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I. pMRI and SMS overview – a refresher
II. pMRI- & SMS-based Quality Issues
III. pMRI- & SMS-based Artifacts
   a. Original to pMRI, SMS
   b. Modifications of traditional artifacts
Parallel MR Imaging

Goal: to collect subset of image information to produce images in a shorter period of time.

Benefits:
• Faster image acquisition
• Higher-resolution imaging
• Some susceptibility mitigation

How does it work?
• *Omit phase-encoding information and use coil element arrangement as a replacement*. Undersampled k-space, but not sparse.
pMRI Speed

less phase encodes = smaller FOV (with same resolution)

Small FOV

FOV ”shrinkage” → undersampling (acceleration=R)

1 out of 2 lines of k-space → ½ FOV

aliasing
Parallel MR Imaging

Spatial sensitivity varies for each element → can use this in conjunction with undersampling. Can reduce phase encoding steps in both 2D and 3D imaging*.

- Conventional use of phased-array (unaliased)
- Parallel reconstruction of data (aliased)

*depending on coil
Sensitivity Map

Sensitivity map → spatial sensitivity of each coil element. Sometimes, a *calibration scan* is usually required to calculate this.

*Auto-calibration*: acquire sensitivity information simultaneously with clinical image.

Might present different artifacts
Calibration Scan (SENSE method)

This takes a few seconds to acquire, at the beginning of a patient exam

- a) Individual element scan
- b) Body coil scan
- c) a/b
- d) Threshold b \(\rightarrow\) noise
- e) Filtering
- f) Dilate f
- g) Polynomial fit: sensitivity map

Does this accurately represent sensitivity?

Example: Using Coil Sensitivity to Un-alias an Image

Aliased

Unaliased (maybe?)
Using Coil Sensitivity to Un-alias an Image
A Simplistic SENSE Example

\[ S_{\text{alias},1} = B_{1,a} l_a + B_{1,b} l_b \]

\[ S_{\text{alias},2} = B_{2,a} l_a + B_{2,b} l_b \]
K-space for each individual element.

Weights come from auto-calibration data.
Parallel MR Imaging – Through-plane acceleration

3D Imaging: 2 possible directions of phase encoding (1 in-plane, 1 through-plane).

In-plane pMRI pattern (no 3D acceleration)
Parallel MR Imaging – Through-plane acceleration

3D Imaging: 2 possible directions of phase encoding (1 in-plane, 1 through-plane).

Through-plane pMRI pattern
Parallel MR Imaging – Through-plane acceleration

3D Imaging: 2 possible directions of phase encoding (1 in-plane, 1 through-plane).

Caipirinha pMRI pattern
Simultaneous Multi-Slice Imaging (SMS): Comparison to pMRI
SMS Imaging (Controlled Aliasing – approach)

- Benefit: acquire N images in the time required for 1.
- Differences: Data summed over N image sets \(\rightarrow\) SNR increase of \(N^{1/2}\) (unlike pMRI).
- Reconstruction: somewhat analogous to pMRI image-based reconstruction**.
- Phase offset in k-space (slice shift) \(\rightarrow\) helps with the reconstruction (N=2 shown)
- RF pulses require tailoring and care (excite multiple slices, multiplex vs. simultaneous, high SAR and RF amplifier concerns)

Think about how artifacts may propagate between slices

**Beyond the scope of this talk.
pMRI Quality Issues: non-uniform SNR (and SNR reduction by \((1/R)^{1/2}\))

pMRI Quality Issues: masking of sensitivity map $\rightarrow$ no noise in periphery
SMS Quality Issues: Saturation and Slice Ordering

Example: Axial acquisition for non-SMS scanning (12 slices, with TR=2 sec, no gap)

Non-interleaved – can get saturation of slices (here, excitation difference = TR/12 \rightarrow T1 effects between slices)

https://mriquestions.com/cross-talk.html
SMS Quality Issues: Saturation and Slice Ordering

Example: Axial acquisition for non-SMS scanning (12 slices, with TR=2 sec, no gap)

Non-interleaved – can get saturation of slices (here, excitation difference = TR/12 → T1 effects between slices)

Interleaved – slices too far to saturate (here, excitation difference = TR/2)

https://mriquestions.com/cross-talk.html
SMS Quality Issues: Saturation and Slice Ordering

Example: Axial acquisition for SMS scanning (12 slices, with TR=2 sec, no gap, multi-slice N=2)

Interleaving for SMS: interaction effect between # of slices and N – can get saturation effects periodically in stack.
Artifacts
What happens when the FOV before acceleration is too small?

Center region in this example should be unaliased, for acceleration $R=2$. Treated as non-aliased tissue during reconstruction.
Tissue Outside of FOV

- With SENSE-based technique, tissue outside of the FOV yields “wrap-into” artifact

Goldfarb, JMagn Reson Imag. 2004
Tissue Outside of FOV

- Must open up the field of view, or potentially need to use a different angle.

Yanasak and Kelly, Radiographics, 2014
pMRI 3D FOV Clinical Artifact Example

Non-pMRI case (coronal reformat of sagittal image)

Slice-select PE direction
pMRI 3D FOV Clinical Artifact Example

3D artifact: faint ghost near the middle of FOV that resembles structures located at the edges of scanned volume (nose, ear).

Slice-select PE direction
Motion After Calibration Scan (any non-auto-calibrated sequence)

Calibration scan must accurately represent tissue position.

Here, phantom moved after calibration scan.

