

AD_____

Award Number: W81XWH-12-1-0098

TITLE: Evaluation of Diffusion Kurtosis Imaging in Traumatic Brain Injury

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Rao P Gullapalli

CONTRACTING ORGANIZATION: University of Maryland, Baltimore
Baltimore, MD 21201

REPORT DATE: May 2013

TYPE OF REPORT: Annual

PREPARED FOR: U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command
Fort Detrick, Maryland 21702-5012

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT: Approved for Public Release;
Distribution Unlimited

The views, opinions and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy or decision unless so designated by other documentation.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. **PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.**

1. REPORT DATE May 2013		2. REPORT TYPE Annual		3. DATES COVERED 2 Apr 2012 - 1 Apr 2013	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Evaluation of Diffusion Kurtosis Imaging in Traumatic Brain Injury				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER W81XWH-12-1-0098	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Rao P Gullapalli Email: rgullapalli@umm.edu				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) University of Maryland, Baltimore Baltimore, MD 21201				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command Fort Detrick, Maryland 21702-5012				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT The goal of this study is to identify novel imaging marker such as diffusion kurtosis that may serve as a prognostic marker in the evaluation and management of traumatic brain injury patients. This study will recruit patients patients with varying severity of traumatic brain injury (mild, moderate, severe) from the Shock Trauma center with an initial diagnosis of diffuse axonal injury. Neuropsychological testing and magnetic resonance imaging will be performed in the acute, sub-acute and chronic stages (through 6 months). The relationship between the advanced magnetic resonance imaging markers and the clinical condition of the patient will be evaluated at each time point to determine which of the imaging markers, or a combination of imaging markers are best representative of the clinical condition of the patient. Further, the markers will be evaluated for their prognostic ability to determine the clinical course of the TBI patients.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS- none listed					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			USAMRMC
U	U	U	UU	20	19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code)

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction.....	4
Body.....	4-5
Key Research Accomplishments.....	n/a
Reportable Outcomes.....	n/a
Conclusion.....	attached
References.....	n/a
Appendices.....	attached

Annual Report

Grant/Cooperative Agreement Number: W81XWH-12-1-0098

Title: Evaluation of Diffusion Kurtosis Imaging in Traumatic Brain Injury

Type of Report: Annual Report

Performance Period: Through March 2013

Principal Investigator: Rao P Gullapalli

Date of Publication: March 28, 2013

Grant Officer's Representative: Dr. Stephen Grate

Introduction

The goal of this study is to identify novel imaging marker such as diffusion kurtosis that may serve as a prognostic marker in the evaluation and management of traumatic brain injury patients. This study will recruit patients patients with varying severity of traumatic brain injury (mild, moderate, severe) from the Shock Trauma center with an initial diagnosis of diffuse axonal injury.

Neuropsychological testing and magnetic resonance imaging will be performed in the acute, sub-acute and chronic stages (through 6 months). The relationship between the advanced magnetic resonance imaging markers and the clinical condition of the patient will be evaluated at each time point to determine which of the imaging markers, or a combination of imaging markers are best representative of the clinical condition of the patient. Further, the markers will be evaluated for their prognostic ability to determine the clinical course of the TBI patients.

Overall Progress

Significant delays were experienced in the establishment of the award and the approval of the IRB protocol for this project. However we are now in an active state of recruitment of patients which is progressing smoothly.

Protocol Modification

The IRB approvals from University of Maryland and eventually from the HRPO took significantly longer than expected. Some of the delays were related to coordination between our site and Georgetown which unfortunately has been in a flux. Since Dr. Mhyre leaving Georgetown sometime in December there have been two other personnel changes which delayed the start date for recruitment. Currently we have Dr. Fiandaca as the contact person for receiving the blood samples at Georgetown. This modification was made as recently as March 15th, 2013. We believe we have all the approvals now for us to actively recruit patients

Study Tasks

Screening and recruitment for this study has begun.

