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Abstract—Pulse-echo ultrasound (US) aims at imaging tissue using an array of piezoelectric elements by transmitting short US pulses and receiving backscattered echoes. Conventional US imaging relies on delay-and-sum (DAS) beamforming which retrieves a radio-frequency (RF) image, a blurred estimate of the tissue reflectivity function (TRF). To address the problem of the blur induced by the DAS, deconvolution techniques have been extensively studied as a post-processing tool for improving the resolution. Most approaches assume the blur to be spatially invariant, i.e. stationary, across the imaging domain. However, due to physical effects related to the propagation, the blur is non-stationary across the imaging domain. In this work, we propose a continuous-domain formulation of a model which accounts for the diffraction effects related to the propagation. We define a PSF operator as a sequential application of the forward and adjoint operators associated with this model, under some specific assumptions that we precise. Taking into account this sequential structure, we exploit efficient formulations of the operators in the discrete domain and provide a PSF operator which exhibits linear complexity with respect to the grid size. We use the proposed model in a maximum-a-posteriori estimation algorithm, with a generalized Gaussian distribution prior for the TRF. Through simulations and in-vivo experimental data, we demonstrate its superiority against state-of-the-art deconvolution methods based on a stationary PSF.

Index Terms—Deconvolution, Point-Spread-Function, Ultrasound Imaging

I. INTRODUCTION

ULTRASOUND (US) imaging is a widely used medical imaging modality due to its non-invasiveness, relative low-cost and real time capability. By appropriately placing a US probe, usually an array of piezoelectric transducer elements, a medical doctor is able to visualize cross-section images of regions of interest in the body resulting from local variations in density and sound velocity.

The US imaging process exploits the transducer elements for both transmitting acoustic pulses in the region of interest and recording the response of the medium to these pulses as echo signals. The set of these signals is related to the spatial distribution of variations in acoustic impedance, i.e. in medium density and sound velocity, denoted as the tissue reflectivity function (TRF), by a US propagation operator. Due to finite aperture of the probe and bandlimited properties of each transducer element, retrieving the TRF from the echo signals is an ill-posed problem. In standard US imaging, the delay-and-sum (DAS) operator is used as an approximate inverse of the propagation operator. Such an approximation leads to a radio-frequency (RF) image, a blurred estimate of the TRF. The point-spread-function (PSF) is introduced to relate these quantities.

Wave propagation and diffraction in the medium imply that the PSF is spatially varying, as it can be seen in Figure 1. While this is problematic for most deconvolution techniques, accounting for this non-stationarity\(^1\) is the only way to retrieve an accurate estimate of the TRF.

Most of state-of-the-art methods exploit spatially invariant PSF. In several studies, the PSF is estimated in a preliminary step either through in-vitro measurements or by simulation [1], [2], [3], [4]. Other approaches estimate directly the PSF on the RF image using homomorphic filtering of the cepstrum [5], [6], [7], inverse filtering based on parametric [8], [9], [10] or non-parametric models [11], [12], [13] and power spectrum equalization [14]. Only few recent studies deal with spatially-varying PSF [15], [16]. But, the proposed methods are either too restrictive in the class of functions the PSF belongs to [15] or too computationally expensive to be used in realistic imaging scenarios [16].

In this work, we address the problem of non-stationary deconvolution in US imaging. More precisely, we propose a continuous spatially-varying PSF operator which accounts for diffraction effects related to US propagation and extends the one presented in our previous work [16]. The proposed model is based on a physical modelling of both the US propagation and the DAS, recently discussed in several studies [17], [18].

\(^1\)It has to be noted that the terms “stationarity” and “stationary” are used as synonyms for “spatial invariance” and “spatially invariant”, respectively.
It only relies on few assumptions, e.g. Born approximation, propagation of an ideal plane or spherical wavefront and assume 2D propagation and 1D transducer geometry. Such assumptions are rather standard in 2D US imaging. It is therefore far more realistic than a model based on a stationary PSF and less restrictive on the PSF than state-of-the-art non-stationary approaches [15]. We also exploit computationally efficient formulations of the discrete operators involved in the above mentioned models, based on parametric formulations described in our previous work [19], [20], and demonstrate both theoretically and experimentally that they scale well in realistic 2D imaging cases.

We use the proposed model in a maximum-a-posteriori (MAP) estimation algorithm, with a generalized Gaussian distribution (GGD) prior for the TRF [4], [21]. We test the method on an extensive number of experiments, namely a numerical phantom of point reflectors, a numerical calibration phantom and two in-vivo carotids, for both diverging wave (DW) and plane wave (PW) imaging. We demonstrate that it leads to an improvement of the lateral and axial resolutions on both the point-reflector and the calibration phantoms and provides a higher visual quality on in-vivo carotid images.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces the non-stationary PSF operator and Section III describes the corresponding fast formulations. Experimental settings are described in Section IV and results are reported and discussed in Section V. Concluding remarks are given in Section VI.
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**Fig. 1.** An example of a TRF (a) and the corresponding demodulated RF image (b) obtained with the DAS operator. We clearly see the spatially varying blur induced by classical beamforming.

### II. Mathematical Modelling of Ultrasound Imaging and Continuous Level Operators

In this section, we describe a mathematical formalism of US imaging and propose formulations of the associated operators at the continuous level. Such a formalism is used to introduce a PSF operator that we sequentially split into propagation and DAS operators, which can benefit from fast formulations [19] detailed in Section III.

