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The new hope: Compressed Sensing or Compressive Sensing

• It states that signals or images can be accurately reconstructed from far fewer measurements than traditional methods that satisfy Shannon-Nyquist theorem under certain conditions.
• It works on two principles, sparsity and incoherence.

Courtesy: Mike Davies (University of Edinburgh)
Potential applications

Compressed Sensing provides a new way of thinking about signal acquisition.

Applications areas already include:

• Medical imaging
• Hyperspectral imaging
• Astronomical imaging
• Distributed sensing
• Radar sensing
• Geophysical (seismic) exploration
• High rate A/D conversion
MRI data acquisition

- Acquisition Time is proportional to the number of phase encodes \(N_p\) (i.e.) equal to the number of repetitions (TR’s)

Spin Echo Pulse sequence diagram

- The readout gradient \(G_x\) is on for the echo duration (i.e.) a line of k-space is acquired for each echo along the x direction.
- The phase encode gradient \(G_y\) varies for every repetition pulse which causes the shift in k-space along the y direction.
MR image acquisition: Challenges

• an inherently slow process.
• Complete measurements can be costly and time consuming.
• Currently, parallel imaging is used to speed up image acquisition.
• However, there is a great need for further acceleration in several MRI applications due to clinical time constraints (i.e. maximum permissible time inside an MRI scanner) and local motion (i.e. due to breathing, beating heart) as a result of the long data acquisition process.
• **Compressed Sensing** is the answer to solve this problem as it has been shown to provide further acceleration in MR data acquisition.
Compressed Sensing (CS) in MRI (Sparse MRI)

A successful application of CS has three requirements:

• Transform sparsity: The desired image should have a sparse representation in a known transform domain (i.e., it must be compressible by transform coding).

• Incoherence of undersampling artifacts: The artifacts in linear reconstruction caused by k-space undersampling should be incoherent (noise like) in the sparsifying transform domain.

• Nonlinear reconstruction: The image should be reconstructed by a nonlinear method that enforces both sparsity of the image representation and consistency of the reconstruction with the acquired samples.
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CS implementation in MRI Scanner: Challenges

• CS works well for a random undersampling scheme that requires subsampling in both directions.

• It cannot be implemented in traditional 2D MRI because of the presence of only one phase encode direction. Subsampling the frequency encode or readout does not provide a reduction in scan time.

• However, it can be implemented in 3D MRI by exploiting the two phase encoding directions (generally $k_y$ and $k_z$)

• We have successfully managed to implement this subsampling scheme by modifying a clinical 3D MRI sequence (efGRE3d). As a result 3d MRI datasets can be acquired at reduced scan times.

• It has been validated by custom built in-house phantom data so far. The next step is to collect real brain data from volunteers at reduced scan times and test the efficacy of CS reconstruction.
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### RMSE/ nRMSE values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calibration size</th>
<th>Type of sampling mask</th>
<th>RMSE</th>
<th>nRMSE (%)</th>
<th>No. of samples</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16x16</td>
<td>Poisson Disk</td>
<td>5.8933</td>
<td>20.98</td>
<td>7625</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24x24</td>
<td>Poisson Disk</td>
<td>5.1622</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>7495</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32x32</td>
<td>Poisson Disk</td>
<td>5.0043</td>
<td>16.78</td>
<td>7460</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32x32</td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>7.2809</td>
<td>26.85</td>
<td>7576</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32x32</td>
<td>Uniform</td>
<td>5.5393</td>
<td>18.59</td>
<td>7680</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion/ Open Questions??

• Does the performance of CS reconstruction depend on the contrast setting in the image??

• Can an intuitive subsampling scheme be designed according to the type of structure being imaged??

• Is there any other way to quantify reconstruction errors apart from RMSE and nRMSE values??

• Is it important to investigate the nature of the error rather than just look at error values??

• Can the performance of CS reconstructions improve if an efficient segmentation method is incorporated into the algorithm??
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