open-UST: An Open-Source Ultrasound **Tomography Transducer Array System**

Morgan Roberts¹⁰, Eleanor Martin¹⁰, *Member, IEEE*, Michael D. Brown, *Member, IEEE*, Ben T. Cox¹⁰, and Bradlev E. Treeby¹⁰

Abstract-Fast imaging methods are needed to promote clinical adoption of ultrasound tomography (UST), and more widely available UST hardware could support the experimental validation of new measurement configurations. In this work, an open-source 256-element transducer ring array was developed (morganjroberts. github.io/open-UST) and manufactured using rapid prototyping, for only £2k. Novel manufacturing techniques were used, resulting in a 1.17° mean beam axis skew angle, a 104 μ m mean element position error, and a ±13.6 μ m deviation in matching layer thickness. The nominal acoustic performance was measured using hydrophone scans and watershot data, and the 61.2 dB signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), 55.4° opening angle, 10.2 mm beamwidth, and 54% transmit-receive bandwidth (-12 dB) were found to be similar to existing systems and compatible state-of-the-art full-waveform-inversion image with reconstruction methods. The interelement variation in acoustic performance was typically <10% without using normalization, meaning that the elements can be modeled identically during image reconstruction, removing the need for individual source definitions based on hydrophone measurements. Finally, data from a phantom experiment were successfully reconstructed. These results demonstrate that the open-UST system is accessible for users and is suitable for UST imaging research.

Index Terms-Interelement variation (IEV), open source, rapid prototyping, transducer array, ultrasound tomography (UST).

Manuscript received 13 February 2023; accepted 19 May 2023. Date of publication 31 May 2023; date of current version 28 June 2023. This work was supported in part by the National Physical Laboratory; in part by the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme H2020 ICT 2016-2017 (as an initiative of the Photonics Public Private Partnership) under Grant 732411; in part by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC), U.K., under Grant EP/S026371/1, Grant EP/T014369/1, and Grant EP/P008860/1; in part by the UKRI Future Leaders Fellowship under Grant MR/T019166/1; and in part by the EPSRC Centre for Doctoral Training in Intelligent Integrated Imaging in Healthcare (i4health). For the purpose of open access, the author has applied a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising. (Corresponding author: Morgan Roberts.)

Morgan Roberts, Michael D. Brown, Ben T. Cox, and Bradley E. Treeby are with the Department of Medical Physics and Biomedical Engineering, University College London, WC1E 6BT London, U.K. (e-mail: morgan.roberts.18@ucl.ac.uk).

Eleanor Martin is with the Department of Medical Physics and Biomedical Engineering and the Wellcome/EPSRC Centre for Interventional and Surgical Sciences, University College London, WC1E 6BT London, U.K.

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TUFFC.2023.3280635



UFFC

I. INTRODUCTION

BREAST cancer screening reduces mortality, but mam-mograms have lower sensitivity for people with high breast density, and overdiagnosis causes harm in healthy people [1]. Ultrasound tomography (UST) is a method for measuring the 3-D distribution of acoustic properties in an object and has been demonstrated as a promising technique for breast imaging [2]. A transducer array is used to transmit ultrasound waves into the breast from different angles and measure the transmitted and scattered fields. Full-waveform inversion (FWI) is a family of UST reconstruction methods that model the full physics of wave propagation, resulting in high-resolution images [3]. However, FWI can have a high computational cost of up to 24 h [4] and further improvement is still needed to achieve clinically useful reconstruction times of tens of minutes or less using FWI [5]. UST hardware allows new measurement configurations to be investigated, but

1525-8955 © 2023 IEEE. Personal use is permitted, but republication/redistribution requires IEEE permission.

See https://www.ieee.org/publications/rights/index.html for more information. Authorized licensed use limited to: University College London. Downloaded on October 28,2024 at 17:43:37 UTC from IEEE Xplore. Restrictions apply.

Highlights

- This work presents a novel open-source instructional guide for transducer array manufacture with rapid prototyping. Novel fabrication methods give low interelement variation in acoustic performance.
- The array has a 1.17° beam skew angle, a 104 μm element position error, 61.2 dB SNR, 55.4° opening angle, 10.2 mm beamwidth, and 54% transmit–receive bandwidth (–12 dB), and is suitable for UST.
- The open-UST system provides an affordable and reconfigurable UST transducer array. More widely available
 hardware could accelerate progress toward fast, accurate UST imaging methods.



Fig. 1. Top left: transducer module during manufacture. Top right: finished transducer module. Bottom: open-UST system.

there is a high barrier to entry since UST systems are not available off the shelf, and custom arrays are expensive. Therefore, more widely available and reconfigurable UST hardware could accelerate progress toward fast, accurate imaging methods and promote widespread clinical adoption of UST.

Rapid prototyping technologies, such as 3-D printing, can be used to manufacture ultrasound hardware in-house, without expensive specialist equipment [6], [7]. Rapid prototyped ultrasound hardware is low cost, has a short lead time, and can be easily modified, but the user has to design components from scratch. However, rapid prototyped hardware can also be easily open-sourced, a concept that has already promoted collaboration in the UST community [8], [9], which reduces the upfront design time, and could allow users without transducer manufacture experience to build a UST system in-house.

Open-source designs have been released for a microbubble characterization chamber [10] and an acoustic levitation system [11], and the files were accompanied by manufacturing instructions, which are essential for users to access the project. However, an open-source instructional guide for ultrasound transducer array manufacture does not exist. This article presents the design, manufacture, and evaluation of open-UST: a low-cost UST transducer array system optimized for inhouse manufacture using rapid prototyping (Fig. 1) [12]. The

hardware distribution includes computer aided design (CAD) models, printed circuit board (PCB) and 3-D printing files, a bill of materials, assembly videos, and full manufacture documentation. End users would be UST researchers comfortable with manual assembly processes, for example, soldering and polymer casting. The goals of the open-UST project are given as follows.

- 1) The manufacture is accessible to users.
- 2) The design parameters and nominal acoustic behavior are suitable for UST imaging research.
- 3) The interelement variation (IEV) in acoustic behavior is low.

