

The Influence of Anti-Scatter Grid Usage for Knee Computerized Radiography

ABSTRACT

Aims: This experimental study investigated the effect of using an anti-scatter grid in computerized knee radiography (CR) on image quality (IQ) and patient surface radiation dose (Equivalent Surface Air Kerma— $K_{a,e}$), measured with an ionization chamber.

Place and Duration of Study: The experimental study was conducted between February 2024 and April 2024, in the radiodiagnosis laboratory belonging to the Medical Physics and Radiology Technology courses at the Franciscan University (UFN) in the city of Santa Maria, Rio Grande do Sul.

Methodology: Utilizing a semi-anatomical knee phantom to simulate clinical examination conditions, ten images were acquired, with five obtained using technique 1 (70 kV, 200mA, and 20mAs) and another five with technique 2 (70 kVp, 200mA, and 5 mAs), with and without an anti-scatter grid, respectively. The phantom images were digitized in a CR system and quantified using a publicly available automatic analyzer software based on histograms and regions of interest (ROI), defined by signal and noise. The obtained results were used to calculate the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), contrast-to-noise ratio (CNR), and radiographic contrast (RC), considered IQ descriptors.

Results: As a selection criterion, the percentage deviation (D%) was chosen, considering technique 1 as the reference concerning technique 2. It was observed that technique 1 showed an SNR 1.20%, RC 3.86%, and $K_{a,e}$ 73.68% higher than technique 2; on the other hand, technique 2 indicated a CNR 4.76% higher compared to technique 1.

Conclusion: It is concluded that technique 2 without an anti-scatter grid may be preferable when considering the principle of optimization, where the dose is significantly reduced without a significant loss in IQ descriptors.

Keywords: Imaging Radiodiagnosis; Process Optimization; Radiography; Knee; Scattering Radiation; Signal-to-Noise Ratio.

1. INTRODUCTION

Computerized radiography (CR) of the knee is widely utilized as an accessible and economical method for the majority of the population, with an approximate incidence of 23.2% compared to other examinations [1]. During the radiographic examination, the acquisition of information regarding internal structure occurs through the interaction of X-rays, resulting in a primary component and another in radiation scatter [2].

Recent studies by Abela et al. [3] highlighted that the use of anti-scatter grids in knee examinations enhances image quality (IQ) by reducing radiation scatter. This may necessitate a considerable increase in radiation dose to the patient; however, they concluded that the use of anti-scatter grids may be omitted in certain knee thicknesses without significant loss in IQ.

Assessment of IQ can be conducted qualitatively and quantitatively. The former pertains to the visual perception of diagnostic features in the image, crucial for clinical diagnosis, while the latter involves physical measurements such as signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) and contrast-to-noise ratio (CNR), which are descriptors related to contrast, resolution, and noise in the image [4,5].

Radiation dose measurements are based on readings of Air Kerma, representing the energy deposited in the detector due to the interaction of the primary X-ray beam when adjusted for the distance between the X-ray focus and anatomy, namely, Entrance Skin Air Kerma ($K_{a,e}$) [6].

Excessive or insufficient X-ray exposures during radiographic examinations can result in images with little diagnostic value. The prevalence of interaction types, absorption, and/or scatter, is directly correlated with the energy of the involved radiations. In extremity examinations, such as knee examinations, the photoelectric effect predominates, while the decision regarding the use of anti-scatter grid is delicate due to anatomical location and patient biotype. Consequently, part of the incident photons on the tissue is absorbed, while the rest undergoes Compton scattering, responsible for X-ray scatter [7].

The implementation of the exposure index (EI) in digital systems (DS) has provided radiology professionals with an exposure parameter for the image receptor [8]. EI provides feedback on the radiation dose to the detector and the level of noise present in the image, if the reference value established by the DS manufacturer is not achieved [9]. Thus, the objective of this study was to evaluate the influence of anti-scatter grid use on IQ descriptors and radiation dose in anteroposterior (AP) knee examinations in CR systems.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study was conducted in the radiodiagnosis laboratory, affiliated with the courses of Medical Physics and Radiology Technology, as an integral part of ongoing investigations within the disciplines of Radiodiagnosis and Procedures III, which are part of the curriculum at Franciscana University (UFN) in the city of Santa Maria, Rio Grande do Sul.

