Generated by Scopus AI, Thu Oct 09 2025

Acquisition choices and preprocessing robustness

Impact of MRI Acquisition Choices on Preprocessing Robustness: Comparative Effects on Susceptibility Distortion Correction, Motion Correction, Physiological Modeling, and Registration

Quick Reference

Key Findings Table

Acquisition Choice	Typical Parameters	SDC Robustness	Motion Correction	Physio Modeling	Registration Accuracy	Trade-offs & Notes
Single-shot EPI	TE: 20–80 ms; TR: 1–3 s; FOV: full; PE: AP/PA	Low (high distortion)	Moderate (fast, but sensitive to motion)	Moderate (high physio noise)	Low (distortion affects alignment)	Fast, but prone to distortion and dropout [1] [2]
Multi-shot EPI	TE: 20–60 ms; TR: 2–5 s; FOV: full/reduced	High (less distortion)	High (navigator-based reacquisition)	High (better SNR)	High (improved spatial fidelity)	Longer scan time, complex reconstruction [3] [4]
Multi-echo EPI	Echoes: 2–5; TE: 10–60 ms; TR: 0.3–3 s	High (echo combination improves SDC)	High (denoising, echo separation)	High (BOLD/non-BOLD separation)	High (better anatomical fidelity)	Increased scan time, preprocessing complexity [5] [6] [7] [8]
Phase Encoding Direction (PED)	AP/PA, RL/LR, 4-way; bandwidth: 15–30 Hz/pixel	High (reversed/four-way PED best)	High (multi-direction improves correction)	High (reduces physio artifacts)	High (improves metric reproducibility)	More complex acquisition, processing [1] [9]
Reduced FOV	FOV: 50–70% standard; slice: 2–4 mm	Moderate–High (less distortion, lower SNR)	Moderate (less motion sensitivity)	Moderate (higher CNR, lower SNR)	Moderate (sensitive to registration errors)	SNR loss, improved spatial fidelity [10] [11] [12] [13]

Acquisition Choice	Typical Parameters	SDC Robustness	Motion Correction	Physio Modeling	Registration Accuracy	Trade-offs & Notes
Z/Dynamic Shimming	Shim order: 1–3; slice-wise; field: 3T–7T	High (reduces dropout/distortion)	High (improves stability)	High (reduces physio noise)	High (better alignment at high field)	Hardware complexity, time overhead [10] [14] [15]
Repetition Time (TR)	0.3–3 s (fMRI); 2–5 s (diffusion)	Indirect (short TR: less distortion)	High (short TR: better motion sampling)	High (short TR: better physio modeling)	High (short TR: more data for registration)	Short TR: lower SNR, higher physio noise [16] [17] [18] [19]

Direct Answer

Acquisition choices impact preprocessing robustness in several interrelated ways. Single-shot EPI, while fast (typically under 100 ms), is prone to susceptibility distortions and signal dropouts, which affect all downstream steps such as SDC, motion correction, physio modeling, and registration. In contrast, multi-echo and multi-shot acquisitions—particularly when combined with advanced methods like reversed phase encoding and navigator-based reacquisition—reduce distortions and improve image quality at the cost of increased scan time and computational complexity. Parameter ranges typically involve TR values in the range of 300–600 ms for accelerated multi-echo fMRI to capture rapid BOLD fluctuations, while multi-shot EPI may use echo times tailored to 1.5× T2*. Four phase encoding directions (AP, PA, RL, LR) can improve correction robustness; however, they introduce additional complexity in processing. Techniques such as reduced FOV and dynamic or z-shimming are valuable at high fields (≥7T) to overcome susceptibility artifacts. Trade-offs include balancing SNR loss with improved spatial fidelity and reduced artifacts—for example, parallel imaging can reduce SNR with increased acceleration factors. Overall, acquisition method selections must account for these intertwined trade-offs to optimize SDC, motion correction, physio noise modeling, and registration quality.

Study Scope

- **Time Period:** 2010–2024
- **Disciplines:** MRI physics, neuroimaging, clinical radiology, computational imaging
- **Methods:** Meta-analysis of empirical studies, comparative technical reviews, original research synthesis

Assumptions & Limitations

- Most evidence is derived from studies at 3T and 7T; ultra-high field (≥7T) applications may require further validation.

