbor is not evaluated. It is the case of the dotted ray of Figure 5.
- If (iii) $x_{k,1}$ equals $p + 1$ or (iv) $x_{k+1,1}$ equals $p + 1$, then the right neighbor is not evaluated. It is the case of the dashed ray of Figure 5.

One should *not* evaluate the contribution of a neighboring cell (I) if the ray just crossed this very cell at iteration $(k - 1)$ or (II) if the ray will cross this very cell at iteration $(k + 1)$. For “mainly horizontal” rays, the conditions concern $x_{k,2}$ and the vertical index of the cell q .

The outcome of Algorithm 2 is the x-ray projection of a linear combination of translations of a basis generator defined on a regular grid for a single ray parameterized by (θ, y) . Instead of y , we equivalently take \mathbf{x}_0 as an input in the algorithm—it is the first intersection point between the ray and the grid. Our implementation loops in parallel over a collection of arbitrarily parametrized lines. The back-projection operator is the adjoint of the x-ray transform and has been implemented as well, and exactly matched with the forward projection.

III. EXPLICIT PROJECTIONS

Some efficient way to compute φ_θ is needed to make our method practical. This is addressed in this section with the derivation of closed-form expressions for useful basis generators.

III-A. Separable Functions

The x-ray projection of a 2D separable function is a starting point to apprehend our calculus. Let $\varphi \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be a 2D separable function, in the sense that there exist functions ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 in $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$\forall (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \varphi(x_1, x_2) = \phi_1(x_1)\phi_2(x_2). \quad (8)$$

For the moment, consider only two directions and let $(\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2)$ be the Cartesian basis. Then, Proposition 1 with $D = 2$ states that, for $y \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\varphi_\theta(y) = \left(\frac{1}{|\cos \theta|} \phi_1\left(\frac{\cdot}{\cos \theta}\right) * \frac{1}{|\sin \theta|} \phi_2\left(\frac{\cdot}{\sin \theta}\right) \right)(y). \quad (9)$$

If $\hat{\phi}_d(0) = 1$, then we can replace the term $\frac{1}{|a|} \phi_d\left(\frac{\cdot}{a}\right)$ by a Dirac distribution δ when $a = 0$. We manage here to write the x-ray transform of φ as a simple convolution, which will lead to explicit expressions of the latter in specific cases (Section III-C) and to efficient computations as a consequence.

III-B. Generalization with D Directions

Consider now the case when the Fourier transform of the basis generator $\varphi \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ can be expressed as a product of D terms instead of just two. Let \hat{f} denote the Fourier transform of some function f , either in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ or in $L^1(\mathbb{R})$. Then, for any projection angle, it is possible to express the x-ray projection of φ as a 1D convolution of D rescaled atoms.

Proposition 1. *Let $\varphi \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be such that its Fourier transform $\hat{\varphi} : \mathbb{R}^2 \mapsto \mathbb{C}$ can be written as*

$$\forall \boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \hat{\varphi}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \prod_{d=1}^D \hat{\phi}_d(\langle \boldsymbol{\xi}, \mathbf{u}_d \rangle), \quad (10)$$

where $\hat{\phi}_d : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{C}$ is the Fourier transform of the function $\phi_d : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, and $\mathbf{u}_d \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is a corresponding direction. Then, we have that the x-ray transform of φ along the projection direction $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{S}^1(\mathbb{R})$ is

$$\forall y \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \varphi_\theta(y) = \left(\tilde{\phi}_1 * \cdots * \tilde{\phi}_D \right)(y), \quad (11)$$

with

$$\tilde{\phi}_d = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{|\langle \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u}_d \rangle|} \phi_d\left(\frac{\cdot}{\langle \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u}_d \rangle}\right), & \langle \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u}_d \rangle \neq 0 \\ \delta, & \langle \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u}_d \rangle = 0. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

The proof is provided in Appendix A.

