

对比 FBP、ASIR 算法对常规剂量腹部 CT 脏器图像质量的影响

战红雪

东阳市中医院 浙江 东阳 322100

【摘要】: 目的: 对比 FBP、ASIR 算法对常规剂量腹部 CT 脏器图像质量的影响。方法: 2019 年 1 月至 2021 年 12 月, 选取 80 例常规剂量腹部 CT 检查患者, 分为 4 组: A 组 (20 例)、B 组 (20 例)、C 组 (20 例)、D 组 (20 例)。A 组采用 FBP 算法, B 组采用 ASIR 40% 算法, C 组采用 ASIR 20% 算法, D 组采用 ASIR 10% 算法。结果: 4 组患者 CT 图像的信噪比 (SNR) 和噪声比 (NR) 均存在显著差异 ($P < 0.05$)。结论: 40% ASIR 算法对常规剂量腹部 CT 脏器图像质量的影响优于 FBP 算法。

【关键词】: CT

Comparing the Effects of FBP and ASIR Algorithms on the Image Quality of Conventional-dose Abdominal CT Organs

Hongxue Zhan

Dongyang Hospital of Traditional Chinese Medicine Zhejiang Dongyang 322100

Abstract: Objective: To compare and study the influence of filtered back projection and adaptive statistical iterative reconstruction algorithms on the image quality of viscera during routine dose abdominal CT examination. Methods: a total of 80 patients who received routine dose upper abdominal CT examination in our hospital from January 2019 to December 2021 were selected, including 20 patients with liver disease, 20 patients with spleen disease, 20 patients with pancreatic disease and 20 patients with kidney disease. They were defined as group A, B, C and D respectively. The filtered back projection method is used to process the image, which is defined as group a 1, group B 1, group C 1, group D 1; Then 40% adaptive statistical iterative reconstruction method is used to process the image, which is defined as group a 2, group B 2, group C 2 and group D 2. The standard deviation of objective measurement parameters, signal-to-noise ratio and noise ratio of groups a, B, C and D were compared. Results: The standard deviation of objective measurement parameters in group a 1 was higher than that in group a 2 ($P < 0.05$); Group B 1 was higher than group B 2, and the comparison between groups was $p < 0.05$; Group C 1 was higher than group C 2 ($P < 0.05$); Group D 1 was higher than group D 2 ($P < 0.05$). The signal-to-noise ratio and noise ratio of group a 1 were lower than those of group a 2, and the comparison between groups was $p < 0.05$; Group B 1 was lower than group B 2 ($P < 0.05$); Group C 1 was lower than group C 2 ($P < 0.05$); Group D 1 was lower than group D 2 ($P < 0.05$). Conclusion: The image quality processed by 40% adaptive statistical iterative reconstruction in the routine dose abdominal CT examination is more ideal than the filtered back projection method, which can better help reduce the noise level, improve the image quality, provide more reliable basis for clinical diagnosis, prevent misdiagnosis and missed diagnosis, and strive for more effective treatment time for patients.

Keywords: Conventional dose; Abdomen; CT; Adaptive statistical iterative reconstruction; Filtering back projection method

CT

[1]

[2-3] CT 1.4
 SPSS22.0 P 0.05 X² t

1 资料和方法 [n %] $\bar{x} \pm s$

1.1 2 结果

2019 1 -2021 12 21

CT 80 20 1 2

20 20 P 0.05 1 2

13 7 23-75 41.9± 6.5 1

1-18 5.4± 0.7 12

8 21-74 41.6± 6.3

1-16 5.2± 0.5 14

6 24-72 41.8± 6.6

1-15 5.1± 0.6 13

7 25-78 41.7± 6.8 1-17

5.2± 0.4 P

0.05

1.2

1 CT 1 40% 1

2 2 2 2

1 CT

CT

120kV

1.375 smartmA,

5.0mm 10

0.6s/r

2 CT

0.625mm 350HU

40HU 1 1 2

1 1 40% 2

2 2 2

1.3

1 3 2

2 4

	(n)			
1	20	25.22± 1.98	2.63± 0.49	9.06± 3.24
2	20	19.03± 1.86	3.91± 0.25	12.53± 3.25
t		7.135	3.117	4.756
P		0.05	0.05	0.05

2.2

1 2

P 0.05 1 2

P 0.05 2

	(n)			
1	20	24.80± 1.75	2.73± 0.30	9.13± 2.06
2	20	18.05± 2.03	4.08± 0.55	11.94± 2.41
t		7.863	3.527	4.021
P		0.05	0.05	0.05

2.3

1 2

P 0.05 1 2

P 0.05 3

	(n)			
1	20	27.48± 3.19	2.03± 0.26	9.08± 2.16
2	20	20.81± 2.64	3.24± 0.51	12.00± 2.54
t		9.137	3.105	4.263
P		0.05	0.05	0.05

2.4

1 2

P 0.05 1 2

P 0.05 4

4

40%

	(n)			
1	20	25.48± 3.12	4.16± 0.61	8.12± 1.37
2	20	19.76± 2.85	5.99± 0.84	11.86± 2.33
t		7.821	3.004	4.851
P		0.05	0.05	0.05

3 讨论

CT

[4]

[5]

CT

[6]

CT

[7]

CT

[8]

CT

参考文献:

- [1] , , , . CT ASIR [J]. ,2017,27(6):1128- 1129.
- [2] , , , . CT [J]. ,2017,52(6):887- 888.
- [3] , , , . CT [J]. , 2018, 34(4): 605- 606.
- [4] , , , . [J]. , 2017,33(4): 603- 604.
- [5] , , , . CT [J]. ,2018,34(3):438- 439.
- [6] , , , . CT [J]. ,2018,34(1):118- 119.
- [7] , , , . CT ASIR [J]. ,2017,33(16):2769- 2770.
- [8] , , , . CT [J]. ,2018,38(4):311- 312.