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Purpose: Repeated brain MRI scans are performed in many clinical scenarios, such as follow up of patients with tumors and therapy response assessment. In this paper, the authors show an approach to utilize former scans of the patient for the acceleration of repeated MRI scans.

Methods: The proposed approach utilizes the possible similarity of the repeated scans in longitudinal MRI studies. Since similarity is not guaranteed, sampling and reconstruction are adjusted during acquisition to match the actual similarity between the scans. The baseline MR scan is utilized both in the sampling stage, via adaptive sampling, and in the reconstruction stage, with weighted reconstruction. In adaptive sampling, $k$-space sampling locations are optimized during acquisition. Weighted reconstruction uses the locations of the nonzero coefficients in the sparse domains as a prior in the recovery process. The approach was tested on 2D and 3D MRI scans of patients with brain tumors.

Results: The longitudinal adaptive compressed sensing MRI (LACS-MRI) scheme provides reconstruction quality which outperforms other CS-based approaches for rapid MRI. Examples are shown on patients with brain tumors and demonstrate improved spatial resolution. Compared with data sampled at the Nyquist rate, LACS-MRI exhibits signal-to-error ratio (SER) of 24.8 dB with undersampling factor of 16.6 in 3D MRI.

Conclusions: The authors presented an adaptive method for image reconstruction utilizing similarity of scans in longitudinal MRI studies, where possible. The proposed approach can significantly reduce scanning time in many applications that consist of disease follow-up and monitoring of longitudinal changes in brain MRI. © 2015 American Association of Physicists in Medicine. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1118/1.4928148]
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1. INTRODUCTION

Repeated brain MRI scans are performed in many clinical scenarios, such as follow up of patients with tumors and therapy response assessment. They constitute one of the most efficient tools to track pathology changes and to evaluate treatment efficacy in brain diseases. In many cases, most of the imaging data of the repeated scan are already present in the former scan. In this paper, we aim at exploiting this temporal similarity in MRI longitudinal studies for rapid MRI acquisition of the repeated scan.

The use of a reference image in medical image reconstruction is quite established and is popular in various imaging modalities. Examples include computed tomography, spectroscopic imaging, imaging of contrast agent uptake, dynamic MRI (Refs. 10–15) and real time tracking of tumors, locally focused MRI, and feature-recognizing MRI. Since the introduction of compressed sensing (CS) to the field of MRI, the use of a reference image has been exploited within CS, such as in rapid dynamic MRI, by exploiting temporal sparsity. Gamper et al. perform randomly skipping phase-encoding lines in each dynamic frame to speed-up acquisition. Liang et al. propose an iterative algorithm to detect the signal support in CS dynamic MRI. Zonoobi and Kassim use the previous time-frame in dynamic MRI to weight the $l_1$ minimization in the CS reconstruction process. Trzasko et al. exploit a preinjection background image and Wu et al. utilize a constraining image to enhance MR angiography (MRA), while incorporating CS and parallel imaging.

Samsonov et al. suggested using a reference frame to speed-up MRI in longitudinal studies. Their approach, as well as most other techniques that exploit a reference image in MRI applications, relies on similarity between the reference scan and the current scan. The similarity assumption is indeed valid in cases where imaging data consist of many images acquired at a high frame rate.

However, longitudinal MRI poses a different challenge due to the large time gaps between the scans. On the one hand, similarity across time points is not guaranteed, since in many cases, we observe vast changes between scans due to pathology changes or surgical interventions. In addition, undersampling in the time domain is impractical, due to the demand for high quality reconstruction at each time point. Therefore, reconstruction errors in this single time-frame imaging modality cannot be compensated for by adjacent time-frames like in dynamic imaging. On the other hand, in cases where similarity between previous and current scans does exist, the high resolution former scan of the patient may constitute a very strong...
prior for the reconstruction of the repeated scan. Therefore, for the scenario of longitudinal MRI, we suggest exploiting the former scan in an adaptive manner. The similarity of the reference scan to the current scans is “learned” during the acquisition process, leading to an iterative update of sampling and reconstruction accordingly.

In the context of MRI, image reconstruction quality highly depends on the $k$-space sampling pattern. The concept of adaptive sampling (also known as “adaptive sensing”) suggests that samples are selected sequentially, where the choice of the next samples may depend on previously gathered information. This concept has been implemented previously, mainly for dynamic MRI, and was later extended and implemented in a CS framework. In this work, we utilize this concept and explore whether we can adaptively optimize the sampling pattern on-the-fly, based on partial reconstruction results from previously acquired samples in longitudinal MRI.

