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Abstract—Computational ultrasound imaging has become a well-established methodology in the ultrasound community. Simulations of ultrasound sequences and images allow the study of innovative techniques in terms of emission strategy, beamforming and probe design. There is a wide spectrum of software dedicated to ultrasound imaging, each having its specificities in its applications and in the numerical method. We describe in this two-part paper a new ultrasound simulator (SIMUS) for Matlab, which belongs to the Matlab UltraSound Toolbox (MUST). The SIMUS software is based on far-field and paraxial approximations. It simulates acoustic pressure fields and radiofrequency RF signals for uniform linear or convex probes. SIMUS is an open-source software whose features are 1) rapidity, 2) ease of use, 3) harmonic domain, 4) pedagogy. The main goal was to offer a comprehensive turnkey tool, along with a detailed theory for pedagogical and research purposes. This article describes in detail the underlying linear theory of SIMUS and provides examples of simulated acoustic fields and ultrasound images. The accompanying article (part II) is devoted to the comparison of SIMUS with popular software: Field II, k-Wave, and the Verasonics simulator. The Matlab open codes for the simulator SIMUS are distributed under the terms of the GNU Lesser General Public License, and can be downloaded from https://www.biomecardio.com/MUST.
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I. INTRODUCTION

COMPUTATIONAL ultrasound imaging, which uses numerical analysis to solve problems that involve ultrasound wave propagations, has become a standard methodology in the medical and non-destructive ultrasound community. Before considering in vitro or in vivo investigations, computational ultrasound imaging can be used, for example, to 1) analyze ultrasound sequences and arrays [1], 2) develop or optimize beamforming or post-processing algorithms [2], 3) explore multiple configurations through serial tests [3], 4) compare with peers in international challenges [4]. Among the freely available ultrasound simulators, Field II [5], [6], and k-Wave [7], [8] are likely the most popular. These Matlab toolboxes have widely promoted the use of ultrasound simulations for research purposes, and the number of works that use these tools has been increasing over the years (Fig. 1). There is a whole range of software packages dedicated to ultrasound imaging, available for free, as open-source or not. A non-exhaustive list of ultrasound-imaging programs is available on the k-Wave website1. These software programs each have their specificities, both in their application and in the numerical method: propagation to simulate acoustic pressure fields [9], [10] and/or backpropagation to also generate ultrasound images [5], [7]; two- and/or three-dimensional; solved in the time [11] or frequency [12] domain; linear [13] and/or non-linear [14]; grid-based [7] or mesh-free [5]; for speed-homogeneous [6] or inhomogeneous media [7], [11].

In this article, I propose a harmonic-based ultrasound simulator called SIMUS. The goal was not to bring a theoretical innovation since I wrote SIMUS based on linear models described in several articles [15]–[21] and in Schmerr’s book [22]. As detailed in the following sections, this simulator is based on far-field (Fraunhofer) and paraxial (Fresnel) approximations. SIMUS and its associated function PFIELD are open-source codes that can be adapted by an advanced user for her/his own purpose. I created SIMUS primarily for educational and practical purposes. It was first intended for students and postdoctoral fellows, as they needed fast, open-source programs for their research projects [1], [23]. The ultrasound simulator SIMUS is an integral part of the MUST toolbox (Matlab UltraSound Toolbox), which I distributed online under the terms of the GNU Lesser General Public License v3.0 (www.biomecardio.com/MUST). The MUST toolbox is intended for students and researchers, both novice or advanced, for teaching or research in ultrasound medical imaging. The website includes many practical examples that allow a quick understanding of the essentials of ultrasound imaging.

As with Field II [5] and k-Wave [7], MATLAB was chosen as the programming language because of its widespread use in universities and research labs, and its rich repertoire of built-in
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functions for data analysis, data processing, and image display. At the time of submission of this paper, only 1-D probes, rectilinear or convex, with elevation focusing, are considered in SIMUS. Although there is a growing interest in ultrasound imaging with a high number of transducer elements (e.g. 1024) and 2-D matrix arrays [24], [25], it appears that the 1-D configuration with a limited number of channels (typically 64 to 192) remains by far the most common configuration at present. The main assumptions on which SIMUS relies are

1. Linearity,
2. Scatterers acting as monopole sources,
3. Weak (single) scattering.

In essence, these hypotheses are similar to those in Field II. SIMUS, however, works in the Fourier domain. The Fourier domain is indeed more appropriate in many ways. Besides some numerical advantages, the Fourier domain can easily consider the physical aspects that depend on the frequency, such as the directivity of the elements and the attenuation. The challenge was that the function SIMUS could be easily manipulated after a few minutes of training. For the sake of clarity, the syntax of SIMUS has been standardized with that of the functions included in the MUST toolbox, and the default settings are those commonly used in medical ultrasound. It should be noted that SIMUS calls the PFIELD function, which is the main program. PFIELD calculates acoustic pressure fields and derives the pressure signals reflected by monopole point scatterers and measured by the elements.

