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Abstract

Accurate localization and uptake quantification of lesions in the chest and abdomen using PET imaging is challenged by respiratory motion occurring during the exam. This work describes how a stack-of-stars MRI acquisition on integrated PET/MRI systems can be used to derive a high-resolution motion model, how many respiratory phases need to be differentiated, how much MRI scan time is required, and how the model is employed for motion-corrected PET reconstruction. MRI self-gating is applied to perform respiratory gating of the MRI data and simultaneously acquired PET raw data. After gated PET reconstruction, the MRI motion model is used to fuse the individual gates into a single, motion-compensated volume with high signal-to-noise ratio (SNR). The proposed method is evaluated in vivo for 15 clinical patients. The gating requires 5–7 bins to capture the motion to an average accuracy of 2 mm. With 5 bins, the motion-modeling scan can be shortened to 3–4 min. The motion-compensated reconstructions show significantly higher accuracy in lesion quantification in terms of standardized uptake value (SUV) and different measures of lesion contrast compared to ungated PET reconstruction. Furthermore, unlike gated reconstructions, the motion-compensated reconstruction does not lead to SNR loss.

1. Introduction and purpose

Typical scan durations for positron emission tomography (PET) imaging of the lung and abdomen vary between two and ten minutes per bed position. Due to the long acquisition time, breath-hold techniques cannot be applied to manage respiratory motion. Respiratory-gating approaches have the drawback of discarding data, resulting in reduced signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) or prolonged scan time. Further, the implementation of respiratory gating is challenging, e.g., in cardiac imaging, where the scan efficiency is already reduced by ECG gating. Therefore, artifacts due to respiratory motion are frequently seen in clinical PET/MRI protocols. These artifacts can be categorized into two groups: Firstly, there is a mismatch between the MR-based attenuation correction map (μ-map) and the PET image. The former is typically acquired in an end-expiratory breath-hold, while the latter is acquired during free breathing. The anatomical mismatch causes regionally varying under- or overestimation of tracer activity, especially in the vicinity of the diaphragm (Keller et al., 2013; Buerger et al., 2012b), resulting in inaccurate uptake quantification. Secondly, respiration leads to local image blurring (smearing) along the direction of motion, i.e., primarily in the cranio-caudal direction. This can result in an incorrectly estimated volume, shape, and apparent tracer uptake of lesions (Liu et al., 2009; Geramifar et al., 2013; Nehmeh et al., 2002; Bundschuh et al., 2008; Würslin et al., 2013) as well as in reduced conspicuity of small lesions.

Respiration is a predominantly periodic type of motion that can be compensated for if a model of the motion is available. Typically, this model is manifested as displacement vector fields describing the nonrigid deformation that maps voxels between different respiratory states. A comprehensive review of respiratory motion models has recently been published by McClelland et al. (2013).

On integrated PET/MRI scanners that recently became available (Delso et al., 2011), PET motion compensation can be achieved using MR data. Respiratory motion models are formed either by...
fast MRI sequences (Buerger et al., 2012b; Dikaios et al., 2012; King et al., 2012) or by retrospective gating and averaging over multiple respiratory cycles (Würslin et al., 2013; Buerger et al., 2012a; Ouyang et al., 2013; Huang et al., 2013). While the use of fast imaging techniques allows to capture complete volumes within 0.4–0.7 s, spatial resolution and SNR are compromised. Gated reconstructions, on the other hand, usually provide better image quality but are unable to reflect inter-cycle variations in the respiration pattern.

In both cases, the MRI scan can be conducted (1) with only short acquisition time or (2) throughout the whole PET acquisition. Approach (1) relies on a physiological surrogate signal (e.g., a respiratory bellows) that must be available for the entire PET scan and has to be mapped reliably to the respiratory gates of the MRI acquisition. While this method cannot account for a later drift in respiration amplitude, approach (2) prohibits the acquisition of other diagnostic MRI images in parallel to the PET scan.

Retrospectively gated MRI motion models can further be subdivided into three categories according to the acquisition method: Displacement fields can be measured (a) directly using tagged MRI (Ouyang et al., 2013; Guérin et al., 2011; Chun et al., 2012), or the volume can be sampled using (b) a 2D multi-slice technique (Würslin et al., 2013; Dikaios et al., 2012; Dutta et al., 2013) or (c) using a 3D acquisition (Dikaios et al., 2012; Buerger et al., 2012a; Grimm et al., 2013b). The displacements are estimated with the help of deformable image registration methods.

The correspondence between the motion model and the patient motion is established through a physiological signal surrogate. Often, 1D navigator echoes (Würslin et al., 2013; Ouyang et al., 2013; Dutta et al., 2013) are interleaved with the image acquisition. If the imaging sequence itself generates a physiological signal, the term self-gating is used (Buerger et al., 2012b; Grimm et al., 2013b). Other options include an external sensor that is attached to the patient, such as respiratory bellows or belts (Chun et al., 2012), and 2D or 3D navigator acquisitions (King et al., 2012).

