not as expected during acquisition. Further investigation may be performed on how to balance image quality and processing time so that the significance of the preview image can be further improved. This work may also be extended to non-TOF data with sophisticated methods in image generation—for example, a fast maximum-likelihood expectation maximization algorithm for each update or other efficient alternatives—provided that the preview generation will not consume too much computing resources.

DISCLOSURE

All authors were Philips employees when the work was conducted. No other potential conflict of interest relevant to this article was reported.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The patient data are courtesy of Drs. Michael V. Knopp and Jun Zhang and were acquired at Ohio State University using a precommercial investigational Philips Vereos Digital PET/CT device. We are grateful to Sydney Kaplan, who proofread the manuscript and improved its presentation.

REFERENCES

1. Vandenberghe S, Mikhaylova E, D'Hoe E, Mollet P, Karp JS. Recent developments in time-of-flight PET. *EJNMMI Phys.* 2016;3:3.
2. Sciascio E, Manni A, Guzzardi R. Design of an architecture for real-time 3D PET imaging. *Real-Time Imaging.* 1998;4:255–262.
3. Cui JY, Pratx G, Prevrhal S, Levin C. Fully 3D list-mode time-of-flight PET image reconstruction on GPUs using CUDA. *Med Phys.* 2011;38: 6775–6786.
4. Snyder D, Thomas L, Ter-Pogossian M. A mathematical model for positron-emission tomography systems having time-of-flight measurements. *IEEE Trans Nucl Sci.* 1981;28:3575–3583.
5. Karp JS, Surti S, Daube-Witherspoon M, Muehllehner G. Benefit of time-of-flight in PET: experimental and clinical results. *J Nucl Med.* 2008;49:462–470.
6. Conti M. Why is TOF PET reconstruction a more robust method in the presence of inconsistent data? *Phys Med Biol.* 2011;56:155–168.
7. Thompson CJ, Moreno-Cantu J, Picard Y. PETSIM: Monte Carlo simulation of all sensitivity and resolution parameters of cylindrical positron imaging systems. *Phys Med Biol.* 1992;37:731–749.
8. *NEMA NU 2-2012: Performance Measurements of Positron Emission Tomographs (PETs).* Rosslyn, VA: National Electrical Manufacturers Association; 2013.

Erratum

In the article "Protocols for Harmonized Quantification and Noise Reduction in Low-Dose Oncologic ^{18}F-FDG PET/CT Imaging," by Machado et al. (*J Nucl Med Technol.* 2019;47:47–54), the value *1.00* was inadvertently left out of the OSEM3D column (first row) in Table 1 during copyediting. The corrected table (with missing value italicized) appears below. We regret the error.

TABLE 1

*HBI*s for Groups of Acquisition Parameters and Different Reconstruction Settings

Acquisition parameter	OSEM3D	PSF7	PSF2-EQ6	PSF2-EQ6.5	PSF2-EQ7
Group A: 1,272 MBq·s/kg	*1.00*	1.02	1.13	1.08	1.13
Group B: 416 MBq·s/kg	1.00	1.00	1.17	1.02	1.06
Group C: 216 MBq·s/kg	1.00	1.01	1.20	1.06	1.12
Group D: 81 MBq·s/kg	1.29	1.02	1.40	1.18	1.15