#### A. Mathematical Modelling of Ultrasound Imaging

In a standard US imaging configuration, described in Figure 2, an array of transducer elements is used to propagate an acoustic wave in a medium \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \) which contains inhomogeneities as local fluctuations in acoustic impedance, defining the TRF \( \gamma \in L_2(\Omega) [22], [23], [19] \). As a reminder, \( L_2(\Omega) \) is the Hilbert space of the square integrable functions which take values in \( \Omega \). In addition, for \( f, g \in L_2(\Omega) \) we denote their inner product as \( (f, g)_{L_2(\Omega)} \). Depending on the desired transmit wavefront, e.g. plane wave (PW), diverging wave (DW), focused-wave or synthetic-aperture approaches, each transducer element starts to transmit after a given delay defined by an inter-element delay profile.

In a receive phase, a set of transducer elements, located at \( (p_i)_{i=1}^{N_{el}}, p_i \in \mathbb{R}^2 \), detect echo signals \( m_i(t), t \in [0,T] \), defining the following measurements

\[
m(t) := \left[ m_1(t), \ldots, m_{N_{el}}(t) \right] \in L_2([0,T])^{N_{el}},
\]

where \( L_2([0,T])^{N_{el}} := L_2([0,T]) \times \cdots \times L_2([0,T]) \).

The measurements \( m(t) \) are related to the TRF \( \gamma \) by the propagation of the US wave during the time interval \([0,T]\). It can be demonstrated using the Born approximation that a linear operator \( \mathcal{H} : \gamma \mapsto m \), called the propagation operator, relates the TRF to the measurements [17], [19], [20].
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**Fig. 2.** Standard 2D US imaging configuration (adapted from [19]).

Standard US image reconstruction process reconstructs the RF image \( \hat{\gamma} \), an estimate of the TRF \( \gamma \), which should be ideally close to \( \gamma \). This process involves a second operator \( \mathcal{D} : m \mapsto \hat{\gamma} \) known as the DAS operator and described in Section II-C.

Using the operators introduced above, we define the US imaging procedure as a mapping between the TRF and the RF image

\[
\mathcal{K} : L_2(\Omega) \rightarrow L_2(\Omega)
\]

\[
\gamma \mapsto \hat{\gamma} = \mathcal{D}\mathcal{H}(\gamma)
\]

(2)

The operator \( \mathcal{K} \) is denoted as the PSF operator since it characterizes the blur introduced by the imaging process when approximating \( \gamma \) by \( \hat{\gamma} \). A further description of the PSF is given in Section II-D.

#### B. Ultrasound Propagation Operator

The proposed physical modelling of wave propagation is based on the pulse-echo spatio-temporal impulse response...
model introduced by Stepanishen [24]. Furthermore, the effect of the transducer element surface is approximated by a directivity function using a far-field assumption [25]. Under this approximation, we can express the element raw data received on the $i$-th channel as

$$m_i(t) = \int_{r \in \Omega} o(p_i, r) v_{pe} (t - \tau (r, p_i)) \gamma (r) \, dr,$$

where $o(p_i, r)$ accounts for the spatial directivity and decay of the reflected wave and $v_{pe} (t)$ is the pulse-echo waveform [26] which depends on the transducer impulse response and the excitation signal. The round trip time-of-flight $\tau (r, p_i)$ is defined as

$$\tau (r, p_i) = t_{Tx} (r) + t_{Rx} (r, p_i),$$

where $t_{Rx} (r, p_i) = \| r - p_i \| / c$ denotes the propagation delay in receive and $t_{Tx} (r)$ is the propagation delay in transmit, supposed to be independent from the location of the emitters assuming a planar wavefront in PW imaging [27] or a spherical wavefront in DW imaging and synthetic aperture approaches [28].

Equation (3) can be compactly expressed in terms of a linear integral operator acting on the TRF $\gamma \in L_2 (\Omega)$ and outputting the measurements

$$m(t) = \mathcal{H} \{ \gamma \} (t),$$

where $\mathcal{H} : L_2 (\Omega) \rightarrow L_2 ([0, T])^{N_{el}}$ whose $i$-th component is given by

$$(\mathcal{H} \{ \gamma \})_i (t) = \int_{r \in \Omega} o(p_i, r) v_{pe} (t - \tau (r, p_i)) \gamma (r) \, dr.$$

C. Delay-and-sum Operator

Starting from the measurements $m(t)$, standard US image reconstruction exploits the well-known delay-and-sum (DAS) algorithm for computing the following RF image:

$$\hat{\gamma} (r) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{el}} a(p_i, r) m_i (\tau (r, p_i))$$

where $a(p_i, r)$ accounts for the aperture-apodization weights, commonly applied to reduce the sidelobe levels. The intuition behind DAS is rather simple. In order to estimate the TRF at location $r$, we sum echo signals originating from this point and reaching the transducer elements at each given time-of-flight. Reformulating DAS in terms of a linear integral operator acting on $m(t) \in L_2 ([0, T])^{N_{el}}$ is also straightforward,

$$\hat{\gamma} (r) = \int_0^T \sum_{i=1}^{N_{el}} a(p_i, r) \delta (t - \tau (r, p_i)) m_i (t) \, dt$$

$$= \mathcal{D} \{ m \} (r),$$

where $\mathcal{D} : L_2 ([0, T])^{N_{el}} \rightarrow L_2 (\Omega)$.

