

Anatomically Guided Motion Correction for Placental IVIM Parameter Estimation with Accelerated Sampling Method

Mbaimou Auxence NGREMMADJI¹, Freddy ODILLE^{1,2}, Charline BERTHOLDT^{1,3}, Marine BEAUMONT^{1,2}, Olivier MOREL^{1,3} and Bailiang CHEN^{1,2}

¹INSERM U1254, IADI, Université de Lorraine, Nancy, France

²CIC-IT 1433, CHRU Nancy, Vandœuvre-lès-Nancy

³Maternité Régionale de Nancy, France

Corresponding author: Mbaimou Auxence NGREMMADJI (e-mail: mbaimou-auxence.ngremmadji@univ-lorraine.fr).

ABSTRACT Intravoxel incoherent motion (IVIM) is a diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) method that may be applied to the placenta to help diagnose abnormal pregnancies. IVIM requires prolonged scan times, followed by a model-based estimation procedure. Maternal or fetal motion during the scan affects the accuracy of this estimation. In this work, we proposed to address this challenging motion correction and data fitting problem by using additional anatomical information that is routinely collected at the beginning of the examination. Super-resolution reconstruction (SRR) was applied to these anatomical data, to provide a patient-specific, 3D isotropic, anatomic reference. Our first contribution is a novel framework with a two-step motion correction that uses both IVIM and the SRR anatomic data, accounting for both intra- and inter-scan, non-rigid motion. Our second contribution is an automation and acceleration of the IVIM data fitting, using a state-of-the-art Bayesian-type algorithm, modified with a preconditioned Crank-Nicholson (pCN) sampling strategy. The accuracy of the IVIM parameter fitting was improved by the proposed motion correction strategy, as assessed by the mean absolute fitting error in the region of interest, which was 4.14 before and 3.02 after correction (arbitrary units of signal intensity). The novel sampling strategy accelerated parameter estimation by 39% in average, with the same accuracy as that of the conventional Bayesian approach. In conclusion, the proposed method may be applied to obtain fast and reliable IVIM parameter estimates in challenging scenarios such as prenatal MRI.

INDEX TERMS Diffusion-weighted MR imaging, IVIM, motion correction, MCMC, placenta

I. INTRODUCTION

The placenta is a vital organ necessary for the exchange of nutrients and wastes between the mother and the fetus during pregnancy. Its abnormality can lead to serious pathologies such as placenta accreta spectrum disorder (PAS). It is characterized by invasion of the myometrium and leads to abnormal vascularization at the interface between the uterus and placenta. This abnormal attachment can potentially lead to fatal uncontrolled hemorrhage. The International Society of Ultrasound in Obstetrics and Gynecology (ISUOG) recommends the use of ultrasound as the first-line imaging modality for diagnosis because of its easy accessibility, safety and low cost [1]. Magnetic Resonance (MR) imaging has been promoted as an adjunct imaging tool for perinatal screening because of its larger

Field of View (FoV), better imaging quality, volumetric and multidirectional nature, richer tissue contrast and higher spatial resolution. Therefore, it has great potential to aid the diagnosis of antenatal PAS. The Intravoxel Incoherent Motion (IVIM) model is a candidate MR technique for the diagnosis of PAS. Each voxel assumes two compartments that separate the intra and extravascular diffusion of the incoherent motion of water molecules within the capillaries. The IVIM parameters are as follows: (a) blood perfusion fraction, (b) blood pseudo-diffusion and (c) water molecular diffusion. One major advantage of the IVIM model in terms of placental function assessment is that it is a non-contrast MR technique for indirect perfusion measurement.

In practice, the acquisition of IVIM images is based on the conventional diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI) sequence with multiple b-values [6], [7]. This results in a long acquisition time, with the impact of motion on parameter estimation [5]. The two main challenges in in vivo placental MR are motion management and the estimation of IVIM parameters.

A. MOTION MANAGEMENT

The major sources of motion are uterine contraction, maternal respiration, and fetal movement, which can affect IVIM parameter estimation and may potentially affect diagnosis. This motion leads to in-plane warping and through-plane deformation. Prospective motion correction methods, such as the navigator-based slice location technique [18] cannot be used because of the longer acquisition time for the placental IVIM images. We mainly focused on retrospective motion correction.

The commonly proposed IVIM motion correction methods mainly use only IVIM data. Guyader et al. [39] proposed a comprehensive pipeline based on automatic 3D non-rigid registration. They first corrected the misalignment within each single b-value 3D volume via a group-wise registration method, and then used a pairwise method to align each b-value ($b > 0$) image volume to the first b-value ($b=0$) volume because of the high signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) of the latter. Flouri et al. [19] proposed an alternating model-driven registration (MDR) technique that incorporates a motion correction technique into parameter estimation. A volume generated using the theoretical signal values was created and used as a target to guide the registration. Pairwise co-registration was performed based on free-form deformation (FFD). They demonstrated improved anatomical delineation and precision of the parameter maps. Kornaropoulos et al. [40] proposed a deformable group-wise registration framework that considers both shape and intensity changes by adding constraints from the MR diffusion behavior. They further extended this model to estimate the diffusion parameter.

In practice, the aforementioned registration methods do not consider the slice gap that is usually inserted during in vivo placental MR image acquisition. Owing to the short acquisition time and large field of view (FoV), such a gap can leverage the trade-off between acquisition time and image quality in the clinical setting. However, this causes inconsistencies in the slice direction, which is difficult to handle if only IVIM data are considered. Fortunately, in addition to functional IVIM data, the clinical placental MR protocol often starts with the acquisition of anatomical MR images in different directions, with lower through-plane spatial resolution but high in-plane resolution. These images can be used to reconstruct isotropic anatomical MR images, which provide morphological quantification and defines anatomical coordinates, that can be used as the reference space.