Small displacement  Medium displacement  Large displacement
Motion After Calibration Scan (any non-auto-calibrated sequence)

Affected by FOV choice as well.

Small FOV

Large FOV
Motion After Calibration Scan - Breath-holds

This happens most often in abdominal scans.

If the patient’s chest is not in the same location as it was when the calibration was scanned, YOU WILL GET AN ARTIFACT.

Inhale vs. exhale?

Yanasak and Kelly, Radiographics, 2014
What to do about these?

Rescan the calibration scan, then rescan the sequence again.

Or, use auto-calibration if you can.

If a patient moves all the time, **parallel imaging may not be for you.**

Pseudo-”failure” of fat sat: Patient moved between reference and SENSE scans
Sensitivity Map Mismatch Artifacts ("Thin Structures")

Sometimes, small detail in regions of darkness get partially/fully masked or de-emphasized → non-accurate sensitivity in that region.
Thin, bright structures in the periphery of sensitivity map — mismatch between sensitivity and anatomy.

Here, notice that the separation is about 1/2 of the FOV (Acceleration factor = 2).
Separation related to amount of acceleration.

Here, notice that the separation is about $1/3^{rd}$ of the FOV (acceleration = 3).
Cerebellar lesion?

No ... sensitivity map mismatch, projected in slice direction (PE #1),

...and in-plane phase-encoding direction (PE #2)

Note the separation (½ FOV, ½ stack)
pMRI Clinical Artifact Example (2D Caiparinha)

Fiducial is mirrored in two dimensions. Caipirinha sampling shifts its location.

Crop, et al., Physica Medica, 2021
SMS Artifact: Leakage (similar to g-factor for pMRI)

Leakage: inaccuracies in separating slices during reconstruction.

Unlike pMRI (sensitivity mismatch → in-plane duplicates), leakage can be more subtle with multiple slices.

Cauley, et al. MRM, 2014
SMS Artifacts (leakage)

Grappa + SMS time series
(overlay: signal variance in images, natural eyelid motion)

Artifacts in single volume
pMRI Sensitivity Map and Slice Thickness Interaction

Research group noticed a slice-to-slice striation in axial-acquired images.

No obvious issues with interleaving, etc...

Turns out that calibration scan slice thickness (5mm) = integer # of slices (1mm).
Measure the “periodicity” in the image using ImageJ:

Repeats about every 5 slices (@ 1mm slice thk, effect is 5mm).

Eureka! (and texting with Jason Stafford to think this through)

- 3D scan is non-oblique axially prescribed
- pMRI calibration scan purely in axial orientation...5mm slice thickness.
pMRI Sensitivity Map and Slice Thickness Interaction

Change calibration scan thickness

Phantom tests

Solution:
• Slight obliquity of calibration scan
• Force calibration slices to be non-multiple of imaging slice thickness.

Why did we never see this clinically?

Intersection of pure axial 3D scans and cal scans of certain thickness.
pMRI and Traditional Artifacts
pMRI and Traditional Artifacts: Susceptibility

Appearance of traditional artifacts may be modified by pMRI

Susceptibility (artifact not perfectly represented on sensitivity map)

Yanasak and Kelly, Radiographics, 2014
Another susceptibility artifact for 3D scan, affecting a GEM 2D acceleration scan. Susceptibility affects reconstruction along slice-select phase encoding.
pMRI and Traditional Artifacts: Zippers

Zipper causes poor reconstruction.

Yanasak and Kelly, Radiographics, 2014
pMRI and Traditional Artifacts: Zippers

Zippers prevalent in ALL scans can also be a problem → sensitivity scan might have another zipper, in a different place.

Zipper, showing L-R PE direction

Zipper in calibration scan, showing A-P PE direction

Zipper in SENSE scan, showing noise in A-P (red)
pMRI and Traditional Artifacts

Appearance of traditional artifacts may be modified by pMRI.

Profound motion is made much worse by pMRI.

Yanasak and Kelly, Radiographics, 2014
Coil Dropout Issues & pMRI

Two potential scenarios:

1) 1 or more coil elements are **completely dead** (might be ok w/ small # of elements).

No coil element data for both sensitivity map and for image data → coil element does not contribute to the image (but, dropout or decreased SNR).

2) 1 or more coil elements are **intermittent** or exhibit compromised performance (worst-case scenario)

Coil element data for both sensitivity map and for image data, but the gain may go up and down → sensitivity mismatch artifacts.
Coil Dropout Issues: Dead Elements

One coil element disabled for both imaging and calibration scan (image right)

Yanasak and Kelly, Radiographics, 2014
Coil Dropout Issues: Intermittent Element

8-channel head coil.

Normal sensitivity map + missing data during scan (worst case scenario).

Actual performance would be somewhat better.

Yanasak and Kelly, Radiographics, 2014
Summary

• Quality differences
  • pMRI: non-homogeneous noise distribution
  • SMS: leakage, and potential slice saturation issues if not careful.

• Any difficulties with using auxiliary information during reconstruction leads to artifacts
  • pMRI: FOV must be larger than tissue being imaged.
  • Sensitivity map mismatches (e.g., traditional artifacts changing between map and scan...susceptibility, thin bright objects) can lead to duplicate structures appearing in various parts of the image.
  • Shift of the duplicate structures related to acceleration factor (pMRI) and number of slices (SMS) and inter-slice phase shifting scheme.
  • Motion artifact is greatly enhanced.