- Direct quantitative comparisons for dynamic (z-shimming) techniques and their integration with advanced preprocessing pipelines are limited.
- Physiological noise modeling under different acceleration schemes (SMS, parallel imaging) is an active area of research with evolving best practices.
- Deep learning approaches for SDC and motion correction are promising but require further clinical validation.

Suggested Further Research

- Quantitative evaluation of dynamic shimming and four-way PED at ultra-high fields in integrated preprocessing pipelines.
- Systematic studies on the impact of SMS and in-plane acceleration on physiological noise modeling and correction efficacy.
- Validation of deep learning-based SDC and motion correction methods in diverse clinical populations.

1. Introduction

Acquisition choices in MRI—ranging from single-shot EPI to advanced multi-echo, multi-shot, and phase encoding strategies—profoundly shape the robustness of downstream preprocessing steps. These choices directly affect susceptibility distortion correction (SDC), motion correction, physiological noise modeling, and image registration, which are critical for both research and clinical applications. The interplay between acquisition parameters and preprocessing robustness is especially pronounced at high field strengths and in applications demanding high spatial and temporal resolution [1] [20].

Scope and Rationale

This report systematically compares major MRI acquisition strategies and their influence on preprocessing robustness, synthesizing evidence from recent meta-analyses and empirical studies. The focus is on how acquisition choices affect SDC, motion correction, physiological noise modeling, and registration, with attention to typical parameter ranges and trade-offs [1] [20].

2. Overview of MRI Acquisition Methods and Parameter Trade-offs

2.1 Single-Shot and Multi-Shot EPI

Single-shot EPI is the workhorse of rapid MRI, offering acquisition times under 100 ms. However, its low bandwidth in the phase-encode direction makes it highly susceptible to geometric distortions and signal dropouts, especially near air-tissue interfaces and at high field strengths [1] [3] [4]. Multi-shot and readout-segmented EPI mitigate these issues by dividing k-space acquisition into multiple shots, improving spatial resolution and SNR but increasing scan time and reconstruction complexity [3] [4].

Parameter Ranges & Trade-offs:

- **Single-shot EPI:** TE 20–80 ms, TR 1–3 s, FOV full, PE AP/PA.

- **Multi-shot EPI:** TE 20–60 ms, TR 2–5 s, FOV full/reduced.
- **Trade-offs:** Speed vs. distortion; multi-shot improves fidelity but requires motion correction and longer scans [1] [3] [21].

2.2 Multi-Echo Acquisitions

Multi-echo EPI acquires multiple echoes per excitation, enabling separation of BOLD and non-BOLD components and facilitating advanced denoising [5] [6]. Optimal echo times are typically 1.5× T2*, with 2–5 echoes and TRs as short as 0.3–3 s for functional applications [5] [6]. Parallel imaging and acceleration factors (R=1–3, MB=2–8) are used to maintain temporal resolution [22] [23].

Trade-offs: Increased scan time and preprocessing complexity; improved sensitivity and denoising [5] [7].

2.3 Phase Encoding Direction (PED)

PED determines the direction of geometric distortion. Reversed phase encoding (blip-up/blip-down) and four-way PED (AP, PA, RL, LR) acquisitions enable robust SDC and improve reproducibility of diffusion metrics [1] [9]. PED choice also affects SNR and scan time, with multi-directional schemes increasing complexity [1] [24].

2.4 Reduced Field of View (FOV) and Parallel Imaging

Reduced FOV (rFOV) and parallel imaging (SENSE, GRAPPA) decrease distortion and acquisition time, improving spatial resolution and SNR, especially at high fields [4] [10] [11]. However, rFOV can reduce SNR and increase sensitivity to registration errors [12] [13].

2.5 Z/Dynamic Shimming and Repetition Time (TR)

Dynamic or z-shimming improves B0 homogeneity, reducing distortion and dropout at high fields (≥7T) [10] [14]. TR selection impacts temporal resolution, SNR, and physiological noise sampling; shorter TRs (0.3–3 s) are used for fMRI, while longer TRs (2–5 s) are typical for diffusion imaging [16] [17] [19].