A. Accessibility

For users to access open-UST, the cost and lead time of the system should be low, meaning that the material cost should be minimized and only essential features should be included to accelerate the assembly. Also, the manufacturing processes should be simple, and it is assumed that users do not have access to specialist transducer manufacture equipment, only a vacuum chamber, a 3-D printer capable of printing polylactic acid (PLA) and polyvinyl alcohol (PVA) filament, and standard workshop hand tools.

B. Design Parameters and Nominal Acoustic Behavior

The open-UST system should be compatible with FWI reconstruction methods since they are the state of the art. Breast UST systems typically have a center frequency between 0.9 [13] and 3 MHz [14], and for FWI to avoid cycle skipping errors, there must be energy available at very low frequencies. The goal of this work was to create a system with a 750 kHz -40 dB cutoff frequency and a 50 dB signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) since excellent reconstructions have been achieved for experimental data with these characteristics [3], due to the tolerance of FWI to noise [4]. The finite bandwidth and size of physical transducer elements affect the way that they emit and respond to ultrasound waves, and modeling their angledependent frequency response (ADR) during image reconstruction can help to better match simulated and observed data, leading to increased reconstruction accuracy [15]. The open-UST transducers should have a smooth ADR since this makes the UST data easier to interpret and allows the response to be easily incorporated into the reconstruction forward model, for example, by representing the transducers as ideal pistons with an effective element size chosen to best represent the watershot data. The transducer element beamwidth and opening angle should be <12 mm [16], [17] and $>43^{\circ}$ [18], [19] since other UST systems with these characteristics have performed well.

Authorized licensed use limited to: University College London. Downloaded on October 28,2024 at 17:43:37 UTC from IEEE Xplore. Restrictions apply.

C. IEV in Acoustic Behavior

For transducer arrays, manufacturing tolerances can cause the individual elements to have slightly different ADRs, small variations in position, and beam axis skews. These can be characterized to improve reconstruction accuracy [15], but this requires additional time, hydrophone measurements, and computational complexity, presenting another barrier to entry to users. Although reconstruction methods exist that have achieved excellent results without modeling the ADR of the transducer elements [3], their implicit assumption is still that the transducers behave identically. Therefore, the IEV in acoustic behavior of the open-UST system must be low so that the transducers can be modeled identically.

For high-performance arrays, low IEV is achieved using high-precision manufacturing equipment, for example, dicing saws, spin coaters, and lapping machines, and thus, a tradeoff between cost and IEV is expected for rapid prototyped transducer arrays. Previously, the IEV in electrical impedance was measured for a 3-D printed histotripsy array [6]. In this article, the IEV in electrical impedance, transmit impulse response, beam axis skew, beamwidth, opening angle, SNR, receive crosstalk, and transmit-receive directional response are assessed for the open-UST system.

Previously, prototype transducer modules were evaluated for open-UST [20], and low-cost techniques for matching layer deposition were developed [21]. In this article, the design and manufacture of the open-UST system is explained, and then, the experimental evaluation of IEV in acoustic performance is described. Finally, results from a phantom imaging experiment are shown as a proof of principle of the open-UST system.

II. DESIGN AND MANUFACTURE

A. Array Design

The open-UST aperture configuration and acoustic performance should support typical UST imaging use cases and facilitate experimentation with new arrangements. Two singleelement or clinical array transducers could be purchased and mounted to a rotation stage to sample a virtual array [22], [23], but this configuration has a large data acquisition time, and thus, multielement transducer arrays that fully surround the object are typically used instead. Either bowl [24] or rotating planar [13] configurations are used in 3-D, but the most common design is a vertically translated 2-D ring array [14], [23], [25], since these allow data to be collected and reconstructed in 2-D slices, which is computationally efficient. The standard open-UST configuration is a 2-D ring array, but its modularity also allows reconfiguration into 3-D geometries. To simplify manufacture, each module is a linear array, with a total of 16 modules forming a hexadecagon approximation to a ring.

Current UST systems have between 40 [25] and 2304 [24] transducer elements. Systems with many elements have denser sampling and higher image quality but are complex to manufacture and require a data acquisition system (DAQ) with an equivalent channel count or a multiplexer. Rotating the array can increase the sampling density but adds complexity and cost and increases the data acquisition time. The standard open-UST configuration is a 256-element ring array since this is a typical number of channels available from open ultrasound

TABLE I KEY PARAMETERS OF THE OPEN-UST TRANSDUCER ARRAY

Parameter	Value
Number of elements	256
Number of transducer modules	16
Elements per module	16
PZT element thickness	1 mm
PZT element width	1 mm
PZT element length	10 mm
PZT pitch	2.54 mm
Material costs	£2k
Assembly time	4 months

DAQ platforms [26]. Excellent reconstructions of in vivo data from 256-element ring arrays have been demonstrated using FWI [16].

The open-UST array diameter is 220 mm, which is larger than the pendant breast diameter for an entire study population of American women [27]. The diameter and number of elements constrain the intramodule element pitch, which was chosen to be 2.54 mm to align with common PCB connector sizes. An overview of the array design is shown in Table I.

B. PZT Element Selection

The open-UST system uses individual PZT plates for the transducer elements since users are unlikely to have access to a dicing saw, and custom-diced PZT slabs are expensive. PZT 850 was selected as a piezoelectric material, which is ideal for sensing applications, with an acoustic impedance of $Z_p = 31.5$ MRayl and frequency constants of $N_T = 2040$ m/s and $N_{\rm L} = 1500$ m/s in the thickness and lateral directions, respectively. The dimensions of the PZT elements affect their beam patterns, and for 2-D ring arrays, a wide lateral opening angle and thin elevation beamwidth are required to confine the waves to a slice through the entire breast.

Decreasing the lateral width of PZT elements increases their lateral opening angle but decreases their sensitivity and presents manufacturing challenges. The minimum PZT plate width widely available off-the-shelf is 1 mm. Fig. 2 shows the opening angle predictions for lateral widths from 0.7 to 1.5 mm between 800 kHz and 2 MHz, simulated using the acoustic field propagator [28] from the k-Wave toolbox. For each simulation, the -6 dB opening angle was extracted from the far-field directional response in the lateral plane. A width of w = 1 mm provides a minimum opening angle of 54° at 2 MHz, which satisfies the $>43^{\circ}$ design requirement.