The MRI-derived motion model can be applied to the PET data in different ways to compensate for motion. Two important groups of algorithms for non-rigid motion correction are commonly distinguished in the literature (Rahmim et al., 2013; Dikaios et al., 2012; Ouyang et al., 2013; Lamare et al., 2007; Polycarpou et al., 2012):

1. Motion-compensated image reconstruction (MCIR): The motion field is incorporated directly into the PET reconstruction process, e.g., by adapting the system matrix (Ouyang et al., 2013; Chun et al., 2012).
2. Post-reconstruction registration (PRR): Each PET gate is first reconstructed using conventional algorithms, then warped to a reference respiratory phase, and finally averaged (Buerger et al., 2012b; Würslin et al., 2013).

Theoretical examinations promise more accurate quantification and improved SNR for MCIR (Lamare et al., 2007; Polycarpou et al., 2012; Dikaios and Fryer, 2011; Chun and Fessler, 2013; Tsoumpas et al., 2013), but it is generally assumed that PRR provides similar results (Rahmim et al., 2013; Polycarpou et al., 2012) as long as the individual gates contain a comparable and sufficiently high number of counts. The computational complexity of PRR is significantly lower than that of MCIR, and it allows to use clinically established reconstruction algorithms.

According to these characteristic features, the approach for respiratory motion compensation on integrated PET/MRI scanners proposed in this work is classified as follows. It utilizes a radial stack-of-stars 3D MRI pulse sequence. The motion model is acquired during the entire PET acquisition, thereby assuring high spatial fidelity while being able to adapt to changes in the respiratory pattern. The MRI sequence allows for retrospective self-gating, i.e., a respiratory signal is derived without the need for additional MRI navigator echoes or sensors attached to the patient. The MRI motion model is utilized for motion-corrected PET image reconstruction according to the PRR scheme.

In this work, an extensive evaluation of the self-gated MRI motion model and its utilization in PET image reconstruction is presented. We examine the minimal number of respiratory phases to be differentiated in the MRI motion model, which was chosen between 4 and 8 bins in related work. Moreover, we analyze the required MRI scan time for motion modeling. The efficacy and robustness are validated in a detailed quantitative evaluation, based on a population of 15 patients, which is considerably larger than in previous and related work. Table 1 compares the key features of the present technique against current literature. A proof of concept of our proposed method in three patients was published previously (Grimm et al., 2013b).

2. Materials and methods

Our proposed approach is based on the following workflow for an integrated whole-body PET/MRI scanner. An overview of the individual steps is provided in Fig. 1, and a detailed discussion follows in the subsections.

The μ-maps are acquired with a conventional breath-hold 3D Dixon spoiled GRE scan. Then, the self-gating MRI sequence for motion modeling and the PET list-mode acquisition are carried out simultaneously during free breathing. In this study, a scan duration of 10 min was used.

2.1. Self-gated radial MRI

The respiratory motion model is generated with a prototype implementation of a T1-weighted radial stack-of-stars spoiled 3D gradient-echo sequence with fat suppression (StarVIBE) (Chandarana et al., 2011). It samples k-space in sagittal slab orientation to capture the dominant motion in the readout plane. Slice encoding is performed in a Cartesian manner, as illustrated in Fig. 2. All Ns slice encoding steps are performed for a given radial angle before moving to the next angle. An increment of 111° is used for subsequently acquired radial angles. This angle is the golden ratio over 180° (Winkelmann et al., 2007) and distributes the sampling incoherently but approximately uniformly over the readout plane, facilitating retrospectively gated reconstruction (Buerger et al., 2012a; Lin et al., 2008).

The stack-of-stars k-space trajectory allows to derive a self-gating signal (SGS) from the k-space center (k0 = kx = kz = 0) (Lin et al., 2008; Paul et al., 2014). The k-space center is crossed by every readout in the central k-space partition (kz = 0). The mean value of the central three k-space samples in such a readout is taken to compute one sample of the SGS. Thus, with the interleaved slice encoding along kx, one SGS sample is generated every Ns · TR, where TR is the MRI repetition time and Nz the number of slices. For typical scan protocols, the sampling rate is in the order of 5–10 Hz. The SGS can be determined for all utilized RF receive coils, but not all coil elements reflect the respiratory motion equally well. We use a heuristic method to automatically select a suitable coil element according to a score that favors the signal of a coil element that has a distinct spectral component in the range of expected respiratory frequencies but is not affected by high-frequency variations due to noise or cardiac motion (Grimm et al., 2013a).