A substantial body of mathematical theory has recently been published establishing the basic principles of adaptive sampling of sparse signals. According to these mathematical results, reconstruction from samples selected sequentially based on partial reconstruction results can be significantly better than reconstruction from nonadaptive (deterministic or random) samples.

Knowledge of the former scan may be advantageously used not only to design an adaptive sampling pattern but also to improve image reconstruction from sampled data. This improvement can be obtained via the definition of regularization weights in the reconstruction optimization problem. We apply this approach, coined “weighted reconstruction,” for the scenario of longitudinal MRI. This weighting mechanism allows to relax or enforce the demand for sparsity according to the level of similarity between the current scan and the reference scan.

In this paper, we develop a framework for CS longitudinal MRI, by employing the two well established approaches above in parallel: adaptive sampling and weighted reconstruction. In this way, we exploit the prior scan of the patient to reconstruct the repeated scan from highly undersampled $k$-space data. To keep the discussion as simple as possible, we focus on Cartesian sampling for brain MRI.

The novelty of this paper lies in the unique implementation of weighted reconstruction and adaptive sampling for the scenario of longitudinal studies, where the temporal similarity is not taken for granted. Unlike traditional CS MRI approaches that utilize prior constraints, in our approach, the temporal similarity assumption is continuously examined, and the sampling and reconstruction algorithms are updated accordingly. Experimental results demonstrate the superiority of the proposed method regardless of the validity of the temporal similarity assumption in the examined cases.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the theory of weighted reconstruction and adaptive sampling and their implementation for longitudinal MRI. Section 3 describes the experimental results. Section 4 discusses practical issues related to implementation of the method in real time applications; Sec. 5 concludes by highlighting the key findings.

2. METHOD

2.A. Summary of compressed sensing MRI

The application of CS for rapid MRI (Ref. 22) exploits the fact that MRI scans are typically sparse in some transform domain, which is incoherent with the sampling domain. Non-linear reconstruction is then used to enforce both sparsity of the image representation and consistency with the acquired data. A typical formulation of CS MRI recovery aims to solve the following constrained optimization problem:

$$\min_x \|\Psi x\|_1 \text{ such that } \|F_k x - y\|_2 < \epsilon,$$

where $x \in \mathbb{C}^N$ is the $N$-pixel complex image to be reconstructed, represented as a vector, $y \in \mathbb{C}^M$ represents the $k$-space measurements, $F_k$ is the undersampled Fourier transform operator, $\Psi$ is a sparsifying transform operator, and $\epsilon$ controls the fidelity of the reconstruction to the measured data.

This fundamental CS MRI formulation is the basis for many MRI reconstruction applications, where the sparse transform domain varies depending on the particular setting. In MR angiography, where images are truly sparse, finite-differences are used as a sparsifying transform. In dynamic MRI, the difference between adjacent time frames is sparse. Sparsity can also be exploited in multiple domains, for example, in both temporal and spatial domains.

Here, we focus on Cartesian sampling, so that $F_k$ represents line samples of the $k$-space in 2D imaging. We further consider brain MRI, known to be sparse in the wavelet domain. Therefore, we will assume throughout that $\Psi$ is an appropriately chosen wavelet transform.

2.B. The sparsity of longitudinal MRI scans

In longitudinal studies, patients are scanned every several weeks or months. This scanning scheme is broadly used, for follow-up purposes and for therapy response assessment. In this setting, we could save scanning time if we are able to scan only the changes from the baseline. This type of scanning is, of course, not feasible, due to practical difficulties in designing such a sequence and the fact that prior information on the changes is mostly unavailable.

While the scenario of longitudinal studies is fundamentally different from dynamic MRI in many aspects, we still find that similarity across time points often exists. Figure 1 shows an example of the same axial slice taken from multiple scans acquired from a patient with optic pathway glioma (OPG), demonstrating a relatively slow growing tumor pattern. The bottom row of the figure shows the representation of each time point in the Daubechies-4 wavelet transform, which is widely used as a sparse transform for brain MRI. The similarity between image slices acquired at several time points is clearly demonstrated. Moreover, the representation of the images in the wavelet domain is sparse, and the locations of the dominant wavelet coefficients (also known as the support of the image in the wavelet domain) are similar across the patient’s time points.

Exploiting temporal similarity can be embedded in Eq. (1) by an additional term, which will promote sparsity of the
difference between the image to be reconstructed, $x$, and a previously acquired image of the same patient, $x_0$. This leads to the modified problem,

$$\min_x \|\Psi x\|_1 + \lambda \|x - x_0\|_1 \text{ such that } \|F_x - y\|_2 < \epsilon. \quad (2)$$

Here, term 1 enforces sparsity of $x$ in the wavelet domain, and term 2 enforces similarity of $x$ to $x_0$ in the image domain. The parameter $\lambda$ trades sparsity in the wavelet domain with sparsity in the temporal domain. This approach of utilizing sparsity in both spatial and temporal domains via CS is coined hereinafter temporal compressed sensing-MRI (TCS-MRI).