A t = 1 mm PZT thickness was selected due to its availability. A width-to-thickness aspect ratio $w/t \approx 1$ can cause complex behavior due to the interaction of lateral and thickness vibration modes [29], meaning that the exact plate resonances could not be calculated from the width and thickness. However, approximate thickness and lateral resonances of $N_T/t =$ 2 MHz and $N_L/w = 1.5$ MHz were predicted, which are within the center frequency range typically used for UST.

Lenses can provide a thin and uniform elevational beamwidth [17], but these add complexity to the manufacturing procedure, and instead, the elevation height of the elements was optimized to provide weak focusing. Fig. 2 shows -6 dBelevational beamwidth predictions, averaged over all axial positions from the source to the array radius, for elevational Authorized licensed use limited to: University College London. Downloaded on October 28,2024 at 17:43:37 UTC from IEEE Xplore. Restrictions apply.



Fig. 2. (a) Predicted opening angle as a function of source width and frequency. (b) Simulated average beamwidth as a function of source height and frequency. White crosses indicate the optimal elevation height with minimum beamwidth at each frequency.

heights from 7 to 15 mm, simulated using the acoustic field propagator. The elevation height was selected as 10 mm due to its off-the-shelf availability, which is the optimal value from 1.34 to 1.58 MHz. Following the dimension selection (summarized in Table I), $1 \times 1 \times 10$ mm PZT elements (Item 689, APC International Ltd., Mackeyville, PA, USA) were purchased.

Fig. 3 shows the in-air electrical input impedance spectrum of a single PZT plate, measured using a vector impedance analyzer (4193A, Hewlett Packard, Palo Alto, CA, USA). There are multiple resonances in the phase spectrum from 1.22 to 2.86 MHz, which is a wider range than originally predicted, highlighting the difficulty in estimating resonances from the element dimensions alone. This spectrum suggested that the acoustic center frequency would be close to 1.22 MHz, and the acoustic response was expected to tail off smoothly toward 2.86 MHz after adding a damping backing layer, providing a suitable bandwidth for UST imaging. Although the 10 mm elevation height is optimal for 1.34–1.58 MHz, at the 1.22 MHz resonance, the average beamwidth was 10.24 mm, which is only slightly larger than the optimal value of 10.15 mm.

C. Acoustic Stack Design and Manufacture

The acoustic stack for each element, shown in Fig. 4(o), is a PZT plate with a backing layer, a quarter-wavelength matching layer, and a thin polyurethane waterproof coating. The transducer module manufacturing procedure is documented on the open-UST website [12] and is summarized in Fig. 4.

Matching and backing layer composites can be made by mixing filler powder with castable polymers. Tungsten powder was chosen because relatively low volume fractions can produce high impedance composites, which results in a low enough viscosity for the composite to be properly hand mixed. Araldite Standard epoxy (Huntsman Advanced Materials, Cambridge, U.K.) was chosen for the polymer since it is widely available, low cost, and has a high enough viscosity to prevent particle settling during curing.

Matching layers are typically tuned to the existing PZT resonance to achieve an even larger response. Here, the



Fig. 3. Electrical impedance (a) magnitude and (b) phase spectra of 128 transducer elements measured in water, after backing layer casting. The mean and entire measured range of the data are shown. Red lines show the in-air electrical input impedance spectra for a single PZT plate before manufacture.

matching layer resonance frequency was selected to be 2 MHz, which is higher than the main resonance and in the middle of the 1.22-2.86 MHz range where an acoustic response was expected after damping. This was done because boosting the high frequency content is useful for improving resolution during image reconstruction. Fig. 5 shows that this design worked as intended. For a tungsten-epoxy composite used to match PZT with impedance $Z_p = 31.5$ MRayl to water with impedance $Z_w = 1.5$ MRayl, the target impedance of the matching layer should be $Z_l = \sqrt{Z_p Z_w} =$ 6.87 MRayl. Preliminary testing showed that a tungsten weight fraction of 86.7% provides a sound speed of 1317 m/s, an acoustic impedance of 6.67 MRayl [30] and requires a quarter-wavelength matching layer thickness of 165 μ m. For manufacture, a low-cost deposition method was developed, first using blade coating [Fig. 4(b)-(d)] and then compression between glass plates [21], producing a thickness distribution of $174 \pm 13.6 \ \mu m$ (N = 128). To confirm that the transmit pressure at 1.22 MHz was high enough for imaging using matching layers tuned to 2 MHz, the on-axis transmit-receive response of the first batch of two transducer modules was measured, which showed a high SNR of 61 dB.

A backing layer was added to the rear face of each PZT element to increase damping and widen the bandwidth. For tungsten–polymer composites, increasing the tungsten weight fraction increases acoustic impedance but decreases attenuation [31]. Previous prototyping showed that a tungsten weight ratio of 80.8% has a high enough impedance to provide damping and a high enough absorption to attenuate internal backing layer reverberation to below the noise floor [20]. A common backing layer was cast onto the rear electrodes of the PZT elements with a 24 mm thickness, and its rear face was given a scattering structure to further attenuate backing layer reverberation [Fig. 4(h) and (i)].

A 400 μ m layer of Aptflex F7 polyurethane (Precision Acoustics, Dorchester, U.K.) was added to the front face of the transducer, to provide electrical insulation. This material has an acoustic impedance of 1.5 MRayl, making the transmission coefficient at the coating-water boundary approximately 1.



Fig. 4. (a)–(n) Summary of the transducer module manufacture. (o): Cross section through the acoustic stack.

The total material cost of the manufacture was $\pounds 2k$, comprising $\pounds 906$ for the PZT elements, $\pounds 140$ for 3-D printing filament, and $\pounds 954$ for off-the-shelf components, adhesives, and consumable materials. The total manufacture duration was four

months of one person working full time, including the manufacture of custom tooling. Due to the large number of transducer modules and elements, most manufacture processes were typically performed in eight separate batches, meaning that the time taken for 3-D printing parts was not a limiting factor, since this took place in parallel to the manual assembly steps.

