## Acceleration of IDEAL Water-Fat Imaging using Compressed Sensing

S. D. Sharma<sup>1</sup>, H. H. Hu<sup>1</sup>, and K. S. Navak<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, United States

Introduction: IDEAL is an iterative technique for separating water and fat signals on a per-voxel basis [1]. Water-fat imaging plays an important role in many clinical applications, including high-spatial-resolution 3D knee imaging to characterize bone marrow and cartilage [2], and 3D whole-abdomen imaging to quantify fat in adipose tissue depots and organs [3]. However, the long scan times required increase susceptibility to motion artifacts. Thus, water-fat imaging applications can significantly benefit from data acceleration. In this work, we reformulate the IDEAL algorithm to estimate water and fat signals on a whole-image basis [4], and present an approach to integrate Compressed Sensing (CS) [5] into the accelerated water-fat separation framework [6]. We demonstrate up to 3x acceleration using CS-IDEAL.

Theory: Each iteration of the IDEAL reconstruction solves two least-squares (LS) problems: 1) water and fat signal estimation, and 2) estimation of the current iteration's field map error. We reformulate these LS problems in Equations 1

and 2. The vector k represents the acquired k-space data from all TEs and all coils.  $\Phi$  is the Fourier sampling operator.  $\Psi$  represents a function of the image field map estimate, C denotes the coil sensitivity maps, A is

$$\min_{c_{w,c_{f}}} \|k - \Phi \Psi CADc\|_{2}^{2} + \lambda_{1} [|c_{w}|_{1} + |c_{f}|_{1}]$$
 (1)

the water-fat chemical-shift coefficient matrix, D represents a sparsifying transform and c are its coefficients such that cw and cf are the water and fat transform coefficients. In Equation 2, the vector e denotes the difference between the true and the estimated k-

$$\left| \min_{\Delta \psi} \left\| \mathbf{e} - \mathbf{B} \mathbf{y} \right\|_{2}^{2} + \lambda_{2} \left| \Delta \psi \right|_{\mathsf{FD}}$$
 **(2)**

(e)

CS-IDEAL (3x) fat

difference

0.2

0.1

n

-0.1

-0.2

space signals, B represents the error-modeling matrix [1], and y is a matrix of field map error ( $\Delta \psi$ ), water signal error, and fat signal error. FD denotes the finite-difference operator. By solving these problems on a whole-image-basis, we are able to leverage presumed compressibility of both water and fat images as well as the field map error to regularize our underdetermined system of equations.

Method and Results: We used a variable-density retrospective sampling scheme and the Daubechies4 wavelet transform to compress both the water and fat images [7]. Phantom: We verified this method on a 256x256 water-fat phantom using an oblique coronal slice that spanned the fat fraction spectrum. Figure 1 shows line profiles of the estimated fat fractions using conventional IDEAL and CS-IDEAL with 2x and 3x acceleration. reconstructions agree quite well with the IDEAL estimation. In vivo: We applied this technique to a 256x256 sagittal knee slice. Figure 2 shows field maps, fat fraction maps, and the fat fraction difference map for IDEAL and CS-IDEAL (3x). The bone marrow regions outlined in Figure 2e have high fat fractions. In these regions, the average absolute fat fraction difference between IDEAL and CS-IDEAL is only 2.7%. At tissue interfaces, some large fat fraction differences did occur due to unreliable field map estimates in both IDEAL and CS-IDEAL.

Conclusion: We have demonstrated accelerated water-fat imaging by reformulating the IDEAL algorithm and solving the

problem via CS on a wholeimage basis. One limitation of the present framework is the lack of consideration for T2\*-decay. This remains as future work.

References: [1] Reeder et al., MRM 2004; [2] Kijowski et al., JMRI, 2009; [3] Winkelmann et al., MAGMA, 2006; [4] Hernando et al., MRM 2008; [5] Candes et al., IEEE IT 2004; [6] Lustig et al., ISMRM 2009; [7] Lustig MRM 2007;

IDEAL

fraction 9.0

更 0.4

0.2

CS-IDEAL(2x)

CS-IDEAL(3x)




Figure 1: fat fraction line profile along water-fat interface