D. From the Point-Spread-Function Operator to the Point-Spread-Function

We are now equipped with the two operators $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ that can be injected in (2) to compute the PSF operator. By following similar arguments to the ones developed in [16], $\mathcal{K}$ can be decomposed as follows,

$$\mathcal{K} : L_2 (\Omega) \rightarrow L_2 (\Omega)$$

$$\gamma \mapsto \int_{s \in \Omega} \gamma (s) k (s, s) \, ds,$$

where $k : \Omega \times \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$, the bivariate kernel of $\mathcal{K}$, defines the PSF. Moreover, by simple calculations involving $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ (derived in [16]), the kernel can be expressed as follows

$$k (r, s) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{el}} a(p_i, r) o(p_i, s) v_{pe} (\tau (r, p_i) - \tau (s, p_i)).$$

Let us proceed with several comments on the above defined kernel:

- If we assume that $\gamma (r) = \delta (r - r_0)$, with $r_0 \in \Omega$, then

$$\hat{\gamma} (r) = k (r, r_0),$$

leading to a natural interpretation of $k$ as the PSF, i.e. the response of the US system to a TRF composed of a single point reflector located at $r_0$;

- In a spatially invariant case, the bivariate kernel $k (r, s)$ is simplified to a univariate one leading to $k (r, s) = k (r - s)$. Under this approximation, Equation (9) becomes the standard bi-dimensional analytical convolution;

- Considering that $\Omega$ is discretized with $N_g$ grid points, the evaluation of (9) requires $O (N_g^2 N_{el})$ operations, which is not compatible with 2D US imaging configurations where $N_g$ is of the order of $10^4$ to $10^6$.

Equipped with the above defined PSF operator, the deconvolution problem can be stated as:

$$\text{Recover } \gamma \text{ from } \hat{\gamma} = \mathcal{K} \{ \gamma \}. \quad (12)$$

E. Adjoint of the Point-Spread Function Operator

In most deconvolution methods, the adjoint operator $\mathcal{K}^\dagger$ is required to solve Problem (12). For instance, deconvolution approaches that require to solve a convex optimization need to compute the gradient of a data fidelity term, usually expressed using the squared $\ell_2$-norm. Such a gradient is defined as $\mathcal{K}^\dagger \left( \mathcal{K} \gamma - m \right)$. At the continuous operator level, the adjoint PSF operator can also be decomposed in terms of the adjoint DAS and adjoint propagation operator,

$$\mathcal{K}^\dagger = \mathcal{H}^\dagger \mathcal{D}^\dagger, \quad \mathcal{K}^\dagger : L_2 (\Omega) \rightarrow L_2 ([0, T])^{N_{el}},$$

$$\mathcal{H}^\dagger : L_2 ([0, T])^{N_{el}} \rightarrow L_2 (\Omega), \quad \mathcal{D}^\dagger : L_2 (\Omega) \rightarrow L_2 ([0, T])^{N_{el}}.$$

In addition, the adjoint operators $\mathcal{D}^\dagger$ and $\mathcal{H}^\dagger$ are directly obtained from their definitions,

$$\langle \gamma, \mathcal{H}^\dagger m \rangle_{L_2 (\Omega)} = \langle \mathcal{H} \gamma, m \rangle_{L_2 ([0, T])^{N_{el}}}, \quad (14)$$

$$\langle \gamma, \mathcal{D} m \rangle_{L_2 (\Omega)} = \langle \mathcal{D}^\dagger \gamma, m \rangle_{L_2 ([0, T])^{N_{el}}}, \quad (15)$$
by simply flipping the order of integration over Ω and [0, T] [19]. These changes are legitimate thanks to the square integrability of the involved functions.

Consequently, the adjoint operator of the propagation model is given by

$$ \mathcal{H}^\dagger \{ m \} (r) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{el}} T \int_0^T o(p_i, r) m_i(t) v_{pe} (t - \tau(r, p_i)) dt, \quad (16) $$

and the adjoint DAS operator by

$$ \left( \mathcal{D}^\dagger \{ \gamma \} \right)_i (t) = \int_{r \in \Omega} a(p_i, r) \delta(t - \tau(r, p_i)) \gamma(r) dr, \quad i = 1, \ldots, N_{el}. \quad (17) $$

Interestingly, the adjoint PSF operator can be expressed immediately using the PSF kernel defined in (10), by flipping the two arguments, i.e. using a symmetrised kernel $\hat{k}(s, r) = k(s, r)$. 

