Efficient Algorithms for the Regularization of dynamic inverse Problems – Part II: Applications

U Schmitt^{*}, AK Louis^{*}, C Wolters^{†,‡} and M Vauhkonen^{\sharp}

* Institute for Applied Mathematics, P.O. Box 151150, Saarland University, 66041 Saarbrücken, Germany.

† Max-Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences, Inselstr. 22, 04103 Leipzig, Germany.

[‡] Max-Planck Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience, PO Box 500355, 04303 Leipzig, Germany.

 \sharp Department of Applied Physics, University of Kuopio, PO Box 1627, 70211, Kuopio, Finland.

E-mail: schmitt@num.uni-sb.de

Abstract. In the first part of this paper the notion of dynamic inverse problems was introduced and two procedures, namely STR and STR-C, for the efficient spatio-temporal regularization of such problems were developed.

In this part the application of the new methods to three practical important problems, namely dynamic computerized tomography, dynamic electrical impedance tomography and spatio-temporal current density reconstructions will be presented. Dynamic reconstructions will be carried out in simulated objects which show the quality of the methods and the efficiency of the solution process. A comparison to a Kalman-smoother approach will be given for dynEIT.

Submitted to: Inverse Problems

AMS classification scheme numbers: 34A55, 49N45

1. Introduction

In the first part [1] of this paper we introduced the notion of dynamic inverse problems and developed two efficient procedures for spatio-temporal regularization, namely STR and STR-C. We will now give a brief repetition of the key facts appearing in the first part.

Starting point is a measuring procedure which needs a certain amount of time. During this time span, measurements are taken at time steps t_i . A dynamic problem is then described by equations $A_i x_i = y_i$, where *i* is a temporal index, i.e., the linear operator A_i maps the properties x_i of an investigated object to the measurements y_i at time step t_i .

Since the operators A_i are under-determined in most cases, the degree of freedom in $A_i x_i = y_i$ is very high. Due to this fact, and due to the ill-posedness of these equations, we consider the *a priori* information "temporal smoothness" which is introduced as follows: in order to achieve a solution with the desired properties we expand the well known Tikhonov-Phillips minimization task with an additional term which measures the total variance of the x_i . Thus, we solve

$$\Phi(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{T} \|A_i x_i - y_i\|^2 + \lambda^2 \sum_{i=1}^{T} \|x_i\|^2 + \mu^2 \sum_i \frac{\|x_{i+1} - x_i\|^2}{(t_{i+1} - t_i)^2} \to \min.(1)$$

If we introduce

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{t_2 - t_1} & -\frac{1}{t_2 - t_1} & & \\ & \frac{1}{t_3 - t_2} & -\frac{1}{t_3 - t_2} & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & \frac{1}{t_T - t_{T-1}} & -\frac{1}{t_T - t_{T-1}} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times (T-1)}$$

the efficient solution of this minimization task is given by the following procedure named STR [1]:

- (i) **Input**: data y, spatial regularization parameter λ , temporal regularization parameter μ .
- (ii) Calculate Q and R

$$Q = \left(DD^{\top} + \frac{\lambda^2}{\mu^2} I_{T-1}\right)^{-1}$$
$$R = I_T - D^{\top} QD = (r_{i,j})_{i,j}.$$

(iii) C is defined by

$$C = [r_{i,j}A_iA_j^*]_{i,j}.$$

(iv) Solve

$$(C + \lambda^2 I_{G_1 \oplus \dots \oplus G_T}) u = y.$$

(v) Finally the x_i are calculated by

$$x_i = \sum_j r_{i,j} A_j^* u_j.$$

In order to achieve efficiency, in a first step one calculates $A_j^* u_j$ for each j and afterwards x_i .

As this procedure is formulated in terms of operator equations, which may map between infinite dimensional spaces, one needs a discretization scheme for their numerical solution. See [1] for further information.

If the linear operators A_i are identical for all time steps and if these operators are matrices, one can enhance the efficiency by using the following procedure STR-C:

- (i) **Input**: data y, spatial regularization parameter λ , temporal regularization parameter μ .
- (ii) Calculate Q and R according to

$$Q = \left(DD^{\top} + \frac{\lambda^2}{\mu^2} I_{T-1}\right)^{-1}$$
$$R = I_T - D^{\top} QD.$$

(iii) Solve the generalized Sylvester equation

$$(A_0 A_0^*)UR + \lambda^2 U = \operatorname{Mat}_n(y) =: Y.$$

(iv) Calculate

$$X = A_0^* UR$$

and get x_i as the *i*-th column of X.

The equation in step (iii) is an equation of Sylvester type, an efficient solution algorithm can be found in [2].

2. Dynamic computerized tomography

In the following the problem of dynamic computerized tomography (dynCT) will be studied. We will describe how procedure STR can be applied and some numerical tests will be carried out. An overview of the mathematics of computerized tomography can be found in [3, 4, 5].

