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Plan for Today’s Lectures

1. A bit of motivation.
2. The algebraic formulation; matrix notation and interpretation.
3. Kaczmarz’s method (also known as ART) – fully sequential.
5. Least squares problems.

Points to take home today:

- Algebraic formulations provide more flexibility than formulations based on the Radon transform.
- Linear algebra provides a concise framework for formulating the associated algorithms for algebraic formulations.
- Convergence analysis of iterative algebraic methods:
  - Kaczmarz’s method = ART converges for consistent problems only.
  - Cimmino’s method always converges.
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FBP: Filtered Back Projection

- This is the classical method for 2D parallel-beam reconstructions.
- There are similar (approximate) methods for 3D, such as FDK.
- Many years of use → lots of practical experience.
- The FBP method is very fast (it uses the Fast Fourier Transform)!
- The FBP method has low memory requirements.
- With many data, FBP gives very good results.
- Example with 3% noise:
FBP Versus Algebraic Methods

- Limited data, or nonuniform distribution of projection angles or rays → artifacts appear in FBP reconstructions.
- Difficult to incorporate constraints (e.g., nonnegativity) in FBP.
- Algebraic methods are more flexible and adaptive.
- Same example with 3% noise and projection angles $15^\circ, 30^\circ, \ldots, 180^\circ$:

Algebraic Reconstruction Technique, box constraints (pixel values $\in [0,1]$).
Another Motivating Example: Missing Data

Irregularly spaced angles & “missing” angles also cause difficulties for FBP:
The change $dI$ in intensity is proportional to the intensity $I(\ell)$ and the slab thickness $d\ell$. The proportionality constant is called the linear attenuation coefficient $\mu(\ell)$. Hence:

$$dI = -\mu(\ell)I(\ell)d\ell$$

which in the limit of $d\ell \to 0$ results in

$$\frac{dI}{d\ell} = -\mu(\ell)I(\ell).$$

This is a linear first-order differential with the general solution

$$I(\ell) = C \exp \left\{ - \int \mu(\ell)d\ell \right\}.$$

The initial condition $I(0) = I_0$ determines the constant and we arrive at the usual form of the Lambert-Beer law

$$I(\ell) = I_0 \exp \left\{ - \int \mu(\ell)d\ell \right\}.$$
Setting Up the Algebraic Model

Taking the “log” on both sides of the Lambert-Beer law we see that the attenuation $I - I_0$ of the $i$th X-ray through the object is a line integral of the attenuation coefficient $\mu$ along the ray:

$$b_i = \int_{ray_i} \mu(\xi_1, \xi_2) \, d\ell, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, m.$$ 

Assume that $\mu$ is a constant $x_j$ in pixel $j$. This leads to:

$$b_i = \sum_{j \sim ray_i} a_{ij} \, x_j, \quad a_{ij} = \text{length of ray}_i \text{ in pixel } j,$$

where the sum is over those pixels $j$ that are intersected by ray$_i$.

Define $a_{ij} = 0$ for those pixels not intersected by ray$_i$. Then we have a simple sum

$$b_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij} \, x_j, \quad n = \text{number of pixels}.$$
A Big and Sparse System

If we collect all $m$ equations then we arrive at a system of linear equations

$$A x = b$$

with a very sparse system matrix $A$. Example: $5 \times 5$ pixels and 9 rays:

**Flexibility:** We only set up equations for the data that we actually have. In case of missing data, e.g., for certain projection angles or certain rays in a projection, we just omit those from the linear system.
The System Matrix is Very Sparse

Another example: 256 × 256 pixels and 180 projections with 362 rays each. The system matrix $A$ is $65,160 \times 65,536$ and has $\approx 4.27 \cdot 10^9$ elements. There are 15,018,524 nonzero elements corresponding to a fill of 0.35%.
A “Sudoku” Problem

Four unknowns, four rays $\rightarrow$ system of linear equations $A \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$:

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
x_1 \\
x_2 \\
x_3 \\
x_4
\end{pmatrix}
=
\begin{pmatrix}
3 \\
7 \\
4 \\
6
\end{pmatrix}
$$
A “Sudoku” Problem

Four unknowns, four rays $\rightarrow$ system of linear equations $A x = b$:

Unfortunately there are infinitely many solutions, with $k \in \mathbb{R}$:

(There is an arbitrary component in the null space of the matrix $A$.)
More Data Gives a Unique Solution

With *enough rays* the problem has a unique solution.

