Adjusting kV to Reduce Dose or Improve Image Quality - How to Do it Right

J. G. Fletcher, MD

Associate Professor of Radiology

CT Clinical Innovation Center

Department of Radiology

Mayo Clinic, Rochester MN

DISCLOSURES

Research Support:

Siemens Healthcare

Off Label Usage

None

Background

- Majority of abdominal CT scans: 120 kV
- It is possible to reduce to 80-90 kV*
- Benefits of low-kV CT:
  - Radiation dose reduction**
  - Increased contrast provides increased conspicuity to enhancing lesions and structures ***



80 kV 120 kV

*Funama, et al., Radiology 2005
*Nakayama, et al., Radiology 2005
**Ende, et al., Invest Radiol 1999
**Huda, et al., Med Phys 2004
***Nakayama, et al. AJR 2006
*** Macari, et al. AJR 2010



Lower-kV Benefits –
Increased Iodine Contrast





Lower-kV Benefits – Increased Iodine Contrast



120 kV, $CTDI_{vol}$=5.18 mGy



100 kV, $CTDI_{vol}$=3.98 mGy

Lower-kV Benefits – Reduced Radiation Dose



Lower-kV Risks – Increased Noise or Artifacts

The appropriateness of using lower-kV is highly dependent on patient size and diagnostic task

Overview

- How does kV affect iodine enhancement and noise?
- How does patient size affect this relationship?
- How can I safely pick lower kV imaging without sacrificing diagnostic image quality?
- Who is going to benefit from low kV imaging?
- How can I integrate lower kV imaging into my practice?
- How do lower kV images look different?
- Future of lower kV imaging

*How does kV affect **iodine** enhancement?*



- Iodine att'n at 80 kV twice that of 140 kV
- Relative to iodine att'n at 120 kV
  - 70% higher at 80 kV
  - 25% higher at 100 kV

From Bodily et al. RSNA 2008

How does kV affect **water** enhancement?



- Relative contrast changes only hold for high atomic number substances
  - Iodine, barium
  - *NOT* water, soft tissue, calcium

Courtesy Dr. Lifeng Yu
Bruesewitz et al. RSNA 2009

How does kV affect iodine enhancement?



80 kV
1193 HU



120 kV
695 HU



140 kV



80 kV

Relative Contrast Differences due to Iodine Also Increase at Low kV



120 kV



100 kV

Relative Contrast Differences due to Iodine Also Increase at Low kV

140 kV

80 kV

Macari M et al. AJR 2010

How does kV affect iodine noise?



For large patients, lower kV imaging can result in excessive beam hardening and other artifacts



80 kV imaging with excessive artifacts limiting diagnostic quality


80 kV
100 kV
120 kV
140 kV
10 cm
25 cm
40 cm
Courtesy Dr. Lifeng Yu

Low kV Imaging: Maintaining Image Quality

- Issue is noise (patient size)
  - Organ of interest
  - Measurements of size



Guimaraes et al. RSNA 2008

- 116 pts undergoing 80 kV CT
- 2 – 3 mm slices
- IQ, artifact, confidence
- Multiple pt size measures

Association of Patient Size with Unacceptability

	Odds Ratio	p-value
14 x 1.2 mm		
Liver	**2.5**	**0.005**
Pancreas	**1.9**	**0.014**
Kidneys	**1.2**	**0.42**
Ileum	**1.4**	**0.11**
64 x 0.6 mm		
Liver	**1.8**	**0.005**
Pancreas	**2.0**	**0.014**
Kidneys	**4.8**	**0.42**
Ileum	**1.7**	**0.11**

Association of Patient Size with Unacceptability

cm	14 x 1.2 mm	64 x 0.6 mm
	≥ 90% Sensitivity	≥ 90% Sensitivity
Liver	**36**	**33**
Pancreas	**35**	**34**
Kidney	**36***	**37**
Ileum	**35***	**35**

Dimension cut-offs (cm) that would achieve **≥90%** sensitivity and **≥80%** sensitivity for prediction of an unacceptable exam

*** Likely underestimated due to small # of unacceptable cases (n=2 or 3)**

Association of Patient Size with Unacceptability

- Lateral width the best predictor of acceptable image quality

  < 36 cm => 80 kV imaging acceptable

  < 41 cm => 100 kV imaging acceptable

- Larger patients may not be able to undergo low kV imaging
- Patient size selection only insures good quality
  - Dose reduction is considered separately (later)

Who is going to benefit from lower kV imaging?

Who is going to benefit from lower kV imaging?