2.1. Application of procedure STR

dynCT is a linear problem which will be formulated as operator equations between infinite dimensional Hilbert spaces.

We consider *parallel geometry*, i.e., the forward problem is described as follows: First

$$L(s,\omega) = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \, | \, s - x \cdot \omega = 0 \} \qquad \omega \in S^1, s \ge 0$$

is defined. Thus, L is a line orthogonal to ω with distance s to the origin. The *Radon* transform \mathcal{R} is then defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R} &: L^2(\Omega) \to L^2([-1,1],S^1) \\ \mathcal{R}f(s,\omega) &= \int_{L(s,\omega)} f(x) \, \mathrm{d}x = \int_{\Omega} \delta(s-x \cdot \omega) f(x) \, \mathrm{d}x \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}_i f(s) = \mathcal{R}_{\theta_i} f(s) = \mathcal{R} f(s, \omega_i)$$

according to $\omega_i = (-\sin \theta_i, \cos \theta_i)^{\top}$, $1 \leq i \leq T$, and $\Omega = \{x \mid ||x|| \leq 1\}$. We assume that the θ_i are equidistant, $0 \leq \theta_i < 2\pi$. So \mathcal{R}_i maps the density f_i of the scanned object at a time t_i to the measurements at this point of time. Due to the variation of θ during a fixed period of time, we get a dynamic problem.

In order to apply the procedure STR to this problem, we have to determine the weights $r_{i,j}$ as described in step (ii) of STR. As the angles are equispaced, we assume

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & & \\ & 1 & -1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Now, $R = (r_{i,j})$ can be computed as described in step (ii) of STR.

Then, we have to consider the operator

$$C = [r_{i,j}A_iA_j^*]$$

with $A_i = \mathcal{R}_{\theta_i} = \mathcal{R}_i$. So *C* maps from $(L^2([-1,1]))^T$ to itself. It is easy to show that $\mathcal{R}_i^* g(x) = g(x \cdot \omega_i).$

That is, \mathcal{R}_i^* extends the function g on the detector to a function on the object Ω , such that $\mathcal{R}_i^* g$ is constant along lines $L(s, \omega_i)$. Due to geometric invariances of the Radon transform [4] we have

$$\mathcal{R}_i \mathcal{R}_j^* = \mathcal{R}_{(i-j) \mod T} \mathcal{R}_0^*$$

and if we define

$$C_i = \mathcal{R}_i \mathcal{R}_0^*$$

[C] can be written as

$$[C] = [r_{i,j}C_{(i-j) \mod T}] \tag{2}$$

If we want to solve step (iv) in STR numerically by a projection scheme, we discretize the C_i and weight and compound the emerging matrices according to Lemma 4.1 and (2) to a discretization of [C].

For the discretization of C_i we start from angles

$$\theta_i = 2\pi \frac{i-1}{T}, 1 \le i \le T$$

and N detector elements at

$$s_j = \frac{2j - 1 - N}{N - 1}$$

such that $s_1 = -1$ and $s_N = 1$. If we now use pointwise linear basic functions ϕ_k on the detector, defined by $\phi_k(s_j) = \delta_{j,k}$ and point collocations $\psi_k = \delta_{s_k}$, we get a discrete version $\tilde{C}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ of C_i by

$$(\tilde{C}_i)_{j,l} = \psi_j C_i \phi_l = (\mathcal{R}_i \mathcal{R}_0^* \phi_l)(s_j)$$

That is, one has to extend the "hat"-function ϕ_i to the object Ω , such that the extension is constant along lines parallel to the x-axis. Next, one has to calculate the line integral of this function along the line $L(s_j, \omega_i)$. See figure 1. In detail: first, we have to calculate the points

$$p_1 = L(s_{l-1}, \omega_0) \cap L(s_k, \omega_i) \quad p_2 = L(s_l, \omega_0) \cap L(s_k, \omega_i) \quad p_3 = L(s_{l+1}, \omega_0) \cap L(s_k, \omega_i).$$
Then, we determine linear functions α_i such that

Then, we determine linear functions α_i such that

$$\alpha_1(p_1) = 0$$
 $\alpha_1(p_2) = 1$ $\alpha_2(p_2) = 1$ $\alpha_2(p_3) = 0.$



Figure 1. Calculation of the entries of \tilde{C}_i

Now

$$(\tilde{C}_i)_{k,l} = \int_{p_1}^{p_2} \alpha_1(x) \, dx + \int_{p_2}^{p_3} \alpha_2(x) \, dx.$$

Further, we have to consider several subcases: the points p_i may be outside the object, the points p_i may not exist, or the linecuts in (3) may be whole lines, not just points. These are technical details which are handled accordingly.