This article (Part I: theory) is completed by a second one (Part II: comparison with Field II, k-Wave, and Verasonics, Varray F. and Garcia D.) This first part describes the linear acoustic theory that is in PFIELD. Several approximations and linearizations have been used. It is essential to review them to identify the limits of PFIELD and under which conditions it can be used. I have illustrated Part I with simulations of sound pressure fields and ultrasound images. The second article (Part II) is devoted to the comparison of the acoustic pressures generated by PFIELD with those obtained by Field II, k-Wave, and the Verasonics simulator.

In this first-part article, I will outline the theoretical reasoning leading to the equations included in PFIELD. I will first explain how sound pressure fields are simulated and then address the generation of backscattered pressure signals. The last section will be illustrated with some realistic examples related to medical imaging.

II. PFIELD INSIDE OUT

This section describes the theory inside PFIELD. PFIELD simulates the pressure fields in the harmonic domain; i.e. it is assumed that the pressure waves have a harmonic time dependence such that the pressure is written as:

\[ p(X, t) = \text{Re} \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} P(X, \omega, t) e^{-i\omega t} d\omega \right\}, \tag{1} \]

with \( X \) representing a point in the radiated region of interest, and \( \omega \) being the angular frequency. In the following subsections, I will describe how the pressure component \( P(X, \omega, t) \) generated from one array element can be approximated, from which the backscattered echoes will be deduced. Although PFIELD also works for curvilinear arrays, the following sections describe the theory in the context of a rectilinear probe (Fig. 2). The interested reader can refer to the PFIELD code\(^2\) to learn about the slight modifications required for a convex probe. To estimate the waves that are backscattered by a medium of point-like scatterers, one must first calculate the acoustic pressure radiated by a single element transducer and an ultrasound array. As we will see, the width (\( = 2b \), see Fig. 2) and height (\( h \)) of the element transducers are two key parameters. Recalling that only 1-D arrays will be addressed, elevation focusing will be taken into consideration.

---

\( ^2 \) https://www.biomecardio.com/MUST
A. Overview of the problem

We will use the conventional coordinate system for a rectangular array (Fig. 2), i.e. $X$ along the azimuthal direction, $Y$ for the elevation, and $Z$ describing the axial position. A similar system, noted in lowercase letters $(x, y, z)$, will be applied for individual elements or sub-elements (Fig. 3): i.e. $x, y, z$ all equal zero at the center of an individual (sub-)element. The model starts with the Rayleigh-Sommerfeld integral, which describes an isolated element behaving like a baffled piston that vibrates on the $x$-$y$ plane (Fig. 4). From the pressure waves radiated by a single element will follow those of the ultrasound probe. The distance between a point $x' = (x', y', 0)$ of the piston and a point $x = (x, y, z)$ in the field (Fig. 3), is noted

$$r' = \sqrt{(x - x')^2 + (y - y')^2 + z^2}. \tag{2}$$

The distance between the center of the piston and a point $x$ in the field (Fig. 3), is noted

$$r = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2 + z^2}. \tag{3}$$

Fig. 3. Coordinate system for an individual element. The distance $r'$ is approximated by the expression (6).
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Medical ultrasound one-dimensional arrays contain an acoustic lens that focuses the ultrasound waves on the elevation plane. In PFIELD, the incident waves can be focused on the elevation plane at a given distance $R_f$ (Fig. 2 and Fig. 4), whose value is generally provided by the probe manufacturer. A strategy for simulating elevation focusing is to use a large concave element [26] or to position small elements onto a curved surface [27]. Another strategy is to modify the piston velocity delays along the elevation direction (Fig. 4), as described by Eq. (3.27) in [22]:

$$v(y', \omega) = v_0(\omega) e^{-ik'y' \over 2r} \text{ if } |y'| \leq h \over 2, \quad 0 \text{ otherwise}, \tag{4}$$

with $v_0(\omega)$ being the velocity amplitude.

B. Acoustic field of a single array element

Let us consider a planar piston embedded in an infinite rigid baffle, and vibrating along the $z$-direction. The resulting harmonic pressure $P$ at position $x = (x, y, z)$ is given by the Rayleigh-Sommerfeld integral (see e.g. Eq. 1 in [21] or Eq. 6.19 in [22])

$$P(x, \omega, t) = \frac{kpc}{2\pi} e^{-i\omega t} \int_{-b}^{b} \int_{-h/2}^{h/2} v(\omega) e^{ikr} \frac{d\xi'}{r'} \, dx' \, dy', \tag{5}$$

where $\xi = \sqrt{-1}, t$ is time, $\omega$ is the angular frequency, $\rho$ is the medium density, $c$ is the speed of sound, and $k = \omega/c$ is the wavenumber. Assuming a paraxial propagation with respect to the $y$-direction, the distance $r'$ [Eq. (2)] can be rewritten, in the far field, as (see Appendix)

$$r' = r - x' \sin \theta + (y-y')^2 \over 2r, \tag{6}$$

where the angle $\theta$ is defined in Fig. 3. The far-field pressure can thus be approximated by inserting (6) into (5) and by substituting $r$ for $r'$ in the denominator:

$$P(x, \omega, t) = \frac{kpc}{2\pi} e^{-i\omega t} \int_{-b}^{b} \int_{-h/2}^{h/2} v(y', \omega) e^{ikr} \frac{d\xi'}{r'} \, dx' \, dy', \tag{7}$$

which gives

$$P(x, \omega, t) = \frac{kpc}{2\pi} v_0(\omega) e^{-i\omega t} \times ... \int_{-b}^{b} e^{-ikx' \sin \theta} \, dx' \int_{-h/2}^{h/2} v(y', \omega) e^{ik(y-y')^2 \over 2r} \, dy'. \tag{8}$$