Term 2 is sparse if there are no major changes between $x$ and $x_0$, both images have similar gray-level intensities and they are spatially matched. While these conditions are met in many applications of dynamic imaging, such as prior image constrained compressed sensing (PICCS) in CT (Refs. 6 and 7) and dynamic MRI,4,23,43,44 in longitudinal MRI, none of these requirements are guaranteed. Although there are solutions for mis-registration and variable gray-level intensities (see Sec. 4), the temporal similarity in longitudinal MRI is a priori unknown. Thus, despite the fact that longitudinal MRI often exhibits temporal similarity,28 we have to take into account that in many cases, the follow-up scan can be substantially different than the baseline scan. Such cases may occur, for example, if a surgical intervention was applied between the time points or if there is a major progressive or therapy response. Figure 2 shows two representative examples.
We conclude that using Eq. (2) for image reconstruction under the assumption of substantial similarity between time points may result in improper reconstruction in cases where this assumption does not hold. To avoid this, we have to carefully design a sampling and reconstruction mechanism that will adjust to match the temporal similarity of the case at hand. To achieve this goal, we extend TCS-MRI using weighted reconstruction and adaptive sampling.

2.C. Adaptive sampling and weighted reconstruction

Many extensions to CS-MRI have been proposed to improve performance of the sampling and reconstruction phases. One of these extensions consists of embedding prior knowledge by weighted reconstruction.\textsuperscript{40,41,46–49} Weighted reconstruction can be mathematically embedded into basic CS Eq. (1) by adding a diagonal weighting matrix, $W = \text{diag}([w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_N])$ as proposed by Candès et al.\textsuperscript{39}

\[
\min_x \|W\Psi x\|_1 \text{ such that } \|F_a x - y\|_2 < \epsilon. \tag{3}
\]

Here, $w_i$ represents the probability that $i \notin T$, and $T$ is the support of $x$ in the sparse transform domain. It has been shown that weighted reconstruction outperforms traditional CS-MRI for dynamic MRI,\textsuperscript{41,50} where the support of the previous time frame is used as an estimate for the support of the current frame.

Prior knowledge can also be used to optimize the way that data are acquired.\textsuperscript{51–53} However, since in longitudinal MRI the similarity between scans is not guaranteed, an adaptive mechanism is needed to determine the level of similarity between scans. Adaptive sampling proposes a selective sample selection, where the choice of the next samples depends on the previously gathered information. It has been proposed to improve signal’s support detection from a low number of samples or under a constraint on the total sensing effort.\textsuperscript{36,37,54} The rational behind this approach is that the estimation error one can get by using clever sampling based on previously acquired data is generally lower than that achievable by a nonadaptive scheme. While Arias-Castro et al.\textsuperscript{35} have shown that the validity of this claim is limited in general, it is proven to be valid for many cases.

In MRI, Seeger et al.\textsuperscript{33} employ this concept to optimize $k$-space trajectories, by formulating the optimization problem as a Bayesian experimental design problem. They use the posterior uncertainty as the criterion for selecting the next trajectory at each round. Ravishankar and Bresler\textsuperscript{34} propose an adaptive scheme that relies on training image scans to optimize the sampling pattern. Their criterion takes into account training data and the reconstruction strategy.

In the application of CS for longitudinal studies, we use weighted reconstruction and adaptive sampling in a “patient-specific” way: $k$-space trajectories are optimized based on the past scan of the patient currently being scanned and reconstruction is improved via weighted reconstruction. In addition, this approach iteratively detects cases in which the assumption of temporal similarity is not valid and updates the sampling and reconstruction processes accordingly.

2.D. Adaptive-weighted CS for longitudinal MRI

Embedding weighted reconstruction into the longitudinal MRI results in the following minimization problem:

\[
\min_x \|WF_1\Psi x\|_1 + \lambda_1 \|W_2(x-x_0)\|_1 \text{ such that } \|F_a x - y\|_2 < \epsilon, \tag{4}
\]

where $W_k$ is a diagonal matrix, $W_k = \text{diag}([w^1_1, w^2_2, \ldots, w^K_N])$, and $w^K_i$ controls the weight given to each element in the support of term 1 or term 2. Adding $W_1$ to term 1 relaxes the demand for sparsity on the elements in the support of the image in its sparse transform domain. As a result, sparsity in the wavelet domain is strongly enforced on elements outside of the support. Adding $W_2$ to term 2 controls the demand for similarity between $x$ and $x_0$, enforcing sparsity only in image regions where $x$ and $x_0$ are similar.