2.1 Image Acquisition and Radiation Dose Measurement

In this study, a radiographic system Intecal, model Radiologist's House (MAAF) (manufactured in July 2010, Brazil), and a digital image scanning system for CR from Carestream, model Vitaflex (manufactured in August 2018), were employed. The radiographic system was used for image acquisition and measurements of $K_{a,e}$, operating within a voltage range between 40 and 120 kV and an electric current between 100 and 630 mA, coupled with a high-frequency generator.

For image acquisition, a semi-anatomical phantom was used to simulate clinical examination conditions, with a thickness of 12 cm (Figure 1). Ten images (radiographs) were obtained with the same cassette, five of them acquired with technique 1 using a grid with a 10:1 ratio (52 lines/cm) (Figure 1A), and the other five with technique 2 without anti-scatter grid (Figure 1B), maintaining a fixed distance from the source to the phantom surface of 1 meter.

A RADICALdosimetric set, model 9015, was positioned and aligned with the sensitive area of the ionization chamber above the phantom, representing the patient's surface. A total of 10 exposures were performed as shown in Figure 1C. For each group of five $K_{a,e}$ measurements for each technique, we calculated the mean value to reduce random error.




Fig. 1 - Exposure geometry for image acquisition of the semi-anatomical phantom and radiation dose measurement.

To digitize the images, a cassette of 24cm x 30cm, an imaging plate (IP) with a spatial resolution of 10 pixels/mm, and a resolution scale of 16 bits/pixel were used. This IP was processed in the reader of the CR system itself, and the resulting images were displayed on the workstation monitor. The electrical parameters, voltage (kV), and current-time product (mAs) selected on the control panel of the radiographic system are indicated in Table 1.

Table 1 - Selected electrical parameters for each exposure technique

Electrical parameters	Technique 1 (With grid)	Technique 2 (Without grid)
Voltage(kV)	70	70
mA.s	20	5

In our study, we kept the type of examination (knee), field size, beam energy (kV), and electrical current at 200mA constant for both techniques.

2.2 Image Quality

Quantitative evaluation of the images was facilitated by the public domain computational program ImageJ [10]. The program allowed for the generation of histograms for each image, displaying a graph in a new window. The histogram stands out as a useful tool for evaluating the intensity spectrum of the image matrix and quantifying the average signal and noise values. To quantify an overall analysis of IQ, the Signal-to-Noise Ratio (SNR).

$$SNR = \frac{\text{Average of signal values}}{\text{Average of noise values}} \quad (1)$$

To identify regions of interest (ROI), the signal and noise of the captured images were selected in six specific areas for each examination/anatomy. These regions were defined in the image according to the following criteria: the first region was centered on the Medial Femoral Condyle (MFC), the second on the Lateral Femoral Condyle (LFC), the third on the Medial Tibial Condyle (MTC), the fourth on the Lateral Tibial Condyle (LTC), the fifth on the Femur, and the sixth on the Background ROI, representing the image background without

anatomy. All regions were delineated circularly and had the same area (101,997 mm²), as shown in Figure 2.



Fig. 2. Position of enumerated ROI/Anatomy. The first region was focused on the Medial Femoral Condyle (MFC), the second on the Lateral Femoral Condyle (LFC), the third on the Medial Tibial Condyle (MTC), the fourth on the Lateral Tibial Condyle (LTC), the fifth on the Femur, and the sixth on the Background ROI, representing the image background without anatomy.

For each image, we evaluated the mean signal value (average of pixels) of each Region of Interest (ROI), as well as the corresponding noise (standard deviation). In pursuit of a comprehensive analysis of IQ, we calculated the Signal-to-Noise Ratio (SNR) and Contrast-to-Noise Ratio (CNR) for each ROI/Anatomy. The signal and noise values of each ROI were assessed following the methodology of Mraity et al. [11], to obtain a comprehensive analysis of IQ, according to Equations 2 and 3, respectively.

$$SNR = \frac{SignalAverageROIs_{1;2;3;4;5}}{BackgroundNoiseROI_{6}} \quad (2)$$

$$CNR = \left| \frac{Average\ background\ signal\ values_{(ROI\ 6)} - Average\ signal\ values_{(ROI\ 1)}}{BackgroundNoiseROI_{6}} \right| \quad (3)$$

To evaluate the radiographic contrast (RC), the mean signal difference between ROI 1 (MFC) and ROI 6 (background) was chosen, as per Equation 4.

$$RC = (ROI\ 1) - (ROI\ 6) \quad (4)$$

The Signal-to-Noise Ratio (SNR) reflects the system's ability to detect signal intensity variations relative to background noise, indicating sensitivity to image resolution [4]. On the other hand, the Contrast-to-Noise Ratio (CNR) expresses the relationship between the intensity difference between two areas in the image and background noise, highlighting the ability to distinguish different levels of contrast in the image [12]. Radiographic Contrast (RC)

represents the difference between signal intensities in two areas of interest in the image, offering a direct measure of contrast resolution [4].