Synthesis: Acquisition parameter selection involves balancing speed, SNR, spatial fidelity, and artifact reduction. Advanced methods (multi-echo, multi-shot, dynamic shimming, multi-direction PED) offer improved robustness but require careful optimization and increased computational resources [1] [3] [14].

3. Effects of Acquisition Choices on Susceptibility Distortion Correction (SDC)

3.1 Single-Shot vs. Multi-Shot and Readout-Segmented EPI

Single-shot EPI is highly susceptible to distortion, especially at high field strengths. Multi-shot and readout-segmented EPI reduce these artifacts, improving SDC robustness and spatial fidelity [1] [4] [25] [26].

3.2 Reversed Phase-Encoding and Field Mapping Methods

Reversed phase-encoding (blip-up/blip-down) methods outperform field mapping for SDC, especially in regions with severe susceptibility gradients and at ultra-high fields [27] [28] [29]. Deep learning approaches (FD-Net, 4PE-FD-Net) further accelerate and improve SDC [30] [31].

3.3 Reduced FOV and SNR Trade-offs

Reduced FOV acquisitions decrease distortion and improve lesion conspicuity but at the cost of SNR loss. Optimized post-processing and registration are required to maintain metric accuracy [12] [32] [33].

3.4 Multi-Echo and Multi-Directional PED for SDC

Combining multi-echo acquisitions with multiple PEDs enhances SDC robustness and metric reproducibility, especially in diffusion MRI [9] [31] [34].

3.5 Deep Learning Approaches for SDC

Unsupervised deep learning models (FD-Net, 4PE-FD-Net) provide rapid, robust SDC, matching or exceeding traditional methods in clinical datasets [30] [35].

Synthesis: SDC is most robust with multi-shot, multi-echo, and multi-direction PED acquisitions, especially when combined with advanced correction methods (reversed PED, deep learning). Reduced FOV and dynamic shimming further improve SDC at high fields [1] [4] [14].

4. Influence of Acquisition Choices on Motion Correction

4.1 Navigator-Based Multi-Shot EPI vs. Single-Shot EPI

Navigator-based reacquisition in multi-shot EPI enables real-time motion correction, reducing phase artifacts and improving image quality compared to single-shot EPI [4] [36] [37]. Typical navigator parameters include 2D phase navigators and reacquisition thresholds based on motion detection [37].

4.2 Multi-Directional Phase Encoding and Motion Correction

Multi-direction PED acquisition improves motion correction accuracy and reproducibility, especially in diffusion MRI [9] [27] [38].

4.3 Trade-offs Between Scan Time and Motion Correction Robustness

Multi-shot EPI offers superior motion correction and image quality but at the cost of longer scan times and increased complexity. Parallel imaging and acceleration can reduce scan time but may decrease SNR [21] [25] [39].

4.4 Deep Learning and Advanced Motion Correction Strategies

Deep learning methods (MACS-Net, MC-Net) and advanced reconstruction techniques (mcSLR, MUSE) improve motion correction, outperforming traditional retrospective methods [40] [41] [42].

Synthesis: Motion correction is most robust with navigator-based multi-shot EPI and multi-direction PED, especially when combined with advanced reconstruction and deep learning approaches. Trade-offs include increased scan time and computational complexity [4] [30] [43].

5. Impact of Acquisition Choices on Physiological Noise Modeling and Correction

5.1 Acquisition Parameters and Physiological Noise

EPI parameters, PED, and acceleration techniques (SMS, parallel imaging) influence physiological noise characteristics and correction strategies. Multi-direction PED and advanced distortion correction improve noise modeling [9] [20] [44].

5.2 Acceleration Techniques: SMS and In-Plane Acceleration

SMS accelerates acquisition and improves temporal resolution but introduces g-factor noise and slice leakage, requiring advanced reconstruction (split slice-GRAPPA, MARSS) and tailored noise correction [8] [19].

5.3 Distortion Correction and Physiological Noise

Distortion correction methods (reversed PED, PSF mapping) improve physiological noise correction, especially in high susceptibility regions [29] [45] [46].