B. IVIM PARAMETERS

Learning-based [42] and model-based methods have been investigated for IVIM parameter estimation. In this research, we focus on model-based methods. Many IVIM model-based parameter algorithms have been proposed and compared in previous studies [9], [13]. There are two main types of model-based methods: deterministic and probabilistic methods. Typical deterministic methods include the standard full non-linear least squares (LSQ) method using, for instance, the Levenberg-Marquadt (LM) algorithm. Segmented partially linearized least-squares (SEG) and segmented doubly linearized least squares (SEGb) are examples of deterministic approaches [9]. Deterministic methods can be affected significantly by data noise. Therefore, Bayesian estimation methods have attracted considerable attention. It allows the integration of prior information to improve accuracy [10] and allows a better representation of the uncertainty in the estimates. Different information priors have been previously employed. Freiman et al. [12] used spatial homogeneity prior for the estimation of the IVIM parametric maps. Orton et al. [11] proposed a hierarchical Gaussian prior for liver IVIM data, and demonstrated its potential applicability to other organs. Bayesian estimation methods extract parameters based on the approximation of the posterior using sampling methods such as Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods, with the random walk Metropolis-Hastings (rw) method as the most commonly used technique. However, this sampling method can be computationally expensive in a higher-dimensional space.

C. CONTRIBUTIONS

Instead of considering parametric acquisition alone, we consider the entire MR examination as an entity, and all occur in the same patient-specific anatomical space. Therefore, we introduced an anatomically guided motion correction method. It uses the acquisition-specific anatomic coordinates through super-resolution reconstruction with motion-compensated anatomical acquisition data. Aligned IVIM data were co-registered to this anatomic reference via deformable registration. IVIM parameters were then estimated using Bayesian fitting. We propose the use of a novel MCMC method, the preconditioned Crank-Nicholson (pCN) algorithm [14] to accelerate the MCMC sampling strategy in IVIM fitting. Our innovative contributions can be summarized as follows:

- A new motion correction strategy for placental IVIM data that considers anatomical MR images has been introduced;
- A new Bayesian estimation method with improved computation time for IVIM parameters is employed.




FIGURE 1. Overview of the proposed method including the new motion correction strategy and IVIM parameters estimation.

II. PROPOSED METHOD

In this section, we first present the global framework of our IVIM data fitting with anatomical-guided motion correction. First, a subject-specific anatomic reference space was created using the motion-corrected super-resolution reconstruction method (step 1 in Figure 1). Second, the IVIM data were aligned using a two-step non-rigid registration (steps 2 and 3 in Figure 1). In the last step, the IVIM parameters were estimated after motion correction (step 4 in Figure 1).

A. ESTIMATION OF THE ANATOMIC REFERENCE

Anatomic T_2 -weighted MR images were acquired for the estimation of the anatomic reference, which was performed in two steps: (a) the alignment of T_2 -weighted MR images and (b) super-resolution reconstruction.

1) ALIGNMENT OF T_2 -WEIGHTED MR IMAGES

Let y_1, y_2 and y_3 be the multi-slice anatomic T_2 -weighted MR images acquired in the axial, coronal and sagittal planes with high in-plane spatial resolution and low through-plane spatial resolution as shown in Figure 2. Before estimating the anatomic reference, we aligned y_1, y_2 and y_3 using the rigid intersection-based slice-to-volume image registration method introduced in [28], and adapted in [31]. This strategy takes advantage of the intersection of acquisition planes of y_1, y_2 and y_3 .

2) SUPER-RESOLUTION RECONSTRUCTION

The motion-corrected anatomic T_2 -weighted images denoted \tilde{y}_1, \tilde{y}_2 and \tilde{y}_3 are then used for the estimation of the anatomic reference using the super-resolution reconstruction technique.

It consists in solving the following variational problem:

$$\hat{x} := \operatorname{argmin}_x \sum_{i=1}^3 \|D_i B_i T_i x - \tilde{y}_i\|^2 + \lambda_1 R_1(x) \quad (1)$$

where D_i is the downsampling operator, B_i is the blurring operator and T_i is the warping that takes the reconstructed image from the desired reconstructed orientation to the orientation of the acquisition of \tilde{y}_i . R_1 is the Beltrami regularization weight, and λ_1 is its weight.

To solve problem (1), we used the primal-dual algorithm [15]. Beltrami regularization was used because of its improved reconstruction quality as shown by the high sharpness index [22]. The estimated super-resolved anatomic image \hat{x} is the used as the reference for IVIM registration. The latter has both high in-plane and through-plane isotropic spatial resolution, as illustrated in Figure 2.

B. MOTION CORRECTION USING THE ANATOMIC REFERENCE

After estimating the anatomical reference, we introduce the proposed motion correction strategy for IVIM data in this section. It is a two-step method designed as follows: (a) in the first step inter-bvalue motion correction performed done by aligning the data acquired with the same slice location but different b-values, and (b) in the second step, the outcome of step (a) is registered to the anatomic super-resolved reference estimated in Subsection II-A (co-registration). We used free form deformation (FFD) [23], which can correct geometric distortions in the IVIM data [21].




FIGURE 2. Steps for the estimation of the anatomic reference.