Including the expression of the piston velocity [Eq. (4)] in the integrand of the second integral of Eq. (8) yields

$$P(x, \omega, t) = \frac{kpc}{2\pi} v_0(\omega) e^{-i\omega t} \times ... \tag{9}$$
\[
\left\{ \int_{-b}^{b} e^{-i k x' \sin \theta} \, dx' \right\} \left\{ \int_{-h/2}^{h/2} e^{-i k y'^2 / 2r} \, dy' \right\}.
\]

The two integrals in the curly brackets will now be determined. The first integral in Eq. (9) yields
\[
\int_{-b}^{b} e^{-i k x' \sin \theta} \, dx' = 2b \text{sinc}(kb \sin \theta).
\]

The second integral of Eq. (9) could be explicitly expressed by using the imaginary error function (erfi). However, the numerical estimation of the erf function, e.g. through estimating the Faddeeva function [28], is computationally expensive. I thus opted for the use of a Gaussian superposition model [20]. The second integral of Eq. (9) is rewritten as
\[
\int_{-h/2}^{h/2} e^{-i k y'^2 / 2r} \, dy' = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Pi\left(\frac{y'}{h}\right) e^{-i k y'^2 / 2r} \, dy'.
\]

where \( \Pi \) stands for the rectangle function. In the Gaussian superposition model, the rectangle function is approximated by a sum of Gaussians with complex coefficients (Fig. 5):
\[
\Pi\left(\frac{y'}{h}\right) \approx \sum_{g=1}^{G} A_g e^{-\beta y'^2 / \pi^2}.
\]

Equation (11) thus becomes
\[
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Pi\left(\frac{y'}{h}\right) e^{-i k y'^2 / 2r} \, dy' \approx \sum_{g=1}^{G} A_g \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-a y'^2 + \beta y'^4 + \gamma y'^6} \, dy',
\]

where
\[
a_g = \frac{B_g}{\pi^2} + \frac{ik}{2r} \left( \frac{1}{\pi r^2} \right); \quad \beta = \frac{-i k y^2}{r^2}; \quad \gamma = \frac{i k y^2}{2 r^2}.
\]

Solving the right-hand side Gaussian integral in Eq. (13) yields
\[
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Pi\left(\frac{y'}{h}\right) e^{-i k y'^2 / 2r} \, dy' \approx \sum_{g=1}^{G} A_g \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{a_g}} e^{\beta^2 / 4a_g}.
\]

From Eq. (15), the second integral of Eq. (9) thus reduces to
\[
\int_{-h/2}^{h/2} e^{-i k y'^2 / 2r} \, dy' \approx \sum_{g=1}^{G} A_g \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{a_g}} e^{\beta^2 / 4a_g}.
\]

Replacing the two integrals in (9) by their respective expressions (10) and (16) provides an estimate of the acoustic pressure generated by a single element:
\[
P(x, \omega, t) \approx \frac{\sum_{g=1}^{G} A_g \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{a_g}} e^{\beta^2 / 4a_g}}{\delta(\theta, r, k)}.
\]

The coefficients \( A_g \) and \( B_g \) can be determined through an optimization method. We found that four coefficients (Fig. 5) offer a good compromise when comparing against Field II and k-Wave (see Part II):
\[
A_1 = 0.187 \pm 0.275 i, \quad B_1 = 4.558 \pm 25.59 i,
\]
\[
A_2 = 0.288 \pm 1.954 i, \quad B_2 = 8.598 \pm 7.924 i,
\]
\[
A_3 = A_1, B_3 = B_1,
\]
\[
A_4 = A_2, B_4 = B_2.
\]

Lists with up to 25 coefficients are provided in [19] and [28].

Fig. 5. The rectangle function can be approximated by the sum of Gaussians, which simplifies the estimation of the integral in Eq. (11).

In practice, it is not the velocity of the element that is known, but the acoustic pressure generated by an element, measured for example with a hydrophone. The first term in brackets (dimensionally homogeneous to pressure) in the expression (17) represents the spectrum of the transmit pressure pulse (up to a constant multiplier), noted \( P_{T_x}(\omega) \). The sine cardinal sinc term represents the x-directivity of one element, noted \( D(\theta, k) \). The last term in brackets is related to the elevation focusing. It is homogeneous to a distance and is noted \( \delta(y, r, k) \). Using these notations, the acoustic pressure of one element finally reduces to
\[
P(x, \omega, t) \approx \frac{P_{T_x}(\omega)}{r} D(\theta, k) \delta(y, r, k) e^{-i \omega t}.
\]
More generally, if the transmission is delayed by $\Delta \tau$, the wave field is given by

$$P(x, \omega, t) \approx P_{Tx}(\omega) e^{i k r} \frac{e^{i \omega \Delta \tau}}{r} D(\theta, k) \delta(y, r, k) e^{i \omega \Delta \tau} e^{-i \omega t}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (20)

It is recalled that the position variables $(x, \theta, r)$ in (20) are relative to the element (Fig. 3).