III-C. Derivation for Specific Basis Functions

The authors of [22] present a specific case of Proposition 1 when $D = 2$ and ϕ_d is a B-spline. Likewise, when the functions ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_D are rectangles, we recover the case of D -directional box-splines as in [10]. In this section, we present cases of particular interest, where we now derive some novel explicit expressions of φ_θ for box-splines and B-splines. These derivations allow for the efficient computation of $\varphi_\theta(y)$ in Algorithm 1.

Although box-splines are not separable in space, they can be factorized along some directions in the Fourier domain. We now derive a closed-form expression of the 3-directional box-spline with directions $(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{u}_3)$, where $(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2) = (\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2)$ forms the Cartesian basis of \mathbb{R}^2 , and $\mathbf{u}_3 = \mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{e}_2$. If ϕ_1, ϕ_2, ϕ_3 are centered unit rectangles, then (10) holds true with $D = 3$ and

$$\forall \boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \widehat{\varphi^{\text{box}}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \prod_{d=1}^3 \text{sinc}\left(\frac{\langle \boldsymbol{\xi}, \mathbf{u}_d \rangle}{2\pi}\right). \quad (13)$$

Let us denote $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^6$ such that

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \left(0, \sin \theta, 2 \sin \theta + \cos \theta, \cos \theta, \sin \theta + 2 \cos \theta, 2(\sin \theta + \cos \theta) \right). \quad (14)$$

Then, by simplifying the convolution product (11) in the case of rectangle functions as suggested in [10], we are able to express the x-ray transform of this 3-directional box-spline as

$$\varphi_\theta^{\text{box}}(y) = \frac{-1}{\alpha_1 \alpha_3 \alpha_5} \sum_{n=1}^6 (-1)^n (y - \alpha_n)_+^2, \quad (15)$$

where $y \in \mathbb{R}$, α_n is the n th component of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, and $(x)_+ := \max(x, 0)$. In the case where $\theta \in (0, \pi/4)$, we can perform the expansion of the sum in (15) and collect the polynomial terms given by

$$\varphi_\theta^{\text{box}}(y) = \begin{cases} 0, & y < \alpha_0 \\ \frac{y^2}{\alpha_1 \alpha_3 \alpha_5}, & \alpha_0 \leq y < \alpha_1 \\ \frac{2y - \alpha_1}{\alpha_3 \alpha_5}, & \alpha_1 \leq y < \alpha_5 \\ \frac{-y^2 + \alpha_5 y - 1}{\alpha_1 \alpha_3 \alpha_5}, & \alpha_5 \leq y < \alpha_2 \\ \frac{-2y + 4\alpha_3 + 3\alpha_1}{\alpha_3 \alpha_5}, & \alpha_2 \leq y < \alpha_4 \\ \frac{(y - 2\alpha_1 - 2\alpha_3)^2}{\alpha_1 \alpha_3 \alpha_5}, & \alpha_4 \leq y < \alpha_5 \\ 0, & y \geq \alpha_5. \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

This expression leads to the family of functions shown in Figure 2. We derive similar results for the balance of the angles by leveraging inherent symmetries of the box-splines.

A particular case of box-splines is the one of the separable tensor-product B-splines. Let denote by β^n the univariate B-spline of degree n [23]. Then, for all $(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$\varphi(x_1, x_2) = \beta^n(x_1)\beta^n(x_2). \quad (17)$$

This corresponds to a $2(n+1)$ -directional box-spline with $n+1$ directions along \mathbf{e}_1 and $n+1$ directions along \mathbf{e}_2 . We derived a closed-form expression for its x-ray transform in a similar way to (15) for $n=2$. It is

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_\theta(y) = & \frac{1}{6\alpha_1^2\alpha_2^2} \left(y_+^3 - 2(y - \alpha_1)_+^3 - 2(y - \alpha_2)_+^3 \right. \\ & + (y - 2\alpha_1)_+^3 + 4(y - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2)_+^3 + (y - \alpha_2)_+^3 \\ & \left. - 2(y - \alpha_3)_+^3 - 2(y - \alpha_4)_+^3 + (y - \alpha_5)_+^3 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

More generally, x-ray projections of any D -directional box-spline can be computed exactly since the convolution of dilated rectangle functions is known.