Task 1

a. Enroll patients into the study. Screening and recruitment for this study has begun. We have already recruited 16 patients into the study, but unfortunately we were not able to bank the blood samples from these patients because the bio-sample recipient site was not ready.

b. Obtain Diffusion Kurtosis images within 10 days of injury, 4 weeks and 6 months following injury. For the enrolled patients, each has completed an initial MRI (within 10 day). For some of these patients, only a standard of care MRI was able to be obtained for various clinical reasons, but for the majority we have obtained DKI images. Several of the enrolled patients have returned for their 4 week follow-up visit and undergone DKI scans. We will continue to follow enrolled patients to obtain follow-up scans.

c. Obtain data on normal control subjects. 3 healthy volunteers have been enrolled as normal control subjects, and DKI images have been obtained.

d. Obtain blood samples at the time of each MRI. Due to the above mentioned delays in coordinating with our bio-sample recipient site, we have not obtained blood samples from the enrolled patients. However, we are now in a position to begin collecting blood samples from prospectively enrolled patients.

e. Pre-process the imaging data. Convert all imaging data to standard atlas, perform regional analysis, perform histogram analysis for whole brain data, quantify DTI and kurtosis analysis quantify MRSI data, develop hemorrhagic lesion burden scale, perform image segmentation to separate white and gray matter and obtain regional volumes. Pre-processing has begun. As imaging data begin to accumulate we will begin to perform various analyses.

Processing of data will continue on an ongoing basis for both data quality monitoring purposes and to assess the general trend of the data as new data is obtained. Data is reviewed every Thursday afternoon with the team to discuss various ways to analyze data and potential for manuscript generation.

A technical presentation on the behavior of DKI when multiple diffusion weightings and multiple directions are used was presented at the International Society for Magnetic Resonance in Medicine. We investigated whether the number of directions were more important compared to the number of diffusion weightings (b-factors) in order to sample the kurtosis tensor. Our interest was also to determine the shortest acquisition time possible without losing much information regarding the tensor. It was determined that the maximum b-value of 2500 s/mm² and a minimum of two b-values provided a reasonable representation of the tensor for an acquisition of time of less than ten minutes. The slides from this presentation are provided in the Appendix. A manuscript of this work is near completion for submission to Magnetic Resonance in Medicine Journal.

Work During Next Reporting Period

We will now actively recruit patients for the study. We expect to recruit at the rate of about 10-15 patients a month which is about the average from the ongoing parent study. The parent study will stop recruiting any new patients and all the new patients will flow into this study. By the next quarter we hope to have about 40-50 patients recruited with about half the patients finishing their one month follow up.

Administrative Comments: We hope that all the administrative issues are behind us and can actively recruit patients. At this time there are no administrative comments.

APPENDIX

Optimal Diffusion Kurtosis Imaging for Clinical Use - Fewer diffusion weightings or diffusion directions?

Jiachen Zhuo, Jonathan Z. Simon,
Rao P. Gullapalli

Diagnostic Radiology, University of Maryland School of Medicine
Electrical Engineering, University of Maryland



Introduction

- Diffusion Kurtosis Imaging (DKI)* measures the non-Gaussian behavior of water diffusion and has gained much interest lately as a tool to reveal significantly more tissue microstructure information, over and above which can be achieved from than Diffusion Tensor Imaging (DTI)
- However clinical application of DKI faces a major challenge, as it involves long acquisition times (~20 min) due to more complex model (21 model parameters vs. 6 in DTI)
- Little is known about how different DKI imaging schemes affect the variability in estimated DKI parameters

* Jensen JH, et al. 2005


Goal of this study

- To study the effect of imaging schemes:
 - Diffusion weightings (b-values)
 - Diffusion directionson estimated DKI parameters
- To find an optimal DKI imaging schemes within a clinically feasible image acquisition time (< 10min)

Diffusion Weighted Imaging Schemes


4 DKI dataset, each with: b_1 b_2 b_3 b_4 b_5
 5 b-values: $b = 500, 1000, 1500, 2000, 2500$ s/mm²
 64 diffusion directions

Acquisition time: 30 min×4




Methods

- Both regions of interests (ROI) and whole brain analysis
- For ROI analysis, four regions are selected:



- In order to minimize directional bias for the chosen Ndir sets to the tensor direction in each ROI, eight maximally different subsets of 15, 30 and 45 diffusion directions were chosen from the full 64 direction set
 - Based on minimizing electrostatic energy of the direction vectors
 - 32 data points for each ROI (4 repeats x 8 subsets)