III. NOMINAL ACOUSTIC PERFORMANCE AND IEV

After the 16 array modules were manufactured, their nominal acoustic performance and IEV were characterized. All of the results are shown without normalization and are summarized in Table II.

A. Electrical Input Impedance

Fig. 3 shows the electrical input impedance of the transducer elements immersed in deionised water, measured after backing layer casting. The phase spectra have a peak at 1.22 MHz matching the series resonance of the in-air PZT plate, with a small -8.58° phase angle. This indicates relatively weak damping and qualitatively matches the expected behavior for a low backing layer to PZT impedance ratio of $Z_B/Z_P = 0.22$ [32].

The IEV in impedance magnitude and phase was low, with no defective channels. The $\pm 4.96^{\circ}$ standard deviation in peak phase angle is very similar to the $\pm 5.7^{\circ}$ standard deviation reported for 144 UST transducer elements manufactured using advanced equipment [33], with a smaller overall range. This demonstrates the reliability of the conductive-epoxy technique used to connect the PZT element electrodes to the PCB and also demonstrates that the matching layers, PZT plates, and backing layers have uniform acoustic properties and dimensions. The ability to measure the electrical input impedance of the acoustic stack during manufacture is a useful interface since it allows users to discard defective transducer modules as soon as possible or to collect data when making modifications, such as changing the PZT element dimensions.

B. Transmit Impulse Response

Fig. 5 shows the mean transmit impulse response for 64 elements, measured using a calibrated 200 μ m polyvinylidene fluoride needle hydrophone (Precision Acoustics, Dorchester, U.K.) after driving each element with a unipolar 80 ns pulse, using a Vantage 256 (Verasonics, Inc., Kirkland, WA, USA) with an 8 Ω + j ω (1.4 μ H) output impedance. This pulse is much shorter than the driving conditions used for imaging and excited a harmonic at 6.8 MHz. The impulse response was low-pass filtered (cutoff 5 MHz) so that the waveform shape and IEV could be more easily visualized in the frequency range of interest.

The -6 and -12 dB fractional bandwidths are 53% and 175%, with passbands at 967 kHz–1.67 MHz and 833 kHz–3.23 MHz, respectively. Fig. 5 shows the weak resonance features from the 1.22 MHz acoustic center frequency up to 2.86 MHz, which correspond to the in-air PZT resonances shown in Fig. 3. The IEV in impulse response was low with no outliers and only a small amplitude deviation at resonance of $\pm 6.9\%$, which again demonstrates the consistency in



Fig. 5. (a) Transmit impulse response hydrophone signals, aligned in time. (b) Amplitude spectra are shown before and after low-pass filtering (LPF). The red line shows the mean amplitude spectra of N = 16transducer elements without matching layers (displayed with the same decibel reference).

the acoustic properties and dimensions of the matching layers, PZT plates, and backing layers.

Fig. 5 also shows the mean amplitude spectrum of a prototype 16-element module manufactured identically to the final transducers, but without matching layers. Comparing the two spectra shows that tuning the matching layer resonance to 2 MHz to boost the high frequency response was successful since the -6 and -12 dB bandwidths increased from 39% and 70% to 53% and 175%, respectively. At the 1.22 MHz center frequency, the mean amplitude was 4.7% lower for the 16 elements measured without matching layers.

Users could tune the matching layer resonance by choosing a different thickness during manufacture, or the matching layers could be omitted altogether, which could reduce manufacture time by two months. Fig. 5 shows that this may decrease image resolution due to the lower SNR above 1.4 MHz, but the low frequency data required for FWI would be unaffected.

C. Field Scans

Fig. 6 shows the peak positive pressure field of a single element (channel 8). To reduce acquisition time, field scans were performed for three modules with all 16 elements driven simultaneously with a one-cycle 1.40 MHz 80 V tristate pulse using a Vantage 256, which matches the driving conditions used for UST imaging. Hydrophone voltage signals were acquired over a 100.1 mm \times 20.3 mm plane (0.35 mm step and 30.45 mm axial offset), within a time window, including the entire pulse. The frequency dependent sensitivity of the hydrophone was deconvolved to obtain the pressure, and the measured field was backprojected to the source plane using the angular spectrum method [34]. A mask was used to isolate the source field of each element, which was then reprojected forward to five planes from z = 70 mm to z = 110 mm (for channel 8, the entire peak pressure field was projected for visualization). The pressure amplitude field of each element F(x, y, z, f) was calculated using a fast Fourier transform, and the beam axis was located at each axial z position by



Fig. 6. Peak pressure field for element 8, normalized, and log compressed. (a) Lateral plane and directional response profile calculated using 2-D interpolation. (b) Elevational plane and elevational response profile. The projected planes and the beam axis intersection points are also shown.

TABLE II SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR THE OPEN-UST TRANSDUCER RING ARRAY

Parameter	Mean Value	Standard Deviation	
Electrical input impedance $(N = 128)$			
Resonance frequency	1.23 MHz	18 kHz	
Phase at resonance	-8.58 °	4.96 °	
Magnitude at resonance	1114 Ω	121 Ω	
Transmit impulse response $(N = 64)$			
Resonance frequency	1.22 MHz	26 kHz	
Amplitude deviation at resonance	_	6.9 %	
-6dB FBW (967 kHz - 1.67 MHz)	53 %	12 %	
-12dB FBW (833 kHz - 3.23 MHz)	175 %	32 %	
Transmit impulse response, no matching layers $(N = 16)$			
Resonance frequency	1.25 MHz	26 kHz	
-6dB FBW (967 kHz - 1.43 MHz)	39 %	3.2 %	
-12dB FBW (867 kHz - 1.73 MHz)	70 %	2.4 %	
Beam pattern ($N = 48$)			
Elevational skew	0.457 °	0.207 °	
Lateral skew	1.17 °	0.834 °	
-6 dB beamwidth ($z = 110 \text{ mm}$)	16.3 mm	0.456 mm	
Average -6 dB beamwidth ($z = 0 \text{ mm}$	10.2 mm	-	
to 110 mm)	FF 4 0	2.06.0	
Lateral -6 dB opening angle	55.4 *	2.96	
On-axis transmit-receive response (N = 256)			
Resonance frequency	1.21 MHz	7.1 kHz	
Amplitude deviation at resonance	-	7.9 %	
-6 dB FBW (1.08 MHz - 1.41 MHz)	29 %	6.1 %	
-12 dB FBW (924 kHz - 1.58 MHz)	54 %	4.9 %	
-40 dB FBW (528 kHz - 2.61 MHz)	170 %	3.0 %	
Signal to noise ratio	61.2 dB	1.2 dB	
Arrival time	150 μs	$0.070 \ \mu s$	
Off-axis transmit-receive response (N = 256)			
Receive cross talk	-37.1 dB	6.0 dB	

