DCMTK - Bug #1079

Specifications of DICOM DS and JSON number not fully compatible

2023-06-12 10:17 - Marco Eichelberg

Status: Closed Start date: 2023-06-12

Priority: Normal Due date:

Assignee: Marco Eichelberg % Done: 100%

Category: Library and Apps Estimated time: 2:00 hours

Target version:

Module: dcmdata Compiler:

Operating System:

Description

dcm2json uses the method DcmJsonFormat::normalizeDecimalString() to normalize DICOM DS values before writing them as JSON. However, the method currently does not catch all cases where a legal DICOM DS value is not permitted in JSON.

The JSON type number is defined in https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7159#section-6 as follows:

The definition of DICOM DS relies on the ANSI X3.9 standard, i.e. the specification of FORTRAN. The FORTRAN 'signed-real-literal-constant' is defined (in slightly simplified form) as:

```
R709 kind-param is digit-string or scalar-int-constant-name
R710 signed-digit-string is [ sign ] digit-string
R711 digit-string is digit [ digit ] ...
R712 sign is + or -
R713 signed-real-literal-constant is [ sign ] real-literal-constant
R714 real-literal-constant is significand [ exponent-letter exponent ] or digit-string exponent-letter exponent
R715 significand is digit-string . [ digit-string ] or . digit-string
R716 exponent-letter is E or D
R717 exponent is signed-digit-string
```

As a regular expression, DICOM DS values can thus be defined as

```
[+-]?([0-9]+.[0-9]*|.?[0-9]+)(E[+-]?[0-9]+)?
```

Differences between JSON number and DICOM DS are thus:

- 1. JSON does not permit a leading '+' in the significand (i.e. "+1.0" is valid in DICOM but not in JSON)
- 2. JSON does not permit leading zeroes in the significand (i.e. "0003" is valid in DICOM but not in JSON)
- 3. JSON does not permit a leading '.' in the significand (i.e. ".5" is valid in DICOM but not in JSON)
- 4. JSON does not permit a trailing '.' in the significand (i.e. "5." is valid in DICOM but not in JSON)

DcmJsonFormat::normalizeDecimalString() currently accounts for differences 1 and 3, but not for 2 and 4. This should be fixed.

History

#1 - 2023-08-14 18:57 - Marco Eichelberg

- % Done changed from 0 to 100
- Estimated time set to 2:00 h
- Status changed from New to Closed

2025-09-12 1/2

- Assignee set to Marco Eichelberg

The previous implementation actually did handle cases 1, 2 and 3. Now we also handle case 4 correctly. Thanks to Mathieu Malaterre for the report.

Closed by commit #862de6320.

2025-09-12 2/2