### III. Fast Formulations of the Discretized Operators and Resulting Complexity

In this section, we express the deconvolution problem over a regular grid. More precisely, the TRF $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_z}$ is defined on a regular grid $\Omega_\gamma = \{(x_i, \tau_i) \in \Omega, u = 1, \ldots, N_u, v = 1, \ldots, N_v\}$ and the RF image $\hat{\Gamma} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_z}$ is defined on a second regular grid $\Omega_\gamma = \{(x_k, \tau_k) \in \Omega, k = 1, \ldots, N_x, \tau = 1, \ldots, N_z\}$. In Section II, we have established a decomposition of the PSF operator, $\mathcal{K} : L_2(\Omega) \rightarrow L_2(\Omega)$ and its adjoint, in terms of the propagation operator $\mathcal{H}$ and DAS operator $\mathcal{D}$. This is a key property when deriving a computationally efficient formulation of the PSF operator relating the TRF to the RF image, each expressed over a specific grid:

$$ K : \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_z}, \quad \hat{\Gamma} = K \Gamma. \quad (18) $$

In particular, we have the discrete equivalent of the decomposition,

$$ \mathcal{K} = \mathcal{D} \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{K}} = \mathcal{D} \mathcal{H}, \quad (19) $$

where,

$$ D : \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_{el}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_{el}}, \quad \mathcal{H} : \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_{el}}. \quad (20) $$

The above defined operators allow us to define the discrete counterpart of the continuous deconvolution problem as:

$$ \text{Recover } \Gamma \text{ from } \hat{\Gamma} = K \Gamma. \quad (21) $$

The remaining of this section defines fast formulations of the discrete operators $D$ and $H$ from their continuous counterpart. For the sake of simplicity, the grids supporting both the RF and TRF images are assumed to be the same. The pseudo raw-data generated when computing $M = H \Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_{el}}$ are expressed with a uniform time spacing

$$ M_{ki} = m_i(t_k), \quad i = 1, \ldots, N_{el}, \quad k = 1, \ldots, N_t, \quad (22) $$

associated to a given sampling frequency $f_s$.

#### A. Fast Propagation Operator and its Adjoint

Based on our previous work [19], the $i$-th component of the integral operator defined in (6) can be reformulated as the following convolution,

$$ (\mathcal{H} \{ \gamma \})_i(t) = v_{pe} *_{t} \mathcal{G}_i \{ \gamma \}(t), \quad (23) $$

where $v_{pe}$ denotes the analytical convolution over the time dimension and $\mathcal{G}_i : L_2(\Omega) \rightarrow L_2([0, T])$ is defined by

$$ \mathcal{G}_i \{ \gamma \}(t) = \int_{r \in \Omega} o(p_i, r) \gamma(r) \delta(t - \tau(r, p_i)) dr. \quad (24) $$

Equation (24) can be re-written as the following line integral [19],

$$ \mathcal{G}_i \{ \gamma \}(t) = \int_{r \in S_i(t)} o(p_i, r) \gamma(r) \left| \nabla_r g_i(t, r) \right| dr, \quad (25) $$

where the set of points defining the curve $S_i(t)$ is given by

$$ S_i(t) = \{ r \in \Omega : g_i(t, r) = 0, \quad g_i(t, r) := t \tau(r, p_i) \}. \quad (26) $$

By appropriate reparameterization of $S_i(t)$ described in our previous work [19], [20], Equation (25) can be expressed as

$$ \mathcal{G}_i \{ \gamma \}(t) = \int_{r \in \Omega} o(p_i, r) \gamma(r) \left| \nabla_r g_i(t, r) \right| dr, \quad (27) $$

where $r (\alpha, p_i, t) = (\alpha, z(\alpha, p_i, t))$ and $\left| J_r \right| : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denotes the Jacobian associated with the change of variable.

The discretization of the integral over $r$ leads to

$$ (\mathcal{H} \{ \gamma \})_{i}(t) \approx v_{pe} *_{t} \sum_{j=1}^{N_t} w_j(p_i, t) \gamma(r(\alpha_j, p_i, t)). \quad (28) $$

where $w_j(p_i, t)$ accounts for the spatial directivity, the decay of the reflected wave, the Jacobian, the gradient of $g$ and the weights related to the numerical approximation of the integral.

Consequently, the application of the discretized forward operator $H$ over the TRF image can be formulated as

$$ H \Gamma = V_{pe} \sum_{j=1}^{N_t} W_j \circ I_j \Gamma_s \in \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_{el}}, \quad (29) $$

where $\circ$ denotes the Hadamard product, $V_{pe} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_t}$ is the Toeplitz matrix associated with the discrete convolution with $v_{pe} = \left[ v_{pe}(t_1), \ldots, v_{pe}(N_t) \right]^{T}$, $I_j : \mathbb{R}^{N_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_{el}}$ performs the interpolation of the points of the parametric curves at locations $\{ z(\alpha_j, p_i, t_k) \}_{k=1}^{N_t}$ and $W_j \in \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_{el}}$ is defined element-wise as $(W_j)_{ik} = w_j(p_i, t_k).

The adjoint operator $H^\dagger$ defined in Equation (16) can be seen as the following convolution,

$$ H^\dagger \{ m \} (r) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{el}} o(p_i, r) (u_{pe} *_{t} m_i)(\tau(r, p_i)), \quad (30) $$

where $u_{pe}(t) = v_{pe}(-t)$ is the matched filter of the pulse-echo waveform.
The adjoint propagation operator $H^\dagger$ expressed over the grid is thus given by,

$$H^\dagger M = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{el}} O_i \circ I_i \left( V_{pe} M_{el} \right) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_z},$$

(31)

where $O_i \in \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_z}$ is defined element-wise as $(O_i)_{kl} = o(p_i,(x_k,z_l))$. The operator $I_i : \mathbb{R}^{N_i} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_z}$ performs the interpolation of the time sequence at delay instants \{$(x_k, z_l) \cdot p_i$\}$_{x_k, z_l=1}^{N_x, N_z}$, for $i = 1, \ldots, N_{el}$.