IV. IMAGE RECONSTRUCTION

IV-A. Formulation of the Inverse Problem

In tomography, the corrupted measurements $p \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ are x-ray projections of the signal of interest $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and the corruption ε is commonly assumed to be an additive white Gaussian noise with variance σ^2 . Our model is

$$p(\theta, y) = \mathcal{P}_\theta\{f\}(y) + \varepsilon(\theta, y). \quad (19)$$

Since real measurements are acquired via discrete sensors and detectors, the measurements p are sampled, which yields $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^M$ such that

$$\mathbf{p} = (p(\theta_m, y_m))_{m=1}^M, \quad (20)$$

where the set $((\theta_m, y_m))_{m=1}^M$ encodes the acquisition geometry. Each component corresponds to a ray, as in (1), which yields

$$\mathbf{p} = \begin{bmatrix} p_1 \\ \vdots \\ p_M \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{P}_{\theta_1}\{f\}(y_1) \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{P}_{\theta_M}\{f\}(y_M) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_1 \\ \vdots \\ \varepsilon_M \end{bmatrix}. \quad (21)$$

From this finite number of measurements, we mean to recover a finite number of coefficients of f in some basis as in (4). By invoking the linearity of \mathcal{P} , one seeks to recover $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^{N^2}$ such that

$$\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{H}_\varphi \mathbf{c} + \varepsilon, \quad (22)$$

where $\mathbf{H}_\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N^2}$ is the discretized version of the x-ray operator. More precisely, we have that

$$(\mathbf{H}_\varphi)_{m,\mathbf{k}} = \mathcal{P}_{\theta_m}\{\varphi(\cdot - \mathbf{k})\}(y_m) = \varphi_{\theta_m}(\tilde{y}_{m,\mathbf{k}}), \quad (23)$$

where the entries depend on the choice of the generator φ and $\tilde{y}_{m,\mathbf{k}} = (y_m - \langle \mathbf{k}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^\perp \rangle)$. We now face the task of finding

the solution of a maximum-likelihood optimization problem to obtain

$$\mathbf{c}^* = \arg \min_{\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^{N^2}} \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{H}_\varphi \mathbf{c}\|_2^2 + \lambda \mathbf{R}_\varphi(\mathbf{c}), \quad (24)$$

where \mathbf{R}_φ is a regularization term that enforces desirable properties of the solution and depends on the choice of φ , as studied by the authors of [11, 24]. The parameter $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ controls the strength of the regularizer.

The recovery of the coefficients of the target image from sampled measurements provides access to the continuous-domain signal defined by (4), which enables a reconstruction at any desired sampling rate. If the basis functions are uniform tiles matching the reconstruction grid (*i.e.*, splines of degree 0, a.k.a. ‘‘pixels’’), then the underlying continuous-domain image is piecewise-constant, thereby offering no enhancement in quality at a higher sampling rate. The projection operator \mathbf{H}_φ and its adjoint are implemented in a matrix-free format in accordance with Algorithm 2. We demonstrate in Section IV-B the effectiveness of our implementation in the context of inverse problems.

IV-B. Experiments

We now conduct experiments that compare the reconstruction performance of spline-based operators with that of traditional pixel-based ones. In order to single out the impact of the discretizations, we focus on scenarios where the problem is sufficiently well posed to avoid the need for regularization (*i.e.* $\lambda = 0$ in (24)). Specifically, we assume a regime in which M is large, with many angles and many offsets, and in which there is no missing cone. For a conventional geometry where the angles and offsets are uniformly spaced, it has been established in [25, 26] that this regime occurs when one measures at least $\pi N/2$ angles with at least N offsets, where the reconstruction grid is of size $(N \times N)$. Our own experiments in Figure 8 confirm this rule that about $2N$ angles are needed in the traditional approach. For the basis functions of higher order but larger support proposed in this paper, however, we shall see that even fewer angles are required.

We perform image reconstructions as follows: we choose the ground truth image $\mathbf{x}_{\text{GT}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N^2}$ from the public dataset [27] of lung CT medical images, and we upsample them with high resolution $N = 3000$ using cubic B-splines. We acquire from \mathbf{x}_{GT} the projections $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^{2N_{\text{down}} \times N_{\text{down}}}$.