**C. Acoustic field of a rectilinear array**

The expression (20) models acoustic waves radiated by one element. To derive this expression, the distance $r$ with respect to the element [see Eq. (6)] was simplified by using a Fraunhofer (far-field) approximation in the azimuthal $x$-direction, and a Fresnel (paraxial) approximation in the elevation $y$-direction. In order to fulfill the far-field condition, it may be necessary to split the array elements into $\nu$ sub-elements, in the azimuthal $x$-direction, if they are too wide (Fig. 6). In PFIELD, $\nu$ is chosen so that a sub-element width ($= 2b/\nu$) is not greater than the minimal wavelength (defined at -6dB):

$$\nu = \lceil \frac{2b}{\lambda_{\min}} \rceil,$$ \hspace{1cm} (21)

where $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ being the ceiling function. As an indication, the number $\nu$ of simulated sub-element(s) per array element is typically 1 for cardiac phased arrays, and 2 for linear arrays. If an array contains $N$ elements, the total number of sub-elements is thus $(\nu N)$. Given the properties of linearity, the acoustic wavefield produced by an $N$-element array can be modeled by superimposing the $(\nu N)$ individual sub-element models described by (20):

$$P_{Tx}(\omega) e^{-i \omega t} \approx \sum_{n=1}^{\nu N} \frac{P(X, \omega, t)}{W_n} e^{i k r_n} D(\theta_n, k) \delta(y, r_n, k) e^{i \omega \Delta \tau_n}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (22)

In (22), the position variables $(\theta_n, y_n, r_n)$ are relative to the $n^{th}$ sub-element. One has $y_n = Y$ for a 1-D array. The position $X = (X, Y, Z)$ is relative to the coordinate system of the array depicted in Fig. 2. If $X_{c,n}$ stands for the abscissa of the $n^{th}$ sub-element centroid, then

$$r_n = \sqrt{(X - X_{c,n})^2 + Y^2 + Z^2},$$ \hspace{1cm} (23)

and

$$\sin \theta_n = (X - X_{c,n})/(\sqrt{(X - X_{c,n})^2 + Z^2}).$$

We here used $X_{c,n} = 0$ (non-convex array). Let the leftmost to rightmost sub-elements be numbered sequentially, from 1 to $n$. In the case of a uniform linear array of pitch $p$ (Fig. 6), it can be shown that its centroid abscissa can be written as

$$X_{c,n} = \frac{p}{2} \left( \left\lfloor \frac{n}{\nu} \right\rfloor - N - 1 \right) + \frac{p}{2}(n - 1)(\text{mod }\nu) + \nu + 1.$$ \hspace{1cm} (24)

The term $\left\lfloor \frac{n}{\nu} \right\rfloor$ corresponds to the number of the element to which the sub-element $n$ belongs. Note that only $X_{c,n}$ (and $Z_{c,n} \neq 0$) must be modified for a convex array (see the PFIELD code for details). The transmit delay $\Delta \tau_n = \Delta \tau_{\lceil n/\nu \rceil}$ in (22) is that of the $\lceil n/\nu \rceil^{th}$ element. Each element has been weighted by $W_n = W_{\lceil n/\nu \rceil}$ to consider transmit apodization. The equation (22) is the backbone of PFIELD. Once the transmit pressure $P_{Tx}(\omega)$ is given, it allows simulation of realistic fields of acoustic pressure produced by an ultrasound array. In PFIELD, the transmit pressure is generated by convolving the one-way response of the transducer with a windowed sine, as explained in the next section. From the acoustic reciprocity principle, Eq. (22) can also be applied to derive the backscattered echoes, as it will be explained in section IV.

**III. SPECTRUM OF THE TRANSMIT PRESSURE**

The general expression (22) contains the spectrum of the transmit pressure $P_{Tx}(\omega)$. In SIMUS and PFIELD, the transmit pressure waveform is obtained by convolving a rectangularly-windowed sinusoid (a “perfect” pulse) with the point spread function (PSF) of the transducer. The angular frequency of the sinusoid is that of the transducer ($\omega_c = 2\pi f_c$), the center frequency $f_c$ being provided by the manufacturer). The temporal width $T$ of the rectangular window is defined in terms of number of wavelengths $n_\lambda$ by $T = n_\lambda/f_c = 2\pi n_\lambda/\omega_c$. The spectrum
of the rectangularly-windowed pulse is given by

$$S_p(\omega) = i \left[ \frac{\sin \left( \frac{\omega_0 - \omega c}{2} \right) - \sin \left( \frac{\omega + \omega c}{2} \right)}{\sigma \omega c} \right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (25)$$

The spectrum of the transducer PSF is defined by a generalized Gaussian window that depends on two positive parameters $p$ and $\sigma$:

$$S_T(\omega) = e^{-\left( \frac{\omega - \omega_0}{\sigma \omega c} \right)^p}$$  \hspace{1cm} (26)$$