Here, one more ray is enough to ensure a full-rank matrix:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
\sqrt{2} & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{2}
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
x_1 \\
x_2 \\
x_3 \\
x_4
\end{pmatrix}
= 
\begin{pmatrix}
3 \\
7 \\
4 \\
6 \\
5\sqrt{2}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

In practise, algebraic iterative reconstruction methods do not care if the matrix \( A \) is rank deficient.
In principle, all we need to do in the algebraic formulation is to solve the large sparse linear system $A x = b$:

Math: $x = A^{-1}b$,  
MATLAB: $x = A\backslash b$.

How hard can that be?

Actually, this can be a formidable task if we try do use a traditional approach such as Gaussian elimination.

Researchers in tomography have therefore focused on the use of iterative solvers – and they have rediscovered many methods developed by mathematicians . . .

In tomography they are called algebraic reconstruction methods. They are much more flexible than FBP with respect to measurement geometry and constraints, but at a higher computational cost!
Some Algebraic Reconstruction Methods

**Fully Sequential Methods**
- Kaczmarz’s method + variants.
- These are row-action methods: they update the solution using one row of $A$ at a time.
- “Fast” convergence.

**Fully Simultaneous Methods**
- Landweber, Cimmino, CAV, DROP, SART, SIRT, ...
- These methods use all the rows of $A$ simultaneously in one iteration (i.e., they are based on matrix multiplications).
- Slower convergence.

**Block Methods**
- These methods combine the best properties of the above two classes.
- They are not covered today.
Matrix Notation & Interpretation (· denotes inner product)

Notation:

\[
A = \begin{pmatrix}
| & | & & | \\
| c_1 | c_2 | \cdots | c_n |
| & | & & |
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
| \cdots | r_1 | \cdots |
| \vdots |
| \cdots | r_m | \cdots |
\end{pmatrix},
\]

The matrix \( A \) maps the discretized absorption coefficients (the vector \( x \)) to the data in the detector pixels (the elements of the vector \( b \)) via:

\[
b = \begin{pmatrix}
b_1 \\
b_2 \\
\vdots \\
b_m 
\end{pmatrix} = A x = \begin{pmatrix}
\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij} x_j, & i = 1, 2, \ldots, m.
\end{pmatrix}
\]

The \( i \)th row of \( A \) maps \( x \) to detector element \( i \) (through the \( i \)th ray) via the inner product:

\[
b_i = r_i \cdot x = \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij} x_j,
\]
A $32 \times 32$ image has four nonzero pixels with intensities $1, 0.8, 0.6, 0.4$. In the vector $\mathbf{x}$ these four pixels correspond to entries $468, 618, 206, 793$. Hence the sinogram, represented as a vector $\mathbf{b}$, takes the form

$$\mathbf{b} = 0.6 \mathbf{c}_{206} + 1.0 \mathbf{c}_{468} + 0.8 \mathbf{c}_{618} + 0.4 \mathbf{c}_{793}.$$
Geometric Interpretation of $Ax = b$

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{r}_1 \cdot \mathbf{x} &= a_{11}x_1 + a_{12}x_2 + \cdots + a_{1n}x_n = b_1 \\
\mathbf{r}_2 \cdot \mathbf{x} &= a_{21}x_1 + a_{22}x_2 + \cdots + a_{2n}x_n = b_2 \\
&\vdots \\
\mathbf{r}_m \cdot \mathbf{x} &= a_{m1}x_1 + a_{m2}x_2 + \cdots + a_{mn}x_n = b_m.
\end{align*}
\]

Each equation $\mathbf{r}_i \cdot \mathbf{x} = b_i$ defines an affine hyperplane in $\mathbb{R}^n$: 

\[a_{i1}x_1 + a_{i2}x_2 = b_i\]
Assuming that the solution to $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$ is unique, it is the point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ where all the $m$ affine hyperplanes intersect.

Example with $m = n = 2$:
Kaczmarz’s Method = Algebraic Reconstruction Technique

A simple iterative method based on the geometric interpretation.

In each iteration, and in a cyclic fashion, compute the new iteration vector such that precisely one of the equations is satisfied.