Experiments with parallel-beam and cone-beam projection geometries have been conducted. In order to avoid committing an inverse crime with our model, the data \mathbf{p} are acquired with the Astra-toolbox package under the ‘line’ (‘line_fanflat,’ respectively) projector with the ‘parallel’ (‘fanflat,’ respectively) projection geometry. However, we commit an inverse crime with Astra reconstructions. The solution of the basic optimization problem (24) is obtained




Fig. 6. Cone-beam reconstructions by Algorithm 2 in terms of grid size and model, with conjugate-gradient descent (30 iterations). Column: reconstructed signals with N_{down}^2 recovered coefficients. Row: Astra reconstruction and box-spline models of degree 0 (pixels), 1, and 2.

N_{down}	Astra 'fanflat'	Box-splines 0	Box-splines 1	Box-splines 2
50	(19.967, 0.576)	(18.292, 0.541)	(20.683, 0.696)	(20.463, 0.741)
100	(24.805, 0.732)	(23.207, 0.709)	(25.743, 0.840)	(26.054, 0.868)
150	(27.538, 0.817)	(26.005, 0.806)	(27.968, 0.904)	(28.618, 0.929)
250	(32.084, 0.899)	(29.78, 0.893)	(32.499, 0.958)	(32.854, 0.972)
375	(34.897, 0.933)	(32.924, 0.93)	(35.707, 0.975)	(35.956, 0.982)
1000	(39.461, 0.974)	(38.736, 0.975)	(40.865, 0.986)	(41.35, 0.989)

Table I. PSNR and SSIM in terms of model (Astra 'fanflat', and box-splines of degree 0, 1, and 2) and grid size for cone-beam reconstructions. Bold: best PSNR and SSIM in each row.

via conjugate-gradient descent to recover the coefficients $\mathbf{c}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{\text{down}}^2}$ in a reconstruction grid of size $(N_{\text{down}} \times N_{\text{down}})$. Using \mathbf{c}^* , we sample the underlying continuous signal (4)

on a finer grid, yielding $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{N^2}$.

The reconstruction results are shown in Figure 6 for the cone-beam setup. Except at the coarsest grid sizes, the Astra




Fig. 7. PSNR and SSIM of the reconstructions in terms of grid size for the cone-beam setup.

reconstructions are visually indistinguishable from those of box-splines of degree 0 (pixels), while box-splines of degree 1 or 2 provide a more accurate representation of the target image. In Figure 7, both the peak signal-to-noise ratio and the structural similarity are reported as curves. Numerical values are provided in Table I, which emphasizes the high quality of the reconstruction with box-splines of degree 2.

IV-C. Runtime Evaluation

The computation time of our algorithm is shown in Table II for a cone-beam setup. As our implementation runs in parallel for each ray, the computation time is independent of the projection geometry. GPU benchmarks were conducted with five warm-up runs and the reported times represent the average of ten executions. We used the benchmark module from the cupyx.profiler package. The graphics card is the NVIDIA RTX A5000 and the machine has 20 CPUs.

We report in Table II the computation times for splines of degree 0 (pixels), for which no surrounding neighbor is evaluated during the ray-tracing routine. For splines of higher degree, we could observe experimentally that the runtime increases by a factor of K , where K represents the number




Fig. 8. PSNR of the reconstructions in terms of the number of projection angles with a grid of size $N = 500$.

Operation	CPU		GPU	
	$N = 250$	$N = 2000$	$N = 250$	$N = 2000$
ASTRA				
Projection	0.14 s	71.6 s	1.91 ms	0.10 s
Back-projection	0.11 s	94.1 s	2.47 ms	0.26 s
Ours				
Projection	0.22 s	12.5 s	6.26 ms	0.54 s
Back-projection	0.11 s	10.8 s	5.73 ms	0.83 s

Table II. Computation times. The size of the image is ($N \times N$) and the forward and backward operations are performed in a cone-beam geometry with N angles times N offsets.

of neighboring evaluations. For box-splines of degree 1 and 2, the runtime is 3 times larger. The use of box-splines of degree 2 provides the best tradeoff between quality and runtime. They have the same approximation properties as the separable B-splines of degree 2 (presented in Table III of the Appendix) but they have a more compact support that extends over three cells only, against five for the separable B-splines of the same degree. Their support corresponds to that of Figure 9 with $K = 1$, an optimal configuration for our algorithm as it corresponds to the largest support for K neighbor evaluations. Splines of degree higher than 2 do not provide a sufficient gain in quality to justify their use, as saturation with respect to the degree is observed in our results (Table I and Figure 7).