To compensate for low-frequency drifts in the signal that can be caused by peristaltic motion and other non-periodic events, a baseline correction is applied by subtracting the signal mean value over
different, respiratory-gated MRI are generated that can be processed using the deformation field $T_i$ that contains the voxel-wise displacement $x_i$. This method is also referred to as optimal gating (van Elmp et al., 2011). Thus, the required deformations are $T_{1,i}$ and $T_{1,ref}$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, N_{\text{bins}}\}$.

### 2.3. PET imaging and motion compensation

The deformations are applied, firstly, to generate matching $\mu$-maps $U_i$ for the respiratory phases $i \in \{2, \ldots, N_{\text{bins}}\}$. The original end-exhale $\mu$-map $U$ is warped to each respiratory state using the corresponding deformation field $T_{1,i}$:

$$U_i = T_{1,i}(U).$$

Secondly, the self-gating signal from the MRI acquisition is applied to reconstruct gated images $x_i$ from the PET list-mode data. A custom software tool was used to insert respiratory gating tagwords into the original list-mode file, according to the binning table of all SGS samples and the respective timestamps. Thus, $N_{\text{bins}}$ gated list-mode frames $y_i$ are generated that can be processed using the respiratory gating functionality in the vendor-supplied PET reconstruction software. The provided clinical implementation (3D ordered-subset expectation maximization, OSEM3D) is applied as reconstruction algorithm $P$. The matching $\mu$-maps are utilized for attenuation correction:

$$x_i = P(y_i, U_i).$$

Finally, the gates are co-registered by applying the deformation fields $T_{1,ref}$ and then combined into the motion-compensated PET volume $x$.

**Fig. 1.** Overview of the data processing workflow. Firstly, a static MRI attenuation-correction (MR-AC) map $U$ is acquired in a breath-hold Dixon MRI scan at end-expiration. Afterwards, the self-gating MRI sequence (SGMR) and PET list-mode (PET-LM) acquisition are carried out simultaneously. The SGMR delivers a self-gating signal (SGS) and retrospectively gated image volumes at different respiratory levels (bins). Registration of the phases yields the deformation fields $T_{i,j}$ to reconstruct gated images.

**Fig. 2.** The stack-of-stars trajectory uses radial sampling for the readout plane $k_x \times k_y$ and Cartesian slice encoding.

a 50 s sliding window. Variable amplitude-based binning (Dawood et al., 2007) is applied to partition the radial readouts into $N_{\text{bins}}$ bins containing equal amounts of data, according to the respective self-gating signal amplitude. This scheme ensures comparable statistics also for the PET list-mode data that are gated in the same manner (see Section 2.3). Since on the utilized PET/MRI system the PET and MRI data are recorded on physically different computers with a possible mismatch in system time, the sequence was modified to transmit a synchronization trigger into the PET list-mode stream immediately before the first readout of the MRI data acquisition. This trigger defines a common reference time point, allowing to perform PET gating based on the time and gate information of the MRI SGS.

### 2.2. MR-based motion modeling

A nonrigid registration algorithm that was recently proposed for lung registration (Heinrich et al., 2012) is employed to compute the deformation between the $N_{\text{bins}}$ different, respiratory-gated MRI volumes. Empirically determined parameters for the deformable registration were smoothing $\alpha = 65.0\%$, 85% randomized sampling, and 3 levels with a grid spacing of 6, 4, and 2. Its output is a 3D deformation field $T_{i,j}$ that contains the voxel-wise displacement mapping from a volume at respiratory phase $i$ to a volume at respiratory phase $j$, with $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, N_{\text{bins}}\}$. Phase 1 is defined as maximal expiration. The deformations are estimated from the $\mu$-map phase, i.e., endexpiration, to all other phases, and from each respiratory phase to a reference volume. The reference volume is a self-gated reconstruction using a fixed amount of the data (here: 40%) with the most consistent amplitude in the self-gating signal, representing the most frequently visited respiratory position, which is most often close to endexpiration. This method is also referred to as optimal gating (van Elmp et al., 2011). Thus, the required deformations are $T_{1,i}$ and $T_{1,ref}$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, N_{\text{bins}}\}$.