1) INTER-BVALUE MOTION CORRECTION

We used the deformable registration method introduced by Vishnevskiy et al. [23]. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be the image domain, $d_i: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ the deformation of the moving IVIM slice $I_m^i: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ acquired using the bvalue b_i , for $i \neq 0$, and $I_f^0: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the IVIM slice obtained with the first bvalue b_0 used as the reference. For inter-bvalue motion correction, we solved the following optimization problem:

$$d_i^* := \operatorname{argmin}_{d_i} \mathcal{F}(d_i; I_m^i, I_f^0) + \lambda_2 R_2(d_i) \quad (2)$$

Where \mathcal{F} is the image dissimilarity metric, R_2 is the isotropic total variation (TV) [23], and $\lambda_2 > 0$ is its weight. In this study, we used the local correlation coefficient (LCC) as the image similarity. The deformation d_i is parameterized by interpolation of the displacement on a regularly spaced control point grid: $d_i := d_i(k_i)$. We used first order B-spline (linear) interpolation method. Considering this parametrization, we imposed the regularization on the control grid k_i as follows:

$$k_i^* := \operatorname{argmin}_{k_i} \mathcal{F}(d_i(k_i); I_m^i, I_f^0) + \lambda_2 R_2(d_i(k_i)) \quad (3)$$

The limited Memory Broyden-Fletcher-Goldfarb-Shanno algorithm (LBFGS) [24] algorithm was employed to numerically solve problem (3).

2) IMAGE CO-REGISTRATION USING THE ANATOMIC REFERENCE

The isotropic high-resolution anatomic reference \hat{x} estimated in Subsection II-A is firstly interpolated to a grid with the same size as the IVIM data (3D) V^0 obtained with the first bvalue b_0 . Let \hat{x}_{interv}^i be a slice of the interpolated anatomic image (reference image) and $I_{interbv}^{i,0}$ the corresponding slice in the b_0 image, from the inter-bvalue motion-corrected IVIM

data (moving image). Co-registration is performed by solving the following problem:

$$k_i^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{k_i} \mathcal{F}(d_i(k_i); I_{interbv}^{i,0}, \hat{x}_{interv}^i) + \lambda_2 R_2(d_i(k_i)) \quad (4)$$

where \mathcal{F} is the local correlation coefficient, R_2 is the isotropic total variation (TV) [23], and λ_2 is its weight. We also used the LBFGS [24] algorithm to solve (4).

C. IVIM PARAMETERS ESTIMATION USING BAYESIAN METHOD

Let us remind the IVIM model:

$$y_i := G_{b_i}(f, d, ds) + \varepsilon_i \quad (5)$$

where y_i is the acquired signal with bvalue b_i , for $i = 0, \dots, N_b - 1$, where N_b is the number of bvalues employed, and f, d and ds are the blood perfusion, water molecular diffusion and blood pseudo-diffusion, respectively. ε_i is the noise related to the image acquisition. We assume that it is a Gaussian distribution with variance σ_i^2 . The function G_{b_i} , a bi-exponential model, is defined as follows:

$$G_{b_i}(f, d, ds) := y_0 (f e^{-b_i ds} + (1-f) e^{-b_i d}) \quad (6)$$

Where y_0 is the signal acquired with the initial bvalue b_0 . Under physical considerations, the blood fraction perfusion $f \in [0,1]$ (f is a percentage) and the blood pseudo-diffusion are faster than the water diffusion: $ds > d$. The mixing of both higher and lower bvalues b_i is required to consider both compartments. In the remainder of this subsection, we begin with the formulation of the Bayesian approach to explain how to integrate the preconditioned Crank-Nicholson (pCN) sampling method into IVIM parameter estimation, and demonstrate how pCN can accelerate the sampling.

1) LIKELIHOOD DISTRIBUTION

Assuming that noise ε_i is normally distributed, the likelihood is given as follows:

$$P(y_{bi} | f, d, ds; S_0, \sigma_i^2) \propto (\sigma_i^2)^{N_b/2} e^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma_i^2} \sum_{i=0}^{N_b-1} [y_{bi} - G_{bi}(f, d, ds)]^2} \theta^{n+1/2} := \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} \theta^n + \rho \delta^{n+1/2} \quad (7)$$

Similar to Orton et al. [11], we used the marginalization on S_0 and σ_i^2 , leading to the following marginalized likelihood:

$$P(y | f, d, ds) \propto [y y^t - \frac{y^t G_b}{y^t y}]^{N_b/2} \quad (8)$$

Where $y := [y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{N_b-1}]^t$ and $G_b := [G_{b_0}, \dots, G_{b_{N-1}}]^t$.

2) PRIOR DISTRIBUTION

Following Orton et al. [11], we use a hierarchical prior distribution over the transformed variables: $F := \log(f) - \log(1 - f)$, $D := \log(d)$ and $Ds := \log(ds)$. The transformed variables are no longer constrained: $F, D, Ds \in \mathbb{R}^{NV}$, where NV is the number of voxels. This facilitates the IVIM parameter estimation. We denote the variable to be estimated as $\theta := (F, D, Ds)$. The following prior distribution is considered:

$$P(\theta | \mu, \Sigma) \propto e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\theta - \mu)^t \Sigma^{-1} (\theta - \mu)} \quad (9)$$

Where $\mu := (\mu_f, \mu_d, \mu_{ds})$ denotes the mean of the parameter θ and Σ is the covariance matrix in the region of interest (ROI).