Step (iv) of STR now delivers vectors u_i and corresponding piece wise linear

functions $\tilde{u}_i = \sum_j (u_i)_j \phi_j$. In order to complete the implementation of STR we have to compute step (v) as follows. First we divide [-1,1] into n points $z_i = \frac{2i-n-1}{n-1}$, such that $z_1 = -1$ and $z_n = 1$. Then we construct a grid G_n by

$$G_n = \{(z_i, z_j) \,|\, 1 \le i, j \le n\}$$

The resulting dynamical solutions f_i of $\mathcal{R}_i f_i = g_i$ will be computed according to step (v) of STR in points $p \in G_n \cap \Omega$ by

$$f_i(p) = \sum_j r_{i,j}(R_j^* \tilde{u}_j)(p) = \sum_j r_{i,j} \tilde{u}_j(p \cdot \omega_j).$$

In order to evaluate this formula in an efficient way, we first compute functions U_j on G_n by

$$U_j(p) = \tilde{u}_j(p \cdot \omega_j)$$

and then compute the sum

$$f_i(p) = \sum_j r_{i,j} U_j(p)$$

To summarize, we get the following algorithm

(i) **Input**: data g, spatial regularization parameter λ , temporal regularization parameter μ . (ii) Starting with D, λ, μ compute Q, R according to $Q = \left(DD^{\top} + \frac{\lambda^2}{\mu^2} I_{T-1}\right)^{-1}$ $R = I_T - D^\top Q D = (r_{i,j})_{i,j}.$ (iii) Compute matrices $(\tilde{C}_i)_{j,l} = \psi_j C_i \phi_l = (\mathcal{R}_i \mathcal{R}_0^* \phi_l)(s_j)$. Then, \tilde{C} is compounded according to $\tilde{C} = (r_{i,j}\tilde{C}_{(i-j) \bmod T}) \in \mathbb{R}^{NT \times NT}.$ (iv) Solve $(\tilde{C} + \lambda^2 I_{NT}) u = q.$ with $u = (u_1^{\top}, ..., u_T^{\top})^{\top}$ and $g = (g_1^{\top}, ..., g_T^{\top})^{\top}$. (v) Discretize $[-1, 1]^2$ using a grid G_n and compute $U_j(p) = \begin{cases} \tilde{u}_j(p \cdot \omega_j) & \text{if } p \in \Omega \cap G_n, \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$ Compute $\tilde{u}_i(s)$ by linear interpolation of u_i . Finally, the solution of dynCT is achieved by $f_i(p) = \sum_i r_{i,j} U_j(p)$ with $p \in G_n$.

Step (iv) in this procedure corresponds to a linear system on the detector and step (v) is a weighted and discrete version of the backprojection $\mathcal{R}^{\sharp}\tilde{u}_{j}$, see [5, 4].

If we had used step wise constant functions on the detector and functionals

$$\psi_l(f) = \int_{s_{l-1/2}}^{s_{l+1/2}} f(x) \mathrm{d}x,$$

we would have got a dynamic version of the *direct algebraic method* as proposed in [4].

2.2. Numerical Tests

We will see two numerical tests based on the procedure STR applied to dynCT.

The design parameters are as follows: We used a 300×300 grid for reconstruction, that is n = 300. Further, we had 87 angular positions, which means we considered T = 87 time steps. The detector is divided into 81 points, which means N = 81. We determined $\lambda = 0.01$ and $\mu = 1.0$ by experimentation. The data were generated analytically, no noise was added.

The two dynamic objects, that will be studied, have the same structure, see figure 2. The circular objects are static and the emphasized ellipse is dynamic.



Figure 2. The structure of the considered dynamic objects. The numbers describe the density of the objects, the highlighted ellipse is the dynamic part of the object.

2.2.1. First Example The first example considers the case of slight patient motion: the examined organs behave statically up to time step 44 and the ellipse lies on the right side. Then, from time step 45 on, the ellipse lies on the left side, the other organs do not move. The object and the according reconstructions are shown in figure 3. At



Figure 3. Dynamic object number one and reconstructions. In the left part one can see the original dynamic object, in the right part the reconstructions are depicted. The numbers above the single pictures are the corresponding time steps.

the beginning and at the end of the scanning process the quality of the reconstruction is quite good, in the neighborhood of timestep 43 the reconstructions are blurred and show slight artifacts. Nevertheless one can see the underlying dynamics.

2.2.2. Second Example In this case we examine a dynamic object where the size of the ellipse increases from time step one to time step 87. This corresponds to a CT at the human heart or to a CT of the lung during inhalation. The object and the according reconstructions can be seen in figure 4.



Figure 4. Dynamic object number two and reconstructions. In the left part one can see the original dynamic object, in the right part the reconstructions are depicted. The numbers above the single pictures are the corresponding time steps.