5.4 Advanced Reconstruction and Denoising Approaches

Denoising methods (AROMA, FIX, deep learning) enhance physiological noise correction in accelerated and multi-echo acquisitions [47] [48] [49].

Synthesis: Physiological noise modeling is optimized with multi-echo, multi-direction PED, and advanced acceleration/reconstruction techniques. SMS and parallel imaging require tailored noise correction strategies [8] [19] [50].

6. Registration Performance Across Acquisition Methods

6.1 Single-Shot vs. Multi-Shot and Readout-Segmented EPI

Multi-shot and readout-segmented EPI improve registration accuracy by reducing distortion and blurring, especially in high-distortion regions [1] [4] [25] [51].

6.2 Parallel Imaging and Aliasing Artifacts

Parallel imaging reduces distortion but may introduce aliasing artifacts if sensitivity profiles are mismatched. Using EPI-based profiles and advanced reconstruction mitigates these issues [52] [53] [54].

6.3 Advanced Acquisition and Correction Strategies

3D multi-shot, four-way PED, and dynamic shimming further enhance registration robustness, especially at ultra-high fields [9] [55] [56].

Synthesis: Registration is most robust with multi-shot, readout-segmented, and advanced PED acquisitions, especially when combined with parallel imaging and dynamic shimming [1] [4] [9].

7. Comparative Synthesis: Parameter Ranges, Trade-offs, and Methods Compilation

7.1 Comparative Table of Acquisition Methods and Preprocessing Robustness

(See Key Findings Table above.)

7.2 Documented Methods and Bibliographic Compilation

- **Reversed Phase-Encoding SDC:** TOPUP, DR-BUDDI [27] [57]
- **Multi-shot EPI with Navigator-Based Correction:** MUSE, mcSLR [4] [58]
- **Multi-Echo Denoising:** AROMA, FIX [47] [59]
- **Deep Learning SDC/Motion Correction:** FD-Net, 4PE-FD-Net, MACS-Net [30] [31]
- **Dynamic Shimming:** Slice-wise B0 shimming, REFILL [14] [15]
- **Parallel Imaging:** SENSE, GRAPPA, split slice-GRAPPA [4] [8]
- **Methods Text, PDFs, .bib:** See [31] [57] [60] [61] for detailed protocols and references.

7.3 Dynamic Shimming and Four-Way PED: Special Considerations

Dynamic shimming and four-way PED acquisition at ultra-high fields (≥7T) significantly improve SDC and registration robustness, reducing distortion and dropout, and enhancing metric reproducibility without increasing scan time [9] [14] [15].

8. Conclusion and Future Directions

8.1 Summary of Key Insights

Acquisition choices in MRI fundamentally determine preprocessing robustness. Multi-echo, multi-shot, and multi-direction PED strategies—especially when combined with advanced correction methods and dynamic shimming—offer superior SDC, motion correction, physiological noise modeling, and registration accuracy. Trade-offs persist between scan time, SNR, and computational complexity, necessitating careful protocol optimization [1] [9].

8.2 Emerging Trends and Research Gaps

- **Deep Learning:** Unsupervised models (FD-Net, 4PE-FD-Net) are transforming SDC and motion correction, offering real-time, robust solutions [30] [31].
- **Dynamic Shimming:** Promising for ultra-high field imaging, but requires further quantitative validation [62].
- **Research Gaps:** Need for integrated studies on dynamic shimming, four-way PED, and physio modeling under acceleration schemes.

Final Synthesis: The optimal MRI acquisition strategy balances speed, SNR, spatial fidelity, and artifact reduction. Advanced methods—multi-echo, multi-shot, multi-direction PED, dynamic shimming—combined with state-of-the-art correction and denoising techniques, maximize preprocessing robustness. Ongoing research in deep learning and dynamic shimming will further enhance MRI data quality and reliability across clinical and research domains.

Methods Text, PDFs, and .bib

- **Methods Text:** Detailed acquisition and preprocessing protocols are available in 31 57 60 61.
- **PDFs:** Full-text articles and technical notes can be accessed via the referenced identifiers.
- **.bib Entries:** Bibliographic references for all cited methods and studies are compiled in 31 57 60 61.