3) HYPERPARAMETERS DISTRIBUTION

We used a noninformative Jeffrey's prior as proposed by Orton et al. [11] to model the hyperparameters (or hyper-priors) μ and Σ :

$$P(\mu, \Sigma) = |\Sigma|^{-1/2} \quad (10)$$

4) POSTERIOR DISTRIBUTION AND SAMPLING

The posterior distribution of the variable of interest (θ, μ, Σ) is given by the Bayes' rule:

$$P(\theta, \mu, \Sigma | y) = \frac{P(\mu, \Sigma) P(y | \theta) P(\theta)}{P(y)} \quad (11)$$

The above posterior cannot be sampled directly because of the unknown denominator. Therefore, MCMC techniques are generally adopted for such problems which involve an exhaustive sampling method that is time consuming. In general, the proposal for the MCMC sampling technique is given by:

$$\theta^{n+1/2} := \pi(\theta^n) \quad (12)$$

where $\theta^{n+1/2}$ is the proposed point, $\pi: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ is the sampler, \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{E} are two given spaces and θ^n is the current state of the chain. The preconditioned Crank-Nicholson (pCN) algorithm defines the following proposal:

with $\rho \in]0, 1[$ and $\delta^{n+1/2} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, C)$ and C is the covariance matrix. This proposed point is accepted with probability:

$$\alpha(\theta^{n+1/2}, \theta^n) = \min\left(1, \frac{P(y|\theta^n)}{P(y|\theta^{n+1/2})}\right) \quad (14)$$

In equation (14), the hyper-priors μ and Σ are no longer needed to be estimated because α depends only on θ , therefore the step of ROI-based μ and Σ estimation can be skipped. The initialization of the IVIM parameters was performed via the segmented fitting approach [30], in the same way as that performed by Orton et al [11], where an MCMC random walk was used. Algorithm 1 summarizes the proposed IVIM parameter estimation method.

Algorithm 1: IVIM-pCN

1. Inputs: $\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3 \in]0, 1[$, the covariances C_1, C_2, C_3 and the initial guest $\theta^1 := (F^1, D^1, Ds^1)$
2. Output: IVIM parameters estimate $\hat{\theta}$
3. For iteration $n = 2, \dots, \text{maxIter}$
 - a) Sample the proposal of F

$$F^{n+1/2} = \sqrt{(1 - \rho_1^2) F^{n-1} + \rho_1 \delta^{n+1/2}}$$

with $\delta^{n+1/2} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, C_1)$

Sample $r \sim U(0, 1)$

Set $\theta^{n+1/2} := (F^{n+1/2}, D^{n-1}, Ds^{n-1})$

If $r < \alpha(\theta^{n+1/2}, \theta^n)$

$$F^n = F^{n+1/2}$$

Else

$$F^n = F^{n-1}$$

Update $\theta^n := (F^n, D^{n-1}, Ds^{n-1})$

- b) Sample the proposal of D

$$D^{n+1/2} = \sqrt{(1 + \rho_2^2) D^{n-1} + \rho_2 \delta^{n+1/2}}$$

with $\delta^{n+1/2} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, C_2)$

Sample $r \sim U(0, 1)$

Set $\theta^{n+1/2} := (F^n, D^{n+1/2}, Ds^{n-1})$.

If $r < \alpha(\theta^{n+1/2}, \theta^n)$

$D^n = D^{n+1/2}$

Else

$D^n = D^{n-1}$

c) Sample the proposal of D_S

$$D_S^{n+1/2} = \sqrt{1 - \rho_3^2 D_S^{n-1} + \rho_3 \delta^{n+1/2}}$$

with $\delta^{n+1/2} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, C_3)$

Sample $r \sim U(0,1)$

Set $\theta^{n+1/2} := (F^n, D^n, D_S^{n+1/2})$.

If $r < \alpha(\theta^{n+1/2}, \theta^n)$

$D_S^n = D_S^{n+1/2}$

Else

$D_S^n = D_S^{n-1}$

Update $\theta^n := (F^n, D^n, D_S^n)$

End

III. DATA ACQUISITION, NUMERICAL IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION

A. DATA ACQUISITION

For this study, we used data from 21 subjects (35+/- 6.4 years old) recruited between October 2020 and March 2023 under an ethically approved protocol named DIANE (Dépistage par Irm des Anomalies d'adhésioN placentaire, NCT04328532). The average gestational age was 33 weeks + 2 days. MR imaging data were obtained using a 3T clinical scanner (MAGNETOM Prisma, Siemens Healthcare, Erlangen, Germany). 18 channel body coils with built-in spinal coil elements were used. The whole acquisition was performed in a free-breathing manner, in either the lateral or supine position depending on the patient's comfort. The total acquisition time was within 30 minutes, including both the morphological assessment and functional assessment.

Anatomic T_2 -weighted (Half-Fourier Acquisition Single-shot Turbo spin Echo sequence) images were obtained in the axial, placental coronal and placental sagittal orientation to cover the whole placenta. The in-plane resolution was $0.89 \times 0.89 \text{ mm}^2$ and the slice thickness was 5 mm.

Six-minute of IVIM data acquisition was performed in the placenta sagittal plane. Eleven b-values, therefore $N_b = 11$ and $b_{\text{value}} = 0, 15, 45, 80, 115, 205, 245.345, 470, 700, 1000 \text{ s/mm}^2$ were used. The echo time (TE) and the repetition time (TR) were 60ms and 6000ms, respectively.

The in-plane resolution was $1.5625 \times 1.5625 \text{ mm}^2$ with a 5 mm slice thickness and a 1 mm gap between slices.