2.2.3. Discussion As we have seen the described method is able to reveal dynamics in a scanned object. The reconstructions are afflicted with artifacts which correspond to the weak *a priori* information we considered. Nevertheless, the method is able to distinguish between pathological findings (which should appear in reconstructions belonging to all time steps) and motion artifacts (which are supposed to appear in reconstructions according to few time steps only). Reconstruction procedures which deliver only one picture do not have this property. Thus, a practical application of our method is imaginable.

3. Dynamic electrical impedance tomography

Electrical impedance tomography (EIT) tries to determine the conductivity inside a given object based on electrical measurements on the objects surface. For applications see [6, 7, 8, 9, 10]. Article [11] gives an extensive survey of EIT.

EIT is based on a non-linear ill-posed problem that can be interpreted as a dynamic problem, which we will name as dynEIT in the following. In the first section we will give some preliminaries and we will apply the procedure STR to the problem of dynEIT by linearization of the underlying problem. In a second section we will give some numerical tests which we will compare to a known procedure based on so-called (fixed interval) Kalman-smoothers.

3.1. Application of the procedure STR

The electrical measurements addressed above consist of measured voltages based on injected current patterns. Due to the variation of the currents from time step to time step, one can interpret EIT as a dynamic problem dynEIT. We assume that the time steps are equispaced.

Our calculations are based on a so-called *complete electrode model* which is proposed in [12]. The outstanding quality of this model is studied in [13]. It is formulated by the following equations

$$\operatorname{div}(\sigma \nabla u) = 0$$

Dynamic inverse Problems – Part II: Applications

$$\int_{e_l} \sigma \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} dS = I_l \qquad 1 \le l \le L$$

$$\sigma \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} \Big|_{\partial \Omega \setminus \cup e_l} = 0$$

$$\left(u + z_l \sigma \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} \right) \Big|_{e_l} = U_l \qquad 1 \le l \le L.$$

Here, L is the number of electrodes, I_l is the injected current at electrode e_l , U_l is the measured voltage at this electrode, σ is the conductivity distribution, u is the electrical potential inside the examined object Ω , z_l is a so-called contact impedance at electrode e_l and n is the outward normal at $\partial\Omega$.

This equation can be solved by converting it to a *variational equation* which can be solved by a finite element method (FEM), see [14, 15, 16, 13]. The uniqueness of the solution induces a non-linear operator in form of a real valued matrix

$$\Gamma: (\rho, I_l) \mapsto U$$

Here $\rho = (\rho_i)_i$ and $\sum_i \rho_i \chi_i$ is a discretized version of $\rho = 1/\sigma$. U is a vector of the measured voltages. χ_i are characteristic functions of elements Δ_i .

In order to consider EIT as a dynamic problem operators

$$A_t(\rho) = T(\rho, I_t),$$

are used which are linearized in ρ^0 as follows:

$$A_t(\rho) = A_t(\rho^0) + J_t(\rho^0)(\rho - \rho^0) + o(\|\rho - \rho^0\|)$$

The matrix $J_t(\rho^0)$ can be computed using the *stiffness matrix* of the underlying finite element method, see [14, 15, 16]. $\rho^0 \in \mathbb{R}$ can be estimated from the data according to [14, 15, 16]. In the following, ρ^0 is either a real number, or we identify ρ^0 with the vector $\rho^0(1, \ldots, 1)$. The length of this vector is arbitrary.

Starting point for the solution of dynEIT are T measurement vectors $U_i = (U_k)_i, 1 \le k \le L, 1 \le i \le T$ together with the minimization task

$$\Phi(\rho) = \|A(\rho) - U\|^2 + \lambda^2 \sum_t \|\rho - \rho^0\|^2 + \mu^2 \|B\rho\|^2 \to \min$$

with the notions

$$\rho = (\rho_1^\top, \dots, \rho_T^\top)^\top$$

$$U = (U_1^\top, \dots, U_T^\top)^\top$$

$$A = \operatorname{diag}(A_t)$$

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} I & -I \\ & I & -I \\ & & \ddots & \ddots \\ & & & I & -I \end{bmatrix}$$

If we now use

$$J(\rho) = \operatorname{diag}(J_t(\rho_t))$$

and approximate A iteratively by linearization we get the following Gauß-Newton type iteration

$$\rho^{i+1} = \operatorname{minarg}_{\rho} \left\{ \|A(\rho^{i}) + J(\rho^{i})(\rho - \rho^{i}) - U\|^{2} + \lambda^{2} \|\rho - \rho^{0}\|^{2} + \mu \|B\rho\|^{2} \right\}.$$

The upper indices are iteration indices. It has to be pointed out, that this minimization problem can not be tackled by the procedure STR due to the spatial regularization term $\|\rho - \rho^0\|$. If we want to use procedure STR, we have to introduce $u = \rho - \rho^0$ and $u^i = \rho^i - \rho^0$. If we consider $Bu = B\rho$ we get the iteration

$$\begin{split} u^{i+1} &= \operatorname{minarg}_u \left\{ \|J(\rho^i)u - (U + J(\rho^i)u^i - A(\rho^i))\|^2 + \lambda^2 \|u\|^2 + \mu^2 \|Bu\|^2 \right\} \\ & \text{respectively} \\ \rho^{i+1} &= \rho^0 + \operatorname{minarg}_u \left\{ \|J(\rho^i)u - (U + J(\rho^i)(\rho^i - \rho^0) - A(\rho^i))\|^2 + \lambda^2 \|u\|^2 + \mu^2 \|Bu\|^2 \right\}. \end{split}$$

This iteration has now the right mode so that STR can be applied.