- Limited IV access
- Limited contrast dose
- Subtle attenuation differences
- Young patients
- Small and medium-sized adult patients

Limited IV access

80 kV

< 1 cc injection over 3 minutes

Limited IV access



2 cc/s with pedal access
Imaged at 85 sec

Who is going to benefit from lower kV imaging?

- Limited IV access
- Limited contrast dose
- Subtle attenuation differences
- Young patients
- Small and medium-sized adult patients

Limited Contrast Dose



80 cc Omnipaque due to solitary kidney

Who is going to benefit from lower kV imaging?

- Limited IV access
- Limited contrast dose
- Subtle attenuation differences
- Young patients
- Small and medium-sized adult patients

Subtle Attenuation Differences

80 kV
45 HU $diff_{lesion\text{-}liver}$



120 kV
21 HU $diff_{lesion\text{-}liver}$

Who is going to benefit from lower kV imaging?

- Limited IV access
- Limited contrast dose
- Subtle attenuation differences
- Young patients
- Small and medium-sized adult patients

Low kV to Lower Radiation Dose



120 kV
17.3 mGy



100 kV
7.71 mGy

Who is going to benefit from lower kV imaging?

- Limited IV access
- Limited contrast dose
- Subtle attenuation differences

Maintain Radiation Dose ($CTDI_{vol}$)

- Young patients
- Small and medium-sized adult patients

↓ Radiation Dose ($CTDI_{vol}$)

Who is going to benefit from lower kV imaging?

- Limited IV access
- Limited contrast dose
- Subtle attenuation differences

Maintain Radiation Dose ($CTDI_{vol}$) → Dose-match / Look-up table

- Young patients
- Small and medium-sized adult patients

↓ Radiation Dose ($CTDI_{vol}$) → Later

Low kV Imaging While Maintaining Dose

- Limited IV access
- Limited contrast dose
- Subtle attenuation differences

- Size < 36 cm => 80 kV
- Size ≤ 41 cm => 100 kV

- Plug protocol from 120 kV scan and record $CTDI_{vol}$
  - Change tube energy
  - Adjust mAs upwards until $CTDI_{vol}$ is achieved
  - Make sure you are operating within tube limits
- Use a look up table with your technique charts

mAs Conversion for Siemens Scanners*			
mAs at 80 kVp	mAs at 100 kVp	mAs at 120 kVp	mAs at 140 kVp
190	90	50	30
230	100	60	40
270	120	70	50
300	140	80	50
340	150	90	60
380	170	100	70
420	190	110	70
460	200	120	80
490	220	130	80
530	240	140	90
570	260	150	100
610	270	160	100
650	290	170	110
680	310	180	120
720	320	190	120
760	340	200	130
800	360	210	140
840	370	220	140
870	390	230	150
910	410	240	160
950	430	250	160
990	440	260	170
1030	460	270	180
1060	480	280	180
1100	490	290	190
1140	510	300	200
1180	530	310	200
1220	540	320	210
1250	560	330	210
1290	580	340	220
1330	600	350	230
1370	610	360	230
1410	630	370	240
1440	650	380	250
1480	660	390	250
1520	680	400	260

*Not all mAs settings may be possible

mAs Conversion for Siemens Scanners*			
mAs at 80 kVp	mAs at 100 kVp	mAs at 120 kVp	mAs at 140 kVp
1560	700	410	270
1600	710	420	270
1630	730	430	280
1670	750	440	290
1710	770	450	290
1750	780	460	300
1790	800	470	310
1820	820	480	310
1860	830	490	320
1900	850	500	330
1940	870	510	330
1980	880	520	340
2010	900	530	340
2050	920	540	350
2090	940	550	360
2130	950	560	360
2170	970	570	370
2200	990	580	380
2240	1000	590	380
2280	1020	600	390
2320	1040	610	400
2360	1050	620	400
2390	1070	630	410
2430	1090	640	420
2470	1110	650	420
2510	1120	660	430
2550	1140	670	440
2580	1160	680	440
2620	1170	690	450
2660	1190	700	460
2700	1210	710	460
2740	1220	720	470
2770	1240	730	470
2810	1260	740	480
2850	1280	750	490
2890	1290	760	490

*Not all mAs settings may be possible

mA Conversion for GE-64 Scanners*			
mA at 80 kVp	mA at 100 kVp	mA at 120 kVp	mA at 140 kVp
160	80	50	40
190	100	60	40
230	110	70	50
260	130	80	60
290	150	90	60
320	160	100	70
350	180	110	80
390	190	120	90
420	210	130	90
450	230	140	100
480	240	150	110
520	260	160	110
550	270	170	120
580	290	180	130
610	310	190	140
650	320	200	140
680	340	210	150
710	350	220	160
740	370	230	160
770	390	240	170
810	400	250	180
840	420	260	190
870	440	270	190
900	450	280	200
940	470	290	210
970	480	300	210
1000	500	310	220
1030	520	320	230
1060	530	330	240
1100	550	340	240
1130	560	350	250
1160	580	360	260
1190	600	370	260
1230	610	380	270
1260	630	390	280
1290	650	400	290