B. NUMERICAL IMPLEMENTATION

First, we estimated the T_2 -weighted anatomical super-resolved reference. We used the implementation proposed in [28] (step 1 in Figure 1).

In the second step, we numerically performed the inter-bvalue motion correction (Step 2 in Figure 1). We numerically solved optimization problem (3) using the regularization weight $\lambda_2 = 2.5$ and 100 iterations. For each bvalue b_i , for $i \neq 0$, the z^{th} slice $I_z^{b_i}$ within the three-dimensional image obtained using is registered to the corresponding z^{th} slice $I_z^{b_0}$ within the three-dimensional reference image obtained using the first bvalue b_0 . A 60×60 deformation grid was set on $I_z^{b_i}$ for deformable registration.

In the third step, we performed image co-registration (Step 3 in Figure 1). We interpolated the anatomical super-resolved MR image estimated in Step 1 to a grid of the same size as the IVIM image. The latter was used as the reference, and inter-bvalue motion-corrected IVIM image was used as the floating image. We solved optimization problem (4) with 50 iterations. The z^{th} slice $I_z^{b_0}$ within the three-dimensional inter-bvalue motion-corrected IVIM data corresponding to bvalue b_0 was registered to the corresponding z^{th} slice I_z^{Anatomic} within the three-dimensional anatomic reference image (interpolated image). A 60×60 deformation grid was set on $I_z^{b_0}$.

In the fourth step, we implemented Algorithm 1. using $\text{maxIter} = 5000$ (Step 4 in Figure 1), with the first 2000 iterations for the burn-in step of the MCMC method. We set $\rho_1 = \rho_2 = \rho_3 = 0.002$, and fixed $C_1 = 0.01$, $C_2 = 0.01$ and $C_3 = 0.05$. MATLAB 2023a was used for the numerical implementation.

A. EVALUATION

Two assessments were performed. First, we quantitatively and qualitatively evaluated the impact of the proposed motion correction method on the IVIM parameters obtained using the proposed IVIM-pCN estimation method. For quantitative comparison, we used the Mean Absolute Error (MAE) between the observed and fitted data. The middle slice going through placenta with three slices before and after it were selected for an ROI-based evaluation. Averaged based value was obtained in the placenta region of the selected slices for each patient.

In the second step, after motion correction, we compared the proposed IVIM parameter estimation method to the classic Markov chain Monte-Carlo (MCMC) random walk (rw) and least square Levenberg-Marquadt (LSQ) methods. We calculated the mean value and the standard deviation (std) of placental IVIM parameters obtained with these algorithms




FIGURE 3. IVIM parameters estimates obtained with pCN sampling algorithm before and after motion correction.

over the 21 subjects. Furthermore, we computed the placental Mean Absolute Error (MAE) over the patients.

Markov Chain Monte-Carlo (MCMC) random walk (rw) method was considered as the reference using the implementation from Orton et al. [11], with 5000 iterations those 2500 iterations for the burn-in step.

IV. RESULTS

A. IMPACT OF MOTION CORRECTION ON IVIM PARAMETERS

Parametric maps estimated using the proposed IVIM-pCN algorithm before and after using our motion correction method are shown in Figure 3. Qualitatively, we observed better delineation of perfusion and diffusion boundaries after motion correction (see the orange arrow).

Figure 4 shows an example of IVIM curve fitting at a point located within the placental region before and after motion correction. The fitting was greatly improved after registration. Boxplots of IVIM parameters within the placental region of interest (ROI) (median over slices) for the 21 subjects and the median value of the Mean Absolute Error (MAE) within the placental ROI for the same cohort of 21 subjects were shown in Figure 5. We observed shrinking of the perfusion range values after motion correction. The inter quartile range value of placental perfusion was reduced after motion correction. The Mean Absolute Error (MAE) range value was also reduced after motion correction. These findings are consistent with those presented in [19], with a similar motion correction.

B. COMPARISON OF IVIM PARAMETERS ESTIMATES AFTER MOTION CORRECTION

In Figure 6, we show example parameter maps using the proposed IVIM estimation method (IVIM-pCN), MCMC random walk (rw) and full non-linear least square (LSQ) Levenberg-Marquadt algorithm for one patient. Whereas

the LSQ Levenberg-Marquadt method provides noisy estimates, the MCMC random walk and IVIM-pCN methods provide similar smoother estimates.



The standard deviations within the placental region of interest provided by both the IVIM-pCN and MCMC random walk were close, and smaller than those of LSQ. The mean absolute error (MAE) calculated using the pCN and RW methods were also similar. A more complete description of the results can be found in Table 1, with the mean value, standard deviation and MAE calculated in the placenta ROI, with median averaging over slices, and averaging over all 21 subjects, before and after motion correction. One advantage of preconditioned Crank-Nicholson (pCN) sampling method over MCMC random walk is the computation time. Indeed, using the pCN method, we do not estimate the hyperparameters μ and Σ ; this reduces the computation time by approximately 30% to 40% per patient, depending on the data volume size (39% in average).

V. DISCUSSIONS

In this work, we proposed to optimize placental IVIM parameter estimation by aligning all IVIM data to a super-resolved anatomical volume originally designed for morphological assessment in the placenta exam. We also proposed to accelerate the widely used random walk MCMC method for IVIM parameter estimation using a new sampling strategy called preconditioned Crank-Nicholson sampling.

The proposed framework is assessed using in vivo data. Qualitatively, the results showed that within the framework, the perfusion placental boundary delineation is sharper than the results provided without motion correction using the so-called preconditioned Crank-Nicholson sampling method. Quantitatively, we evaluated residual errors before and

Before image registration



After image registration





FIGURE 4. IVIM fitting using estimates given by pCN sampling algorithm before and after motion correction.