calculating the weighted centroid (x_c, y_c, f_c) of a cross section through the field, ignoring values below -6 dB (see Fig. 6).

D. Beam Axis Skew Angles

Fig. 7 shows the distribution of elevational and lateral beam axis skew angles for 48 elements, calculated in the far field using linear fitting to the beam axis intersection points (x_c, y_c, z) defined above. Transducer body misalignment relative to the hydrophone scan axes was estimated to be 0.115°



Fig. 7. Histograms showing the distribution of (a) elevational skew angle, (b) lateral skew angle, (c) elevational beamwidth, (d) lateral opening angle, (e) on-axis SNR, and (f) receive crosstalk.

and 0.337° in the elevation and lateral planes, respectively, based on surface height data acquired from the transducer body and by inspecting phase differences at the source plane. During UST imaging, the transducer modules are mounted in the same fashion, and thus, the misalignment is also expected to be very small.

The small skew angles show that the PZT elements are well aligned relative to the transducer module, and that beam skew caused by nonuniformity in matching layer thickness is negligible. The lateral skew is larger than the elevational skew because the small element width makes alignment in this plane more sensitive to manufacture error. The beam axis skew angles are so small that they could be ignored during image reconstruction, which simplifies the transducer modeling.

E. Beamwidth, Opening Angle, and Angle-Dependent Frequency Response

Fig. 8 shows the mean elevational response (amplitude as a function of elevation position y and frequency f at the center of the ring array $z_c = 110$ mm) and mean far-field directional response of 48 elements, which were derived from the amplitude fields calculated previously (see Fig. 6).

The ADR is smooth in both planes, suggesting that it could be easily incorporated into the forward model during image reconstruction. The standard deviation in the elevational and directional responses of the elements is low (maximum 9.5% and 11.5%), which is further evidence of the very small beam axis skew angles and the uniformity in the effective sizes of the elements. Fig. 7(c) shows the distribution of -6 dB elevation beamwidth (at the ring array center) and the -6 dB opening angle, extracted at the centroid frequency f_c from the elevational and directional responses, respectively.

The nominal beamwidth of 16.3 mm at the ring array center closely matches the predicted value of 16.4 mm at 1.22 MHz from the simulations in Section II-B, demonstrating that the mean effective radiating length of the elements closely matches the ideal value of 10 mm. The beamwidth can therefore be predicted by simulation at all axial positions, which gives a 10.2 mm average beamwidth from z = 0 to



Fig. 8. (a) Mean elevational response. (b) Standard deviation, relative to maximum of mean. (c) Mean far-field directional response. (d) Standard deviation, relative to maximum of mean.

z = 110 mm at 1.22 MHz. This meets the <12 mm design requirement. The nominal opening angle of 55.4° is smaller than the predicted value of 95.1° at 1.22 MHz from Fig. 2(a), which could be due to the strong lateral resonance modifying the radiating pressure, producing an effective source width larger than the physical extent of the elements [35]. This opening angle meets the >43° design requirement.

The low IEV in ADR is summarized by the small standard deviations in elevational beamwidth and lateral opening angle of 0.456 mm and 2.96°, respectively. This demonstrates that the radiating source pressure distribution was consistent between elements, meaning that the variation in matching layer geometry and acoustic properties was small.

F. On-Axis Transmit–Receive Response

Fig. 9 shows the transmit–receive response for 256 on-axis transmit–receive element pairs, measured in a ring array configuration in deionised water. To acquire the watershot, each transmitter was driven with a one-cycle 1.40 MHz 80 V tristate pulse using the Vantage 256, and receive data was measured on all other elements. This was repeated for all transmitters. The transmit–receive bandwidth is 54% at -12 dB and 170% at -40 dB, with a center frequency of 1.21 MHz. The mean -40 dB cutoff frequency is 528 kHz, which meets the <750 kHz design requirement.

The IEV in on-axis transmit–receive response of the transducer elements was low, with only a small amplitude deviation at the resonance of 7.9%, which captures the combined uniformity in transmit pressure, receive sensitivity, and beam axis alignment. Table II shows a 0.07 μ s standard deviation



Fig. 9. On-axis transmit-receive response. (a) Measured voltages, aligned in time. (b) Amplitude spectra. The mean and the entire measured range of the data are shown.

in arrival time for the on-axis signals, corresponding to a 104 μ m deviation in acoustic path length or 8.4% of a cycle at 1.21 MHz. For comparison, the position errors for a UST bowl array manufactured with a 10 μ m tolerance were between 300 μ m and 1 mm [36]. This shows that the low-cost techniques used for PZT element alignment are accurate.

The distribution of on-axis SNR is shown in Fig. 7(e), calculated using the first 7.9 μ s of each received signal and 3.9 μ s of noise, with a nominal value of 61.2 dB, which meets the >50 dB design requirement. This does not include the insertion loss due to breast tissue, which can be as high as 37 dB at 3.2 MHz [37] or 12 dB at 1 MHz, assuming a linear frequency dependence. This would decrease the SNR to 49.2 dB, but this is still high and averaging could be used to improve SNR further.

G. Directional Transmit–Receive Response

Fig. 10 shows the off-axis transmit-receive response, defined as the peak value of the amplitude spectrum for the watershot dataset above, with the rays grouped into 5° bins based on their emission and incidence angle.