B. Fast Delay-and-sum Operator and its Adjoint

The DAS operator, defined in (7), can be seen as an approximation of the adjoint operator $H^\dagger$ under the following assumptions:

- The pulse-echo wavelet is a Dirac delta, i.e. $v_{pe}(t) = \delta(t)$;
- The apodization weights replace the spatial directivity and the decay $1/r_o$ of the reflected wave.

Thus, the application of the discretized DAS operator on the grid is directly defined by the interpolation operation introduced in (31) as

$$DM = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{el}} A_i \circ I_i M_{el} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_z},$$

(32)

where $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_z}$ is defined element-wise as $(A_i)_{kl} = a(p_i,(x_k,z_l))$.

Similarly, the application of the discretized adjoint DAS operator $D^\dagger$ expressed over the grid can be deduced from (29) as

$$D^\dagger T = \sum_{j=1}^{N_z} W_j \circ I_j T_{el} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_i \times N_{el}},$$

(33)

where the apodization weights $a(p_i, r)$ are used in the computation of $W_j$.

C. Computation Complexity of the Point-Spread-Function Operator

The application of the discretized PSF operator over the grid $K : \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_z}$ requires a priori $O((N_x N_z)^2 N_{el})$ operations using (10). Such a complexity prevents its use in realistic imaging cases, where $N_x N_z$ ranges between $10^4$ and $10^6$ and $N_{el}$ is few hundreds.

To solve the above limitation, we propose to decompose the computation of $KT$ as follows:

$$KT = D (HT),$$

(34)

where $HT$ is first performed, generating a pseudo raw-data $M$, followed by the application of the DAS $DM$.

The computation of $HX$ requires to perform the following operations:

1) $N_x$ interpolations $I_i T_{el}$, where each interpolation has a computational complexity of $O(L N_i N_{el})$ with $L$ the support of the interpolation kernel ($L \ll N_z$);
2) $N_x$ point-wise multiplications with $W_j$, each of which having a cost of $O(N_{el} N_i)$;
3) $N_z$ convolutions with $v_{pe}$ each of which with a complexity of $O(N_i \log N_i)$.

The overall computation complexity of $HT$ is therefore:

$$\text{Cost}(HT) = O (LN_x N_{el} N_i + N_i N_{el} N_z + N_x N_i \log N_i)$$

(35)

$$= O (N_z N_{el} N_i),$$

(36)

since $\log N_i \ll N_x$ in US imaging.

The computation of $DM$ necessitates rather similar operations as the one described above, apart from the convolution:

1) $N_{el}$ interpolations $I_i M_{el}$ where each interpolation has a computational complexity of $O(L' N_x N_z)$ with $L'$ the support of the interpolation kernel ($L' \ll N_i$);
2) $N_{el}$ point-wise multiplications with $A_i$, each of which having a cost of $O(N_i N_z)$.

The computational complexity of $DM$ is:

$$\text{Cost}(DM) = O (L' N_{el} N_x N_z + N_{el} N_i N_z)$$

(37)

$$\approx O (N_z N_{el} N_i),$$

(38)

since $N_i \approx N_z$ in standard US imaging configurations. Thus we have the following:

$$\text{Cost}(KT) \ll O((N_x N_z)^2 N_{el}).$$

(41)

An equivalent reasoning for the computation of the adjoint operation $K^\dagger T$ leads to the same computational complexity as the forward operation. Indeed, the only difference between the two computations resides in the convolution which is negligible in the computational cost.

Thus, the proposed sequential split assumption results in a significant decrease of the computational complexity from quadratic to linear with respect to $N_x N_z$. This decrease allows the method to be applied easily in 2D and even 3D configurations.

IV. EXPERIMENTS

This section describes the imaging configurations, for both DW and PW, used to evaluate the proposed non-stationary PSF estimation against state-of-the-art methods. It also describes the $l_p$-based convex optimization method used to solve (21).

A. Diverging Wave Imaging Configuration

A simulated experiment is performed with a standard phased-array probe (P4-2v) whose characteristics are given in Table I. A single diverging wave (2.5 MHz, 1-cycle sinusoidal wave) is transmitted with a corresponding virtual point source located at $z_n$ equal to $-2.9$ mm and laterally centered. No apodization is used on transmit.

The data are acquired on a numerical point-reflector phantom with eight reflectors with unit amplitude and located at positions described on Figure 3(a). The simulation software used in this experiment is Field II [26].
### TABLE I
**Probe Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Diverging wave</th>
<th>Plane wave</th>
<th>Plane wave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Element number</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center frequency</td>
<td>2.7 MHz</td>
<td>5.133 MHz</td>
<td>7.8 MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling frequency</td>
<td>10.8 MHz</td>
<td>20.832 MHz</td>
<td>31.2 MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element width</td>
<td>255 µm</td>
<td>270 µm</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element height</td>
<td>130 µm</td>
<td>500 µm</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch</td>
<td>280 µm</td>
<td>300 µm</td>
<td>195 µm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevation focus</td>
<td>60 mm</td>
<td>20 mm</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Fig. 3. Numerical point-reflector phantoms used for (a) diverging wave and (b) plane wave imaging configurations.](image)

**B. Plane Wave Imaging Configurations**

Two standard linear-array probes, namely the L11-4v and the L12-5 50mm, whose characteristics are given in Table I are used.