This is achieved by projecting the current iteration vector $\mathbf{x}$ on one of the hyperplanes $\mathbf{r}_i \cdot \mathbf{x} = b_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m, 1, 2, \ldots, m, 1, 2, \ldots$

Originally proposed in 1937, and independently suggested under the name ART by Gordon, Bender & Herman in 1970 for tomographic reconstruction.
The orthogonal projection \( P_i(z) \) of an arbitrary point \( z \) on the affine hyperplane \( \mathcal{H}_i \) defined by \( r_i \cdot x = b_i \) is given by:

\[
P_i(z) = z + \frac{b_i - r_i \cdot z}{\|r_i\|_2^2} r_i, \quad \|r_i\|_2^2 = r_i \cdot r_i.
\]

In words, we scale the row vector \( r_i \) by \((b_i - r_i \cdot z)/\|r_i\|_2^2 \) and add it to \( z \).
Kaczmarz’s Method

We thus obtain the following algebraic formulation:

**Basic Kaczmarz algorithm**

\[
\begin{align*}
x^{(0)} &= \text{initial vector} \\
\text{for } k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \\
&\quad \quad i = k \pmod{m} \\
&\quad \quad x^{(k+1)} = P_i(x^{(k)}) = x^{(k)} + \frac{b_i - r_i \cdot x^{(k)}}{\|r_i\|^2} r_i \\
\text{end}
\end{align*}
\]

Each time we have performed \( m \) iterations of this algorithm, we have performed one **sweep** over the rows of \( A \). Other choices of sweeps:

- **Symmetric Kaczmarz**: \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, m-1, m, m-1, \ldots, 3, 2 \).
- **Randomized Kaczmarz**: select row \( i \) randomly.
Convergence Issues

The convergence of Kaczmarz’s method is quite obvious from the graph on slide 18 – but can we say more?

Difficulty: the ordering of the rows of $A$ influences the convergence rate.

The ordering 1–3–2–4 is preferable: almost twice as fast.
Convergence of Kaczmarz’s Method

One way to avoid the difficulty associated with influence of the ordering of the rows is to assume that we select the rows randomly.

For simplicity, assume that $A$ is invertible and that all rows of $A$ are scaled to unit 2-norm. Then the expected value $\mathcal{E}(\cdot)$ of the error norm satisfies:

$$\mathcal{E}\left(\|x^{(k)} - \bar{x}\|_2^2\right) \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{n \kappa^2}\right)^k \|x^{(0)} - \bar{x}\|_2^2, \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots,$$

where $\bar{x} = A^{-1}b$ and $\kappa = \|A\|_2 \|A^{-1}\|_2$. This is linear convergence.

When $\kappa$ is large we have

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{n \kappa^2}\right)^k \approx 1 - \frac{k}{n \kappa^2}.$$

After $k = n$ steps, one sweep of the rows, the reduction factor is $1 - 1/\kappa^2$. Note that there are often orderings for which the convergence is faster!
Cyclic Convergence

So far we have assumed that there is a unique solution $\bar{x} = A^{-1}b$ that satisfies $Ax = b$, i.e., all the affine hyperplanes associated with the rows of $A$ intersect in a single point.

What happens when this is not true? → cyclic convergence:

![Graph](image)

$m = 3$, $n = 2$

Kaczmarz’s method can be brought to converge to a unique point, and we will discuss the modified algorithm later today.
From Sequential to Simultaneous Updates

Karzmarz’s method accesses the rows sequentially. Cimmino’s method accesses the rows simultaneously and computes the next iteration vector as the average of all the projections of the previous iteration vector:

\[
x^{(k+1)} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} P_i(x^{(k)}) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left( x^{(k)} + \frac{b_i - r_i \cdot x^{(k)}}{\|r_i\|_2^2} r_i \right) \\
= x^{(k)} + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{b_i - r_i \cdot x^{(k)}}{\|r_i\|_2^2} r_i.
\]
Matrix formulation of Cimmino’s Method

We can write the updating in our matrix-vector formalism as follows

\[ x^{(k+1)} = x^{(k)} + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{b_i - r_i \cdot x^{(k)}}{\| r_i \|_2^2} r_i \]

\[ = x^{(k)} + \frac{1}{m} \begin{pmatrix} r_1 \\ \vdots \\ r_m \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \| r_1 \|_2^{-2} \\ \vdots \\ \| r_m \|_2^{-2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} b_1 - r_1 \cdot x^{(k)} \\ \vdots \\ b_m - r_m \cdot x^{(k)} \end{pmatrix} \]

\[ = x^{(k)} + A^T M (b - A x^{(k)}) \]

where we introduced the diagonal matrix \( M = \text{diag} \left( \frac{1}{m \| r_i \|_2^2} \right) \).
Cimmino’s Method

We thus obtain the following formulation:

**Basic Cimmino algorithm**

\[ x^{(0)} = \text{initial vector} \]

for \( k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \)

\[ x^{(k+1)} = x^{(k)} + A^T M (b - A x^{(k)}) \]

end

Note that one iteration here involves all the rows of \( A \), while one iteration in Kaczmarz’s method involves a single row.