Although data are not available for all bins, Fig. 10 shows that the transmit-receive directional response is smooth, suggesting that the transducer elements could be modeled using an ideal rectangular source during image reconstruction. The SNR is also shown to be reduced by up to -14.9 dB when the emission and incidence angles are greater than 45°. The IEV in off-axis response was low, with a maximum standard deviation of 8.3%, again showing that the beam axis skew angles are small and that the effective radiating dimensions of the sources are uniform.

H. Receive Crosstalk

Fig. 11 shows an example of receive crosstalk between channels in the watershot data due to capacitive coupling in the bundled ribbon cable. The receive crosstalk distribution is shown in Fig. 7(f), defined as a power ratio between the crosstalk and acoustic signal for each receive waveform. The mean crosstalk was -37.1 dB, which did not affect the accuracy of the time-of-flight picking during the imaging



Fig. 10. Transmit–receive directional response. (a) Mean amplitude. (b) Standard deviation, relative to maximum of mean.



Fig. 11. Example of receive crosstalk. A single aggressor channel is shown, but the crosstalk on the receptor channel is the superposition of the coupling to all other channels in the transducer module.

experiment in Section IV. The coupling could be reduced using microcoaxial cables or individually shielded twisted pairs, but these are expensive, less widely available, and would increase manufacture time. Further work is required to assess the effect of the receive crosstalk on FWI reconstructions.

IV. UST IMAGING EXPERIMENT

A phantom UST experiment was performed to demonstrate the suitability of the open-UST system for imaging research. The phantom was constructed to mimic the coronal plane of the breast, with a constant elevational cross section to reduce the out-of-plane errors arising from the finite elevation beamwidth of the transducer elements. Fig. 12(b)–(f) shows the phantom manufacture, the tissue-mimicking liquids, and their sound speeds measured using through-transmission on homogeneous samples. Phantom and watershot UST datasets were acquired using the method described in Section III-F.

Fig. 12(a) shows the reconstructed sound speed, calculated using Kaczmarz's method of projections [38] to invert the relative arrival time data (this code has been made available on GitHub [39]). The arrival time for each waveform was first estimated using an Akaike information criterion (AIC) method [40] and then refined by finding the delay that minimizes the L2 distance to a reference waveform with known arrival time. The adipose and fibroglandular regions and all four of the 9 mm inclusions were resolved, but the three 5 mm inclusions and left fibroglandular boundary are distorted because the straight ray model does not capture refraction or diffraction. To compensate for the shape distortions, the reconstruction algorithm estimates biased sound speed values to maintain the correct time of flight across the object. There is also a streaking artifact due to the relatively small number 0 october 28.2024 at 17:43:37 UTC from JEEE Xolore. Restrictions apply.

Authorized licensed use limited to: University College London. Downloaded on October 28,2024 at 17:43:37 UTC from IEEE Xplore. Restrictions apply.



Fig. 12. (a) Reconstructed sound speed. (b) True phantom sound speed map and tissue-mimicking liquids [the same color scale used for (a) and (b)]. (c)-(f) Phantom manufacture using PET bottles and straws.

of elements. Nevertheless, this is good proof of principle that the open-UST system is suitable for imaging.

V. DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

The total material cost of the 256-element transducer array, including cables, was £2k, which is very low. Users without access to a 3-D printer and vacuum chamber could purchase this equipment for <£5k. The cost could be reduced further by using a thin backing layer with a phase canceling structure on the rear face [41] to reduce the required volumes of tungsten and epoxy. Also, the electromagnetic shielding could be omitted to reduce time and cost, and receive averaging could be used instead to reduce noise. The four-month manufacture of the open-UST system is a short lead time for a transducer ring array, but adds staffing costs since the majority of the manufacture requires manual assembly. This could be addressed by omitting the matching layers, as discussed in Section III-B. For this work, a commercial 256-channel DAO was used, but lower cost alternatives are available [26] or a multiplexer [42] could be built to sequentially switch a pulser between each transmit channel and an oscilloscope between each receive channel, since this equipment is widely available.

The open-UST system has a similar cost and lead time to purchasing a pair of single-element or clinical array transducers, and using a rotation stage to create a virtual array. However, these configurations have a significantly higher data acquisition time and mechanical complexity. Also, the open-UST system can be modified during the design phase, for example, changing the ADR of the elements by adjusting their dimensions, which is not possible with off-the-shelf clinical probes and would instead require expensive custom commercial arrays.

Due to its open-source design, the functionality of the open-UST system could be extended by adding temperature measurement, onboard multiplexing, or electrical impedance matching to the interconnect PCB. The impulse response could be modified by adjusting the thickness and acoustic properties of the matching and backing layers. However, further work is needed to create a publicly available database of the acoustic properties of various metal filler/polymer composites, to reduce the upfront time spent on tuning the compositions to achieve the desired properties. The PZT element size could also be modified, but Section II-C demonstrated that it is not straightforward to predict the resonance behavior of small PZT elements from their dimensions alone, without using finiteelement analysis. The open-UST system could also be a useful starting point for the rapid prototyping of low-cost transducer arrays for applications outside of breast UST, for example, in ultrasound therapy, rewarming, or industrial nondestructive testing.

The open-UST manufacture was designed to be accessible, without using specialist equipment. Tight manufacturing tolerances were achieved, but these depended heavily on calibrated offsets added to CAD models to compensate for systematic 3-D printing errors. Further work is needed to assess whether end users could replicate these results, without the experience gained during the prototyping phase.

The nominal bandwidth, beam pattern, and SNR are similar to other UST arrays and are compatible with FWI methods, and thus, the open-UST system is suitable for UST imaging. The smooth ADR of the transducer elements could be modeled by representing the elements as ideal rectangular sources [43] during FWI reconstruction, with dimensions chosen to best match simulated and measured watershot datasets. This removes the need for an individual source definition based on additional hydrophone measurements, simplifying the calibration for the user. The electromechanical impulse response could also be derived from Fig. 9 using de-autoconvolution [44].