As a criterion for selection due to the absence of established reference values to define the limits of IQ descriptors in radiodiagnosis, these values were considered those measured in the reference images acquired with technique 1 (with grid). To compare the acquired images with the reference image, the use of percent deviation (D%) was chosen, as per Equation 5.


$$D(\%) = \left[\left(\frac{\text{Technique1 (Withgrid)}}{\text{Technique2 (Withoutgrid)}} \right) - 1 \right] \times 100 \quad (5)$$

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In Figure 3, the 10 radiographs obtained from the phantom along with their respective histograms and signal and noise values for each ROI are presented. The signal values represent the average intensity of the radiographic signal, while the noise values represent the average variation of the signal around this mean value.

Images obtained with anti-scatter grid

Images obtained without anti-scatter grid






Fig. 3. Images and their respective Histograms and ROIs/Anatomy obtained with the ImageJ program.

3.1 Dosimetry and Image Quality Results

In Table 2, the average values of $K_{a,e}$ readings in milligrays (mGy) obtained with the dosimetric set are represented, as well as the mean signal and noise values obtained from the histograms of each image and their respective Exposure Index (EI) values obtained with technique 1 (with grid) and technique 2 (without grid). With the IQ values, it was possible to calculate the Signal-to-Noise Ratio (SNR) using Equation 1 and perform the analysis of the results. In addition, the EI values were within and even below the maximum value set by the manufacturer, which considers the optimum values to be between 1800 and 2500.

Table 2 - Relationship of measured values of readings with techniques 1 and 2, as well as the mean value and standard deviation (SD).

Readings	Technique											
	1		2		1		2		1		2	
	Radiation dose				IQ (Histograms)				Exposure Indicator			
	K _{a,e} (mGy)		Image	Signal	Noise	Signal	Noise	EI				
Readings 1	2,492	0,660	Image 1	982,1	994,86	888,65	958,93	1871	2192			
Readings 2	2,496	0,651	Image 2	863,45	946,1	905,89	964,66	2279	2132			
Readings 3	2,507	0,658	Image 3	856,19	935,39	857,17	971,36	2276	2183			
Readings 4	2,502	0,661	Image 4	982,34	1010,94	930,21	1032,26	1866	1944			
Readings 5	2,502	0,660	Image 5	993,66	1000,83	757,88	895,62	1828	2371			
Average	2,500	0,658	Average	935,55	977,62	867,96	964,56	2024	2164,4			
SD	0,006	0,004	SNR	0,96		0,9		-	-			
D%	-73,68%		D%	-6,25%				6,94%				

In Table 2, it is observed that the average K_{a,e} readings for exams with a grid are 2.500 mGy, whereas for exams without a grid, it is 0.658 mGy. This indicates that the K_{a,e} readings for exams performed with a grid are consistently higher compared to exams performed without a grid (3.794 times higher). From the histogram results, it is evident that, on average, images obtained with an anti-scatter grid (technique 1) exhibit a relatively higher SNR (0.96) compared to images obtained without an anti-scatter grid (0.90). Tables 3 and 4 represent the mean signal and noise values obtained using ImageJ from the ROI/Anatomy for techniques 1 and 2, respectively.

Table 3 - Average Signal and Noise values obtained with technique 1 (with anti-scatter grid) for each ROI/Anatomy.

ROI	Anatomy	Image 1		Image 2		Image 3		Image 4		Image 5	
		Signal	Noise	Signal	Noise	Signal	Noise	Signal	Noise	Signal	Noise
1	MFC	2270,8	197,5	2159,8	179,5	2105,4	194,3	2381,9	166,0	2309,3	173,9
2	LFC	2558,5	368,5	2493,7	334,0	2416,8	407,3	2645,9	322,2	2653,7	300,5
3	MTC	1483,2	219,4	1191,3	199,1	1154,2	192,2	1476,0	205,0	1470,4	203,5
4	LTC	2004,4	153,7	1749,7	153,2	1770,0	168,5	1986,1	148,1	2029,0	144,5
5	Femur	2332,4	93,0	2208,5	102,5	2151,3	94,1	2422,9	143,1	2348,1	104,7
6	Background	100,7	4,8	59,1	4,8	60,4	2,5	92,7	5,6	100,0	6,1

Table 4 - Average Signal and Noise values obtained with technique 2 (without anti-scatter grid) for each ROI/Anatomy.