3.2. Numerical Tests

For the testing of our proposed method we used synthetic data calculated by a FEM using 1968 elements for the discretization of the unit disc. Further we used L = 16 electrodes and T = 16 current patterns. For the discretization of the resistivities ρ^i we used a coarser mesh with 492 elements. The examined object is drawn in figure 5. The background has the resistivity 400 Ω , the inclusions 200 Ω . ρ^0 was estimated [14, 15, 16] as $\rho^0 = 396\Omega$. This object reflects the rise of a bubble in a three dimensional tube through a two dimensional plane. In the following we will compare our method with a



Figure 5. The examined dynamic object.

so-called (fixed interval) Kalman-smoother approach. According to [15, 17], we choose the identity matrix as regularization operator. Further details can be found in these two references. For the theory of Kalman-smoothers see [18].

It should be pointed out that in the reconstruction results the contrast was modified in order to achieve meaningful images.

3.2.1. Noiseless data We will now present three different reconstructions: our proposed method with one iteration, see figure 6, our proposed method with two iterations, see figure 7, and the Kalman-smoother method, see figure 8. All

regularization parameters where chosen by experimentation. The reconstructions of the Kalman-smoother have a slightly better quality as the reconstructions achieved by one iteration of our procedure. The quality after two iterations is again enhanced. More iterations do not result in improved reconstructions. After the precalculation of $J(\rho^0)$, the Kalman-smoother needs about 80 seconds on a Pentium-II-CPU, one iteration of our method needs about one second and two iterations need 60 seconds. The leap in the running time between one and two iterations is caused by the calculation of the linearization $J(\rho^1)$ in the second iteration of our procedure which depends on the result of the first iteration and thus can not be precalculated. The memory usage of the Kalman-smoother is about 80 times higher than the usage of our iterative method.



Figure 6. Reconstruction after one iteration of our procedure based on noise-free synthetic data. $\lambda = 0.001, \mu = 0.0055$.

3.2.2. Noisy data Now we superpose our synthetic data with uniform noise in the range $[-0.025 \cdot \max |U|, +0.025 \cdot \max |U|]$. The reconstructions can be seen in figures 9 and 10. Again, the Kalman-smoother reconstructions seem to have a comparable quality as the results of our approach. According to the results in 3.2.1 one further iteration of our procedure leads to slightly better reconstructions.

3.3. Discussion

We have seen that our iterative approach based on STR leads to reconstructions with a satisfying quality. The quality seams to be comparable to the quality of the reconstructions gained by the Kalman-smoother.

There is one important difference between the two approaches which has an impact on the practical use: the Kalman-smoother is controlled by three parameters, the STR approach only needs two of them. As we have already mentioned, the Kalman approach is significantly slower and has a much higher memory usage.



Figure 7. Reconstruction after two iterations of our procedure based on noise-free synthetic data. $\lambda = 0.014, \mu = 0.005$.



Figure 8. Kalman-smoother reconstruction based on noise-free synthetic data. According to [15, 17] we used $\alpha = 0, a_1 = 30, a_2 = 0.00001$.

It should be annotated, that there is another approach called *fixed-lag smoothing* [19] which has less memory consumption than the (fixed-interval) Kalman-smoother used here.

The *extended Kalman filter* studied in [20], is an analogue to our Gauß-Newton approach. This method is supposed to work better than the Kalman-smoother in certain cases.



Figure 9. Reconstruction after one iteration based on noisy data. $\lambda=0.02, \mu=0.07.$



Figure 10. Kalman-smoother reconstruction based on noisy data. $\alpha = 0.08, a_1 = 30, a_2 = 0.08.$

4. Spatio-temporal current density reconstructions

Current density reconstructions (CDR) appear in the field of inverse source localizations. Here, one tries to determine electrical activity in an object by electrical measurements on the surface of the object.

One field of application is the study of neurological activity in the human brain, by means of electroencephalography (EEG) measurements on the heads surface. Focal epileptogenic discharges [21] or sources, underlying somato sensoric evoked potentials

(SEP's) can be localized [22].

An overview of the broad field applications is given in [23] and [24]. Comparable techniques can be applied to the human heart, see [25].