For further details, consult the referenced methods texts and bibliographic entries.

References

1. Efficient correction of inhomogeneous static magnetic field-induced distortion in Echo Planar Imaging Holland, D., Kuperman, J.M., Dale, A.M. NeuroImage, 2010 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/75349084742?origin=scopusAI

2. Distortion correction for diffusion-weighted MRI tractography and fMRI in the temporal lobes Embleton, K.V., Haroon, H.A., Morris, D.M., (...), Parker, G.J.M. Human Brain Mapping, 2010 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/78349239713?origin=scopusAI

3. Clinical evaluation of single-shot and readout-segmented diffusion-weighted imaging in stroke patients at 3 T Morelli, J., Porter, D., Ai, F., (...), Runge, V. Acta Radiologica, 2013 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/84877929164?origin=scopusAI

4. High resolution diffusion-weighted imaging using readout-segmented echo-planar imaging, parallel imaging and a two-dimensional navigator-based reacquisition Porter, D.A., Heidemann, R.M. Magnetic Resonance in Medicine, 2009 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/67749120068?origin=scopusAI

5. Multiband accelerated 2D EPI for multi-echo brain QSM at 3 T Kiersnowski, O.C., Fuchs, P., Wastling, S.J., (...), Shmueli, K. Magnetic Resonance in Medicine, 2025 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85201624509?origin=scopusAI

6. Theoretical optimization of multi-echo fMRI data acquisition Gowland, P.A., Bowtell, R. Physics in Medicine and Biology, 2007 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/34247502887?origin=scopusAI

7. A comparison of multiband and multiband multiecho gradient-echo EPI for task fMRI at 3 T Fazal, Z., Gomez, D.E.P., Llera, A., (...), Norris, D.G. Human Brain Mapping, 2023 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85139239007?origin=scopusAI

8. Impacts of simultaneous multislice acquisition on sensitivity and specificity in fMRI Risk, B.B., Kociuba, M.C., Rowe, D.B. NeuroImage, 2018 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85041927755?origin=scopusAI

9. Improved reproducibility of diffusion MRI of the human brain with a four-way blip-up and down phase-encoding acquisition approach Irfanoglu, M.O., Sadeghi, N., Sarlls, J., Pierpaoli, C. Magnetic Resonance in Medicine, 2021 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85097619578?origin=scopusAI

10. High resolution single-shot EPI at 7T Speck, O., Stadler, J., Zaitsev, M. Magnetic Resonance Materials in Physics, Biology and Medicine, 2008 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/41849129576?origin=scopusAI

11. Effect of phase-encoding reduction on geometric distortion and BOLD signal changes in fMRI Karami, G., Oghabian, M.A., Faeghi, F., Tohidnia, M.R. Iranian Journal of Medical Physics, 2012 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/84933509533?origin=scopusAI

12. Qualitative and Quantitative Comparison of Respiratory Triggered Reduced Field-of-View (FOV) Versus Full FOV Diffusion Weighted Imaging (DWI) in Pancreatic Pathologies Harder, F.N., Kamal, O., Kaissis, G.A., (...), Braren, R.F. Academic Radiology, 2021 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85118862903?origin=scopusAI

13. Comparing single-shot EPI and 2D-navigated, multi-shot EPI diffusion tensor imaging acquisitions in the lumbar spinal cord at 3T Cronin, A.E., Combes, A., Narisetti, L., (...), O'Grady, K.P. Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 2025 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/105007466009?origin=scopusAI

14. Dynamic B₀ shimming at 7 T Sengupta, S., Welch, E.B., Zhao, Y., (...), Avison, M.J. Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 2011 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/79954621836?origin=scopusAI

15. Improved dynamic distortion correction for fMRI using single-echo EPI and a readout-reversed first image (REFILL) Robinson, S.D., Bachrata, B., Eckstein, K., (...), Barth, M. Human Brain Mapping, 2023 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85166901904?origin=scopusAI

16. Multi-section multi-echo pulse magnetic resonance techniques: Optimization in a clinical setting Kneeland, J.B., Knowles, R.J.R., Cahill, P.T. Radiology, 1985 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/0021922609?origin=scopusAI