Image 1	Image 2	Image 3	Image 4	Image 5
---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

ROI	Anatomy	Signal	Noise	Signal	Noise	Signal	Noise	Signal	Noise	Signal	Noise
1	MFC	2304,3	126,0	2297,7	124,6	2190,8	145,9	2451,9	118,4	1997,7	128,1
2	LFC	2210,7	161,4	2274,3	130,0	2437,1	160,4	2508,4	143,0	2277,5	173,0
3	MTC	1339,8	169,9	1345,2	158,7	1322,0	187,1	1580,4	172,5	1065,1	164,0
4	LTC	1611,9	123,1	1637,9	109,7	1832,5	140,5	1888,6	126,8	1623,3	131,0
5	Femur	2153,0	72,3	2146,3	81,3	2235,0	81,8	2413,6	75,0	2064,4	84,1
6	Background	59,5	4,0	59,6	4,2	55,1	3,1	75,9	5,7	38,5	4,7

In Tables 3 and 4, a variation in signal and noise values among different ROIs/anatomies is observed, concerning the images obtained with technique 1 and technique 2, respectively. In Table 3, ROI 2 (CFL) exhibits the highest signal and noise values compared to other ROIs, suggesting a high signal quality and a reasonable amount of noise. In Table 4, ROI 1 CFM (medial femoral condyle) shows relatively high signal and noise values compared to other ROIs, suggesting good signal quality and a reasonable amount of noise. However, in both techniques, ROI 6 (Background) presents the lowest signal and noise values, indicating weak signal and minimal noise, as expected for areas outside the region of interest. Table 5 represents the calculated values of SNR and CNR for the images obtained with and without the use of a grid, as well as the calculated mean values of the images and their respective percentage deviations in relation to Technique 1 (with grid).

Table 5 - Image quality descriptors for techniques 1 and 2.

	Technique 1 (with grid).			Technique 2 (Without grid)		
	SNR	CNR	RC	SNR	CNR	RC
Image 1	442,7	451,1	2304,3	478,8	558,7	2170,1
Image 2	410,3	439,7	2297,7	461,6	532,5	2100,7
Image 3	767,5	817,7	2190,8	638,9	681,0	2045
Image 4	393,3	412,5	2451,9	377,4	413,5	2289,2
Image 5	354,2	361,9	1997,7	382,7	415,3	2209,3
Average	473,6	496,5	2248,5	467,9	520,2	2161,8
D% SNR	-1,20%					
D% CNR	4,76%					
D% RC	-3,86%					

In Table 5, it can be observed that Technique 1 has a relatively higher SNR compared to Technique 2, indicating better sensitivity to image resolution. However, the percentage difference is relatively small (-1.20%). Technique 2 exhibits a significantly higher CNR compared to Technique 1, indicating better differentiation between different levels of contrast in the image. The percentage difference is 4.76%, which is a considerable difference. The RC of Technique 1 is higher than that of Technique 2, indicating better contrast resolution. However, the percentage difference is relatively small (-3.86%). The radiation dose ($K_{a,e}$) in Technique 1 is significantly higher than in Technique 2, with a very large percentage difference of -73.68%. In Figure 4, the values of the IQ descriptors (SNR, CNR, and RC) and $K_{a,e}$ (mGy) are graphically represented.

IQ descriptors (SNR, CNR, RC) Versus ESAK (mGy)




Fig. 4. Comparison between IQ Descriptors Versus Radiation Dose ($K_{a,e}$).

In Figure 4, it is observed that choosing Technique 2 may minimally degrade the SNR and RC descriptors by 1.20% and 3.86%, respectively. However, there is an improvement in CNR by 4.76% compared to Technique 1. Nonetheless, a considerable difference in radiation dose between the two techniques is noted, without equal contribution to improving IQ with the use of anti-scatter grid in knee examinations. Understanding the image creation process and its relationship with contrast, noise, patient dose, and diagnostic performance enhances modern radiology practice [12].

In our study, histogram results suggest that choosing Technique 1 (with the use of anti-scatter grid) may improve SNR by 6.35% compared to Technique 2, indicating an advantage in the signal-to-noise ratio in knee radiographs. This is because radiation scatter generates grayscale areas in the image that do not directly correspond to the projected anatomy, leading to a significant contrast reduction in radiography, as highlighted by Bushberg & Boone [13].