Section III showed that the IEV in ADR was low, the on-axis position errors were small enough to be calibrated using simple time-of-flight methods [36], and the beam axis skew angles were negligible. Therefore, users could model the transducers identically during image reconstruction, avoiding the need to characterize individual elements using hydrophone scans, which would add complexity. Only the ADR amplitude information was assessed in this article, but since the image reconstruction was successful, the IEV in the phase is also expected to be low. Further work is required to assess the reconstruction accuracy using FWI methods, in the case where the transducers are assumed to be identical.

The IEV in transmit-receive response was characterized for all of the elements in the array and was similar to the IEV in the other characteristics. Therefore, the summary statistics in Table II calculated for an array subset are likely to reflect the acoustic performance distribution of the entire array. The IEV in electrical impedance, fractional bandwidth, opening angle, and element position was similar to other UST systems manufactured using advanced equipment. This demonstrates that the low-cost techniques used for open-UST manufacturing framework also achieved high precision and low variation.

This article presented open-UST: a manufacturing framework for a low-cost transducer ring array. The acoustic performance and IEV were evaluated, and a phantom experiment was carried out to demonstrate the suitability of Authorized licensed use limited to: University College London. Downloaded on October 28,2024 at 17:43:37 UTC from IEEE Xplore. Restrictions apply.

open-UST for imaging research. A manufacture guide has been made available online [12].

REFERENCES

- [1] M. G. Marmot, D. G. Altman, D. A. Cameron, J. A. Dewar, S. G. Thompson, and M. Wilcox, "The benefits and harms of breast cancer screening: An independent review," *Brit. J. Cancer*, vol. 108, no. 11, pp. 2205–2240, Jun. 2013.
- [2] B. Malik, E. Iuanow, and J. Klock, "An exploratory multi-reader, multicase study comparing transmission ultrasound to mammography on recall rates and detection rates for breast cancer lesions," *Academic Radiol.*, vol. 29, pp. S10–S18, Jan. 2022.
- [3] E. Bachmann and J. Tromp, "Source encoding for viscoacoustic ultrasound computed tomography," J. Acoust. Soc. Amer., vol. 147, no. 5, pp. 3221–3235, May 2020.
- [4] F. Lucka, M. Pérez-Liva, B. E. Treeby, and B. T. Cox, "High resolution 3D ultrasonic breast imaging by time-domain full waveform inversion," *Inverse Problems*, vol. 38, no. 2, Feb. 2022, Art. no. 025008.
- [5] J. Wiskin and J. Klock, "3D ultrasound tomography timing validation for clinical deployment," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Ultrason. Symp. (IUS)*, Oct. 2022, pp. 1–3.
- [6] Y. Kim, A. D. Maxwell, T. L. Hall, Z. Xu, K.-W. Lin, and C. A. Cain, "Rapid prototyping fabrication of focused ultrasound transducers," *IEEE Trans. Ultrason., Ferroelectr., Freq. Control*, vol. 61, no. 9, pp. 1559–1574, Sep. 2014.
- [7] T. Yddal, S. Cochran, O. H. Gilja, M. Postema, and S. Kotopoulis, "Open-source, high-throughput ultrasound treatment chamber," *Biomed. Eng./Biomedizinische Technik*, vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 77–87, Jan. 2015.
- [8] C. Cueto et al., "Stride: A flexible software platform for highperformance ultrasound computed tomography," *Comput. Methods Pro*grams Biomed., vol. 221, Jun. 2022, Art. no. 106855.
- [9] N. V. Ruiter et al., "USCT reference data base: Conclusions from the first SPIE USCT data challenge and future directions," *Proc. SPIE*, vol. 10580, pp. 170–176, Mar. 2018.
- [10] E. Smith et al., "An open access chamber designed for the acoustic characterisation of microbubbles," *Appl. Sci.*, vol. 12, no. 4, p. 1818, Feb. 2022.
- [11] A. Marzo, T. Corkett, and B. W. Drinkwater, "Ultraino: An open phasedarray system for narrowband airborne ultrasound transmission," *IEEE Trans. Ultrason., Ferroelectr., Freq. Control*, vol. 65, no. 1, pp. 102–111, Jan. 2018.
- [12] M. Roberts. (2022). open-UST Documentation. [Online]. Available: morganjroberts.github.io/open-UST
- [13] B. Malik, R. Terry, J. Wiskin, and M. Lenox, "Quantitative transmission ultrasound tomography: Imaging and performance characteristics," *Med. Phys.*, vol. 45, no. 7, pp. 3063–3075, Jul. 2018.
- [14] O. Roy et al., "Breast imaging using ultrasound tomography: From clinical requirements to system design," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Ultrason. Symp. (IUS)*, Jul. 2013, pp. 1174–1177.
- [15] C. Cueto et al., "Spatial response identification enables robust experimental ultrasound computed tomography," *IEEE Trans. Ultrason., Ferroelectr., Freq. Control*, vol. 69, no. 1, pp. 27–37, Jan. 2022.
- [16] O. C. Agudo, L. Guasch, P. Huthwaite, and M. Warner, "3D imaging of the breast using full-waveform inversion," in *Proc. Int. Workshop Med. Ultrasound Tomogr.*, Jan. 2018, pp. 99–110.
- [17] G. Y. Sandhu, E. West, C. Li, O. Roy, and N. Duric, "3D frequencydomain ultrasound waveform tomography breast imaging," *Proc. SPIE*, vol. 10139, pp. 56–69, Mar. 2017.
- [18] M. Angerer, M. Zapf, S. Gebhardt, and N. V. Ruiter, "Single- PZT-fiber transducers for 3D ultrasound computed tomography: Characterization and modeling," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Ultrason. Symp. (IUS)*, Oct. 2022, pp. 1–4.
- [19] L. Medina-Valdés, M. Pérez-Liva, J. Camacho, J. M. U.ías, J. L. Herraiz, and N. González-Salido, "Multi-modal ultrasound imaging for breast cancer detection," *Phys. Proc.*, vol. 63, pp. 134–140, Jan. 2015.
- [20] M. Roberts, E. Martin, M. Brown, B. Cox, and B. Treeby, "Transducer module development for an open-source ultrasound tomography system," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Ultrason. Symp. (IUS)*, Sep. 2021, pp. 1–4.
- [21] M. Roberts, E. Martin, M. Brown, B. Cox, and B. Treeby, "Matching layer deposition for an open-source ultrasound tomography system: Inter-element variation in frequency response," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Ultrason. Symp. (IUS)*, Oct. 2022, pp. 1–4.