It is designed so that its pulse-echo response has a given bandwidth $\omega_0$ at -6 dB (Fig. 7). The pulse-echo fractional bandwidth is generally given by the manufacturer in percent. For example, a 65% bandwidth means that the frequency bandwidth of the response is such that $\omega_0 = 0.65 \omega_c$. To determine both $p$ and $\sigma$, it is postulated that $S_T(0) = 2^{-126}$ (the smallest positive single-precision floating-point number). It follows that (see Appendix)

$$S_T(\omega) = e^{-\ln \left( \frac{\omega_0}{\omega} \right)^p}, \text{ with } p = \ln 126 / \ln \left( \frac{\omega_0}{\omega_c} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (27)$$

Fig. 7 (left panel) depicts an example of the simulated transducer response for a pulse-echo fractional bandwidth of 77%. PFIELD does not include the electrical-acoustic conversions that occur in the piezoelectric elements. The units of the simulated acoustic and electrical signals are thus arbitrary (not Pa or V). By using this simplified representation and writing the convolution in the frequency domain, the spectrum of the transmit pressure $P_{Tx}(\omega)$ is given by this proportionality relationship:

$$P_{Tx}(\omega) \propto S_p(\omega) \sqrt{S_T(\omega)}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (28)$$

A square root is needed since the transducer response $S_T(\omega)$ is two-way (transmit + receive). Fig. 7 (right panel) presents a transmit pulse (one-way) in the temporal domain.

IV. SIMUS INSIDE OUT

A. Echoes received by a sub-element

SIMUS uses PFIELD and point-like scatterers to simulate radiofrequency (RF) ultrasound signals. These scatterers become individual monopole point sources when an incident wave reaches them. They do not acoustically interact with each other according to the assumption of single weak scattering. Each scatterer is defined by its reflection coefficient ($R_s$), which describes how much amplitude of a wave is reflected. Although some tissues, such as blood, are governed by Rayleigh scattering [30], the $R_s$ coefficients are assumed constant, i.e. independent of frequency and incidence angle. From (22), the pressure signal received by a scatterer $s$ located at $X_s = (X_s, Y_s, Z_s)$ is

$$P(X_s, \omega, t) \approx P_{Tx}(\omega) e^{-i\omega t} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} W_n e^{ikr_{ns}} D(\theta_{ns}, k) \delta(Y_s, r_{ns}, k) e^{i\omega \Delta t n}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (29)$$

where $r_{ns} = \sqrt{(X_s - X_{cm})^2 + Y_s^2 + Z_s^2}$ and $\sin \theta_{ns} = (X_s - X_{cm})/\sqrt{(X_s - X_{cm})^2 + Y_s^2 + Z_s^2}$. The principle of acoustic reciprocity dictates that an acoustic response remains identical when the source and receiver are exchanged. Expression (19) can therefore give the pressure received by the $m$th sub-element from a scatterer $s$, after accounting for its reflection coefficient $R_s$:

$$P_{se_{ms}}(\omega, t) \approx R_s \frac{P_{Tx}(\omega) e^{-i\omega t}}{P(X_s, \omega, t)} e^{ikr_{ms}} D(\theta_{ms}, k) \delta(Y_s, r_{ms}, k),$$  \hspace{1cm} (30)$$

where $r_{ms} = \sqrt{(X_s - X_{cm})^2 + Y_s^2 + Z_s^2}$ and $\sin \theta_{ms} = (X_s - X_{cm})/\sqrt{(X_s - X_{cm})^2 + Y_s^2 + Z_s^2}$. In (30), the superscript “se” means “sub-element”. Inserting (29) in (30), it follows that:

$$P_{se_{ms}}(\omega, t) \approx R_s \frac{P_{Tx}(\omega) e^{-i\omega t}}{P(X_s, \omega, t)} \left[ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} W_n e^{ikr_{ns}} D(\theta_{ns}, k) \delta(Y_s, r_{ns}, k) e^{i\omega \Delta t n} \right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (31)$$

The expression (31) is the acoustic pressure backscattered by a single scatterer and received by the $m$th sub-element. Assuming now that there is a total of $S$ scatterers, the combination of their independent effect (single scattering assumption) gives the total pressure received by the $m$th sub-element:

$$P_{se_{m}}(\omega, t) \approx P_{Tx}(\omega) e^{-i\omega t} \left[ \sum_{s=1}^{S} R_s \left( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} W_n e^{ikr_{ns}} D(\theta_{ns}, k) \delta(Y_s, r_{ns}, k) e^{i\omega \Delta t n} \right) \right].$$  \hspace{1cm} (32)$$

The expression (32) is for an individual sub-element #m. The pressure wave $P_m(\omega, t)$ received by one transducer element is the coherent sum of the pressures received by all its sub-elements (Fig. 6). For the element #1:

$$P_{m_1}^e(\omega, t) = \sum_{\mu=0}^{v-1} P_{se_{n+\mu}}(\omega, t)$$  \hspace{1cm} (33)$$

The theoretical pressures were all derived for a single angular...
frequency \( \omega = 2\pi f \). The full-band waveforms can be obtained by summation in the frequency domain through an inverse fast Fourier transform.