However, when comparing the calculated mean values of signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), contrast-to-noise ratio (CNR), and radiographic contrast (RC) concerning the values obtained from the ROIs, minimal differences between the two techniques are revealed: Technique 1 showed an SNR 1.20%, RC 3.86% higher than Technique 2. However, a significant difference in $K_{a,e}$, 73.68% higher than Technique 2, while Technique 2 indicated an CNR 4.76% higher than Technique 1.

Studies by Huda & Abrahams [12] concluded in their studies that CNR can be seen as a relative descriptor of the visibility of a specific lesion, suggesting that increasing contrast, reducing noise, or adopting a balanced combination of these two aspects can enhance its visualization. Other studies by Tompe & Sargar [5] found that contrast remains constant in these images, regardless of radiation exposure, which can be used to optimize the process and result in additional radiation dose reduction to the patient. Studies by Abela et al. [3] corroborate with our findings, demonstrating a significant reduction in radiation dose and an improvement in IQ without the use of anti-scatter grid for a thickness of 12 cm.

This analysis suggests that optimizing diagnostic accuracy through excessive exposure may not be the most appropriate strategy, as improving visualization of anatomical structures of

interest may not be achieved solely through additional dose increments. Additionally, the electrical parameters of the exposure technique, such as voltage (kV) and current-time product (mA.s), directly influence the workload and lifespan of the radiographic tube, with the use of lower loads (Technique 2) possibly associated with a longer lifespan of the radiographic tube.

4. CONCLUSION

The results indicate that although Technique 1 with anti-scatter grid may improve the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), it comes with a significant cost in terms of radiation dose ($K_{a,e}$) and image quality (IQ). While Technique 2 demonstrated superior contrast resolution capability and a longer lifespan of the radiographic tube, suggesting that a balanced approach, considering technical and clinical factors, is essential to optimize IQ and minimize $K_{a,e}$ for patients during clinical practice.

REFERENCES

1. Da rocha, D. G. V. B., & Marcelino, L. G. (2022). *Knee trauma approach and treatment: a systematic review*. Brazilian Journal of Development., 8(5), 33902-33912.
2. Henner, A., Ilves, S., & Yrjänheikki, T. (2015, March). Demonstrating the Scattering of Radiation in Radiographic Imaging. European Congress of Radiology-ECR 2015.
3. Abela, N., Couto, J. G., Zarb, F., & Mizzi, D. (2022). Evaluating the use of anti-scatter grids in adult knee radiography. *Radiography*, 28(3), 663-667.
4. Moore, C. S., Wood, T. J., Jones, S., Saunderson, J. R., & Beavis, A. W. (2019). A practical method to calibrate and optimise automatic exposure control devices for computed radiography (CR) and digital radiography (DR) imaging systems using the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) metric. *Biomedical Physics & Engineering Express*, 5(3), 035027.
5. Tompe, A., & Sargar, K. (2020). X-ray image quality assurance.
6. Metaxas, VI, Messaris, GA, Lekatou, AN, Petsas, TG e Panayiotakis, GS (2019). *Patient doses in common diagnostic X-ray examinations*, 184 (1), 12-27.
7. Dimenstein, R., & Ghilardi Netto, T. (2005). Physical and technological bases applied to x-rays. In *Physical and technological bases applied to x-rays* (pp. 90-90).
8. Seeram, E., Davidson, R., Bushong, S., & Swan, H. (2016). Optimizing the exposure indicator as a dose management strategy in computed radiography. *Radiologic technology*, 87(4), 380-391.
9. Braga, L. F., Pimentel, R. B., Dias, T. S., Assunção, M. F., Salido, F. S., Neves, R. F., ... & Freitas, M. B. (2019). Methodology for analysis and interpretation of exposure indicators (EI) and their deviations (DI) in computerized radiology. *Brazilian Journal of Medical Physics*, 13(3), 33-37.
10. Wayne R. (2024). Software for image processing and analysis. USA: National Institute of Mental Health, java, Homepage: <http://rsbweb.nih.gov/ij/download.html>.
11. Mraity, H. A., England, A., Cassidy, S., Eachus, P., Dominguez, A., & Hogg, P. (2016). Development and validation of a visual grading scale for assessing image quality of AP pelvis radiographic images. *The British Journal of Radiology*, 89(1061), 20150430.
12. Huda, W., & Abrahams, R. B. (2015). Radiographic techniques, contrast, and noise in x-ray imaging. *American Journal of Roentgenology*, 204(2), W126-W131.
13. Bushberg, J. T., & Boone, J. M. (2011). *The essential physics of medical imaging*. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.