The solution of problem (4) can be obtained by extending one of the well-known approaches for classical CS.\textsuperscript{56,57} In our experiments, we extended the fast iterative shrinkage-thresholding algorithm (FISTA)\textsuperscript{58} to solve the unconstrained problem in so-called Lagrangian form.

\[
\min_x \|F_a x - y\|_2^2 + \lambda_1 \|W_1\Psi x\|_1 + \lambda_2 \|W_2(x-x_0)\|_1. \tag{5}
\]

The values of $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ can be selected appropriately such that the solution of Eq. (5) is approximately equal to that of Eq. (4), for a given $\lambda$. These values control the trade-off between enforcing sparsity in the wavelet and temporal domains.

When determining the values of $W_1$ and $W_2$, we would like to avoid utilizing the prior scan in the reconstruction process if the assumption of similarity between consecutive scans does not hold. More specifically, we design $W_1$ and $W_2$ to achieve the following goals:

1. Convergence to CS-MRI Eq. (1) if the assumption of similarity between consecutive scans is not valid (i.e., $w^1_i \rightarrow 1$ and $w^2_i \rightarrow 0$ if $x$ and $x_0$ are significantly different in both image and wavelet domains).
2. Relaxing the demand for sparsity of $\Psi x$ in regions where $\Psi x_0$ is not sparse and the similarity assumption between $\Psi x$ and $\Psi x_0$ is valid (i.e., $w^1_i \rightarrow 0$ as $\|\Psi x_0\|_1$ grows and images are similar in the transform domain).
3. Relaxing the demand for sparsity of $x-x_0$ in regions where the similarity assumption between $x$ and $x_0$ is not valid (i.e., $w^2_i \rightarrow 0$ as $\|\Psi x_0\|_1$ grows).

To achieve these goals, we first sample $N_k$ $k$-space samples randomly and reconstruct $\hat{x}$, which is the estimation of $x$, by solving Eq. (5) with $W_1 = I$ and $W_2 = 0$. We then sample $N_k$ additional samples and solve Eq. (5) where the elements of the matrices are chosen as follows:

\[
w^1_i = \begin{cases} 1, & \frac{\|\Psi(x-x_0)\|_1}{1 + \|\Psi(x-x_0)\|_1} > \epsilon_1, \\ \frac{1}{1 + \|\Psi(x-x_0)\|_1}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\]

\[
w^2_i = \frac{1}{1 + \|x-x_0\|_1}. \tag{6}
\]
Here, \([a]_i\) denotes the \(i\)th element of the vector in brackets and \(e_1\) is a threshold for defining similarity in the discrete transform domain. This process is repeated until a sufficient number of samples is obtained for adequate recovery. The proposed iterative approach allows exploration of temporal similarity, when it exists, and prevents degradation of image quality if the consecutive scans are significantly different.

Incorporating adaptive sampling into the longitudinal MRI problem is obtained via adaptive design of the \(N_k\) sampling locations at each iteration. It is well known that reconstruction results highly depend on the chosen sampling trajectories in the \(k\)-space domain. For instance, experimental results have shown that it is desirable to undersample less near the \(k\)-space domain. To do so, a common sampling scheme is variable density random undersampling (VDS), which can be implemented by choosing samples randomly with sampling density scaling according to a power of distance from the origin.

For simplicity, we assume that 2D Cartesian sampling is used, and \(N_k\) is the number of rows in the \(k\)-space domain. To utilize VDS in 2D Cartesian sampling, we define the discrete polynomial distribution as

\[
f_{VDS}(k_y) = \frac{(1 - \frac{2}{N_k}|k_y|)^p}{\sum_{k_y = 1}^{N_k} (1 - \frac{2}{N_k}|k_y|)^p},
\]

where \((-N_k/2) < k_y < N_k/2\) denotes the \(k\)-space coefficients in the phase encoding direction and \(p\) is the power distance from the origin.

VDS is used as the probability density function (pdf) for random sampling in many cases where the real distribution of the data is a priori unknown. However, in longitudinal studies, we may rely on the reference scan data distribution, if scans are similar. Inspired by Chen et al., our adaptive approach will converge to random sampling according to the reference scan data pdf if it is similar to the follow-up scan, and to polynomial pdf otherwise. Therefore, samples in our approach are taken randomly using the following pdf:

\[
f_S(k_y) = \gamma f_B(k_y) + (1 - \gamma)f_{VDS}(k_y),
\]

where \(f_B\) is the pdf of the baseline’s phase encode lines’ energy, defined as

\[
f_B(k_y) = \frac{B_p(k_y)}{\sum_{k_y} g_B(k_y)}, \quad g_B(k_y) = \sum_{i \in k_y} |\text{F}_x y_i|,
\]

where \(\text{F}_x\) indicates the \(N \times N\) Fourier matrix, \([\cdot]_i\) denotes the \(i\)th element of the vector in brackets, and \(\gamma\) is the fidelity we give to the similarity between the current and the previous scan. Since \(W_2\) can serve as a good approximation for this similarity, \(\gamma\) is computed as its mean over the main diagonal: \(\gamma = 1/N \sum_{i=1}^{N_k} w_2^i\).

