# **Universidade de Brasília**

# Estimating Highly Accurate Velocity Maps From FVE MRI Data Using a PDE-Constrained Optimization (#2930)

Vinicius C. Rispoli<sup>1</sup> (*vrispoli@pgea.unb.br*), João L. A. Carvalho<sup>2</sup>, Cristiano J. Miosso<sup>1</sup>, Fabiano A. Soares<sup>1</sup>, Giordanno B. Borges<sup>1</sup> and Ivan R. Siqueira<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Engineering College at Gama, University of Brasilia, Brasilia, Brazil, <sup>2</sup>Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Brasilia, Brasilia, Brazil, <sup>3</sup>Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, Rice University, Houston, TX, United States



- ► Fourier velocity encoding (FVE) [1] provides considerably higher SNR than phase contrast (PC), and is robust to partial-volume effects.
- ► FVE data can be acquired fast with low spatial resolution.
- FVE provides the velocity distribution associated with a large voxel, but does not directly provides a velocity map.
- Previous methods for estimating velocity maps from FVE distributions were already proposed [2].
- **Goal**: proposed a better method for estimate highspatial-resolution velocity maps from low-resolution FVE data based on the FVE signal model and a flow



Figure 1: Pulsatile carotid flow phantom (Phantoms by Design, Inc., Bothell, WA).

<b>Gama</b>
GRUPO de Processamento de Sinais e Imagens Médicas

(a)	(b)	(c)
	. 🥮	· 🧰
	<sup>0</sup> velocity (cm/s) <sup>50</sup>	

Figure 2: Validation experiment using a pulsatile carotid flow phantom: (a) reference phase contrast velocity map, measured at the phantom's bifurcation; (b) velocity map estimated from the simulated low-resolution spiral FVE data with  $\Delta r = 1$  mm spatial resolution with the proposed method (and associated error percentages); and (c) velocity map estimated from the simulated low-resolution spiral FVE data with  $\Delta r = 1$  mm spatial resolution with the method proposed in Ref.[2] (and associated error percentages).

physics model

# Methods

FVE spatial-velocity distribution,  $\hat{s}(x, y, v)$ , model is given by [3]:

$$\hat{s}(x, y, w) = \left[m(x, y) \times \operatorname{sinc}\left(\frac{v - v_z(x, y)}{\Delta v}\right)\right] * \psi(x, y)$$

► Navier–Stokes equation gives the blood flow model [4]:

$$p\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}\right) = -\nabla p + \mu \nabla^2 \mathbf{v}.$$

Velocity map can be estimated from a measured FVE dataset through the PDE-constrained optimization problem:

$$\min_{v_z} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \int_{\Omega} \left\{ f(\mathbf{x}, v_k) - \left[ m(\mathbf{x}) \times \operatorname{sinc} \left( \frac{v_k - v_z}{\Delta v} \right) \right] * \psi(\mathbf{x}) \right\}^2 dA$$

subject to

 $\rho \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v} = -\nabla \boldsymbol{p} + \mu \nabla^2 \mathbf{v}.$ 

N-S equations were discretized using the method of weighted residuals yelding a linear system [5,6]

$$Jc = -R$$

**J** is the residuals' Jacobian matrix and **R** is the residuals vector.

Numerically the PDE-contrained optimization problem can be written as:

$$\min_{\mathbf{v}_z} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left\| \mathbf{f}_k - \left[ \mathbf{m} \times \operatorname{sinc} \left( \frac{\mathbf{v}_k - \mathbf{v}_z}{\Delta \mathbf{v}} \right) \right] * \boldsymbol{\psi} \right\|_{c}^{2}$$