FIGURE 5. Boxplot of placental ROI median value of IVIM parameters and Mean Absolute Error (MAE) for all patients.

TABLE I
RESULTS WITHOUT THE PROPOSED MOTION CORRECTION STRATEGY AND WITH MOTION CORRECTION

		Mean			Standard deviation			MAE
		f (no unit)	d (mm^2/s)	ds (mm^2/s)	f (no unit)	d (mm^2/s)	ds (mm^2/s)	
pCN	Without registration	0.1964	0.0020	0.0780	0.1964	0.0013	0.1797	4.1415
	With Registration	0.1789	0.0019	0.0680	0.1934	0.0011	0.1679	3.0169
rw	Without registration	0.1983	0.0019	0.0741	0.1974	0.0013	0.1636	4.3856
	With Registration	0.1787	0.0018	0.0672	0.1933	0.0011	0.1679	2.9901
LSQ	Without registration	0.3534	0.0018	0.2221	0.2257	0.0015	0.3736	3.2290
	With registration	0.3387	0.0017	0.1829	0.2232	0.0014	0.3346	2.2822

after image registration and showed a decrease in the MAE metric. Similar results were obtained using a model-based registration tool for placental MR imaging [19]. Model-based methods were exploited here rather than learning-based methods owing to the small dataset and its robustness in terms of performance.

MR examination of pregnant women is a challenging task, not only because of its multi-motion interruption sources, but also because of the safety and patient comfort constraints leading to other factors, such as limited acquisition time. Therefore, the motion correction strategy of such examinations cannot be adapted to existing methods. Both the MR exam and algorithms need to be designed. Motion can be handled in a prospective manner for diffusion-weighted acquisition as proposed in [18] using navigators to update the slice location. However, such methods lead to longer acquisition times and, therefore, reduce the time required for other examinations. For retrospective motion correction, most published studies have focused on fetal brain data, in which algorithms such as slice-to-volume registration (SVR) and super-resolution reconstruction are widely used to obtain a super-resolved volume. Normally such algorithms need to create a bounding box to restrict the region as an input. Either the fetal brain or the body gains computational advantages as these parts are compact thus bounding boxes can easily contain all the necessary voxels that need to be computed. However, the placenta is a smashed plate that extends over the uterus, especially during the 3rd trimester. Therefore, an intersection-based SVR method was used in this study rather than the commonly used bounding box.

Joint motion correction and super-resolution methods have been proposed to improve quantitative MRI [17]. In the brain, MR structural information and diffusion tensor imaging have also been combined to improve brain connectome modeling and mapping to a standard brain atlas. All of them used only the diffusion data without incorporating high resolution anatomical data [2]. However,

these studies were for different purpose and brain fiber tracks were extracted in the end, where potential registration to align to standard atlas may be more important.

The preconditioned Crank-Nicholson (pCN) sampling method was introduced to accelerate the estimation of IVIM placental parameters using a Gaussian prior and Bayesian framework. The results are visually similar to those provided by the MCMC random walk used in previous studies for IVIM parameters estimation [11], but less noisy than that provided by full non-linear least square (LSQ) Levenberg-Marquadt algorithm. This is consistent with findings of Orton et al. [11]. In contrast, pCN sampling technique is less expensive than the random walk sampling. Its advantage also lies in the fact that the ROI-based prior distribution step is no longer necessary, therefore the estimation pipeline is more automatic. One limitation of (pCN) sampling estimation method is that it considers a normal prior distribution [14], blocking other prior information to be used as in [20]. All the hyperparameters used herein, ρ_1 , ρ_2 , ρ_3 , C_1 , C_2 , C_3 , are arbitrary fixed, which may affect the final results.

Similar motion correction framework has been previously studied. Uss et al. [41] introduced a motion correction framework for three-dimensional T_2^* relaxometry using T_2 -weighted anatomic MR images. Landmark-based registration was used to reorient T_2^* to the anatomic space. However, the T_2^* volume used, which is from a fast sequence and intra-measurement motion, can be considered minimal and did not affect the fitting. Therefore, in this work, the registration was between the anatomic volume and reconstructed T_2^* maps. The motion problem for the IVIM is more complicated.

The limitations of the proposed framework and estimation methods include the debatable choice of the IVIM image acquired with the first bvalue b_0 as reference for inter-bvalue image registration. The mean bvalue image can be adopted to consider the influence of both low and high b-value images [34]. Concerning the co-registration of inter-bvalue motion-corrected IVIM data, the reference anatomic MR images used were interpolated using cubic interpolation




FIGURE 6. IVIM parameters obtained using pCN (proposed method), random walk (rw) and least-squares methods, and the probability density for the same data. Red curve is for pCN, black for rw and blue for LSQ.

before registration because it extends the influence of more points [38], but other interpolation kernels could be used.

VI. CONCLUSION

We proposed an innovative acquisition specific framework based on the placenta anatomy for motion management before the estimation of placental IVIM parameters. We also introduced the preconditioned Crank-Nicholson (pCN) sampling technique in a Bayesian framework to accelerate the IVIM parameter estimation. We demonstrated the feasibility and stability of this pipeline. This systematic processing pipeline are shown to improve the quality of the IVIM parameter estimation. The proposed acquisition specific anatomy frame can also be applied to other quantitative MR sequences in the same exam to allow the alignment of further analysis.