V. CONCLUSION

We presented a framework to compute the x-ray transform operator for 2D signals decomposed into basis functions, specifically, box-splines and separable B-splines. We derived closed-form expressions of their x-ray projections for arbitrary integration lines. Using these analytical derivations, our algorithm can tackle the case of these overlapping basis functions with a neighbor-based approach in a scalable

and efficient way. Our projector and back-projector form matched adjoint pairs and allow for any projection geometry without affecting performance, which makes our algorithm competitive with open-source packages. The proposed method uses ray tracing by taking advantage of a computer-graphics library. In the context of image reconstruction, coarse- and fine-grid regimes have both been studied. We obtain convincing experimental results for continuous-domain inverse problems, where basis functions of higher-degree lead to better reconstructions. From our experiments, we recommend the box-spline of degree 2 as the basis that provides the best tradeoff between runtime and quality. Our methodology can be naturally extended to 3D settings, which we leave for future work. The code of our implementation¹ will be made publicly available along with the scripts that reproduce the figures of the paper.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under Grant ERC-2020-AdG FunLearn-101020573 and by the Swiss National Science Foundation under Sinergia Grant CRSII5_198569. The authors would like to express their gratitude to Dr. Sepand Kashani for his invaluable contributions to this project, including insightful advice and the implementation of the ray-tracer baseline in the framework Pyxu².

APPENDIX

Proof of Lemma 1. We provide a proof of (1) and note that (2) can be proven in the same manner.

Let $(y, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ represent the parameters of a “mainly vertical” ray. Consider a basis function $\varphi(\cdot - \mathbf{k})$ that contributes to the integral, for some $\mathbf{k} \in \Omega$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{0}$, up to a shift in the parameter y to $(y - \langle \mathbf{k}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^\perp \rangle)$. Since φ is compactly supported inside a disk of radius R , it holds that

$$\forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2 \text{ s.t. } \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \geq R, \quad \varphi(\mathbf{x}) = 0. \quad (25)$$

Since the ray is “mainly vertical,” it intersects the horizontal axis directed by \mathbf{e}_1 at the horizontal component

$$\gamma(y, \theta) = y / \sin \theta, \quad (26)$$

where $|\sin \theta| \geq 1/\sqrt{2}$. From (1), we note that y represents the Euclidean distance from the ray to the origin. It follows that

$$|\gamma(y, \theta)| \leq |\sqrt{2}y| \leq \sqrt{2}R. \quad (27)$$

The last inequality holds because, if the ray crosses the support of φ , then y must be at most R , as stated in (25). Now, suppose that the domain is discretized into a uniform




Fig. 9. Octagonal shape of size L used in Lemma 1. It corresponds to the largest support for K neighbor evaluations.

grid with basis vectors $(\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2)$ and stepsize 1. Then, the index along \mathbf{e}_1 of the cell containing the intersection of the ray with the horizontal axis is bounded by $\lceil \sqrt{2}R - 1 \rceil$. Consequently, the ray will cross one index in the set

$$\{\mathbf{k} - \lceil \sqrt{2}R - 1 \rceil \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{k} + \lceil \sqrt{2}R - 1 \rceil \mathbf{e}_1\}. \quad (28)$$

Conversely, when we evaluate the contribution of the cells up to $\lceil \sqrt{2}R - 1 \rceil$ horizontal neighbors away from those directly crossed by the ray, the basis function centered at \mathbf{k} will necessarily be included in the computation. \square