### Table 1

Summary of related work on PET/MRI respiratory motion compensation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Imaging type</th>
<th>MRI sequence</th>
<th>Physiological signal</th>
<th>Compensation method</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dikaios et al.</td>
<td>Fast/gated MRI</td>
<td>2D/3D</td>
<td>2D navigator</td>
<td>PRR/MCIR</td>
<td>Simulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouyang et al.</td>
<td>Gated MRI</td>
<td>Tagging</td>
<td>1D navigator</td>
<td>MCIR</td>
<td>Phantom, animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chun et al.</td>
<td>Gated MRI</td>
<td>Tagging</td>
<td>Belfows</td>
<td>MCIR</td>
<td>Phantom, animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guérin et al.</td>
<td>Gated MRI</td>
<td>Tagging</td>
<td>Belfows</td>
<td>MCIR</td>
<td>Simulations, phantom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutta et al.</td>
<td>Gated MRI</td>
<td>2D radial</td>
<td>1D navigator</td>
<td>MCIR</td>
<td>1 volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buerger et al.</td>
<td>Fast MRI</td>
<td>3D</td>
<td>1D navigator</td>
<td>PRR</td>
<td>Simulations, phantom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King et al.</td>
<td>Fast/gated MRI</td>
<td>3D</td>
<td>2D navigator</td>
<td>PRR</td>
<td>Simulations, phantom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsoumpas et al.</td>
<td>Fast MRI</td>
<td>3D</td>
<td>1D navigator</td>
<td>PRR/MCIR</td>
<td>Simulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Würslin et al.</td>
<td>Gated MRI</td>
<td>Stack-of-stars</td>
<td>Self-gating</td>
<td>PRR</td>
<td>Phantom, 4 patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Gated MRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 patients</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Fig. 1.** Overview of the data processing workflow. Firstly, a static MRI attenuation-correction (MR-AC) map $U$ is acquired in a breath-hold Dixon MRI scan at end-expiration. Afterwards, the self-gating MRI sequence (SGMR) and PET list-mode (PET-LM) acquisition are carried out simultaneously. The SGMR delivers a self-gating signal (SGS) and retrospectively gated image volumes at different respiratory levels (bins). Registration of the phases yields the deformation fields $T_{i,j}$ and $T_{1,ref}$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, N_{\text{bins}}\}$. The SGS is analyzed to compute bin weights $w_i$. The SGS binning table is also applied to partition the list-mode data $y$ into gates $y_i$. A dynamic MR-AC $U_i$ is computed from $U$ and $T_{1,i}$. Gated PET volumes $x_i$ are reconstructed from $y_i$ and $U_i$ and fused into a single volume with the help of $w_i$ and $T_{1,ref}$.
\[ x = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{bin}}} w_i T_{i, \text{ref}} (x_i). \]

Similar to the registration-weighted combination approach proposed by Dikaios and Fryer (2012) and the count-based weighting by Würslin et al. (2013), we perform a convex combination where the weights \( w_i \), with \( \sum w_i = 1 \), are proportional to the intra-bin amplitude range of the self-gating signal (ignoring the lowest and highest 5% in the first and last bin):

\[ w_i = \frac{S_{i, \text{min}} - S_{i, \text{max}}}{S_{\text{ref}, \text{max}} - S_{\text{ref}, \text{min}}}, \]

where \( S_{\text{min}}/\text{max} \) refers to the amplitude of the minimum/maximum SGS sample in bin \( i \). This scheme gives higher weight to bins with a lower intra-bin motion.

Thus, the whole motion-compensation process based on the list-mode gates \( y_i \) and a static \( \mu \)-map \( U \) can be summarized as follows:

\[ x = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{bin}}} w_i T_{i, \text{ref}} (P(y_i), T_{i, \mu}(U)). \]

For each patient, the following PET reconstructions were computed, focusing on a motion-compensated reconstruction based on \( N_{\text{bin}} = 5 \) for the rest of the study:

1. \( R_{\text{UG}} \): Ungated reconstruction using all PET data and original \( \mu \)-map.
2. \( R_{\text{G}} \): Gated reconstruction using the 40% of the data with the least variation in the SGS amplitude.
3. \( G_5 \): Proposed method – gating by 5 bins, post-reconstruction registration.

The reconstruction \( R_{\text{UG}} \) serves as our gold standard and corresponds to the same optimal gating scheme as applied in the computation of the MRI reference volume for co-registration.

3. Experimental evaluation

The capabilities of the MRI motion model were assessed in three experiments using data from fifteen oncological patients \( P_1 - P_{15} \) with lesions in the chest or abdomen. All scans were conducted on a 3 Tesla integrated PET/MRI system (Biograph mMR; Siemens Healthcare, Erlangen, Germany) according to the scan protocol described in Section 2. Written consent from the subjects and approval from the local ethics committee was obtained prior to the examinations.

The following MRI acquisition parameters were used for a fat-suppressed, radial stack-of-stars GRE pulse sequence; TR/TE = 3.75/1.7 ms, field-of-view (FOV) 400 × 400 × 360 mm³, spatial resolution 1.65 × 1.65 × 5 mm³, \( N_x = N_y = 256 \) pixel matrix, \( N_z = 72 \) slices (61% slice resolution, 5/8 partial Fourier), 4416 radial angles, 10 min scan time. Images were reconstructed by regridding (Jackson et al., 1991).

For PET imaging in \( P_1 - P_{13} \), a weight-adjusted dose of \(^{18}\)F-FDG (332 ± 71 MBq; min: 236 MBq; max: 455 MBq) was administered as radionuclide agent, 102–155 min before the study. For \( P_{14}, P_{15} \), 93/122 MBq of \(^{68}\)Ga-DOTANOC were administered 52/66 min before the start of the simultaneous acquisition.

