Imaging Sciences and Biomedical Engineering



Performance of l1-norm minimizing regularizers on phase/magnitude reconstruction in flow encoded MRI

2011 BASP Frontiers Wokshop

Claudio Santelli



Imaging Sciences and Biomedical Engineering



Flow encoding





Fourier velocity encoding (FVE)

Object





Signal









 $\rightarrow X$

Fourier velocity encoding (FVE)



$$s(\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}}(t),\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{v}}(t)) = \iint \rho(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{v})e^{-j\left[\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}}(t)\cdot\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{v}}(t)\cdot\mathbf{v}\right]} d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{v}$$

$$\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \gamma \int_{0}^{t} \mathbf{G}(\tau) d\tau , \ \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{v}}(t) = \gamma \int_{0}^{t} \tau \mathbf{G}(\tau) d\tau$$

FOV ... field-of-view

FOS ... field-of-speed

Fourier velocity encoding (FVE)



$$s(n,m) = \sum_{x_i} \sum_{v_j} \rho(x_i, v_i) e^{-jn \Delta k_x x_i} e^{-jm \Delta k_v v_j}$$

$$\Delta k_x = rac{2\pi}{FOV}$$
 , $\Delta k_v = rac{2\pi}{FOS} = rac{\pi}{V_{enc}}$

FOV ... field-of-view

FOS ... field-of-speed

$$s = E\rho$$

FVE vs. phase contrast (PC)



Fourier velocity encoding

• Velocity distributions in ascending aorta



Baltes C, et al.

Fourier velocity encoding

• Scan time



Imaging Sciences and Biomedical Engineering



Speed-up





Lustig M et al. MRM 2010

SPIRIT

- "Iterative self-consistent parallel imaging reconstruction"
- Full and shift invariant interpolation kernel, i.e. convolution in kspace
- $\mathbf{s}_c = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{s}_c$ Consistency equation for *all* k-space points

s_c: Cartesian k-space over all coils

G: Interpolation matrix (Convolution operator)

Calibration consistency:

Minimize





acquired (Cartesian sample	•
acquired non-Cartesian sample $ullet$		
missing Cartesian sample		
non-Cartesian data consistency eq 🌑		
Cartesian	calibration consis	tency eq 🌔

SPIRiT

• Data consistency:

Minimize $\|(\mathbf{G} - \mathbf{I})\mathbf{s}_c\|_2^2$, s.t. $\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{s}_c - \mathbf{s}\|_2^2 \le \varepsilon$

D: Linear Operator which maps reconstructed

Cartesian k-space to the acquired data **s**

Image priors

$$\underset{\mathbf{s}_{c}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{s}_{c} - \mathbf{s}\|_{2}^{2} + \lambda_{1} \|(\mathbf{G} - \mathbf{I})\mathbf{s}_{c}\|_{2}^{2} + \sum_{j \geq 2} \lambda_{j} R_{j}(\mathbf{s}_{c})$$



Lustig M et al. MRM 2010



SPIRiT – PC (Cartesian)

• CFD model (SNR = 30, 66 x 89 x 33 voxels)



• Image priors (wavelet, total variation)

$$\underset{\mathbf{s}_{c}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{s}_{c} - \mathbf{s}\|_{2}^{2} + \lambda_{1} \|(\mathbf{G} - \mathbf{I})\mathbf{s}_{c}\|_{2}^{2} + \lambda_{2} \|\boldsymbol{\Psi}\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}\mathbf{s}_{c}\|_{1} + \lambda_{3} \|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}\mathbf{s}_{c}\|_{1}$$

SPIRiT – PC (Cartesian)

RMS error vs. undersampling factor



Phase

۲



Duerst E

SPIRiT – PC (Cartesian)

Phase error vs regularization weights (7.5x undersampling)



- **Dynamic** imaging
- Arbitrary k-space trajectories (e.g. golden angle profile)



Dynamic imaging

Calibration consistency





Dynamic imaging

Data consistency



Minimize
$$\|(\mathbf{G} - \mathbf{I})\mathbf{s}_c\|_2^2$$
, s.t. $\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{s}_c - \mathbf{s}\|_2^2 \le \varepsilon$

Temporal Fourier transform – PC (Cartesian)

RMS error vs. regularization weight

$$\underset{\mathbf{s}_{c}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{s}_{c} - \mathbf{s}\|_{2}^{2} + \lambda_{1} \|(\mathbf{G} - \mathbf{I})\mathbf{s}_{c}\|_{2}^{2} + \lambda_{2} \|\mathcal{F}_{t}\mathcal{F}^{-1}\mathbf{s}_{c}\|_{1}$$



Phase



Radial FVE (rFVE)

Data acquisition



• Why radial?

- Shorter minimum TE
- Oversampled center of k-space (Low res., training/acquisition stage, contrast)
- Motion (Low sensitivity, streak artifacts, motion tracking)

Radial FVE (rFVE)

- Undersampling artifacts (4x, Cartesian, radial, spiral)



- 2D radial (FFE)
- FOV = 250 x 250 mm, voxel size = 2 x 2 x 10 mm
- 24 heart phases, 35.5 ms, 157.1 % (100% radial Nyquist)
- 16 velocity encodes + 1 ref
- Kernel size = 7 x 7 x 3 (k_x k_y t), 30 x 30 x 24 calibration area



In-vivo - k-t rFVE



Imaging Sciences and Biomedical Engineering



Discussion





- Wavelet- or TV-I1 minimization seem not to be suitable for frameby-frame reconstruction in dynamic PC-MRI
- Exploiting temporal correlations with temporal FT as a sparsifier can improve phase reconstruction accuracy
- rFVE has the potential to significantly accelerate FVE, and therefore, to assign complex flow patterns
 - Inclusion of priors (e.g. sparsity)

$$\underset{\mathbf{s}_{c}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{s}_{c} - \mathbf{s}\|_{2}^{2} + \lambda_{1} \|(\mathbf{G} - \mathbf{I})\mathbf{s}_{c}\|_{2}^{2} + \sum_{j \geq 2} \lambda_{j} R_{j}(\mathbf{s}_{c})$$

Self-gating and motion correction

$$\underset{\mathbf{s}_{c}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{T}\mathbf{s}_{c} - \mathbf{y}\|_{2}^{2} + \lambda \|(\mathbf{G} - \mathbf{I})\mathbf{T}\mathbf{s}_{c}\|_{2}^{2}$$