A Channel Domain Higher-Order SVD Clutter Rejection Filter for Small Vessel Ultrasound Imaging
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Abstract—For robust blood flow imaging, filters are used to suppress undesirable noise and clutter signals. In this work, we present a higher-order singular value decomposition (HOSVD) filtering framework. This method is based on a HOSVD applied to a tensor of aperture data, with spatial, slow-time, and channel dimensions. We demonstrate that this HOSVD filtering method can outperform conventional singular value decomposition filters. Preliminary validation of this technique is shown using Field II simulations and in vivo data.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Power Doppler imaging, a preferred technique for blood flow visualization, is susceptible to degradation caused by thermal noise and acoustic “clutter” signals, which arise from reverberation, off-axis scattering, and tissue [1], [2]. These sources of degradation particularly impede visualization of small vasculature, as low velocity blood echoes are often close to the noise floor and can exhibit similar temporal characteristics to clutter signals [3].

To improve sensitivity toward blood flow, clutter rejection filters are applied. Conventionally, clutter rejection is achieved using IIR, FIR, or regression filters, which operate along temporal series of Doppler data [3]–[5]. More recently, singular value decomposition (SVD) filters have emerged as a robust alternative to conventional methods. The primary motivation to use SVD filters is that they are inherently adaptive, as the singular vector basis functions are defined by the variance properties of the data. In comparison, conventional filters may be insufficient if complex tissue and blood motion characteristics reside in the same Fourier or polynomial bases. Further, SVD filters can operate on 1-D (temporal) or 2-D (spatiotemporal) data, which expands the feature space for signal classification. As a result, singular value decomposition (SVD) filters can achieve superior performance over conventional methods [1], [6]–[8].

Higher-order singular value decomposition (HOSVD) filters have recently been proposed to further improve filtering performance [9]. HOSVD has been successfully employed in a multi-rate clutter filtering methodology, initially proposed by Kim et al. [9], [10]. This method has been termed multi-rate because it employs two temporal dimensions: the pulse (slow-time) dimension, which is sampled on the slow-time interval at the pulse repetition frequency, and the Doppler frame dimension, which constitutes a set of pulses. Multi-rate HOSVD has been shown to improve sensitivity toward perfusion in a variety of applications, including for murine [9], [10], tumor [11], and testicular [12] imaging.

However, SVD and multi-rate HOSVD methods of signal separation both predominantly rely on temporal and spatial features. Concurrently, several adaptive beamforming schemes have proposed aperture domain features for clutter mitigation [13]–[16]. This suggests that the aperture data, e.g. delayed channel data, may be leveraged for power Doppler clutter rejection filtering. In addition, several blood flow imaging methods have recently been proposed which rely on clutter rejection operations applied to channel data [17], [18] or sub-aperture data [19], [20], respectively.

We present a clutter rejection filter that uses a HOSVD applied to a tensor of aperture data. We demonstrate that using a multidimensional approach that leverages spatial, slow-time, and channel features can enable greater clutter rejection. Efficacy is shown using simulated and in vivo liver data.

II. BACKGROUND

A. SVD Clutter Rejection Filtering

To perform SVD filtering on Doppler RF data, the depth and lateral spatial extents are often combined in a Casorati form [7]. This produces a 2-D data matrix, \( X \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times N} \) with \( M \) spatial samples and \( N \) frames. After decomposing the data into its constituent singular value and vector matrices, filtering is performed by weighting or zeroing components that correspond to clutter or noise. The set of components to remove is determined manually or with a classifier that leverages \textit{a priori} assumptions about the data features [6]–[8], [21]. After clutter rejection, the filtered matrix is reconstructed.

B. Higher-Order Singular Value Decomposition

Higher-order singular value decomposition (HOSVD) is the extension of the singular value decomposition to tensors, and a generalization of the Tucker decomposition. The HOSVD of a
3-D aperture data tensor, $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times N \times K}$, composed of $M$ spatial samples, $N$ channels, and $K$ frames, is given by

$$\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{G} \times_1 \mathbf{U} \times_2 \mathbf{V} \times_3 \mathbf{W} \quad (1)$$

where $\times_n$ indicates the mode-$n$ product [22]. HOSVD yields a core tensor, $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times N \times K}$, and three unitary matrices: $\mathbf{U}$, $\mathbf{V}$, and $\mathbf{W}$. The unitary matrices are composed of singular vectors, which characterize the dominant features of the data. Our methodology produces singular vectors that correspond to spatial ($\mathbf{U}$), temporal ($\mathbf{V}$), and channel ($\mathbf{W}$) dimensions.