4.1. The forward model

The fundamental equation governing the interaction of electrical sources j and the electrical potential Φ is the Poisson equation in connection with a Neumann boundary condition

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}(\sigma \nabla \Phi) &= \operatorname{div} j & \text{in } \Omega \\ \langle \sigma \nabla \Phi, n \rangle &= 0 & \text{at } \Gamma = \partial \Omega \end{aligned}$$

Here, σ is the conductivity tensor and the open and bounded set Ω describes the geometry of the head. n is the outward normal at $\partial\Omega$. We define $\Gamma_0 \subset \partial\Omega$ as the measurement surface. Then, the electrical measurements are obtained as $\Phi|\Gamma_0$.

In order to achieve a discrete forward model, the current in the object Ω is discretized as a fixed number of dipoles, located at points $p_i \in \Omega, 1 \leq i \leq N$, and point collocation at the measurement points are used. It is assumed that the measurements are taken at points $\xi_i \in \Gamma_0$. The set $\{p_i | 1 \leq i \leq N\}$ is called *influence space*.

If we name the kth unit vector in \mathbb{R}^3 as \bar{e}_k , and if we set $e_{i,k}$ as a dipole in p_i with moment \bar{e}_k , that is $e_{i,k} = \delta_{p_i} \bar{e}_k$, j can be discretized by

$$j = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{k=0}^{2} \alpha_{i+kN} e_{i,k}$$

The forward model of CDR is the so-called *leadfield matrix*. Depending on the geometrical model of the head, this matrix can be computed by analytical formulas [26, 27], boundary element methods [28] or finite element methods [29]. A fast forward solution in realistically shaped anisotropic FE head models is described in [30]. In [31] methods were described how Ω and especially tensor valued σ can be determined non-invasively and individually through multi-modal magnetic resonance imaging.

The leadfield matrix maps a current distribution j described by a vector α to the electrical measurements by $m = L \alpha$. For details see [23]. The determination of α is typical for the CDR methods in contrast to *dipole fit methods*, where only some few dipoles explaining the measured data are determined through an optimization procedure, see [32].

The data are given as functions of time, as provided by an EEG. Most existing CDR methods use separate time slices of voltage measurements without temporal coupling of neighboring time steps. Due to the physiologically motivated *a priori* information of temporal smoothness, it makes sense to use our procedures in order to achieve stability in the presence of noise. As the leadfield matrix is independent of the time, we use procedure STR-C.

4.2. A simple volume conductor model

The setup of the model is as follows: a two-dimensional influence space consisting of a 10×10 grid with a length of ten arbitrary units per side centered at (5.5, 5.5, 0) is considered. Nine sensors are placed in a planar array above the grid with center at (5.5, 5.5, 2), see figure 11. We use constant conductivity σ in \mathbb{R}^3 . Thus, the leadfield



Figure 11. Sketch of the model.

matrix is obtained by

$$L_{i,j} = \frac{1}{4\pi\sigma} \frac{r_{i,1} - p_{j,1}}{\|r_i - p_j\|^3}$$
$$L_{i,j+N} = \frac{1}{4\pi\sigma} \frac{r_{i,2} - p_{j,2}}{\|r_i - p_j\|^3}$$
$$L_{i,j+2N} = \frac{1}{4\pi\sigma} \frac{r_{i,3} - p_{j,3}}{\|r_i - p_j\|^3}.$$

Here $r_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is the position of the *i*th sensor, $p_j \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is the position of the *j*th gridpoint.

Two equally oriented dipoles with moment $(0,0,1)^{\top}$ at x = 3, x = 8 both at y = 5 are placed on the ten by ten grid, see figure 11. A Gaussian dipole-strength time series is assigned to each dipole by

$$q(t) = q_0 \exp\left\{-\frac{(t-t_p)^2}{w^2}\right\}$$

with peaks at time slice $t_p = 5$ (dipole 1) and $t_p = 9$ (dipole 2) and a width of w = 2.5. See figure 12.



Figure 12. The activation curves of the dipoles.

4.3. Numerical Tests

In the following we will compare the results of STR-C and temporal uncoupled Tikhonov-Phillips regularizations [27]. The latter means, that j_t is computed based on

$$\alpha_t = \operatorname{minarg}_{\alpha} \|L\alpha - y_t\|^2 + \lambda^2 \|\alpha\|^2$$

for each time step t and data $y_t, 1 \le t \le T$. In order to improve the signal to noise ratio for the uncoupled case, we used a Savitzky-Golay filter of order 3 and length 5, see [33, 34].

For the following reconstructions we used synthetic data which were superposed by uniform noise in the range $[-0.3 \max_t |y_t|, 0.3 \max_t |y_t|]$. This noise range is typical for EEG measurements.



Figure 13. Temporal uncoupled reconstructions. $\lambda^2 = 2.0$.