Only list-mode events recorded during the 10 min run time of the self-gated MRI sequence were considered. PET reconstruction was performed with standard clinical parameters (Drzezga et al., 2012): OSEM3D with 3 iterations on 21 subsets, with a matrix size of 172 × 172, 127 slices (voxel size 4.17 × 4.17 × 2.03 mm³), and 4 mm Gaussian post-reconstruction filtering. The maximum-likelihood reconstruction of attenuation and activity (Nuyts et al., 2013) was used to compensate for truncation of the arms in the \( \mu \)-maps.

The first evaluation aimed at determining an appropriate value for \( N_{\text{bin}} \) based on the apparent motion in the MR images. The second experiment studied the effect of reducing the MRI scan time on the resulting motion model, for \( N_{\text{bin}} = 5 \). In the third experiment, the proposed approach for PET respiratory motion compensation was compared qualitatively and quantitatively against ungated and gated reconstructions, also using 5 respiratory bins.

3.1. Number of bins

For all patients, gated MR images were reconstructed using \( N_{\text{bin}} \in \{2, \ldots, 15\} \) respiratory bins. Partitioning the data into more bins reduces the SNR in every bin and increases the streaking artifact level, but allows more accurate separation of different respiratory states. In radial k-space trajectories, streak artifacts are predominantly caused by undersampling (with respect to the Nyquist theorem). This occurs for \( N_{\text{bin}} \geq 11 \), when less than 400 radial spokes are used to reconstruct a single bin for the described MRI protocol, or possibly earlier when the distribution of the acquired angles deviates much from uniformity. A virtual 1D navigator column along the head-feet direction was extracted close to the apex of the liver dome in the reconstructed volumes. The position of the liver edge at each respiratory state was detected by applying a threshold of 50% of the image-intensity difference between lung and liver parenchyma. These edge positions were used to determine the minimum number of respiratory bins that need to be used to ensure that the respiratory motion is sufficiently captured.

The number of bins chosen determines the apparent respiratory amplitude or detected maximum displacement \( d_{\text{max}} \):

\[ d_{\text{max}}(N_{\text{bin}}) = |P_{\text{ref}} - P_1|. \]

where \( P_{\text{ref}} \) and \( P_1 \) denote the detected liver edge positions in the end-inspiration and end-expiration states, respectively. Due to the radial sampling scheme, residual intra-bin motion leads to blurring in the MR images, which causes \( d_{\text{max}} \) to appear smaller with a reduced number of bins.

To assess the impact on the observed displacement of the liver edge in all respiratory phases, the average binning error \( B(N_{\text{bin}}) \) was computed as

\[ B(N_{\text{bin}}) = \frac{1}{15} \sum_{b=1}^{15} |P_b^b - P_b^{15}|, \]

where \( P_b^b \) denotes the liver edge position for Bin \( b \) out of 15 for a self-gated reconstruction with \( B \) bins. Nearest-neighbor interpolation was used to re-sample the edge positions to 15 bins for \( N_{\text{bin}} < 15 \). Thus, the score \( B \) represents the average deviation of the reconstruction with a reduced number of bins from the reference \( N_{\text{bin}} = 15 \).

3.2. Effect of MRI scan time on motion model

To further study the required minimum scan time for motion modeling, additional 5-bin reconstructions were computed that utilized only the first 1.2, ..., 9 min of the acquired MRI data. Motion fields were estimated and resampled to the PET resolution and field of view. Using the motion fields from the full, 10 min scan as a reference, the mean squared error (MSE) was computed for all fields derived from the shortened scans and normalized, for each dataset, with respect to the error of the 9 min scan which we considered comparable to a full scan.

Furthermore, also the effect of shortening the MRI scan time on the resulting motion-compensated PET images was analyzed. For this purpose, the previously described motion models from a scan
time of $\{1, \ldots, 10\}$ min were used for motion compensation in the post-reconstruction registration of $G$. It is important to note here that only different deformation fields were applied, but the underlying gated PET images were identical for all tested MRI scan times. Using the result from the full motion model scan as reference, the MSE and structural similarity (SSIM) (Wang et al., 2004) were computed for the shortened scans. Again, the errors were normalized with respect to the difference between the results obtained with a scan time of 9 min and 10 min.