A diagram presenting the major differences between CS-MRI, TCS-MRI, and the proposed method is shown in Fig. 3. Implementation details of our algorithm can be found in our technical report. This scheme for longitudinal adaptive-weighted compressed sensing is coined hereinafter longitudinal adaptive compressed sensing MRI (LACS-MRI).

3. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

3.A. Experimental settings

Our experiments consist of repeated scans of pomelo and patients with OPG and glioblastoma multiforme (GBM). The patients with OPG were scanned with a GE Signa 1.5 T HDxt scanner and the pomelo and GBM experiments were performed on a GE Signa 3 T HDXT scanner. In our experiments, partial k-space acquisition was obtained by down-sampling, in a software environment, a fully sampled k-space. All CS reconstructions were implemented in MATLAB (The MathWorks, Natick, MA). We compare our approach (LACS-MRI) with two nonadaptive schemes, CS-MRI and TCS-MRI. CS-MRI is described in Ref. 22 and TCS-MRI takes into account the knowledge of the prior scan in the time sequence, by solving Eq. (2) for image reconstruction.

In our experiments, we used the Daubechies 4 wavelet transform. Reconstructions based on nonadaptive sampling (CS-MRI and TCS-MRI) were obtained with variable density undersampling. Since we do not know the distribution of the data in the k-space domain, we used the state-of-the-art variable density undersampling scheme considered in many
applications of CS for MRI.\textsuperscript{22,33} In this scheme, samples were taken randomly according to the pdf in Eq. (8) with $p = 4$. In 2D Cartesian sampling, 5\% of the phase encode lines, located in the center of the $k$-space, were acquired in full. In 3D Cartesian sampling, 1\% of the central phase encode plane was acquired in full. For LACS-MRI, we used the same variable density random pattern for the first iteration, while subsequent samples were taken according to our adaptive sampling approach with the pdf in Eq. (9).

LACS-MRI and TCS-MRI $\ell_1$-minimization problems were solved in their Lagrangian form using the FISTA algorithm.\textsuperscript{58} CS-MRI was tested both with our FISTA-based implementation of solving Eq. (1) and with the nonlinear conjugate subgradient algorithm as described in Lustig et al.,\textsuperscript{22} which adds a total variation (TV)\textsuperscript{60} penalty to Eq. (1), where the best results (in terms of resolution improvement) are shown. The threshold for defining similarity in the sparse transform domain was set to $\varepsilon_1 = 0.1$. In all experiments, different values of $\lambda_1$, $\lambda_2$ in the range of [0.001,0.9] were examined, and the best result is shown for each reconstruction algorithm.

For quantitative evaluation, the signal-to-error ratio (SER) is computed for each reconstruction result, as $\text{SER} = 10 \log_{10} \left( \frac{\sigma_x}{V_d} \right)$, where $\sigma_x$ denotes the variance of the values in $x$ and $V_d$ is the mean squared-error (MSE) between the original image, $x$ and the reconstructed image, $\hat{x}$. Note that in some cases, clinical decisions are based on subtle changes between the baseline and the follow-up scans, which are not reflected in SER. Therefore, results are presented both visually and quantitatively.

### Table I. Comparisons of the SER (dB), pomelo experiment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceleration factor</th>
<th>CS-MRI</th>
<th>TCS-MRI</th>
<th>LACS-MRI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>2.2468</td>
<td>2.9052</td>
<td>3.6107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2.9139</td>
<td>7.0814</td>
<td>13.8731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1401</td>
<td>10.9464</td>
<td>18.2111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As expected, reconstruction results improve when the acceleration ratio decreases for all methods. The major differences between the baseline and follow-up scans consist of two enhancing regions (marked in arrows), due to the injection of a contrast agent before the acquisition of the follow-up scan. It can be seen that LACS-MRI converges to a more “uniformly” distributed sampling pattern, leading to improved reconstruction quality thanks to the adaptive sampling mechanism.