Figure 14. Reconstructions based on STR-C. $\lambda^2 = 2.0, \mu^2 = 1.5.$

In figure 13 we see the result of the temporal uncoupled Tikhonov-Phillips procedure, in figure 14 we see the result of STR-C. In the left half of these figures the current density $||j(p,t)||_{\mathbb{R}^3}$ for each of the 16 time steps t is shown. The small boxes mark the exact positions of the dipoles. In the right half, the reconstructed activation curves are shown.

4.4. Discussion

As one can see, our approach STR-C yields reconstructions with a smaller localization error and a more exact activation curve. Furthermore, the two dipoles are better separated. Thus, the *a priori* information of temporal smoothness leads to higher robustness against noise in the data.

For a systematic comparison of these approaches, based on an exactness measure for the localizations and a correlation measure for the activation curves, see the joint work [35].

If we compare our methods with the work of Brooks as proposed in [36], we start from the same model introducing temporal smoothness, but yield an immensely faster algorithm which has a significant impact on the clinical usability.

5. Conclusion

As shown the procedure STR is suited for the regularization of a large class of dynamic inverse problems. It was applied to dynCT which is modeled by operators between infinite dimensional spaces. Here, we could develop a procedure which is able to distinguish between pathological findings and motion artifacts.

Further dynEIT was studied, which is formulated by finite dimensional non-linear operators. Here, linearization lead to a practical algorithm. This algorithm provides reconstructions with a quality comparable to the reconstructions gained by so called Kalman-smoothers. In contrast to this Kalman approach which depends on three regularization parameters, our procedure only needs two such parameters which has an impact on the practical use of these procedures. Further our procedure is significantly faster and has less memory usage.

The last application to Electroencephalography source localization, namely stCDR, proved that the *a priori* information of temporal smoothness leads to an algorithm with higher robustness against noise than a known procedure based on temporal uncoupled Tikhonov-Phillips regularization. Further, the reconstructed peaks and the reconstructed activation curves are more accurate.

Although the used *a priori* information of temporal smoothness is quite general, STR leads in general to reconstructions which give an insight into the temporal behavior of the examined objects. In all applications the efficiency was outstanding.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the German ministry of education and research (03-LO7SA2-2, 03-BU7AA1-4), Prof. E. Zeidler, director of the MPI for Mathematics in the Sciences, Leipzig and by the Leipniz-Prize of the German Research Foundation awarded to Prof. A.D. Friederici, director of the MPI of Cognitive Neuroscience, Leipzig.

References

References

[1] U. Schmitt and A.K. Louis. Efficient Algorithms for the Regularization of dynamic inverse Problems - Part I: Theory. *Inverse Problems*, submitted.