- [22] H. Gemmeke and N. V. Ruiter, "3D ultrasound computer tomography for medical imaging," *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. A, Accel. Spectrom. Detect. Assoc. Equip.*, vol. 580, no. 2, pp. 1057–1065, 2007.
- [23] J. F. C. J. Camacho, N. González-Salido, C. Fritsch, M. Pérez-Liva, J. Herraiz, and J. Udías, "A multi-modal ultrasound breast imaging system," in *Proc. Int. Workshop Med. Ultrasound Tomogr.* Speyer, Germany: KIT Scientific Publishing, 2018, pp. 119–130.
- [24] M. Zapf et al., "Realization of an pseudo-randomly sampled 3D USCT," Proc. SPIE, vol. 12038, pp. 43–47, Apr. 2022.
- [25] J. Cudeiro-Blanco et al., "Design and construction of a low-frequency ultrasound acquisition device for 2-D brain imaging using full-waveform inversion," *Ultrasound Med. Biol.*, vol. 48, no. 10, pp. 1995–2008, Oct. 2022.
- [26] E. Boni, A. C. H. Yu, S. Freear, J. A. Jensen, and P. Tortoli, "Ultrasound open platforms for next-generation imaging technique development," *IEEE Trans. Ultrason., Ferroelectr., Freq. Control*, vol. 65, no. 7, pp. 1078–1092, Jul. 2018.
- [27] S.-Y. Huang et al., "The characterization of breast anatomical metrics using dedicated breast CT," *Med. Phys.*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 2180–2191, Mar. 2011.
- [28] B. E. Treeby, J. Budisky, E. S. Wise, J. Jaros, and B. T. Cox, "Rapid calculation of acoustic fields from arbitrary continuous-wave sources," *J. Acoust. Soc. Amer.*, vol. 143, no. 1, pp. 529–537, Jan. 2018.
- [29] N. de Jong, N. Bom, J. Souquet, and G. Faber, "Vibration modes, matching layers and grating lobes," *Ultrasonics*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 176–182, Jul. 1985.
- [30] M. Roberts, E. Martin, B. Cox, and B. Treeby, "Progress towards an open-source, low-cost ultrasound tomography research system," in *Proc. Int. Workshop Med. Ultrasound Tomogr.*, 2019, pp. 53–66.
- [31] M. G. Grewe, T. R. Gururaja, T. R. Shrout, and R. E. Newnham, "Acoustic properties of particle/polymer composites for ultrasonic transducer backing applications," *IEEE Trans. Ultrason., Ferroelectr., Freq. Control*, vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 506–514, Nov. 1990.
- [32] J. W. Hunt, M. Arditi, and F. S. Foster, "Ultrasound transducers for pulse-echo medical imaging," *IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng.*, vol. BME-30, no. 8, pp. 453–481, Aug. 1983.
- [33] M. Angerer, M. Zapf, B. Leyrer, and N. V. Ruiter, "Semi-automated packaging of transducer arrays for 3D ultrasound computer tomography," in *Proc. IEEE Sensors*, Oct. 2020, pp. 1–4.
- [34] X. Zeng and R. J. McGough, "Evaluation of the angular spectrum approach for simulations of near-field pressures," J. Acoust. Soc. Amer., vol. 123, no. 1, pp. 68–76, Jan. 2008.
- [35] B. Delannoy, C. Bruneel, F. Haine, and R. Torguet, "Anomalous behavior in the radiation pattern of piezoelectric transducers induced by parasitic Lamb wave generation," *J. Appl. Phys.*, vol. 51, no. 7, pp. 3942–3948, Jul. 1980.
- [36] W. Y. Tan, T. Steiner, and N. V. Ruiter, "Newton's method based self calibration for a 3D ultrasound tomography system," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Ultrason. Symp. (IUS)*, Oct. 2015, pp. 1–4.
- [37] D. Sarno, C. Baker, S. Curtis, M. Hodnett, and B. Zeqiri, "In vivo measurements of the bulk ultrasonic attenuation coefficient of breast tissue using a novel phase-insensitive receiver," *IEEE Trans. Ultrason.*, *Ferroelectr., Freq. Control*, vol. 69, no. 10, pp. 2943–2954, Oct. 2022.
- [38] A. C. Kak and M. Slaney, Principles Computerized Tomographic Imaging. Philadelphia, PA, USA: SIAM, 2001.
- [39] M. Roberts. (2022). UST-SART Repository. [Online]. Available: https://github.com/ucl-bug/ust-sart
- [40] A. Javaherian, F. Lucka, and B. T. Cox, "Refraction-corrected ray-based inversion for three-dimensional ultrasound tomography of the breast," *Inverse Problems*, vol. 36, no. 12, Dec. 2020, Art. no. 125010.
- [41] S. M. Ji, J. H. Sung, C. Y. Park, and J. S. Jeong, "Phase-canceled backing structure for lightweight ultrasonic transducer," *Sens. Actuators A, Phys.*, vol. 260, pp. 161–168, Jun. 2017.
- [42] A. Roman, P. Dehghanzadeh, V. Pashaei, A. Basak, S. Bhunia, and S. Mandal, "An open-source test-bench for autonomous ultrasound imaging," in *Proc. IEEE 61st Int. Midwest Symp. Circuits Syst. (MWS-CAS)*, Aug. 2018, pp. 524–527.
- [43] E. S. Wise, B. T. Cox, J. Jaros, and B. E. Treeby, "Representing arbitrary acoustic source and sensor distributions in Fourier collocation methods," *J. Acoust. Soc. Amer.*, vol. 146, no. 1, pp. 278–288, Jul. 2019.
- [44] P. van der Meulen, P. Kruizinga, J. G. Bosch, and G. Leus, "Impulse response estimation method for ultrasound arrays," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Ultrason. Symp. (IUS)*, Sep. 2017, p. 1.