### B. Radiofrequency signals

The spectrum of the radiofrequency RF signal of the \( m \)th sub-element is related to the received acoustic pressure (32) by

\[
\text{RF}^{se}_m(\omega, t) \propto \sqrt{S_T(\omega)} P^{se}_m(\omega, t),
\]

where it is recalled that \( \sqrt{S_T(\omega)} \) is the one-way transducer response. Alike (33), the RF signal related to one element is the coherent sum of the RF signals of its sub-elements.

\[
P_{2-D}(x, \omega, t) \approx \left\{ \frac{kb}{\pi r} \rho c v_0(\omega) \right\} e^{ikr} e^{-i\omega t} \sin(kb \sin \theta) \sqrt{\frac{2\pi r}{k}},
\]

which can be rewritten as

\[
P_{2-D}(x, \omega, t) \approx \sqrt{2b} \left( \frac{kb}{\pi r} \rho c v_0(\omega) \right) e^{ikr} e^{-i\omega t} \sin(kb \sin \theta) \frac{\sin(c/k)}{\partial(\delta k)}.
\]

The acoustic wave (22) radiated by an \( N \)-element array then becomes

\[
P_{2-D}(X, \omega, t) \approx \sqrt{2b} P_{Tx}(\omega) e^{-i\omega t} \sum_{n=1}^{N} W_n e^{ikr_n} D(\theta_{n,k}) e^{i\omega \Delta t_n}.
\]

Similarly, the pressure received by the \( m \)th sub-element (32) in a 2-D space reduces to

\[
P^{se}_{2-D_m}(\omega, t) \approx (2b) P_{Tx}(\omega) e^{-i\omega t} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left\{ \mathcal{R}_s \right\}
\times \sum_{h=1}^{N} W_n e^{ikr_{mh}} D(\theta_{h,k}) e^{i\omega \Delta t_n}
\times e^{ikr_{mn}} D(\theta_{m,k}).
\]

### V. The two-dimensional case

In a two-dimensional (2-D) x-z domain, the piston-like element generates a normal velocity that is constant everywhere (i.e. in \([-\infty, +\infty]\)) in the y-direction. This situation is obtained when \( h \) (element height) and \( R_f \) (distance to elevation focus) both tend to \(+\infty\). In this limit case, the rectangular function in Eq. (12) becomes 1 for any \( y' \), and the coefficients reduce to \( G = 1 \), with \( A_1 = 1 \) and \( B_1 = 0 \). Under these conditions, \( \beta^2/(4\alpha_s) + \gamma = 0 \) and \( \sqrt{(\pi/\alpha_s)} = \sqrt{(2i\pi r/k)} \) [see Eq. (14) and (15)]. In 2-D, from (17), the acoustic pressure generated by a single element thus reads

\[
P_{2-D}(x, \omega, t) \approx \left\{ \frac{kb}{\pi r} \rho c v_0(\omega) \right\} e^{ikr} e^{-i\omega t} \sin(kb \sin \theta) \sqrt{\frac{2\pi r}{k}},
\]

\[
P_{2-D}(x, \omega, t) \approx \left( \frac{kb}{\pi r} \rho c v_0(\omega) \right) e^{ikr} e^{-i\omega t} \sin(kb \sin \theta) \frac{\sin(c/k)}{\partial(\delta k)}.
\]

The acoustic wave (22) radiated by an \( N \)-element array then becomes

\[
P_{2-D}(X, \omega, t) \approx \sqrt{2b} P_{Tx}(\omega) e^{-i\omega t} \sum_{n=1}^{N} W_n e^{ikr_n} D(\theta_{n,k}) e^{i\omega \Delta t_n}.
\]

Similarly, the pressure received by the \( m \)th sub-element (32) in a 2-D space reduces to

\[
P^{se}_{2-D_m}(\omega, t) \approx (2b) P_{Tx}(\omega) e^{-i\omega t} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left\{ \mathcal{R}_s \right\}
\times \sum_{h=1}^{N} W_n e^{ikr_{mh}} D(\theta_{h,k}) e^{i\omega \Delta t_n}
\times e^{ikr_{mn}} D(\theta_{m,k}).
\]

### VI. Baffle impedance and dispersive medium

#### A. Finite impedance baffle

The general expressions (22) and (32) were derived by assuming that the baffle in which the transducer element is embedded has an infinite acoustic impedance (rigid baffle). It might be recommended to use a finite baffle impedance to obtain more realistic radiation patterns [18], [19]. In such a case, an obliquity factor must be added to the element directivity \( D(\theta, k) \) [see Eq. (36)]. The expressions of the obliquity factors