Effect of Diffusion Weighting Selections




- All sets with b_{max} of 2000 s/mm² have higher bias and variability
- Optimal b-value subsets:

Nbval₂: $b = 1000, 2500$ s/mm²

Nbval₃: $b = 1000, 2000, 2500$ s/mm²

Nbval₄: $b = 1000, 1500, 2000, 2500$ s/mm²

Effect of Numbers of b-values and Diffusion Directions



Opt7min: Nbval = 2 ($b = 1000, 2500 \text{ s/mm}^2$), Ndir = 30

Opt10min: Nbval = 2 ($b = 1000, 2500 \text{ s/mm}^2$), Ndir = 45


- How do they perform compared to already proposed DKI imaging schemes?

Orig17min¹: Nbval = 5 ($b = 500, 1000, 1500, 2000, 2500 \text{ s/mm}^2$), Ndir = 30 (~17min)

Orig7min²: Nbval = 2 ($b = 1000, 2000 \text{ s/mm}^2$), Ndir = 30 (~7min)


Gold Standard: Full data (Nbval = 5, Ndir = 64, average of 4 repeats)

Performance of Different Imaging Schemes




- **Opt10min** > **Opt7min** \approx Orig17min > Orig7min

Estimation Variability in Whole Brain



- 1: Orig17min
- 2: Orig7min
- 3: Opt7min
- 4: Opt10min

Variability across four repeated measurements



Box shown are median, 25th and 75th value


- Variability: **Opt10min** < Orig17min < **Opt7min** < Orig7min

Estimation Accuracy in Whole Brain

- GM
- WM

Average bias from four repeated measurements

- 1: Orig17min
- 2: Opt7min
- 3: Opt10min



Box shown are median, 25th and 75th value


- The Orig7min scheme has much higher bias due to a different b_{max} (not shown)
- Accuracy: Orig17min > Opt10min > Opt7min
- Bias for Opt10min may be systematic (lower spatial variability)
- Negative bias in MK and K_r is noise related

How Does Image Noise Affect DKI Fitting

- Diffusion parameters have to be physically meaningful.

Principle of diffusion MRI:


➤ $S_0 > S(b) \implies$ Constraint 1: $D \geq 0$



Constraint violations for DTI parameters are Rare!

➤ $S(b_1) > S(b_2)$, if $b_1 < b_2$

\implies Constraint 2:
 $K \leq K_{max} = 3/(D \cdot b_{max})$




$S(b)$ not monotonically decreasing

$$\ln \frac{S(b)}{S_0} = -bD + \frac{1}{6}b^2D^2K$$

From multi-compartment model and empirical evidence*:

➤ $\ln(S(b)/S_0)$ is a convex function of b ($K > 0$)

\implies Constraint 3: $K \geq 0$




Constraint violations for DKI parameters are very common!

*Tabesh et al., Magn Reson Med. 2011


Constraint Violations of Different Imaging Schemes

Voxels with $K < 0$



Method: Count voxels which violated different constraints*
 - Negative diffusivity ($D < 0$)
 - Negative kurtosis ($K < 0$)
 - Kurtosis value over limit ($K \leq K_{max} = 3/(D \cdot b_{max})$)

Voxels with $K > K_{max}$



- Voxels with $D < 0$ is rare ($< 0.5\%$) (now shown here)

- Percent voxels violations:
Opt10min < Orig17min < **Opt7min**

*Tabesh et al., Magn Reson Med. 2011

Conclusion

- Overall DKI estimation benefit more from increased number of diffusion directions than number of diffusion weightings.
 - More diffusion directions reduces estimation variability of DKI parameters.
 - More diffusion weightings increases estimation accuracy.
- The optimal DKI imaging schemes are with two diffusion weightings. With 45 diffusion directions, the optimal imaging scheme even improves upon the conventional imaging with 17 min.

Acknowledgements

- MR Research Center
 - George Makris
 - Steve Roys
 - Jacki Janowich
 - Chandler Suors
 - Joshua Betz
- University of Florida
 - Dr. Angelos Barmoutis

Grant support: US Army W81XWH-12-1-0098
& W81XWH-08-1-0725, PT 075827