In terms of both image resolution and SER, LACS-MRI outperforms TCS-MRI and CS-MRI, by exhibiting significantly improved recovery of the image at 4-fold acceleration, which also allows to identify changes versus the baseline scans, i.e., the two enhanced areas. Although both TCS-MRI and LACS-MRI utilize temporal similarity in the reconstruction process, this experiment emphasizes the advantage of embedding weighted reconstruction and adaptive sampling. Together with the weighting mechanism, the sampling locations (shown in the bar next to each image) which were chosen adaptively by LACS-MRI lead to improved reconstruction results versus the pure random sampling used in CS-MRI and TCS-MRI.

### 3.C. 3D fast spoiled gradient echo brain imaging

Applying CS for 3D imaging allows undersampling in the 2D phase encode plane, thereby obtaining better performance than applying 2D CS slice by slice. We used two retrospectively undersampled scans of a patient with OPG, where scans were acquired in an interval of six months. We used contrast enhanced 3D $T1$-weighted FSPGR sequence (matrix: $512 \times 512 \times 46$, res $= 0.47 \times 0.47$ mm$^2$, slice thickness $= 1.7$ mm, TI/TR/TE = $450/14.5/6.3$ ms, flip angle $= 20^\circ$). We rigidly registered the latter scan to the former scan and then undersampled the 3DFT trajectory with corresponding acceleration factors of $5$, $10$, and $16.6$ ($20\%$, $10\%$, and $6\%$ of the $k$-space).

For LACS-MRI, we begin with variable density random undersampling of $2\%$ of the $k$-space and acquire additional $2\%$ of the $k$-space at each iteration.

Table II shows the SER values of the different reconstruction results. Figure 5 shows the reconstruction results at $5$, $10$, and $16.6$-fold acceleration of a patient with OPG. Both TCS-MRI and LACS-MRI exhibit almost no loss of information at 10-fold acceleration. Similar results are obtained with CS-MRI only at 5-fold acceleration. Difference images for this experiment are shown in Fig. 10 in the Appendix.

This experiment shows that thanks to the ability to undersample the 2D phase encode plane, the advantage of temporal similarity exploitation is emphasized. Therefore, LACS-MRI allows shortening the scanning time by a factor of 10, with no significant loss of information in this case.
3.D. 2D fast spin-echo brain imaging of rapidly changing tumor

To examine the performance of our approach with brain MRI data when the assumptions of similarity between consecutive scans are not valid, we used retrospectively acquired data of a patient with GBM. The patient was scanned twice within an interval of five months and exhibited changes between scans that occupy more than 50% of the brain region. We used $T_2$-weighted FSE sequence (matrix: $512 \times 512$ res = $0.47 \times 0.47$ mm$^2$, 36 slices with 4 mm thickness and no gap, TR/TE = 3500/113 ms, echo-train length = 24, flip angle = $90^\circ$). We registered the follow-up scan to the baseline scan and examined the results of LACS-MRI ($N_k = 16$), CS-MRI, and TCS-MRI with acceleration factors of 4, 6.4, and 10.6. The goal of this experiment is to validate the performance of LACS-MRI in the case of fast growing tumor, and to show that in the worst case, when the baseline scan and the follow-up scans are different, LACS-MRI does not rely on the baseline scan for reconstruction and provides results that are similar to CS-MRI.

Table III shows the SER values for different reconstructions and Fig. 6 shows reconstruction results visually, at an acceleration factor of 4 (25% of the $k$-space). In this case, there are major changes between the baseline and the follow-up scans due to therapy response. As a result, TCS-MRI exhibits poor performance in the vicinity of the changing tumor, since it is partially based on similarity between the consecutive scans, an assumption which is not valid in this case. LACS-MRI, however, convergences to a result which is similar to CS-MRI. This is obtained thanks to the adaptive sampling and the weighting mechanism embedded in LACS-MRI, which reduces the weight given to the similarity to prior scan in the reconstruction process, if such similarity does not exist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceleration factor</th>
<th>CS-MRI</th>
<th>TCS-MRI</th>
<th>LACS-MRI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>11.5093</td>
<td>20.4286</td>
<td>24.8350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.9917</td>
<td>24.3437</td>
<td>27.3621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.4494</td>
<td>28.0273</td>
<td>29.9281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II. Comparisons of the SER (dB), 3D FSPGR experiment.
F. 5.

3D FSPGR results. While CS-MRI and TCS-MRI exhibit artifacts at 16.6-fold acceleration, improved resolution is obtained using LACS-MRI (pointed by arrows). At 10-fold acceleration, TCS-MRI and LACS-MRI exhibit similar satisfactory performance, while results obtained with CS-MRI include some reconstruction artifacts. At 5-fold acceleration, all methods provide almost no loss of information with slightly better performance obtained by LACS-MRI.