Fig. 8. Focused pressure fields simulated with PFIELD for a 64-element 2.7-MHz P4-2v cardiac phased array (kerf width = 50 μm, pitch = 0.3 mm, fractional bandwidth = 74%, elevation focus = 6 cm). These RMS (root mean square) acoustic fields illustrate emission sequences such as those used in standard transthoracic echocardiography, with focusing in the axial direction.
for a nonnegative finite impedance are given in [18] (null impedance = “soft” baffle) and [19] (positive impedance). The element directivity becomes

\[ D(\theta, k) = \begin{cases} 
  \text{sinc}(kb \sin \theta) & \text{rigid}; \\
  \text{sinc}(kb \sin \theta) \cos \theta & \text{soft}; \\
  \text{sinc}(kb \sin \theta) \cos \theta + \zeta & \text{otherwise};
\end{cases} \]  

(39)

with \( \zeta \) standing for the ratio between the medium and baffle impedances. For a baffle of impedance 2.8 MRayl (epoxy) adjacent to soft tissues of impedance 1.6 MRayl, \( \zeta = 1.75 \) [19]. By default, the baffle is soft in PFIELD and SIMUS.

\[ k_a = \frac{\sigma_{db}}{8.7} \frac{kc}{2 \pi 10^4}. \]  

(40)

The attenuation coefficient \( \sigma_{db} \) is in dB/cm/MHz. A typical value for soft tissues is 0.5 dB/cm/MHz [32]. The \( 10^4 \) accounts for the unit conversion (cm·MHz to m·Hz).

B. Attenuation

In addition to the distance-dependent decrease in amplitude caused by the inverse law (or inverse square-root law in 2-D), an ultrasound wave propagating in tissues is attenuated through scattering and absorption. In SIMUS, scattering is governed by the reflectivity coefficients \( R_s \). In the proposed ultrasound simulator, the medium is assumed non-dispersive to preserve linearity, which means that waves of different wavelengths travel at the same phase velocity \( (= c) \). In PFIELD and SIMUS, absorption can be included in the amplitude by adding a frequency-dependent multiplicative loss term. For numerical reasons (a recursive multiplication is used to calculate the exponential terms), this frequency dependence is linear in PFIELD.

Amplitude absorption is obtained by substituting \( e^{i(k + ik_a)r} \) for \( e^{ikr} \), where \( k_a \) is given by:

Fig. 9. Plane-wave pressure field simulated with PFIELD for a 128-element 7.6-MHz L11-5v linear array (kerf width = 30 μm, pitch = 0.27 mm, fractional bandwidth = 77%, elevation focus = 1.8 cm). This RMS (root mean square) acoustic field illustrates an emission sequence (here, tilt angle = 10°) such as that used in “ultrafast” compound plane-wave imaging, without focusing in the axial direction [31].

VII. RMS PRESSURE FIELDS

Equation (22) gives the acoustic pressure field for a given angular frequency \( \omega \). By default, the PFIELD Matlab code returns the root-mean-square RMS pressure field. If we omit the \( e^{-i\omega t} \) term in (22) and define \( P(X, \omega) \) by the relationship \( P(X, \omega, t) \equiv P(X, \omega) e^{-i\omega t} \), the RMS pressure field is given by

\[ P_{\text{RMS}}(X) = \sqrt{\int_0^{2\omega_c} P(X, \omega)^2 d\omega}. \]  

(41)

The integral can be estimated by using a midpoint Riemann sum with \( N_f \) equally spaced frequency samples:

\[ P_{\text{RMS}}(X) \approx \sqrt{\Delta \omega \sum_{j=0}^{N_f} P(X, 2(\frac{j}{N_f})\omega_c)^2}. \]  

(42)

Fig. 10. RF signals simulated with SIMUS for a P4-2v phased array transmitting a focused wave in a medium that contains five scatterers.
The partition width $\Delta \omega$ must be small enough to ensure a proper approximation, but not too small to avoid computational overload with a large $N_f$. The angular frequency step is chosen so that the phase increment in (20) be smaller than $2\pi$ everywhere in the radiated region of interest (roi), i.e. $\Delta \omega$ must verify 

$$\frac{\Delta \omega}{c} r + \Delta \omega \Delta \tau < 2\pi$$

for any distance $r$ and transmit delay $\Delta \tau$, i.e. $\Delta \omega = \min_{\text{roi}} \left( \frac{2\pi}{r/c + \Delta \tau} \right)$. 

Once the transmit delays $\Delta \tau_n$ and the parameters of the array are given, the equations (22) and (42) yield the RMS pressure field at the location specified by $X$. Fig. 8 and Fig. 9 illustrate two examples of acoustic fields simulated with PFIELD: focused and plane wavefronts with a cardiac and linear array, respectively. In these examples, the 3-D equation was applied to take the elevation focusing into account.

VIII. MEDICAL ULTRASOUND IMAGES WITH SIMUS

Medical ultrasound images, such as B-mode or color Doppler images, can be generated by simulating RF signals through Eq. (32). Once RF signals are obtained, they can be post-processed (e.g. using I/Q demodulation, beamforming, clutter filtering, phase analysis, envelope detection...) by using the Matlab codes available in the MUST toolbox\(^a\). A series of RF signals given by SIMUS in a simplified configuration (a focused wave that radiates five scatterers) is displayed on Fig. 10. Realistic ultrasound images can be obtained when using a large number of point-like scatterers, as explained in the next paragraphs.