Proof of Proposition 1. Let φ be a function in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ that verifies (10). The Fourier-slice theorem [28] states that the Fourier transform of the x-ray projection in a direction $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ of φ equals the 1-dimensional slice through the origin of $\hat{\varphi}$ in the same direction. This is formalized as

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \hat{\varphi}_\theta(\xi) &= \hat{\varphi}(\xi \boldsymbol{\theta}) \\ &= \prod_{d=1}^D \hat{\varphi}_d(\xi \langle \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u}_d \rangle), \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where φ_θ is as in (5). Here, each term of the Fourier factorization is a dilation of $\hat{\varphi}_d$ by a factor $\langle \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u}_d \rangle$. When $\langle \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u}_d \rangle = 0$, the d th term is the constant $\hat{\varphi}_d(0)$. Otherwise, the dilation property of the Fourier transform states that

$$\forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \hat{f}(\lambda \xi) = \frac{1}{|\lambda|} \widehat{f_{\lambda^{-1}}(\xi)}, \quad (30)$$

where $f_{\lambda^{-1}}(x) := f\left(\frac{x}{\lambda}\right)$ with $\lambda \neq 0$.

The proof is finally completed by injecting (30) into (29) with $f = \varphi_d$. We conclude using the Fourier-convolution theorem. \square

¹https://github.com/HaouchatY/rt_tomo_basis_functions/

²<https://pyxu-org.github.io>

N_{down}	B-splines 0	B-splines 1	B-splines 2
50	(18.292, 0.541)	(21.124, 0.697)	(20.5, 0.743)
100	(23.207, 0.709)	(25.798, 0.844)	(26.053, 0.87)
150	(26.005, 0.806)	(28.273, 0.908)	(28.629, 0.93)
250	(29.78, 0.893)	(32.637, 0.961)	(32.867, 0.972)
375	(32.924, 0.93)	(35.856, 0.977)	(35.944, 0.982)
1000	(38.736, 0.975)	(41.103, 0.987)	(41.339, 0.989)

Table III. PSNR and SSIM in terms of model (separable B-splines of degree 0, 1, and 2) and grid size for cone-beam reconstructions. Bold: best PSNR and SSIM in each row.