The L11-4v is used in two simulated configurations (using Field II) for which a single plane wave (5 MHz, 2.5-cycles, square wave) with normal incidence is transmitted without apodization:

- A point-reflector phantom with reflectors described in Figure 3(b);
- The PICMUS numerical phantom\(^2\), whose example B-mode image is displayed on Figure 4.

The L12-5 50mm is used to acquire *in vivo* measurements of two carotids on a Verasonics US scanner (Redmond, WA, USA). A single plane wave (5 MHz, 1-cycle, tri-state waveforms) without normal incidence is transmitted without apodization.

![Fig. 4. Log-compressed B-mode image of the PICMUS numerical phantom.](image)

**C. Proposed $\ell_p$-based Deconvolution Method**

We use a $\ell_p$-norm minimization, one of the most recent methods introduced in US image deconvolution [4], [29], [21], [30], [12], [16]. Since the discretized PSF operator has been described as a tensor in Section III-A, we have to introduce the reshaping operator $P : \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_z}$ such that $\hat{y} = \hat{P} \hat{f} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_z}$. We are therefore interested in solving the following optimization problem,

$$
\min_{\hat{f} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_z}} \lambda \| \hat{y} \|_p^p + \frac{1}{2} \| \hat{y} - \hat{K} \hat{f} \|_2^2.
$$

(42)

where $\hat{K} = PKP^T \in \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_x \times N_z \times N_z}$ accounts for the discretized PSF operator and $\hat{y} = \hat{P} \hat{f} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_z}$, where $\hat{f}$ is the RF image acquired by the US imaging system. In the objective function minimized in (42), the first term is the prior, the second term is the data-fidelity, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ is a regularization parameter and $p$ is a real so that $p \in [1, 2]$, $[31]$. As a reminder, $\| a \|_p^p = \sum_{i_1} |a_i|^p$.

The values of $p$ are set to 1, 4/3 or 3/2, depending on the experiment, similar to the values used in [4] since their corresponding proximity operator are analytically defined (Appendix A). The optimization algorithm used to solve the deconvolution problem is the fast iterative shrinkage thresholding algorithm (FISTA) described in Appendix A [32]. FISTA is stopped when the relative error between two consecutive estimates is lower than $10^{-3}$.

Three different PSF estimation techniques are compared:

- The proposed non-stationary PSF;
- A stationary PSF previously simulated on Field II using a phantom made of a single scatterer located at 25 mm for PW imaging and 45 mm for DW imaging;
- A stationary PSF estimated from the data using the method described in [23].

The methods are implemented using MATLAB\(^3\). For the non-stationary PSF, the reshaped operators $P \lambda$ and $D \hat{P}^T$ are stored as sparse matrices. For the stationary PSF, the forward and adjoint operator are computed in the Fourier domain.

**V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**A. Point-reflector Experiment**

For these experiments, the $\ell_p$-deconvolution is tested with a value of $p$ equal to 1 since we are dealing with sparse images. The comparison is based on the axial and lateral resolution, calculated as the full-width-at-half maximum (FWHM) [33] computed on the log-compressed B-mode image. The regularization parameter is empirically set to its highest value so that all the point reflectors are visible, if possible.

In the DW experiment whose configuration is described in Figure 3(a), Figure 5 shows that the proposed method significantly outperforms the techniques based on a stationary
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3https://github.com/AdriBesson/epfl-ibm-code
PSF, for both the lateral and the axial resolution. Figure 7 shows the B-mode images of the point-reflectors for standard DAS beamforming (top row), deconvolution with the proposed method (middle row) and deconvolution with the estimated PSF (bottom row). It corroborates the above analysis and shows the superiority of the proposed method. Such results were expected due to the non-stationarity of the PSF, noticeable on the first row of Figure 7.

When using a method with a simulated stationary PSF, it can be noted that the values for both the axial and the lateral resolution are not satisfactory, except for point-reflector 4. This is due to the fact that the PSF used in the deconvolution experiment has been simulated with a point-reflector centered at 45 mm, close to point-reflector 4. The high peaks that one may observe on Figure 5 are due to the fact that several points are not reconstructed. Regarding the method with an estimated PSF, the results are better. This can be explained by the fact that the estimated PSF returns a sort of “averaged PSF” over the entire image, resulting in a rather uniform value of the resolution. We can nevertheless observe a non-uniformity of the resolution with respect to depth (point-reflectors 7 and 8), which emphasizes the inability of the method to capture non-stationary blur.

In the PW experiment, it can be noticed on Figure 6 that the proposed approach is either close to or better than the best of the methods based on a stationary PSF, which means that it represents a best compromise between lateral and axial resolution. However, the results are less striking than for the DW experiment which is justified by the reduced non-stationarity of the blur compared to the DW experiment.

Regarding the simulated PSF, while the lateral resolution is relatively constant along the image, the values of the axial resolution are varying significantly. This is due to our choice of regularization parameter. Indeed, it is set so that all the point-reflectors are visible. When the regularization parameter is too high, the first point-reflectors that vanish are point-reflectors 3 and 7 since they are the ones with the highest mismatch with the centered PSF pattern used in the deconvolution.