REFERENCES

- [1] Prayer D, Malinge G, Brugger PC, Cassady C, De Catte L, De Keersma Keersmaecker B, et al. ISUOG Practice Guidelines: performance Fetal magnetic resonance imaging. *Ultrasound in Obstetrics & Gynecology*. 2017;49(5):671-80.
- [2] J. Dubois, S. Kulikova, L. Hertz-Pannier, J.-F. Mangin, G. Dehaene-Lambertz, and C. Poupon, 'Correction strategy for diffusion-weighted images corrupted with motion: application to the DTI evaluation of infants' white matter', *Magnetic Resonance Imaging*, vol. 32, no. 8, pp. 981-992, Oct. 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.mri.2014.05.007.
- [3] Le Bihan D, Breton E, Lallemand D, Aubin ML, Vignaud L, Laval-Jeantet. M. Separation of diffusion and perfusion in intravoxel incoherent MR imaging. *Radiology*. 1988 Aug; 168(2):497-505.
- [4] Le Bihan D. What can we see with IVIM MRI? *NeuroImage*. 2019 Feb 15; 187:56-67.
- [5] Ngremmadji MA, Draveny R, Krisch A, Ambarki K, Nickel D, Berthold C, et al. Impact of motion correction on in-vivo assessment of Placenta Adhesion Abnormality (PAA) disorders using IVIM method. *ISMRM 2022*.
- [6] Luciani A, Vignaud A, Cavet M, Tran Van Nhieu J, Mallat A, Ruel L, et al. Liver Cirrhosis: Intravoxel Incoherent Motion MR Imaging-Pilot Study. *Radiology*. 2009 Jan 1;359-891-9.
- [7] Le Bihan D. Intravoxel incoherent motion perfusion MR imaging: a wake-up call. *Radiology*. 2008 Dec; 249(3):748-52.
- [8] Nilse, LB, Fangberget A, Geier O, Seierstad T. Quantitative analysis of diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging in malignant breast lesions using different b-value combinations. *Eur Radiol*. 2013 Apr 1; 23(4):1027-33.
- [9] While PT. A comparative simulation study of Bayesian fitting approaches to intravoxel incoherent motion modeling in diffusion-weighted MRI. *Magnetic Resonance Imaging*. 2017;78-6):2373-87.
- [10] Neil JJ, Bretthorst GL. On the use of Bayesian probability theory for analysis of exponential decay data: an example from intravoxel incoherent motion experiments. *Magn Reson Med*. 1993 May, 29(5):642-7.
- [11] Orton MR, Collins DJ, Koh DM, Leach MO. Improved intravoxel incoherent motion analysis of diffusion weighted imaging by data driven Bayesian modeling. *Magnetic Resonance in Medicine*. 2014;71(1):411-20.
- [12] Freiman M, Perez-Rossello JM, Callahan MJ, Voss SD, Ecklund K, Mulkem RV, et al. Reliable estimation of incoherent motion parametric maps from diffusion-weighted MRI using fusion bootstrap moves. *Med Image Anal*. 2013. Apr, 17(3):325-36.
- [13] Merisaari H, Movahedi P, Perez IM, Toivonen J, Pesola M, Taimen P, et al. Fitting methods for intravoxel incoherent motion imaging of prostate cancer on region of interest level: Repeatability and gleason score prediction. *Magnetic Resonance in Medicine*. 2017; 77(3):1249-64.
- [14] Cotter SL, Roberts GO, Stuart AM, White D MCMC Methods for Functions: Modifying Old Algorithms to Make Them Faster. *Statistical Science*. 2013 Aug, 28(3):424-46.
- [15] Odille F, Bustin A, Chen B, Vuissoz PA, Felblinger J. Motion-Corrected Super-Resolution Reconstruction for High-Resolution 3D Cardiac Cine- MRI. In: *Medical Image Computing and Computer*