The singular values, which indicate the magnitude of each singular vector, can be computed from the core tensor, $\mathbf{G}$, via a Frobenius norm. For example, the spatial singular values can be computed as

$$\lambda_m^{(1)} = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{K} |g_{m,n,k}|^2. \quad (2)$$

C. Higher-Order Singular Value Decomposition Filter

The HOSVD filtering process is similar to SVD filtering, and is characterized by (1) decomposition of the Doppler data, (2) classification of the dominant signal type contained in each orthogonal component, and (3) rejection of the components corresponding to clutter and noise. We define the HOSVD filter rejection band using four cutoffs, $\{c_t, c_r, c_a, c_s\}$.

Filtering is performed by reducing or zeroing the clutter-dominant components. Therefore, we define the blood core tensor, $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}$, as

$$\tilde{g}_{m,n,k} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } c_s \leq m \leq M \\ 0 & \text{for } c_a \leq n \leq N \\ 0 & \text{for } k \leq c_t, \text{and } k \geq c_r \\ g_{m,n,k} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

and filtered dataset as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = \tilde{\mathbf{G}} \times_1 \mathbf{U} \times_2 \mathbf{V} \times_3 \mathbf{W}. \quad (4)$$

Finally, the beamsum and power estimation are performed, yielding the power Doppler image, $\mathbf{P}_{HOSVD}$.

### Table 1

**Optimal Performance Study Cutoff Ranges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Increment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$c_t$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$K-2$</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_r$</td>
<td>$c_t+2$</td>
<td>$K$</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_a$</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_s$</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

combined using a -40 dB blood-to-tissue ratio and a -45 dB noise-to-tissue ratio.

To assess performance, the HOSVD filter was compared to a SVD filter applied to RF data ($\mathbf{P}_{SVD}$) and to a novel SVD filter applied to the mode-3 unfolded aperture data ($\mathbf{P}_{SVD-a}$), with dimensions of frames $\times$ space $\times$ channels.

B. Cutoff Optimization Study

To assess the optimal performance of the filter, a set of power Doppler images were formed by manually defining the HOSVD cutoffs in a bounded grid search over the ranges depicted in Table 1. The reference SVD filters were manually tuned over the $c_t$ and $c_r$ ranges. The filter performance was assessed using measures of contrast, defined as,

$$\text{Contrast} = 10 \times \log_{10} \left( \frac{\tilde{P}_{\text{blood}}}{\tilde{P}_{\text{background}}} \right) \quad (5)$$

and the contrast-to-noise ratio (CNR),

$$\text{CNR} = 10 \times \log_{10} \left( \frac{\tilde{P}_{\text{blood}} - \tilde{P}_{\text{background}}}{\sigma_{\text{background}}} \right) \quad (6)$$

In addition, blood flow detectability was measured using the area under the receiver-operator curve (AUC) as described by Chee et al. [28]. Since the optimal contrast, CNR, and AUC may
correspond to unique cutoff choices, each performance metric was optimized separately. Ensembles of 50 frames were used.

C. In Vivo Data

Liver data was collected from a healthy adult male subject in agreement with local Institutional Review Board (IRB) protocol. Channel data was acquired using a C5-2 probe on a Verasonics research system (Verasonics Inc., Kirkland, WA), with a sequence composed of nine angled plane wave transmits evenly spaced from -4º to 4º. The pulse was designed with a $f_0$ of 4.167 MHz and $f_0$ of 16.68 MHz. PWSF was applied, producing a net PRF of 600 Hz. Power Doppler images were generated to assess feasibility for clinical imaging applications.

IV. RESULTS

A. Simulated Data

As shown in Figure 2, the HOSVD produced a higher maximum contrast of 19.99 ± 1.97 dB, compared to SVD (14.48 ± 3.13 dB) and SVD-a (19.54 ± 2.21 dB). Similarly, HOSVD produced a higher maximum CNR (22.11 ± 1.72 dB versus 15.59 ± 3.7 dB for SVD and 21.88 ± 1.81 dB for SVD-a). This demonstrates that HOSVD can outperform conventional SVD filtering in an ideal setting.

B. In Vivo Study

In vivo feasibility is demonstrated in liver data, as shown in Figure 3, which depicts the $P_{HOSVD}$, $P_{SVD}$, and $P_{SVD-a}$ images. HOSVD produced greater rejection of clutter and noise, yielding a contrast of 16.20 dB and CNR of 22.72 dB. In comparison, the SVD filter produced a contrast of 14.61 dB and CNR of 20.47 dB, and the SVD-a filter produced a contrast of 15.00 dB and CNR of 21.45 dB. Qualitatively, vasculature is more readily observed with HOSVD filtering in comparison to SVD and SVD-a.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We demonstrate a methodology for clutter rejection filtering using a HOSVD filter, which can achieve greater suppression of clutter and noise without loss of blood flow sensitivity. In a future publication, specific features of aperture data will be assessed for the classification of clutter and noise signals.
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