*Not all mA settings may be possible

mA Conversion for GE-64 Scanners*			
mA at 80 kVp	mA at 100 kVp	mA at 120 kVp	mA at 140 kVp
1320	660	410	290
1350	680	420	300
1390	690	430	310
1420	710	440	310
1450	730	450	320
1480	740	460	330
1520	760	470	340
1550	770	480	340
1580	790	490	350
1610	810	500	360
1650	820	510	360
1680	840	520	370
1710	850	530	380
1740	870	540	390
1770	890	550	390
1810	900	560	400
1840	920	570	410
1870	940	580	410
1900	950	590	420
1940	970	600	430
1970	980	610	440
2000	1000	620	440
2030	1020	630	450
2060	1030	640	460
2100	1050	650	460
2130	1060	660	470
2160	1080	670	480
2190	1100	680	490
2230	1110	690	490
2260	1130	700	500
2290	1150	710	510
2320	1160	720	510
2350	1180	730	520
2390	1190	740	530
2420	1210	750	540
2450	1230	760	540

*Not all mA setting may be possible

Low kV Imaging While Reducing Dose

- More complicated
- Need to consider both patient size and diagnostic task into kV selection process
  - Greater the iodine contrast differences, the greater ability to reduce dose for smaller pts
- kV selection *combined with* lowering of dose-matched mAs
- Creates a new technique chart for each diagnostic task

L. Yu, H. Li, J. Fletcher, C. McCollough, Medical Physics, 37(1), 2010.

General Strategy for kV selection

- Iodine CNR is a not a sufficient image quality index
- Must also constrain image noise
- We already know what noise levels we can tolerate

$$\mathbf{CNR \geq CNR_{ref}, \quad and \quad \sigma \leq \alpha \bullet \sigma_{ref}}$$

- Relative dose factor (RD)
  - Determine relative dose at each tube potential needed to achieve the same CNR as at the reference kV
  - Within the noise constraint α (patient size, diagnostic task)

L. Yu, H. Li, J. Fletcher, C. McCollough, Medical Physics, 37(1), 2010.

Here's the idea

Consider 80 kV imaging

↑ Contrast by 70%

L. Yu, H. Li, J. Fletcher, C. McCollough, Medical Physics, 37(1), 2010.

Here's the idea

Consider 80 kV imaging



L. Yu, H. Li, J. Fletcher, C. McCollough, Medical Physics, 37(1), 2010.

Here's the idea

Consider 80 kV imaging

$$\frac{\uparrow \text{Contrast by 70\%}}{\uparrow \text{Noise by 70\%}} \geq \frac{\text{Contrast}_{120}}{\text{Noise}_{120}}$$

L. Yu, H. Li, J. Fletcher, C. McCollough, Medical Physics, 37(1), 2010.

Here's the idea

Consider 80 kV imaging

$$\frac{\uparrow \text{Contrast by 70\%}}{\uparrow \text{Noise by 70\%}} \geq \frac{\text{Contrast}_{120}}{\text{Noise}_{120}}$$

Improved contrast permits the noise level to increase

L. Yu, H. Li, J. Fletcher, C. McCollough, Medical Physics, 37(1), 2010.

Here's the idea

Consider 80 kV imaging

$$\frac{\uparrow \text{Contrast by 70\%}}{\uparrow \text{Noise by 70\%}} \geq \frac{\text{Contrast}_{120}}{\text{Noise}_{120}}$$

Increased noise permits the dose reduction

L. Yu, H. Li, J. Fletcher, C. McCollough, Medical Physics, 37(1), 2010.

Here's the idea

Consider 80 kV imaging

$$\frac{\uparrow \text{Contrast by } 70\%}{\uparrow \text{Noise by } 60\%} \geq \frac{\text{Contrast}_{120}}{\text{Noise}_{120}}$$

As patients get larger (or task requires less noise), the acceptable increase noise (σ) becomes smaller

L. Yu, H. Li, J. Fletcher, C. McCollough, Medical Physics, 37(1), 2010.

Here's the idea

Consider 80 kV imaging

$$\frac{\uparrow \text{Contrast by } 70\%}{\uparrow \text{Noise by } 50\%} \geq \frac{\text{Contrast}_{120}}{\text{Noise}_{120}}$$

