frontiers in Physics

CORRECTION
published: 11 September 2018
doi: 10.3389/fphy.2018.00103

Corrigendum: Hybrid Imaging: Instrumentation and Data Processing

Jacobo Cal-Gonzalez[1], Ivo Rausch[1], Lalith K. Shiyam Sundar[1], Martin L. Lassen[1], Otto Muzik[2], Ewald Moser[1,3], Laszlo Papp[1] and Thomas Beyer[1]*

[1] QIMP Team, Center for Medical Physics and Biomedical Engineering, Medical University Vienna, Vienna, Austria, [2] Department of Radiology, Children's Hospital of Michigan, The Detroit Medical Center, Wayne State University School of Medicine, Detroit, MI, United States, [3] MR Center of Excellence, Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

OPEN ACCESS

Edited and reviewed by:
Claudia Kuntner, Austrian Institute of Technology (AIT), Austria

****Correspondence:***
Jacobo Cal-Gonzalez
jacobo.calgonzalez@meduniwien.ac.at

Specialty section:
This article was submitted to Biomedical Physics, a section of the journal Frontiers in Physics

Received: *02 July 2018*
Accepted: *23 August 2018*
Published: *11 September 2018*

Citation:
Cal-Gonzalez J, Rausch I, Shiyam Sundar LK, Lassen ML, Muzik O, Moser E, Papp L and Beyer T (2018) Corrigendum: Hybrid Imaging: Instrumentation and Data Processing. Front. Phys. 6:103. doi: 10.3389/fphy.2018.00103

Keywords: hybrid imaging, combined imaging, instrumentation, nuclear medicine, data processing, data corrections

A Corrigendum on

Hybrid Imaging: Instrumentation and Data Processing

by Cal-Gonzalez, J., Rausch, I., Shiyam Sundar, L. K., Lassen, M. L., Muzik, O., Moser, E., et al. (2018). Front. Phys. 6:47. doi: 10.3389/fphy.2018.00047

In the original article, there was a mistake in **Table 1** as published. The reported sensitivity unit should be kcps/MBq (instead of kcps/kBq). The corrected **Table 1** appears below. The authors apologize for this error and state that this does not change the scientific conclusions of the article in any way.

The original article has been updated.

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

TABLE 1 | PET, SPECT, CT, and MR specifications of selected dual and triple modality clinical systems commercially available.