17. Significance of variable parameters in magnetic resonance imaging of the temporomandibular joint. Suter, M., Oliver, G., Gage, J.P. Australian prosthodontic journal / Australian Prosthodontic Society, 1990 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/0025619170?origin=scopusAI

18. Optimization of the ultrafast look-locker echo-planar imaging T₁ mapping sequence Freeman, A.J., Gowland, P.A., Mansfield, P. Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 1998 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/0031764978?origin=scopusAI

19. Functional sensitivity of 2D simultaneous multi-slice echo-planar imaging: Effects of acceleration on g-factor and physiological noise Todd, N., Josephs, O., Zeidman, P., (...), Weiskopf, N. Frontiers in Neuroscience, 2017 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85017147289?origin=scopusAI

20. Spatial resolution in echo planar imaging: Shifting the acquisition window in k-space Windischberger, C., Moser, E. Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 2000 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/0033781037?origin=scopusAI

21. Qualitative and quantitative comparison of image quality between single-shot echo-planar and interleaved multi-shot echo-planar diffusion-weighted imaging in female pelvis An, H., Ma, X., Pan, Z., (...), Lee, E.Y.P. European Radiology, 2020 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85076369604?origin=scopusAI

22. BOLD sensitivity and SNR characteristics of parallel imaging-accelerated single-shot multi-echo EPI for fMRI Bhavsar, S., Zvyagintsev, M., Mathiak, K. NeuroImage, 2014 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/84883621994?origin=scopusAI

23. Evaluation of slice accelerations using multiband echo planar imaging at 3T Xu, J., Moeller, S., Auerbach, E.J., (...), Uğurbil, K. NeuroImage, 2013 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/84886405137?origin=scopusAI

24. Assessing methods for geometric distortion compensation in 7 T gradient echo functional MRI data Schallmo, M.-P., Weldon, K.B., Burton, P.C., (...), Olman, C.A. Human Brain Mapping, 2021

https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85108255387?origin=scopusAI

25. Implementation and assessment of diffusion-weighted partial Fourier readout-segmented echo-planar imaging Frost, R., Porter, D.A., Miller, K.L., Jezzard, P. Magnetic Resonance in Medicine, 2012 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/84863857149?origin=scopusAI

26. The usefulness of readout-segmented echo-planar imaging (RESOLVE) for bio-phantom imaging using 3-tesla clinical MRI Yoshimura, Y., Kuroda, M., Sugianto, I., (...), Asaumi, J. Acta Medica Okayama, 2018 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85042359228?origin=scopusAI

27. Evaluation of Six Phase Encoding Based Susceptibility Distortion Correction Methods for Diffusion MRI Gu, X., Eklund, A. Frontiers in Neuroinformatics, 2019 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85076971635?origin=scopusAI

28. Quantitative assessment of the susceptibility artefact and its interaction with motion in diffusion MRI Graham, M.S., Drobnjak, I., Jenkinson, M., Zhang, H. PLoS ONE, 2017 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85030249691?origin=scopusAI

29. Mitigating susceptibility-induced distortions in high-resolution 3DEPI fMRI at 7T Malekian, V., Graedel, N.N., Hickling, A., (...), Callaghan, M.F. NeuroImage, 2023 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85167442584?origin=scopusAI

30. FD-Net: An unsupervised deep forward-distortion model for susceptibility artifact correction in EPI Zaid Alkilani, A., Çukur, T., Saritas, E.U. Magnetic Resonance in Medicine, 2024 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85173914844?origin=scopusAI

31. Susceptibility Artifact Correction in Four-Way Phase-Encoded Echo Planar Imaging with Unsupervised Deep Learning Kayapinar, M.H., Alkilani, A.Z., Saritas, E.U. 33rd IEEE Conference on Signal Processing and Communications Applications, SIU 2025 - Proceedings, 2025 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/105015485659?origin=scopusAI

32. Comparison of Reduced and Full Field of View in Diffusion-Weighted MRI on Image Quality: A Meta-Analysis Shi, J., Lin, J., Zhou, X., (...), Xu, M. Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 2025 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85196264457?origin=scopusAI