As patients get larger (or task requires less noise), the acceptable increase noise (σ) becomes smaller

L. Yu, H. Li, J. Fletcher, C. McCollough, Medical Physics, 37(1), 2010.

Here's the idea

Consider 80 kV imaging

$$\frac{\uparrow \text{Contrast by } 70\%}{\uparrow \text{Noise by } 40\%} \geq \frac{\text{Contrast}_{120}}{\text{Noise}_{120}}$$

As patients get larger (or task requires less noise), the acceptable increase noise (σ) becomes smaller

The dose reduction will also decline

Optimal kV Settings

Optimal kV based on RD for different phantom sizes with different noise constraints

Noise Constraint α	Extra Small	Small	Medium	Large	Extra Large
1.00	80	100	100	120	120
1.25	80	100	100	100	100
1.50	80	80	80	100	100
2.00	80	80	80	100	100

α = 1.0: Routine non-contrast exams

α = 1.25: Routine contrast-enhanced exams

α = 1.5: CTA with minimal noise constraint

α = 2.0: CT exams no noise constraint

Dose Reduction vs Phantom Size



Workflow for kV Selection with Dose Reduction

- Acquire a CT radiograph (e.g., topogram, scout)
- Select a scanning protocol (mAs, pitch) at 120 kV
- Select the noise constraint parameter
  - CT angiogram: minimal noise constraint (α = 1.5-2.0)
  - Routine contrast enhanced chest: moderate noise constraint (α = 1.1-1.25)
  - Routine non-contrast enhanced chest: maximum noise constraint (α = 1.0)
  - Routine contrast-enhanced CT enterography: moderate noise constraint (α = 1.25)
- PhD's - choose the most dose-efficient kV (*with the smallest Relative Dose*), and adjust the mAs, rotation time, and/or pitch
- MD's – use the look-up table for your diagnostic task

patient lateral width

RD at each kV



Image quality index

Final output

How does this work in clinical practice?

- Two GI radiologists recently evaluated experience with two automatic kV selection tools based on this paradigm
- Evaluated image quality, noise level, diagnostic confidence
- Dose savings ranged from 0 – 55%, mean of ~ 20%
- No non-diagnostic studies

How do low kV images look different?

- More contrast, more noise
- Require modified window-level settings, based on radiologist preference

120 kV
17.3 $CTDI_{vol}$

100 kV
11.9 $CTDI_{vol}$

Future of Low kV Imaging

- 100 kV can be practically implemented already in most patients
  - Task-specific technique charts will include kV and mAs selection to perform most dose-efficient exam
  - 140 kV imaging may be most dose-efficient for large pts
- Manufacturers will integrate automatic kV selection tools into the CT system
  - Based on similar principles, but also take automatic exposure control and tube current limits into account
- Provide a new level of individualization for CT imaging (task + patient-specific)
- Combine low kV + noise reduction to reduce dose while increasing conspicuity

full dose mixed image

sig2 B45 ASA

Im: 220+C
S237.0
DFOV 20.8cm
B40f
Aug 23 2007
09:56:13 AM
512 X 512
Mag = 1.54
FL:
ROT:
R
1
0
9
L
9
9

B40f
Mag = 1.33
FL:
ROT:
R
1
2
2
L
1
1
9

Lesion Characterization

20 patients



15 with HCC

3 with metastases

1 cyst

1 indeterminate

56 lesions



Average size = 1.54 cm

80% (45/56) hypervascular

20% (11/56) hypodense

Lesion Conspicuity

	Reader 1	Reader 2	Reader 3	Average
B43 PSD 80kV	0.544	0.357	0.571	0.494
B40 PSD 80kV	0.518	0.482	0.643	0.548
B40 PSD Mixed kV	0.089	0.321	0.143	0.185
B40 No PSD 80kV	0.544	-0.286	0.544	0.274


B43 Denoised 80kV
B40 Mixed kV
B40 Denoised 80kV
B40 Denoised Mixed kV

Conclusions

- Tube energy (kV) selection can benefit your patients
  - Limited IV access, renal insufficiency, iodine-sensitive pathology
  - Dose reduction
- kV selection is dependent upon patient size and diagnostic task (which affect the acceptable noise in the image)
- Several pathways to begin kV modulation in your practice
  - Look-up tables for dose-matched exams
  - Technique charts for specific diagnostic tasks that include patient size and kV
  - New automatic kV selection tools available by manufacturers

Mayo CT Clinic Innovation Center and Dept. of Radiology

http://mayoresearch.mayo.edu/CTCIC