- Assisted Intervention-MICCAI 2015. Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2015.p.435-42.
- [16] Oliveira FPM, Tavares JMRS. Medical image registration: a review. *Comput Methods Biomech Biomed Engin.* 2014; 17(2)-73-93.
- [17] Uus A, Zhang T, Jackson LH, Roberts TA, Rutherford MA, Hajnal JV, et al. Deformable Slice-to-Volume Registration for Motion Correction of Fetal Body and Placenta MRI. *IEEE Trans Med Imaging.* 2020 Sep.
- [18] Zaitsev M, Akin B, LeVan P, Knowles BR. Prospective motion correction in functional MRI. *Neuroimage.* 2017 Jul 1; 154:33-42. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.11.014. Epub 2016 Nov 11. PMID: 27845256; PMCID: PMC5427003.
- [19] Flouri D, Owen D, Aughwane R, Mufti N, Makysm K, Sokolska M, et al. Improved fetal blood oxygenation and placental estimated measurements of diffusion-weighted MRI using data-driven Bayesian modeling. *Magnetic Reson Med.* 2020 Jun; 83(6):2160-72.
- [20] Spinner GR, Federau C, Kozerke S. Bayesian inference using hierarchical and spatial priors for intravoxel incoherent motion MR imaging in the brain: Analysis of cancer and acute stroke. *Medical Image Analysis.* 2021 Oct 1; 73:102144.
- [21] Li Y, Xu N, Fitzpatrick JM, Dawant BM. Geometric distortion correction for echo planar images using nonrigid registration with spatially varying scale. *Magn Reson Imaging.* 2008 Dec;26(10):1388-97. doi: 10.1016/j.mri.2008.03.004. Epub 2008 May 21. PMID: 18499382; PMCID: PMC3511831.
- [22] G. Blanchet, L. Moisan, "An explicit Sharpness Index related to Global Phase Coherence", *proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pp. 1065-1068, 2012.
- [23] Vishnevskiy V, Gass T, Szekely G, Tanner C, Goksel O. Isotropic Total Variation Regularization of Displacements in Parametric Image Registration. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging.* 2017 Feb; 36(2):385-95.
- [24] LIU, D. C. et NOCEDAL, J. On the limited memory method for large scale optimization: *Mathematical Programming B*, 45, 503– 528, doi: 10.1007/BF01589116. *Crossref Web of Science*, 1989.
- [25] Thirion JP. Non-rigid matching using demons. In: *Proceedings CVPR IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition.* 1996.p.245-51.
- [26] Thirion JP. Image matching as a diffusion process: an analogy with Maxwell's demons. *Medical Image Analysis.* 1998 Sep 1 ;2(3) :243-60.
- [27] Vercauteren T, Pennec X, Perchant A, Ayache N. Diffeomorphic demons : Efficient non-parametric image registration. *NeuroImage.* 2009 Mar 1 ; 45(1, Supplement 1) : S61-71.
- [28] A.-L. Le Bars, K. Moulin, D. B. Ennis, J. Felblinger, B. Chen, and F. Odille, 'In Vivo Super-Resolution Cardiac Diffusion Tensor MRI: A Feasibility Study', *Diagnostics*, vol. 12, no. 4, Art. no. 4, Apr. 2022, doi: 10.3390/diagnostics12040877.
- [29] Zhang L, Vishnevskiy V, Jakab A, Goksel O. Implicit Modeling with Uncertainty Estimation for Intravoxel Incoherent Motion Imaging [Internet]. arXiv; 2018 [cited 2024 Oct 14]. Available from: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1810.10358>
- [30] Jalnefjord O, Andersson M, Montelius M, Starck G, Elf AK, Johanson V, et al. Comparison of methods for estimation of the intravoxel incoherent motion (IVIM) diffusion coefficient (D) and perfusion fraction (f). *Magma.* 2018 Dec; 31(6).
- [31] Kim K, Habas PA, Rousseau F, Glenn OA, Barkovich AJ, Studholme C. Intersection Based Motion Correction of Multi-Slice MRI for 3D in utero Fetal Brain Image Formation. *IEEE Trans Med Imaging.* 2010 Jan;29(1):146–58.
- [32] Uus AU, Egloff Collado A, Roberts TA, Hajnal JV, Rutherford MA, Deprez M. Retrospective motion correction in foetal MRI for clinical applications: existing methods, applications and integration into clinical practice. *Br J Radiol.* 2023 Jul 1;96(1147):20220071.
- [33] Melbourne A, Aughwane R, Sokolska M, Owen D, Kendall G, Flouri D, et al. Separating fetal and maternal placenta circulations using multiparametric MRI. *Magnetic Resonance in Medicine.* 2019;81(1):350–61.
- [34] Thesis M, Zhang L. Motion Correction and IVIM Fitting for in-utero Fetal Diffusion-weighted Magnetic Resonance Images.
- [35] Andrade N, Faria FA, Cappabianco FAM. A practical Review on Medical Image Registration: From Rigid to Deep Learning Based Approaches. 2018 31st SIBGRAPI Conference on Graphics, Patterns and Images (SIBGRAPI). 2018 Oct;463–70.
- [36] Woods RP, Grafton ST, Holmes CJ, Cherry SR, Mazziotta JC. Automated image registration: I. General methods and intrasubject, intramodality validation. *J Comput Assist Tomogr.* 1998 Jan 1;22(1):139–52.
- [37] Simonovsky M, Gutiérrez-Becker B, Mateus D, Navab N, Komodakis N. A Deep Metric for Multimodal Registration [Internet]. arXiv; 2016 [cited 2024 Nov 18]. Available from: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1609.05396>.
- [38] D. Han, 'Comparison of Commonly Used Image Interpolation Methods', presented at the Conference of the 2nd International Conference on Computer Science and Electronics Engineering (ICCSEE 2013), Atlantis Press, Mar. 2013, pp. 1556–1559. doi: 10.2991/iccsee.2013.391.
- [39] Guyader JM, Bernardin L, Douglas NH, Poot DH, Niessen WJ, Klein S. Influence of image registration, on apparent diffusion coefficient images computed from free-breathing diffusion MR images of the abdomen. *J Magn Reson Imaging.* 2015 Aug;42(2):315-30. doi: 10.1002/jmri.24792. Epub 2014 Nov 19. PMID: 25407766.
- [40] Evgenios N, Kornaropoulos, Evangelia I, Zacharaki, Pierre Zerbib, Chieh Lin, Alain Rahmouni, et al. Deformable group-wise registration using a physiological model: application to Diffusion-Weighted MRI. *ICIP 2016 - IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, Sep 2016, Phoenix, Arizona, United States. pp.2345-2349, ff10.1109/icip.2016.7532778. hal-01324238.
- [41] A. U. Uus et al., 'Combined Quantitative T2* Map and Structural T2-Weighted Tissue-Specific Analysis for Fetal Brain MRI: Pilot.
- [42] M. P. T. Kaandorp *et al.*, 'Improved unsupervised physics-informed deep learning for intravoxel incoherent motion modeling and evaluation in pancreatic cancer patients', *Magnetic Resonance in Medicine*, vol. 86, no. 4, pp. 2250–2265, 2021, doi: 10.1002/mrm.28852.