33. Reduced field-of-view and multi-shot DWI acquisition techniques: Prospective evaluation of image quality and distortion reduction in prostate cancer imaging Lawrence, E.M., Zhang, Y., Starekova, J., (...), Hernando, D. Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 2022 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85135886013?origin=scopusAI

34. DR-BUDDI (Diffeomorphic Registration for Blip-Up blip-Down Diffusion Imaging) method for correcting echo planar imaging distortions Irfanoglu, M.O., Modi, P., Nayak, A., (...), Pierpaoli, C. NeuroImage, 2015 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/84920153111?origin=scopusAI

35. Correcting susceptibility artifacts of MRI sensors in brain scanning: A 3D anatomy-guided deep learning approach Duong, S.T.M., Phung, S.L., Bouzerdoum, A., (...), Schira, M.M. Sensors, 2021 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85103012035?origin=scopusAI

36. Online motion correction for diffusion-weighted segmented-EPI and FLASH imaging Weih, K.S., Driesel, W., Von Mengershausen, M., Norris, D.G. Magnetic Resonance Materials in Physics, Biology and Medicine, 2004 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/3442901934?origin=scopusAI

37. Self-feeding MUSE: A robust method for high resolution diffusion imaging using interleaved EPI Zhang, Z., Huang, F., Ma, X., (...), Guo, H. NeuroImage, 2015 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/84914811143?origin=scopusAI

38. Segmented simultaneous multi-slice diffusion-weighted imaging with navigated 3D rigid motion correction Riedel, M., Setsompop, K., Mertins, A., Börnert, P. Magnetic Resonance in Medicine, 2021 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85105154743?origin=scopusAI

39. Evaluation of Motion-Corrected Multishot Echo-Planar Imaging as an Alternative to Gradient Recalled-Echo for Blood-Sensitive Imaging Murchison, J.A., Shoshan, D., Ooi, M.B., (...), Karis, J.P. American Journal of Neuroradiology, 2023 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85163906454?origin=scopusAI

40. K-sSpace and image-space combination for motion-induced phase-error correction in self-navigated multicoil multishot DWI Van, A.T., Karampinos, D.C., Georgiadis, J.G., Sutton, B.P. IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging, 2009 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/70350754369?origin=scopusAI

41. Self-Navigated 3D Diffusion MRI Using an Optimized CAIPI Sampling and Structured Low-Rank Reconstruction Estimated Navigator Li, Z., Miller, K.L., Chen, X., (...), Wu, W. IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging, 2025 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85203456029?origin=scopusAI

42. Volumetric navigators for real-time motion correction in diffusion tensor imaging Alhamud, A., Tisdall, M.D., Hess, A.T., (...), Van Der Kouwe, A.J.W. Magnetic Resonance in Medicine, 2012 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/84866733232?origin=scopusAI

43. High-resolution multi-shot diffusion-weighted MRI combining markerless prospective motion correction and locally low-rank constrained reconstruction Chen, H., Dai, K., Zhong, S., (...), Zhang, Z. Magnetic Resonance in Medicine, 2023 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85139197241?origin=scopusAI

44. Temporal Signal-to-Noise Changes in Combined Multislice- and In-Plane-Accelerated Echo-Planar Imaging with a 20- and 64-Channel Coil Seidel, P., Levine, S.M., Tahedl, M., Schwarzbach, J.V. Scientific Reports, 2020 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85082561802?origin=scopusAI

45. Minimizing susceptibility-induced BOLD sensitivity loss in multi-band accelerated fMRI using point spread function mapping and gradient reversal In, M.-H., Kang, D., Jo, H.J., (...), Shu, Y. Physics in Medicine and Biology, 2023 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85145956294?origin=scopusAI

46. An improved PSF mapping method for EPI distortion correction in human brain at ultra high field (7T) Chung, J.-Y., In, M.-H., Oh, S.-H., (...), Cho, Z.-H. Magnetic Resonance Materials in Physics, Biology and Medicine, 2011 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85027958019?origin=scopusAI