### 3.3. Effect of motion compensation on PET images

The resulting motion-compensated reconstructions based on the 10 min MRI scan and $N_{\text{bins}} = 5$ were analyzed visually as well as quantitatively. In total, 39 moving lesions with focal tracer uptake were identified and enclosed by ellipsoidal volumes of interest (VOIs) in Amide 1.0.4. (Loening and Gambhir, 2003). Non-moving lesions were found only in three patients and not analyzed due to the insufficient sample size. An overview of the VOIs is given in Table 2. Additionally, for every dataset, a 30 mm³ spherical VOI was placed in the liver and a 25 × 15 × 35 mm³ cuboid VOI was placed in a vertebra for SNR analysis. The VOI voxels were exported and processed using custom software written in Matlab (The MathWorks Inc., Natick, MA). Lesions were characterized in terms of two widely used metrics, namely the maximum standardized uptake value (SUVmax in the VOI) and the mean SUV (SUVmean), as well as the volume. The SUVmean and volume were estimated as quantitatively. In total, 39 moving lesions with focal tracer uptake were analyzed visually as well as the volume (cm³)

The relative error was computed for all lesion evaluations. For SUVmax, SUVmean, volume, and the profile measurements, $R_{90}$ was considered as the reference, as these values can be assumed most accurate in a respiratory-gated reconstruction. For instance, the difference $\Delta_{\text{SNR}}(G_5)$ in SUVmax between $G_5$ and the reference was computed as

$$\Delta_{\text{SNR}}(G_5) = \frac{\text{SNR}(G_5) - \text{SNR}(R_{90})}{\text{SNR}(R_{90})}.$$

For the lesion volume estimation based on $\theta_{100\%}$, the magnitude of the relative error is given, due to the inconsistent trend to under- or overestimation:

$$\Delta_{\text{Vol}}(G_5) = \frac{\text{Vol}(G_5) - \text{Vol}(R_{90})}{\text{Vol}(R_{90})}.$$

Table 2: Number, volume and location of lesion VOIs across patients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient no.</th>
<th>Moving lesions</th>
<th>Total VOI volume (cm³)</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>Liver dome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Kidney medulla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>Lung, middle lobe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Pancreas, liver metastases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ribs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Liver, segment V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>Liver, segment VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Lung, middle; mediastinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Lymph node (non-moving)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mediastinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Lung, hilar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Thyroid, mediastinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Lung, upper lobe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Liver, segment III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Liver, various segments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both the MSE and SSIM indicated stability of the motion-compensated PET reconstruction using a model generated from reduced MRI scan times, as can be seen in Fig. 8. The MSE was generally lower than in the deformation fields. A possible explanation is that streak artifacts in low-intensity regions in the MR image, such as in the surrounding air, can cause deviations in the deformation fields that do not affect the PET reconstruction (due to likewise low tracer uptake in those regions). Already 3–4 min of the self-gating MRI scan were sufficient to form a model that resulted in visually comparable motion-compensated PET images.

Fig. 3. Respiratory bins 1, 3, 5 for $P_{13}(N_{\text{bins}} = 5)$.

Fig. 4. Self-gating signal and virtual navigator for patients $P_{12}$ and $P_{4}(N_{\text{bins}} = 15)$. The boundaries of the bins $B_i$ for $N_{\text{bins}} = 5$ are indicated by the dashed horizontal lines in the SGS. Triangles mark the detected liver edge in the navigator. The amplitude, end-expiratory fraction and distribution of the respiratory phases are highly patient-specific.

Fig. 5. Depending on the specific respiratory pattern, a high number of gating bins may be required to resolve the maximum apparent respiratory amplitude (a). Each line represents one patient. The average binning error (b) considers the error in the position of all respiratory bins and falls below the PET slice thickness of 2 mm for $N_{\text{bins}} = 5$.

level, but may also be attributed to a change in the respiratory pattern, e.g., if the patient relaxes after a few minutes.
With 2 min or less, the difference in the motion-compensated PET images increased, although only slight local distortions were noticed visually.

### 4.3. Motion-compensated PET reconstruction

When overlaying the motion model with the Dixon images acquired for the $\mu$-map, it was noticed that five of the patients had held their breath at end-inspiration rather than at end-expiration as instructed. In these cases, the deformation fields ($T_{5,1}$) using the end-inspiratory phase as reference had to be computed in order to generate the deformed $\mu$-maps:

$$U_i = T_{5,1}(U).$$

Similarly, the end-exhale $\mu$-map for reconstructions $R_{100}$. $R_{80}$ was estimated by applying $T_{1,1}$. After that, the tissue interfaces in the deformed $\mu$-maps were visually consistent with the acquired motion model. An exemplary fusion of the motion model at end-expiration and end-inspiration with the corresponding $\mu$-maps in $P_1$ is depicted in Fig. 9.

The weights for averaging the co-registered PET reconstructions were largest in the second bin, with an average of 0.23 ± 0.006, as shown in the box plot in Fig. 10. The bin at end-inspiration typi-
cally received the lowest weight, with an average of 0.15 ± 0.026. Thus, its contribution is weakened, as this bin is typically affected by residual intra-bin motion.