A. B-mode imaging

Fig. 11 illustrates the simulation of a long-axis echocardiographic image (three-chamber view) by scanning the left heart with a series of focused waves. The fake myocardial tissue contained 39,500 randomly distributed point scatterers (density = 10 scatterers per wavelength squared) whose reflection coefficients are shown in Fig. 11. The fan-shaped B-mode image consists of 128 scanlines. Each scanline was constructed from one tilted focused wave generated by a 2.7-MHz phased array (64 elements, 0.3-mm pitch, 74% fractional bandwidth, 6-cm elevation focus). RF signals were simulated with SIMUS, then I/Q demodulated and beamformed [33]. The B-mode image was obtained by log-compressing the real envelopes.

As a comparison, Fig. 12 represents the B-mode image simulated with the same scatterers and transducer, but with 32 tilted 50°-wide diverging waves (tilt angle ranging between -25° and +25°). This cardiac image was obtained by summing the 32 frames coherently after beamforming (compounding). Note that these simulations were not entirely realistic as there was no movement of the scatterers from one frame to the next. Such displacements can highly affect the quality of the compound image in the absence of motion compensation [1].

B. Color flow imaging and Vector flow imaging

SIMUS (and the tools available in the MUST toolbox) can also be used to simulate realistic color flow images (color Doppler) and vector flow images. Two-dimensional simulations of color and vector Doppler in a 2-D carotid bifurcation were introduced in a previous work that combined CFD (computational

\(^a\) https://www.biomecardio.com/MUST
fluid dynamics) by SPH (smooth particle hydrodynamics) with SIMUS [23]. In that paper, radiofrequency RF signals were simulated by SIMUS using a plane-wave-imaging sequence (non-tilted waves transmitted by a 128-element linear array). After I/Q demodulation, and beamforming with two distinct sub-apertures (see details in [23]), a one-lag slow-time autocorrelator was applied to recover 2-D velocity fields. Fig. 13 provides two snapshots adapted from [23]. This vector-Doppler methodology was successfully used in vivo with sub-Nyquist RF sampling [34].

Fig. 13. Simulation of color Doppler and vector Doppler in a 2-D carotid bifurcation. The displacements of ~26,000 blood scatterers (top row) were simulated by SPH (smoothed particle hydrodynamics), a Lagrangian CFD method [23]. The inset is at another time. RF signals were simulated with SIMUS by using unsteered plane waves. Color Doppler (bottom row, red-blue patterns) and vector Doppler (bottom row, arrows) were generated by post-processing the I/Q signals (beamforming, autocorrelator, robust smoothing) with tools available in the MUST toolbox. Adapted from [23].

IX. CONCLUSION

The assumptions and simplifications included in PFIELD and SIMUS make its theory and numerical resolution in the harmonic-time domain convenient. The examples show that realistic ultrasound images can be created for educational and research purposes. How PFIELD compares to Field-II, k-Wave and Verasonics is detailed in the accompanying article (part II). The current version of PFIELD (2021), although it includes the 3-D acoustic equation for elevation focusing, is limited to one-dimensional, linear or convex ultrasonic transducers. A volume version is planned. Nevertheless, based on the equations described in this paper, and keeping the same hypotheses, an advanced user could adapt SIMUS for the simulation of matrix arrays and volumetric acoustic fields.
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APPENDIX

A. Paraxial and far-field distances

Equation (2) can be rewritten as

\[ r' = \sqrt{\left(1 + \frac{(x' - x)^2}{r^2} \right) + \frac{(y' - y)^2}{z^2}}. \]  

(43)

In the paraxial (Fresnel) approximation, \( (y - y')^2/z^2 \ll \left[1 + \frac{(x - x')^2}{r^2}\right] \). One can thus write

\[ r' \approx \sqrt{z^2 + (x - x')^2 + \frac{(y - y')^2}{2r}}. \]  

(44)

In the paraxial approximation, one has also \( r^2 \approx x^2 + z^2 \). The expression (44) can thus be approximated by

\[ r' \approx r \left(1 + \frac{x x'}{r^2} - 2 \frac{x x'}{r^2} + \frac{(y - y')^2}{2r} \right) \]  

(45)

By keeping the 1st order of \( x' \) in the first square root and the 0th order in the second (far-field approximation), we obtain

\[ r' \approx r \left(1 - \frac{x x'}{r^2} + \frac{(y - y')^2}{2r} \right). \]  

(46)

Because \( \sin \theta = x/\sqrt{x^2 + z^2} \approx x/r \) (Fig. 3), (46) reduces to Eq. (6).

B. Spectrum of the transducer PSF

We need a \( \omega_b \) bandwidth at -6 dB. Therefore, from (26):

\[ S_t(\omega_c \pm \frac{\omega_b}{2}) = e^{-\left(\frac{\omega_b^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)} = \frac{1}{2} \]  

(47)

One can thus deduce \( \sigma \):

\[ \sigma = \frac{\frac{\omega_b}{\sqrt{\ln 2}}}{2\omega_c}. \]  

(48)

By assuming that

\[ S_t(0) = S_t(2\omega_c) = e^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2}} = 2^{-126}, \]  

(49)

the expressions (48) and (49) yield \( p \) [Eq. (27)].