# **Results and discussion**

- The velocity maps estimated from simulated low spatial resolution FVE data (Figs.(2)-(3)b and Figs.(2)-(3)c) are very similar qualitatively to the reference map (Figs.(2)-(3)a).
- At first glance can be noted that the velocity map obtained using the previous method previously proposed[2] (Figs.(2)-(3)c) is more similar to the acquired PC-MRI velocity map (Figs.(2)-(3)a) than the proposed method (Figs.(2)-(3)b).
- However the error images show that the velocity map obtained using the technique proposed in this work (Figs.(2)-(3)b) was more accurate than the one obtained with the previous method[2] (Figs.(2)-(3)c) for both resolution.
- Quantitative comparison was also performed based on the signal-to-error ratio (SER) calculated (in decibels) as:

$$\operatorname{SER} = 10 \log_{10} \left( \frac{\sum_{i,j} \left\| v_{\mathrm{pc}}(i,j) \right\|^2}{\sum_{i,j} \left\| v_e(i,j) - v_{\mathrm{pc}}(i,j) \right\|^2} \right),$$

where  $v_{\rm pc}$  is the acquired phase contrast velocity map used as the ground-truth signal and  $v_e$  is the estimated velocity map.

- ▶ Measured SER, relative to the PC reference, was: ▶ Proposed method 50.64 dB and 44.63 dB for  $\Delta$  r = 1 mm and  $\Delta r = 2$  mm resolution, respectively.
  - ▶ Previously proposed[2] method 32.02 dB and 28.68 dB, for  $\Delta r = 1$  mm and  $\Delta r = 2$  mm resolution, respectively.



Figure 3: Validation experiment using a pulsatile carotid flow phantom: (a) reference phase contrast velocity map, measured at the phantom's bifurcation; (b) velocity map estimated from the simulated low-resolution spiral FVE data with  $\Delta r = 2 \text{ mm}$ spatial resolution with the proposed method (and associated error percentages); and (c) velocity map estimated from the simulated low-resolution spiral FVE data with  $\Delta r = 2 \text{ mm spatial}$ resolution with the method proposed in Ref.[2] (and associated error percentages).

# References

[1] Moran PR. MRI 1:197, 1982. [2] Rispoli VC, et al. ISMRM 21:68, 2013. [3] Carvalho JLA, et al. MRM 63:1537, 2010. [4] Chorin AJ, et al. A Mathematical Introduction to Fluid Mechanics, 2000. [5] Gresho PM, et al. Incompressible Flow and the Finite Element Method, 1998. [6] Borges GB, et al. ISMRM 24: 2592, 2016.

۳Z  $\Delta V$  $||\ell_2|$  $k{=}1$   $^{||}$  $+\lambda \|\mathbf{J}[\mathbf{v}_x;\mathbf{v}_z;\mathbf{p}]-\mathbf{r}\|_{\ell_2}^2.$ 

# Experiments

► One experiment was performed:

- (1) Spiral FVE data was simulated from acquired PC data for  $\Delta r = 1 mm$  and  $\Delta r = 2 mm$ ;
- (2) then the optimization was solved;
- (3) resultant velocity map was compared with the acquired PC velocity map
- ► 4D PC-MRI data acquired for a flow phantom (Fig.1)
  - ▶ 32-channel head coil; resolution:  $0.5 \times 0.5 \times 1.0 \text{ mm}^3$ ; FOV:  $4.0 \times 3.5 \times 5.0 \text{ cm}^3$ ; NEX: 10; Venc: 50 cm/s; scan time: 5 hours.

► CFD assumptions:

•  $\rho = 1100 \text{ kg/m}^3$ ;  $\mu = 0.005 \text{ Pa} \cdot \text{s}$ ; voxel size  $1.0 \times 0.5 \text{ mm}^2$ ; elements  $Q_2P_{-1}$ ; no-slip boundary condition.

#### Conclusion

- Was proposed a novel method for estimating highresolution velocity maps from low-resolution FVE measurements.
- ▶ This method is based on a PDE- constrained optimization that incorporates both the FVE signal model and the Navier-Stokes equation.
- Results showed that it is possible to obtain highly accurate velocity maps from the FVE distributions.
- ► These good results are important, meaning that FVE may potentially be a substitute of PC imaging, since it contains both a velocity distribution and also velocity map with considerably higher SNR and robustness to partial voluming.

[7] Wang Y, et al. SIIMS, 1:248, 2008.

# Support

- ► Fundação de Apoio à Pesquisa do Distrito Federal: Edital FAP-DF 01/2018
- Universidade de Brasília Engineering College at Gama



#### Joint Annual Meeting ISMRM-ESMRMB – Paris – 16-21 June, 2018

vrispoli@pgea.unb.br