An example of the reconstruction results is given in Fig. 11a–d, showing a sagittal slice through the heart and a lesion in the lung of $P_8$. The ventricle walls as well as the lesion are blurred in the ungated reconstruction, and improved sharpness is evident in both the gated and the corrected reconstructions. The plots in Fig. 11e and f show line profiles through the lesion and the right ventricle of $P_8$ for the three reconstructions. In both profiles, only minimal differences between the motion-compensated reconstruction $G_5$ and $R_{50}$ are seen, whereas $R_{100}$ appears smoothed and stretched due to motion.

All results from the quantitative evaluation of the motion-compensation accuracy are summarized in Table 3. The reconstructions exhibited a distinct trend: The SUV$_{max}$, SUV$_{mean}$, profile contrast, and slope (39 up- and downslopes, respectively) observed in $R_{50}$ were larger than in both other reconstructions in virtually all cases. However, the corresponding estimations in $G_5$ were larger than in both other reconstructions in virtually all cases. $G_5$ was therefore excluded from the SNR analysis.

The average relative difference with respect to the reference reconstruction is presented in Table 4. The proposed method, $G_5$, achieved a significant improvement in the accuracy for all of the examined quantitative measures and typical indicators for the clarity of lesion depiction, compared to the ungated reconstruction $R_{100}$. The sharpness and SUV quantification of the gated reconstruction $R_{50}$ was not fully met by $G_5$. However, $G_5$ was not associated with the SNR loss of 18–35% that affected $R_{40}$. On the contrary, an increase in SNR by 7% was observed in the liver, potentially due to the interpolation step during image fusion.

### Table 3
Overview of lesion quantification results. Each column indicates in how many of the 39 (slope: 78) cases the corresponding measured quantity was larger in one reconstruction than in another.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of cases</th>
<th>$R_{50} &gt; R_{100}$</th>
<th>$R_{50} &gt; G_5$</th>
<th>$G_5 &gt; R_{100}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesion SUV$_{max}$</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesion SUV$<em>{mean}$ ($\theta</em>{50}$)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesion SUV$<em>{mean}$ ($\theta</em>{100}$)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesion vol. ($\theta_{50}$)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesion vol. ($\theta_{100}$)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile FWHM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile contrast</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile up- and downslope</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver SNR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spine SNR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Discussion

To summarize our key findings, the use of a self-gated stack-of-stars MRI sequence for the purpose of respiratory motion modeling was demonstrated. The first experiment led to the conclusion that gating should use at least 5 bins to reduce most of the intra-bin motion at the diaphragm. The second experiment revealed that for the purpose of motion modeling with 5 bins, 3–5 min of MRI scan time are sufficient. Finally, quantitative analysis in the third experiment showed that PET respiratory motion compensation is feasible with the proposed method. Compared to an ungated reconstruction, the lesion quantification accuracy and sharpness were improved, while, compared to a gated reconstruction, a high
SNR was maintained. The presented study is a first step towards a systematically evaluated protocol for MRI-based motion compensation of PET images. When implementing such techniques, it is important to consider some fundamental points of discussion that will be identified in the following.

5.1. Optimal number of bins

The optimal number of bins to be differentiated, subject of our Experiment Section 3.1, depends on three patient-specific factors: Firstly, the amount of blurring due to respiration depends on the maximum respiratory amplitude. With a larger amplitude, more bins may be required (Dawood et al., 2009). Secondly, the (inter-bin) distribution of the respiratory phases is important (Liu et al., 2009). The more time is spent in a quiescent period at end-exhalation, the smaller is the fraction of the acquisition time affected by motion that needs to be compensated for. Thirdly, if no data should be discarded and the number of bins is limited, intra-bin motion blurring particularly at end-inspiration and in the presence of irregular breathing cannot be avoided and also contributes to the combined, motion-compensated PET image. Thus, the choice of a fixed number of bins has to be seen as a compromise: While the use of too few bins may prohibit complete compensation of the respiratory motion, a high number of bins always comes at increased computational complexity but does not necessarily yield further improvements. The results in our study population indicate that with 5 or more bins, the average binning error falls below the PET slice thickness. At least for PRR-based motion compensation, the PET count rate can also impose an upper limit for the number of respiratory bins. A sufficient coincidence count in every bin should be met to ensure stability of the reconstruction algorithm.

A possible starting point for patient-individual compensation strategies is a classification of the respiratory pattern, e.g., into the three characteristic distribution groups identified by Liu et al. (2009) and Polycarpou et al. (2014), who distinguish between (1) respiration with a quiescent peak at end-expiratory, (2) with a Gaussian or Poisson-like distribution, and (3) an approximately uniform distribution of respiratory phases. A group-specific number of respiratory bins could be utilized, possibly combined with discarding PET data at respiratory outliers such as singular deep inspiration.

A limitation of this study is the fact that the evaluation of the optimal number of bins focused on the effect of detected liver edge positions in the gated MRI volumes. The effect of a varying number of bins on the depiction of lesions remains to be examined in future work. Since the result also depends on the variance in lesion location, size, and motility, a larger patient population or restriction to lesions in a specific organ may be desirable for such experiments. However, since our recommendations were derived from the diaphragm displacement that indicates the maximum expected lesion motion range, the result can be considered a conservative estimate that is not biased by the lesion location.