3.E. Sensitivity analysis

To compare the sensitivity of CS-MRI, TCS-MRI, and LACS-MRI to changes in the values of $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$, we examine the SER results of each algorithm for the pomelo experiment in speed-up factor of 6.4, under various values of $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$.

We decided to use the pomelo experiment for this analysis since it is a static experiment that is not influenced by external additional parameters such as head motion during acquisition and different coil sensitivities.

Figure 7 shows the SER results of CS-MRI as $\lambda_1$ varies, and the results of TCS-MRI and LACS-MRI for various values of $\lambda_2$ as $\lambda_1$ varies. For CS-MRI, we see that the SER results exhibit small changes around the value of 2.9 dB. In TCS-MRI and LACS-MRI, however, SER spans over a wider range of values (between 2.8 and 7.1 dB for TCS-MRI, and between 3.5 and 13.9 dB for LACS-MRI). While LACS-MRI provides better results in terms of SER, both TCS-MRI and LACS-MRI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceleration factor</th>
<th>CS-MRI</th>
<th>TCS-MRI</th>
<th>LACS-MRI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>8.2324</td>
<td>7.4092</td>
<td>8.9705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>9.1760</td>
<td>8.2584</td>
<td>9.7180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.1972</td>
<td>18.1775</td>
<td>20.6306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
results have a global maximum as opposed to CS-MRI that exhibits a fluctuating pattern. This allows the user to better identify the optimal parameters in TCS-MRI and LACS-MRI as opposed to CS-MRI.

Another interesting analysis is the sensitivity to \( \lambda_1 \) of LACS-MRI (using fixed \( \lambda_2 \)) and CS-MRI in the case of rapidly changing tumor. Figure 8 shows the results of this sensitivity analysis. Since LACS-MRI converges to the CS-MRI solution, we see that the sensitivity patterns of both algorithms are similar, where minor differences exist due to a slightly different sampling pattern used in LACS-MRI during the convergence process.

### 3.F. Analysis of sources of image quality improvement

LACS-MRI includes two improvements versus TCS-MRI: adaptively determined sampling pattern and weighted image reconstruction algorithm. To appreciate the potential of the proposed methodology separating contributions from adaptive sampling and weighted reconstruction, we analyze the

---

**Fig. 6.** 2D FSE brain imaging results when similarity between baseline and follow-up is minimal. The leftmost column shows the baseline scan used as \( x_0 \) for TCS-MRI and LACS-MRI. The difference image between the baseline and the follow-up scans shows substantial changes due to rapid tumor changes. The last row shows an enlargement of the white rectangle. The white arrows point to a structure that has been reconstructed properly in both CS-MRI and LACS-MRI. TCS-MRI exhibits artifacts in the reconstruction of this structure due to its wrong assumption of substantial similarity between the baseline and follow-up scans.

**Fig. 7.** Sensitivity analysis: SER results of pomelo experiment for various values of \( \lambda_1 \) and \( \lambda_2 \) for CS-MRI (left), TCS-MRI (middle), and LACS-MRI (right) methods.
contribution of the weighted mechanism solely as follows. We applied the TCS-MRI and CS-MRI algorithms using the samples obtained adaptively with LACS-MRI in the pomelo experiment. Table IV shows the SER of CS-MRI, TCS-MRI, and LACS-MRI using the samples that were taken adaptively.

When we compare the adaptive results of TCS-MRI to its nonadaptive results (Table I), we see that the adaptive scheme is responsible for approximately 30% of the improvement obtained with LACS-MRI compared to TCS-MRI, where the remaining improvement is thanks to the weighted reconstruction. This experiment shows that even when a random sampling pattern is designed such that it converges to the adaptive one for a specific scenario, LACS-MRI shows substantial improvement thanks to its weighted reconstruction.

4. DISCUSSION

4.A. Reproducing image orientation in longitudinal studies

The exploitation of temporal similarity in longitudinal studies assumes that the past scan and the follow-up scan are spatially matched. In our experiments, we worked with retrospectively acquired data and rigidly registered the latter scan to the former scan. Note that our method exhibits reliable performance even when minor registration errors exist (as can be seen in the difference images in Fig. 6), thanks to the similarity of adjacent pixels in MRI.

The practical implementation of our method for prospective acquisition of follow-up scans requires reproducing the past scan’s slice positions for the scan being acquired. This spatial matching is currently offered as a feature by commercial MRI vendors and is based on several anatomical landmarks. As previously noted, our method is expected to overcome minor matching errors which might be produced by these tools thanks to the fact that adjacent pixels have similar values in many MRI applications.