With a close look on Figs. 5 and 6, one may highlight some non-uniformity in the values of the resolution obtained with the proposed method. This can be explained by several approximations made in the model:

- no three-dimensional propagation: The proposed model neglects the effects related to the three-dimensional propagation in the Field II simulation, especially the element height and the elevation focus;
- planar/spherical wavefront assumption: We assume that a planar or spherical wavefront, for PW and DW respectively, of constant amplitude propagates in the medium;
- grid mismatch induced by the discretization of the continuous propagation operator and the continuous medium.

### B. PICMUS Phantom Experiment

In this experiment, we compare the methods based on the dB-contrast-to-noise ratio (CNR) and lateral and axial resolution, computed on the PICMUS phantom displayed in Figure 4. The CNR [33] is a measure of the contrast, calculated on the normalized envelope image, i.e. on the envelope image divided by its maximum value, as follows,

$$\text{CNR} = 20 \log_{10} \frac{|\mu_t - \mu_b|}{\sqrt{\sigma_t^2 + \sigma_b^2}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (43)$$

where $(\mu_t, \mu_b)$ and $(\sigma_t^2, \sigma_b^2)$ are the means and the variances of the target inclusion (anechoic region of Figure 4) and the background, respectively.

The results are reported in Table II for the $\ell_p$-deconvolution, with $p = 1.3$ and 1.5, and with the proposed non-stationary PSF as well as the two stationary ones. We choose to show the results for one specific value of the regularization parameter which recovers acceptable images based on visual assessment, but the results remain stable in a wide range of values.

On Table II, one can see that the proposed PSF outperforms the other methods, for nearly all the cases. For the axial resolution at 45 mm, it appears that the method with the simulated PSF is slightly better than the proposed method. It may be due to some assumptions made in the proposed model of the PSF, described in Section V-A. It can be noticed that the improvement of the proposed method in terms of resolution is slight, which is in accordance with the results of Section V-A.

Regarding the results of the deconvolution procedure, we observe that $p = 1.3$ leads to better resolution but lower contrast than $p = 1.5$. This can be explained by a close look to the definition of the CNR. Indeed, it may be deduced from (43) that the CNR favors piecewise-continuous regions where $\sigma_t$ and $\sigma_b$ tend to 0. On the contrary, high-resolution images exhibit more "spiky" behaviour in speckle region
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than low-resolution images which usually result in lower mean and higher variance, therefore in a lower CNR. In $\ell_p$ deconvolution, the value of $p$ impacts the shape of the GGD prior, resulting in variation of the resolution of the recovered TRF. The lower $p$, the tighter the shape of the prior, the better the resolution and the lower the CNR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$p = 1.5$</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>Prop. PSF</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Est. PSF</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sim. PSF</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p = 1.3$</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>Prop. PSF</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Est. PSF</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sim. PSF</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. In-vivo Carotid Experiments**

Due to the lack of ground truth and appropriate quality metric for in-vivo images, the comparison between the methods is limited to a visual assessment in this Section.

Low resolution demodulated RF images of the two carotids, obtained by DAS beamforming without deconvolution, are displayed on Figs. 8(a) and 8(e). The B-mode images of the $\ell_p$-deconvolution technique for the first carotid, and for $p = 1.5$, are displayed on Figs. 8(b), 8(c) and 8(d). The B-mode images of the $\ell_p$-deconvolution technique for the second carotid, and for $p = 1.3$, are displayed on Fig. 8(f), 8(g) and 8(h).

It can be noticed that the deconvolution methods all lead to significantly higher resolution than the demodulated RF images. The deconvolution effect is more pronounced for the proposed method and the estimated PSF than for the simulated PSF. This can be seen on the artery wall. In addition, the proposed method allows a better reconstruction of the textured area, such as the speckle region under the lower artery wall, than both methods based on a stationary PSF.

**D. Preliminary Computational Times on a Parallel Platform**

The results discussed in the previous sections are based on MATLAB implementations which are obviously not compatible with real-time requirements. To give a flavour of the potential for parallelizability of the proposed approach, we evaluate a preliminary implementation of the operators on a graphical processing unit (GPU). Since the implementation is neither fully validated nor optimized, it has not been used to produce the results presented in this work and will be described in a fully dedicated publication.

The sequential application of $D$ and $H$ takes around 50 ms for the in-vivo carotid image case, a NVIDIA Titan X GPU platform, which is similar to the timings presented in previous publications [19], [20]. For the DW imaging case, the lower number of transducer elements and lower sampling frequency are compensated by the higher number of grid points, due to the wider field of view, resulting in similar computation times. Regarding the adjoint operator $D^\dagger$ and $H^\dagger$, the computation times are also very similar to the ones observed for the forward operators which makes sense since they exhibit similar computational complexity.

The computation times of both operators scale linearly with the number of transducer elements, the number of time samples and the number of grid points which is compatible with the complexity derived in Section III-C.

Again, it has to be noticed that the proposed implementations are not optimal and substantial gain may be achieved by working on simple acceleration strategies. However, it is rather reasonable to argue that the proposed method, while more complex than stationary strategies, scales quite well with large amount of data and may be compatible with real time 2D- as well as 3D-imaging.