- [2] J.D. Gardiner, A.J. Laub, J.J. Amato, and C.B. Moler. Solution of the Sylvester Matrix Equation AXB^T + CXD^T = E. ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software, 18(2):223– 238, 1992.
- [3] G.T. Herman. Image Reconstruction from Projections. The Fundamentals of Computerized Tomography. Academic Press, 1980.
- [4] F. Natterer. The Mathematics of Computerized Tomography. John Wiley & Sons, 1986.
- [5] A.K. Louis. Inverse und schlecht gestellte Probleme. Teubner, Stuttgart, 1989.
- K.S. Osterman et al. Multifrequency electrical Impedance Imaging: preliminary in Vivo Experience in Breast. *Physiol. Meas.*, 21:99–109, 2000.
- [7] A. Dijkstra et al. Review: Clinical Applications of electrical Impedance Tomography. J. Med. Eng. Technol., 17:89–98, 1993.
- [8] G. Alessandrini and L. Rondi. Stable Determination of a Crack in a planar inhomogenous Conductor. SIAM J. Math. Anal., 30:326–40, 1998.
- [9] A. Friedman and M. Vogelius. Determining Cracks by Boundary Measurements. Indiana Univ. Math. J., 38:527–56, 1989.
- [10] P.G. Kaup and M. Vogelius. Method of Imaging Corrosion Damage in thin Plates from electrostatic Data. *Inverse Problems*, 12:279–93, 1996.
- [11] M. Cheney, D. Isaacson, and J.C. Newell. Electrical Impedance Tomography. SIAM Rev., 41:85–101, 1999.
- [12] G. Cheng, D. Isaacson, J.C. Newell, and A. Gisser. Electrode Models for electric Current computed Tomography. *IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng.*, 36:918–24, 1989.
- [13] E. Somersalo, M. Cheney, and D. Isaacson. Existence and Uniqueness for Electrode Models for electric Current computed Tomography. SIAM J. Appl. Math, 52:1023–40, 1992.
- [14] J.P. Kaipio, V. Kolehmainen, E. Somersalo, and M. Vauhkonen. Statistical Inversion and Monte Carlo Sampling Methods in statistical Impedance Tomography. *Inverse Problems*, 16:1487– 1522, 2000.
- [15] M. Vauhkonen and P.A. Karjalainen. A Kalman Filter Approach to track fast Impedance Changes in electrical Impedance Tomography. *IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng.*, 45(4):486–493, 1989.
- [16] M. Vauhkonen. Electrical Impedance Tomography and prior Information. PhD thesis, University of Kuopio, Kuopio, Finland, 1997.
- [17] J.P. Kaipio, P.A. Karjalainen, E. Somersalo, and M. Vauhkonen. State Estimation in timevarying electrical Impedance Tomography. Annals - New York Academy of Sciences, pages 430–439, 1999.
- [18] M.S. Grewal and A.P. Andrews. Kalman Filtering. Prentice Hall, 1993.
- [19] P.J. Vauhkonen, M. Vauhkonen, and J.P. Kaipio. Fixed-lag Smoothing and State Estimation in dynamic electrical Impedance Tomography. Int J Numer Meth Engng, 50:2195–2209, 2001.
- [20] K.Y. Kim, B.S. Kim, M.C. Kim, Y.J. Lee, and M. Vauhkonen. Image Reconstruction in timevarying electrical Impedance Tomography based on the extended Kalman Filter. *Meas Sci Technol*, 12:1032–1039, 2001.
- [21] T.D. Waberski, H. Buchner, G. Herrendorf, R. Gobbele, and W. Paulus. Properties of inverse Methods in temporal Lobe Epilepsie. *Epilepsia, in press*, 2000.
- [22] H. Buchner, T.D. Waberski, and J. Noth. Generators of early cortical somatosensory evoked Potentials in Men. In Kimura and Shibasaki, editors, *Recent Advances in Clinical Neurophysiology*, pages 630–636. Elsevier Amsterdam, 1996.
- [23] U. Schmitt, A.K. Louis, F. Darvas, H. Buchner, and M. Fuchs. Numerical Aspects of spatiotemporal Current Density Reconstruction from EEG-/MEG-Data. *IEEE Trans Med Imag*, 20(4):314–324, 2001.
- [24] Andrä and Nowak. Magnetism in Medicine A Handbook. Wiley-VCH, 1989.
- [25] R.M. Gulrajani, F.A. Roberge, and P. Savard. The inverse Problem of Electrocardiography. In Macfarlane and Veitch Lawrie, editors, *Comprehensive Electrocardiology*, pages 237–288. Pergamon, 1989.
- [26] R. Srebro. Continuous Current Source Inversion of evoked potential Fields in a spherical Model Head. IEEE Trans Biomed Eng, 42:997–1003, 1994.
- [27] A.K. Louis. Parametric Reconstruction in biomagnetic Imaging. In Inverse Problems in Scattering and Imaging, 1992.
- [28] M. Fuchs, D. Drenckhahn, H.A. Wischmann, and M. Wagner. An improved Boundary Element Method for realistic Volume-Conductor Modelling. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng*, 45:980–997, 1998.
- [29] H. Buchner, G. Knoll, M. Fuchs, A. Rienaecker, R. Beckmann, M. Wagner, J. Silny, and J. Pesch. Inverse Localization of electric Dipole Current Sources in finite Element Models of the human

Head. Electroencephalography & Clinical Neurophysiology, 102:267–278, 1997.

- [30] A. Anwander, M. Kuhn, S. Reitzinger, and C. Wolters. A parallel algebraic Multigrid Solver for finite Element Method based Source Localization in the human Brain. http://www.mis.mpg.de/jump/publications.html, 2001.
- [31] C. Wolters, U. Hartmann, M. Koch, F. Kruggel, S. Burkhardt, A. Basermann, D.S. Tuch, and J. Haueisen. New Methods for improved and accelerated FE Volume Conductor Modeling in EEG/MEG-Source Reconstruction. In 4th Symposion on Computer Methods in Biomech. and Biomed. Eng., Lisboa, Oct. 31.-Nov.3, 1999, pages 489–494. Gordon and Breach, 1999.
- [32] C. Wolters, R. Beckmann, A. Rienäcker, and H. Buchner. Comparing regularized and nonregularized nonlinear Dipole Fit Methods: A study in a simulated Sulcus Structure. *Brain Topography*, 12(1):3–18, 1999.
- [33] A. Savitzky and M.J.E. Golay. Analytical Chemistry, 36:1627–1639, 1964.
- [34] R.W. Hamming. *Digital Filters*. Prentice Hall, 2nd edition, 1983.
- [35] F. Darvas, U. Schmitt, A.K. Louis, M. Fuchs, G. Knoll, and H. Buchner. Spatio-temporal Current Density Reconstructions (stCDR) from EEG/MEG-Data. *Brain Topography*, 13:192– 208, 2001.
- [36] D.H. Brooks, G.F. Ahmad, and R.S. MacLeod an G.M Maratos. Inverse Electrocardiography by simultaneous Imposition of multiple Constraints. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng*, 46(1):3–17, 1999.