An additional practical solution could utilize the adaptive sampling mechanism. Partially sampled data can be used to determine the spatial orientation of the patient versus the reference image, during acquisition. This approach has been tested to compensate motions during imaging and may be utilized for the longitudinal scanning case.

The applicability of the proposed method to other body parts such as abdominal MRI is more complicated as it may require nonrigid registration. Therefore, this paper focuses on the application of CS for longitudinal brain scans, while the implementation for regions outside of the brain is left for future research.

4.B. Gray-level intensity differences

The exploitation of temporal similarity is performed by utilizing the fact that the difference between the baseline and the follow-up scans is sparse and consists of changes in anatomy or pathology. However, changes between baseline and follow-up scans may be the result of other factors, such as acquisition parameters and field inhomogeneity. In this work, we normalized the gray-level intensity values of the scans to match the same scale, in order to minimize the effect of external factors on changes between the scans. This normalization was sufficient for producing the results presented in this paper. In prospective scanning, the normalization coefficients can be determined iteratively, during the sampling and reconstruction process.

In order to minimize the effect of external parameters on the resulted clinical follow-up, this method would work best when longitudinal scans are acquired in the same scanning site with the same scanning parameters. When the baseline and follow-up scans are acquired with different acquisition parameters on different systems, we can still exploit the structural similarity between the baseline and the follow-up scans for rapid acquisition. While this extension is not in the scope of this paper, the reader is referred to the works of Bilgic et al. and Huang et al. who utilize the structural similarity between various MRI sequences for rapid scanning.

4.C. Computational complexity

Fast algorithms for solving \( \ell_1 \) minimization problems have gained much attention recently. Besides FISTA, used in our experiments, we find NESTA, SALSA, C-SALSA, and SPGL1 among other approaches that report improved convergence time and have not been explored in this work. Fast convergence time is important in our adaptive sampling approach that requires solving an \( \ell_1 \) minimization problem to decide on the sampling locations for the next iteration. In a MATLAB implementation, each \( \ell_1 \) minimization for 256 x 256 brain image requires approximately 35 s.

While our implementation of FISTA at present does not attain the high rates required for solving \( \ell_1 \) minimization for real-time applications, we expect a significant reduction in the
Weizman, Eldar, and Ben Bashat: Compressed sensing for longitudinal MRI reconstruction time by code optimization. Moreover, recent publications have shown that GPU-based programming can significantly improve the CS based reconstruction speed from a few tens of seconds to less than one second.\textsuperscript{69,70} In addition, during the $\ell_1$ minimization computation time of a certain slice, partial data can be acquired from other 2D slices in the image to avoid “dead” time periods. Examining new approaches for $\ell_1$ minimization, algorithmic simplifications, combined with massively parallel digital computation and GPU programming could allow our framework to be used for real time MRI scanning.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Repeated scans constitute a substantial portion of MRI scanning today, mainly to track changes in pathologies and to monitor treatment efficacy. We presented LACS-MRI based on adaptive sampling and weighted reconstruction for rapid MR imaging of longitudinal studies. We demonstrated experimental verification of several implementations for 2D and 3D Cartesian imaging. We showed that the temporal sparsity of longitudinal MR images can be exploited to significantly reduce scan time of follow-up scans, or alternatively, improve their resolution.

We demonstrated that unlike other CS-MRI applications, sparsity in the temporal domain is not guaranteed in longitudinal studies. We showed that our method provides almost no loss of information at 10-fold acceleration of 3D brain scans, when there is substantial similarity between baseline and follow-up scan. Moreover, our method adapts to a scenario in which there is substantial difference between the scans and results converge to state-of-the-art CS-MRI in this case.

LACS-MRI can play a major part in applications that consist of patient’s disease follow-up and changes monitoring. This could be a first step toward utilizing the huge amount of data in picture archiving and communication systems (PACS) to speed-up MRI.
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APPENDIX: DIFFERENCE MAPS FOR POMELO AND 3D FAST SPOILED GRADIENT ECHO BRAIN IMAGING EXPERIMENTS

To appreciate superiority of the proposed LACS-MRI approach over CS-MRI and TCS-MRI, this appendix includes the difference maps of the results presented in Figs. 4 and 5. It can be seen that the difference maps obtained by LACS-MRI are less noisy than the ones provided by CS-MRI and T-CS-MRI.

![Figure 9. Difference maps for the pomelo experiment. The absolute difference was computed after images were scaled to gray level values between 0 and 1. Reconstruction results are shown in Fig. 4.](image-url)
Fig. 10. Difference maps for the 3D fast spoiled gradient echo brain imaging experiment. The absolute difference was computed after images were scaled to gray level values between 0 and 1. Reconstruction results are shown in Fig. 5.
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