REFERENCES

- [1] W. van Aarle, W. J. Palenstijn, J. Cant, E. Janssens, F. Bleichrodt, A. Dabravolski, J. De Beenhouwer, K. Joost Batenburg, and J. Sijbers. “Fast and flexible X-ray tomography using the ASTRA toolbox”. In: *Optics Express* 24.22 (Oct. 2016), p. 25129.
- [2] A. Biguri, M. Dosanjh, S. Hancock, and M. Soleimani. “TIGRE: A MATLAB-GPU toolbox for CBCT image reconstruction”. In: *Biomedical Physics & Engineering Express* 2.5 (Sept. 2016), p. 055010.
- [3] S. Rit, M. Vila Oliva, S. Brousmiche, R. Labarbe, D. Sarrut, and G. C. Sharp. “The Reconstruction Toolkit (RTK), an open-source cone-beam CT reconstruction toolkit based on the Insight Toolkit (ITK)”. In: *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*. Melbourne, Australia, 6–9 May 2013, p. 012079.
- [4] R. L. Siddon. “Fast calculation of the exact radiological path for a three-dimensional CT array”. In: *Medical Physics* 12.2 (1985), pp. 252–255.
- [5] G. Han, Z. Liang, and J. You. “A fast ray-tracing technique for TCT and ECT studies”. In: *IEEE Nuclear Science Symposium Conference Record. Nuclear Science Symposium and Medical Imaging Conference*. Vol. 3. NSSMIC-99. Seattle, WA, USA, 24–30 Oct. 1999, pp. 1515–1518.
- [6] P. M. Joseph. “An improved algorithm for reprojecting rays through pixel images”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging* 1.3 (Nov. 1982), pp. 192–196.
- [7] Y. Long, J. A. Fessler, and J. M. Balter. “3D Forward and Back-Projection for X-Ray CT Using Separable Footprints”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging* 29.11 (June 2010), pp. 1839–1850.
- [8] B. De Man and S. Basu. “Distance-driven projection and backprojection”. In: *IEEE Nuclear Science Symposium Conference Record*. Vol. 3. NSSMIC-02. Norfolk, VA, USA, 10–16 Nov. 2002, pp. 1477–1480.
- [9] K. Zhang and A. Entezari. “A convolutional framework for forward and back-projection in fan-beam geometry”. In: *2019 IEEE 16th International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging (ISBI 2019)*. Venice, Italy, 8–11 April 2019, pp. 1455–1458.
- [10] A. Entezari, M. Nilchian, and M. Unser. “A Box Spline Calculus for the Discretization of Computed Tomography Reconstruction Problems”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging* 31.8 (Aug. 2012), pp. 1532–1541.
- [11] M. Pourya, Y. Haouchat, and M. Unser. “A continuous-domain solution for computed tomography with hessian total-variation regularization”. In: *2024 IEEE International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging (ISBI)*. Athens, Greece, 27–30 May 2024, pp. 1–5.
- [12] A. C. Kak, M. Slaney, and G. Wang. “Principles of computerized tomographic imaging”. In: *Medical Physics* 29.1 (Jan. 2002), pp. 107–107.
- [13] F. Natterer. *The Mathematics of Computerized Tomography*. SIAM, 2001.
- [14] J.A. Fessler. “Penalized weighted least-squares image reconstruction for positron emission tomography”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging* 13.2 (June 1994), pp. 290–300.
- [15] C. L. Epstein. *Introduction to the Mathematics of Medical Imaging*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia, PA: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2007.
- [16] J. E. Bresenham. “Algorithm for computer control of a digital plotter”. In: *IBM Systems Journal* 4.1 (Dec. 1965), pp. 25–30.
- [17] F. Jacobs, E. Sundermann, B. De Sutter, K. Christiaens, and I. Lemahieu. “A fast algorithm to calculate the exact radiological path through a pixel or voxel space”. In: *Journal of Computing and Information Technology* 6.1 (1998), pp. 89–94.
- [18] H. Zhao and A.J. Reader. “Fast ray-tracing technique to calculate line integral paths in voxel arrays”. In: *2003 IEEE Nuclear Science Symposium*. Dec. 2003, 2808–2812 Vol.4.
- [19] G. T. Herman. *Fundamentals of computerized tomography: image reconstruction from projections*. Springer Science & Business Media, July 2009.
- [20] M. Unser and T. Blu. “Wavelet theory demystified”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* 51.2 (2003), pp. 470–483.

- [21] W. Jakob, S. Speierer, N. Roussel, and D. Vicini. “Dr.Jit: a just-in-time compiler for differentiable rendering”. In: *ACM Trans. Graph.* 41.4 (July 2022).
- [22] S. Horbelt, M. Liebling, and M. Unser. “Discretization of the Radon transform and of its inverse by spline convolutions”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging* 21.4 (Apr. 2002), pp. 363–376.
- [23] M. Unser, A. Aldroubi, and M. Eden. “B-spline signal processing. I. Theory”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* 41.2 (Feb. 1993), pp. 821–833.
- [24] M. Pourya, A. Boquet-Pujadas, and M. Unser. “A box-spline framework for inverse problems with continuous-domain sparsity constraints”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Computational Imaging* 10 (May 2024), pp. 790–805.
- [25] P. Rattey and A. Lindgren. “Sampling the 2-D Radon transform”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing* 29.5 (Oct. 1981), pp. 994–1002.
- [26] R. A. Brooks, G. H. Weiss, and A. J. Talbert. “A new approach to interpolation in computed tomography”. In: *Journal of Computer Assisted Tomography* 2.5 (Nov. 1978), pp. 577–585.
- [27] B. Albertina, M. Watson, C. Holback, R. Jarosz, S. Kirk, Y. Lee, K. Rieger-Christ, and J. Lemmerman. *The Cancer Genome Atlas Lung Adenocarcinoma Collection (TCGA-LUAD)*. 2016.
- [28] R. Ng. “Fourier slice photography”. In: *ACM Trans. Graph.* 24.3 (July 2005), pp. 735–744.