Therefore, the computational work in one Cimmino iteration is equivalent to \( m \) iterations (a sweep over all the rows) in Kaczmarz’s basic algorithm.

The issue of finding a good row ordering is, of course, absent from Cimmino’s method.
Convergence Study

Assume $x^{(0)} = 0$ and let $I$ denote the $n \times n$ identity matrix; then:

$$x^{(k+1)} = \sum_{j=0}^{k} (I - A^T MA)^j A^T M^{-1} b$$

$$= \left( I - (I - A^T MA)^{k+1} \right) (A^T MA)^{-1} A^T M^{-1} b.$$ 

If $A$ is invertible then

$$(A^T MA)^{-1} A^T Mb = A^{-1} M A^{-T} A^T Mb = A^{-1} b.$$ 

Moreover, the largest eigenvalue of the symmetric matrix $I - A^T MA$ is strictly smaller than one, and therefore

$$\left( I - (I - A^T MA)^{k+1} \right) \to I \quad \text{for} \quad k \to \infty.$$ 

Hence the iterates $x^{(k)}$ converge to the solution $\bar{x} = A^{-1} b$. 

Convergence of Cimmino’s Method

To simplify the result, assume that $A$ is invertible and that the rows of $A$ are scaled such that $\|A\|_2^2 = m$. Then

$$\|x^{(k)} - \bar{x}\|_2^2 \leq \left(1 - \frac{2}{1 + \kappa^2}\right)^k \|x^{(0)} - \bar{x}\|_2^2$$

where $\bar{x} = A^{-1}b$, $\kappa = \|A\|_2 \|A^{-1}\|_2$, and we have linear convergence.

When $\kappa \gg 1$ then we have the approximate upper bound

$$\|x^{(k)} - \bar{x}\|_2^2 \lesssim (1 - 2/\kappa^2)^k \|x^{(0)} - \bar{x}\|_2^2,$$

showing that in each iteration the error is reduced by a factor $1 - 2/\kappa^2$.

This is almost the same factor as in one sweep through the rows of $A$ in Kaczmarz’s method.
Incorporating Simple Constraints

We can include constraints on the elements of the reconstructed image. Assume that we can write the constraint as $\mathbf{x} \in C$, where $C$ is a convex set; this includes two very common special cases:

**Non-negativity constraints.** The set $C = \mathbb{R}_+^n$ corresponds to

$$x_i \geq 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n.$$ 

**Box constraints.** The set $C = [0, 1]^n$ ($n$-dimensional box) corresponds to

$$0 \leq x_i \leq 1, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n.$$
Orthogonal Projections

Given a set $C$, the orthogonal projection $P_C(x)$ of an arbitrary vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ on $C$ is the unique vector that satisfies: $P_C(x) \perp (x - P_C(x))$.

If $C = \mathbb{R}_+^n$ (non-negativity constraints) then, in MATLAB, we compute the corresponding projection of $x$ as $\max(x, 0)$. 
The Projected Algorithms

Both algorithms below solve \( \min_{x \in \mathcal{C}} \| M^{1/2}(b - Ax) \|_2 \).

**Projected gradient algorithm** \((\omega_k < 2/\|A^TMA\|_2)\)

\[
\begin{align*}
    x^{(0)} &= \text{initial vector} \\
    \text{for } k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \\
    x^{(k+1)} &= P_C \left( x^{(k)} + \omega_k A^T M(b - Ax^{(k)}) \right) \\
\end{align*}
\]

end

**Projected incremental gradient (Kaczmarz) algorithm** \((\omega_k < 2)\)

\[
\begin{align*}
    x^{(0)} &= \text{initial vector} \\
    \text{for } k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \\
    i &= k \text{ (mod } m) \\
    x^{(k+1)} &= P_C \left( x^{(k)} + \omega_k \frac{b_i - r_i \cdot x}{\| r_i \|^2_2} r_i \right) \\
\end{align*}
\]

end
Iteration-Dependent Relaxation Parameter $\omega_k$

To avoid cyclic and non-convergent behavior, we introduce relaxation:

$$x^{(k+1)} = x^{(k)} + \omega_k \frac{b_i - r_i \cdot x^{(k)}}{\|r_i\|_2^2}.$$ 

Consider the example from slide 23 with:

$\omega_k = 0.8$ (independent of $k$) and $\omega_k = 1/\sqrt{k}$, $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$

- With a fixed $\omega_k < 1$ we still have a cyclic non-convergent behavior.
- With the *diminishing relaxation parameter* $\omega_k = 1/\sqrt{k} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ the iterates converge to the weighted least squares solution $x_{LS,M}$. 
A Few References