**VI. Conclusion**

This work presents a model of a spatially-varying point spread function (PSF) in the context of 2D ultrasound imaging. A mathematical formulation of the PSF operator is derived as a mapping from the tissue reflectivity function (TRF) to its blurred estimate denoted as the radio-frequency image (RF). The proposed formulation is based on a sequential split of
the PSF into a propagation operator which relates the TRF to the measured echo signals, and a DAS operator which forms the RF image from the echo signals. The two operators are interpreted in terms of the pulse-echo spatio-temporal impulse response model in the continuous domain and benefit from computationally efficient discrete counterparts based on parametric formulations of time-of-flight equations and interpolation on appropriate grids. Such formulations allow the PSF operator to scale linearly with the number of image grid points and make non-stationary deconvolution compatible with real-time applications when implemented on parallel architectures.

The proposed model of the PSF is injected into a maximum-a-posteriori deconvolution algorithm and it is demonstrated through simulated and in vivo examples that the deconvolution approach with the proposed kernel outperforms the most recent state-of-the-art deconvolution methods based on a stationary kernel in terms of image quality. We eventually discuss some possible improvements of the proposed model, i.e. by leveraging the planar or spherical wavefront assumption and taking into account effects related to the 3D propagation.

APPENDIX A

FAST ITERATIVE SHRINKAGE THRESHOLDING ALGORITHM AND PROXIMITY OPERATORS

A. Fast Iterative Shrinkage Thresholding Algorithm

This section briefly presents the fast iterative shrinkage thresholding algorithm (FISTA) used to solve Problem (42). For an in-depth description of the method, please refer to [32]. FISTA is an accelerated version of the well-known iterative soft thresholding algorithm (ISTA), that can be used to solve the following problem:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} \|y - Ax\|_2^2 + \phi(x),$$

where $y \in \mathbb{R}^M$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$, $\phi : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ is a non-smooth convex regularizer.

In order to solve Problem (44), FISTA is composed of an acceleration step and a proximal gradient steps described in Algorithm 1. The proximal gradient step involves the following proximity operator [34]:

$$\text{prox}_\phi(x; \lambda) = \arg \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^N} \lambda \phi(z) + \frac{1}{2} \|z - x\|_2^2. \quad (45)$$

Algorithm 1: FISTA used to solve Problem (44)

**Require:** $A, \phi, y, L \geq \lambda_{max} (A^T A)$

**initialization:** $i = 1, t_0 = 1, x_0 = 0$

**repeat**

$$t_i \leftarrow \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4 t_{i-1}^2}}{2}$$

$$\alpha_i \leftarrow \frac{1 - t_{i-1}}{t_i}$$

$$c_i \leftarrow \alpha_i x_{i-2} + (1 - \alpha_i) x_{i-1}$$

$$x_i \leftarrow \text{prox}_\phi \left( c_i + \frac{1}{L} A^T (y - Ac_i) \right)$$

$i \leftarrow i + 1$

**until** stopping criterion

**return** $x_i$

In Algorithm 1, $\lambda_{max}(A^T A)$ denotes the highest eigenvalue of $A^T A$.

B. Proximity operators associated with the $\ell_p$-norm

We consider the proximity operator defined in (45), where $\phi(x) = \|x\|_p^p$ and $p \geq 1$. Thanks to the separability of the two functions involved in the proximity operator, the problem can
be solved element-wise. According to Table 10.2 of [34], the following equivalence holds:

\[ z_i = \arg \min_{z_i \in \mathbb{R}} \lambda |z_i|^p + \frac{1}{2} (z_i - x_i)^2, \quad \forall (x_i, z_i) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}, \lambda > 0 \]  
\[ \iff z_i = \text{sign}(x_i) \max(|x_i| - \lambda, 0), \]  

(46)

Thus, in order to derive the proximity operator associated with the \( f_p \)-norm, one has to solve (47), which, in the general case, involves finding roots of a polynomial with arbitrarily high degree and can be achieved using Newton’s method.

For specific values of \( p \), the polynomial may have a degree lower or equal to 3. In such cases, (47) has an analytical solution. This is the case for the values of \( p \) considered in the study:

a) Case \( p = 1 \): The solution of (47) is immediately deduced as:

\[ z_i = \text{sign}(x_i) \max(|x_i| - \lambda, 0), \]  

(48)

which is the well-known soft-thresholding operator.

b) Case \( p = 3/2 \): The solution of (47) involves to find the positive root of the following polynomial of order 2:

\[ 0 = q + \frac{3}{2} \lambda q^{1/2} - |x_i| \]  
\[ \iff 0 = q^2 - \left( 2|x_i| - \frac{9}{4} \lambda^2 \right) q + x_i^2 \geq q \]  
\[ \iff q = \frac{|x_i| + \frac{9}{8} \lambda^2}{1 - \sqrt{\frac{16}{9} |x_i| + \lambda^2}}. \]  

(50)

Using Cardano’s method and after several calculations not detailed here, one may obtain the following value of \( q \):

\[ q = |x_i| + \frac{1}{9} \left( \frac{16 \cdot 2^{1/3} \cdot \lambda^2}{(z + 27|x_i|)^{1/3}} - 2 \lambda (z + 27|x_i|)^{1/3} \right) \]  
\[ z = \sqrt{256 \lambda^3 + 729|x_i|^2}. \]  

(52)
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