5.2. MRI scan time

A question related to the optimal number of bins is the actually required MRI scan time that was evaluated in Experiment Section 3.2. Despite the advantage of capturing the global course of respiration during the examination, the long scan time of 10 min dedicated for motion modeling prevents other diagnostic MRI scans during this time. Addressing this could improve clinical acceptance. One argument in justifying the self-gated MRI scan time is that the resulting MR images can provide diagnostic information in addition to the deformation fields. The T1-weighted image contrast obtained with the utilized radial MRI sequence in combination with simultaneously acquired PET has been shown to be highly sensitive in the detection of FDG-avid nodules (Chandarana et al., 2013).

As shown in the second experiment, a reduction of the MRI scan time is easily possible by acquiring fewer radial spokes at the cost of increased radial streaking artifacts. Already in the present implementation, both the deformation fields and the resulting motion-compensated PET image volumes indicate that a scan time of 3–4 min may be sufficient for MRI motion modeling. Robust registration methods, on the one hand, and Compressed Sensing reconstruction of the MRI images (Feng et al., 2013), on the other hand, can help to further increase the tolerance of undersampling artifacts.

When shortening the MRI scan, the physiological signal needs to be derived by other means, e.g., by a belt or bellows, or using PET-based self-gating (Büther et al., 2009; Schleyer et al., 2009), for the remaining list-mode acquisition after the motion modeling phase. Thus, after validating the correspondence between the MR-based motion model and the physiological signal surrogate, motion-compensated PET imaging could also be applied while conducting other routine MRI examinations.

5.3. Comparison with related work

The results of the presented evaluation are in accordance to the previous work listed in Table 1, in the sense that motion compensation generally helps to reduce motion-related artifacts. With regard to the number of bins, the value of \( N_{\text{bins}} = 8 \) used by Dikaios et al. (2012) and Dutta et al. (2013) seems conservative, and a reduced number of bins could have been sufficient. Ouyang et al. (2013) utilized also 8 bins, but distinguished between inspiratory and expiratory phases. Similarly, the choice of \( N_{\text{bins}} = 4 \) by
5.4. Gating or motion compensation?

The clearly increased lesion sharpness in $R_{\text{ap}}$ in Experiment Section 3.3 confirms that the MRI-based self-gating signal is a viable physiological surrogate signal for the purpose of respiratory gating. As also observed by Würslin et al. (2013), motion compensation does improve but not fully restore the lesion $\text{SUV}_{\text{max}}$, $\text{SUV}_{\text{mean}}$, FWHM, contrast, and slope. By definition, when a suitable gating tolerance is used, a motion-compensated method that combines multiple gates is always subject to more residual motion than a single gated reconstruction. A limited loss of sharpness is inevitable due to residual motion in the end-inspiratory bin, registration inaccuracies, and the applied interpolation. It should, however, also be borne in mind that $R_{\text{ap}}$, which served as our reference, is not perfect ground truth. The higher noise level due to gating is known to cause, for instance, overestimation of $\text{SUV}_{\text{max}}$ (Liu et al., 2010), which consequently also affects most of the other examined quantitative measures because they typically depend on $\text{SUV}_{\text{max}}$.

Ultimately, the choice of the optimal method for motion compensation also depends on the available PET scan time in the clinical protocol. On the one hand, if scan time is not a concern, a long respiratory-gated scan such as $R_{\text{ap}}$ provides optimal lesion sharpness. On the other hand, the total patient table time is often already long, in particular for hybrid PET/MRI. In such cases, the required additional scan time renders respiratory gating unattractive, so that the bed positions including chest and abdomen are acquired as quickly as possible, e.g., in 4 min. Traditionally, $R_{\text{100}}$ would have been applied to avoid insufficient SNR. Here, a motion-compensated reconstruction such as $G_C$ can improve the quantification accuracy and conspicuity of lesions, while SNR is preserved.

6. Conclusion

We presented comprehensive in vivo results from self-gated MRI motion modeling applied to respiratory motion compensation for PET imaging on integrated PET/MRI systems. Self-gated MRI requires no additional physiological signal sensors and captures image volumes of the averaged respiratory motion cycle throughout the measurement. Hence, it is a convenient method for retrospectively gated reconstruction. To eliminate most of the intrabins, at least 5 bins should be used. For a configuration using 5 bins, a scan time of 3–4 min is sufficient to form the motion model.

The robustness of the approach was demonstrated in a study of 15 oncological patients with lesions of different sizes in the chest and abdomen. The motion model was used to correct for respiratory motion in PET reconstructions, resulting in reduced motion blur and improved quantification accuracy compared to static reconstructions and in higher SNR compared to conventional gated reconstructions.
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