	Company	SPECT/CT			PET/CT									PET/SPECT/CT	PET/MR		
		Siemens	GE	Philips	Siemens	Philips		GE		Toshiba	Kindsway Biotech	United Imaging		Mediso	Siemens	Philips	GE
	System name	Intevo	Discovery NM/CT 670	BrightView XCT	mCT & mCT Flow	Ingenuity PET/CT	Vereos	Discovery 690	Discovery IQ	Celestion	PoleStar m660	uMI 510	uMI 780	Anyscan	mMR	Ingenuity PET/MR	Signa
	References		[18]		[19, 20]	[21]	[22]	[23]	[24]	[25]	[26]	[27]	Vendor	Vendor webpage	[28]	[29]	[30]
PET specifications	Scintillator	–	–	–	LSO	LYSO	LYSO	LYSO	BGO	LYSO	LYSO	LYSO	LYSO	LYSO	LSO	LYSO	LBS
	Crystal size (mm^3)	–	–	-	4 × 4 × 20	4 × 4 × 22	4 × 4 × 19	4.2 × 6.3 × 25	6.3 × 6.3 × 30	4 × 4 × 12	3.63 × 3.63 × 20	2.35 × 2.35 × 15	2.76 × 2.59 × 18	3.9 × 3.9 × 20	4 × 4 × 20	4 × 4 × 22	4.2 × 5.3 × 25
	Total detector elements	–	–	–	32 448	28 336	23 040	13 824	11 520	30 720	37 632	110 592	101 920	39 672	28 672	28 336	20 160
	Photo-detector	–	–	–	PMT	PMT	dSiPM	PMT	PMT	PMT	PMT	PMT	SiPM	PMT	APD	PMT	SiPM
	ToF capability	–	–	–	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
	Patient bore (cm)	–	–	–	78.0	71.7	70.0	70.0	74.0	88.0	N.A.	70.0	70.0	70.0	60.0	70.7	60.0
	Transaxial FOV (cm)	–	–	–	81.5	67.6	N.A.	70.0	70.0	70.0	N.A.	70.0	70.0	55.0	59.4	N.A.	60.0
	Axial FOV (cm)	–	–	–	21.8	18.0	16.4	15.7	26.0	19.6	N.A.	23.6	30.0	23.0	25.8	18.0	25.0
	Energy window (keV)	–	–	–	435–650	440–665	N.A.	425–650	425–650	425–650	425–650	N.A.	LLD, 430	N.A.	430–610	460–665	425–650
	Energy resolution (%)	–	–	–	11.5	11.1	11.1	12.4	N.A.	12.4	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	14.5	11.6	11.0
	Time coincidence window (ns)	–	–	–	4.1	4.5	4.0	4.9	9.5	1.6–3.2	4.1	N.A.	N.A.	5.0	5.9	6.0	4.6
	Time resolution (ns)	–	–	–	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.5	N.A.	0.4	0.43	0.485	N.A.	N.A.	2.9	0.5	0.4
	Transaxial Resolution 1 cm/10 cm (mm)	–	–	–	4.4/4.9	4.8/5.1	4.1/4.5	4.7/5.0	4.5/5.4	5.1/5.1	3.76/4.56	2.85/3.07	Max resol. 2.9	4.1/4.9	4.3/5.0	4.7/5.1	4.2/5.2
	Axial Resolution 1 cm/10 cm (mm)	–	–	–	4.4/5.9	4.7/5.2	4.0/4.3	4.7/5.6	4.8/4.8	5.0 /5.4	3.64/5.29	3.01/2.97		4.2/5.1	4.3/6.6	4.6/5.0	5.8/7.1
	Sensitivity (kcps/MBq)	–	–	–	9.7	7.3	5.7	7.4	22.8	3.8	10.9	8.3	16	8.1	15.0	7.0	21.0
	Scatter Fraction (%)	–	–	–	33.2	36.7	30.0	37.0	36.2	37.3	N.A.	38.4	40.0	N.A.	37.9 at peak NECR	26.0	43.6 at peak NECR
	Peak NEC (kcps @ kBq/mL)	–	–	–	180 @ 28	124 @ 20.3	171 @ 50	139 @ 29	124 @ 9.1	70 @ 29.6	224.6 @ 29.0	109 @ 21.5	170 @ 16.0	150 @ N.A.	184 @ 23.1	89 @ 13.7	210 @ 17.5
SPECT specifications	Detector type	3.8 in. NaI	3.8 in. NaI	3.8 in. NaI	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	NaI	–	–	–
	Photo-detector	PMT	PMT	PMT	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	60(48) PMT	–	–	–
	Detector size (cm)	38.7 × 53.3	40.6 × 54.0	40.0 × 54.0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	58.5(55.8) × 47.0(41.8)	–	–	–
CT specifications	Max CT slices	2,6,16	16	Cone beam	128	128	128	64	16	16	64	16	128	16	–	–	–
	CT tube max voltage (kVp)	130	140	120	140	140	140	140	140	135	140	140	140	140	–	–	–
	CT tube max current (mA)	345	440	80	800	665	665	800	440	600	667	420	833	500	–	–	–
	Max CT rotation (s)	0.5	0.5	12	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.35	0.5	0.5	0.39	0.5	0.3	0.4	–	–	–
MR specifications	PET/MR integration	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	Fully integrated	Sequential	Fully integrated
	Magnet	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	Superconductor	Superconductor	Superconductor
	Magnetic field	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	3T	3T	3T
	Magnet length (cm)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	163	157	N.A.
	Magnet bore (cm)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	60	60	60
	Maximum FOV (cm^3)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	60	50 × 50 × 45	50 × 50× 50

N.A., data not available.