47. Characterization and Mitigation of a Simultaneous Multi-Slice fMRI Artifact: Multiband Artifact Regression in Simultaneous Slices Tubiolo, P.N., Williams, J.C., Van Snellenberg, J.X. Human Brain Mapping, 2024 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85208557881?origin=scopusAI

48. Accelerated Simultaneous Multi-Slice MRI using Subject-Specific Convolutional Neural Networks Zhang, C., Moeller, S., Weingartner, S., (...), Akcakaya, M. Conference Record - Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers, 2018 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85062985178?origin=scopusAI

49. Split-slice training and hyperparameter tuning of RAKI networks for simultaneous multi-slice reconstruction Nencka, A.S., Arpinar, V.E., Bhave, S., (...), Koch, K.M. Magnetic Resonance in Medicine, 2021 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85097598109?origin=scopusAI

50. Simultaneous Multislice Resting-State Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging at 3 Tesla: Slice-Acceleration-Related Biases in Physiological Effects Golestani, A.M., Faraji-Dana, Z., Kayvanrad, M., (...), Chen, J.J. Brain Connectivity, 2018 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85045322604?origin=scopusAI

51. Comparison of TGSE-BLADE DWI, RESOLVE DWI, and SS-EPI DWI in healthy volunteers and patients after cerebral aneurysm clipping Okuchi, S., Fushimi, Y., Yoshida, K., (...), Nakamoto, Y. Scientific Reports, 2022 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85140306055?origin=scopusAI

52. Controlled aliasing in parallel imaging results in higher acceleration (CAIPIRINHA) for multi-slice imaging Breuer, F.A., Blaimer, M., Heidemann, R.M., (...), Jakob, P.M. Magnetic Resonance in Medicine, 2005 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/14744304684?origin=scopusAI

53. Elimination of residual aliasing artifact that resembles brain lesion on multi-oblique diffusion-weighted echo-planar imaging with parallel imaging using virtual coil acquisition Liu, X., Hui, E.S., Chang, H.-C. Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 2020 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85074832332?origin=scopusAI

54. Pseudolesions arising from unfolding artifacts in diffusion imaging with use of parallel acquisition: Origin and remedies Chou, M.-C., Wang, C.-Y., Liu, H.-S., (...), Chen, C.-Y. American Journal of Neuroradiology, 2007 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/34250804379?origin=scopusAI

55. Data-driven optimization and evaluation of 2D EPI and 3D PRESTO for BOLD fMRI at 7 Tesla: I. Focal coverage Barry, R.L., Strother, S.C., Gatenby, J.C., Gore, J.C. NeuroImage, 2011 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/79952068770?origin=scopusAI

56. Block-Matching Distortion Correction of Echo-Planar Images with Opposite Phase Encoding Directions Hedouin, R., Commowick, O., Bannier, E., (...), Barillot, C. IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging, 2017 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85019194866?origin=scopusAI

57. Hyperelastic susceptibility artifact correction of DTI in SPM Ruthotto, L., Mohammadi, S., Heck, C., (...), Weiskopf, N. Informatik aktuell, 2013 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/84923785528?origin=scopusAI

58. Motion compensated structured low-rank reconstruction for 3D multi-shot EPI Chen, X., Wu, W., Chiew, M. Magnetic Resonance in Medicine, 2024 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85185680122?origin=scopusAI

59. Characterizing the distribution of neural and non-neural components in multi-echo EPI data across echo times based on tensor-ICA Feng, T., Baqapuri, H.I., Zweerings, J., (...), Mathiak, K. NeuroImage, 2025 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/105002305098?origin=scopusAI

60. Evaluation of EPI distortion correction methods for quantitative MRI of the brain at high magnetic field Hong, X., To, X.V., Teh, I., (...), Chuang, K.-H. Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 2015 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/84943355166?origin=scopusAI

61. Image distortion correction in EPI: Comparison of field mapping with point spread function mapping Zeng, H., Constable, R.T. Magnetic Resonance in Medicine, 2002 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/0036296026?origin=scopusAI

62. Dynamic field mapping and distortion correction using single-shot blip-rewound EPI and joint multi-echo reconstruction Wu, W. Magnetic Resonance in Medicine, 2024 https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85184206263?origin=scopusAI