

Re: SPAN initial rat imaging test

From: **Thedens, Daniel R** | dan-thedens@uiowa.edu

Thursday, Mar 25, 9:53 AM

To: **Ryan Cabeen** | Ryan.Cabeen@loni.usc.edu, **Cenk Ayata** | CAYATA@mgh.harvard.edu

Cc: **Karisma A Nagarkatti** | nagarkat@usc.edu

I have uploaded a rat MRI study to the Pilot Stage 2, labelled "IR0001" (Iowa rat 0001). This is a Day 2 post-surgery.

The protocol I used was identical to the mouse protocol except that the field of view was increased to 25.6 mm (from 19.2) and the slice thickness was increased to 0.8mm (from 0.5mm). Matrix sizes were kept at 128x128 to keep the scan time the same. Voxel sizes are thus larger than in the mouse. I also added a second RARE_anatomy_192 scan that increased the matrix size to 192 x 192 in-plane and reduced averages from 4 to 3. This resulted in a very similar scan time and should have approximately the same SNR as in the mouse images.

Comments on this initial run:

- Overall image quality was good for RARE and T2 map sequences. This is not surprising given that the voxel volume is nearly 3x larger.
- The DWI scans are probably unusable in this set as there is a large amount of motion artifact. I can think of variety of causes, including vibration in the fixture, respiratory motion arising from sub-optimal positioning and restraint, or even reduced warm airflow causing the animal to shiver. I will need to investigate.
- The higher resolution RARE scan looks considerably more 'crisp' with the same duration.
- There is a decent amount of phase wrap in the images at this field of view, though it does not affect the brain. Still, in larger animals it might be excessive. I have historically done this with phase in the L/R direction, but I don't think there would be an issue swapping and it might alleviate the problem.
- It may be desirable to increase the matrix on the T2 and DWI, but since these are run at 1 average, this is very likely to require additional time unless we do anisotropic resolution in-plane (say 192 x 128).

Cenk, if you want to see the images and it's more convenient, I can put these at an externally accessible link for download.

--

Dan Thedens

dan-thedens@uiowa.edu

Notice: This UI Health Care e-mail (including attachments) is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. 2510-2521 and is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete or destroy all copies of the original message and attachments thereto. Email sent to or from UI Health Care may be retained as required by law or regulation. Thank you.

From: **Ryan Cabeen** | ryan.cabeen@loni.usc.edu

Thursday, Mar 25, 10:05 AM

To: **Karen Crawford** | karen.crawford@loni.ucla.edu

Hi Karen,

Hope you're doing well, just wanted to touch base about this change to the SPAN protocol since I'm not sure if they've coordinated with you yet.

They've added rats to stage 2, and I think they will also be scanning mice concurrently. So, I was wondering if we may need to tag the species in the IDA, since they will probably need different pipelines. What do you think?

Thanks,

Ryan

Ryan P. Cabeen, PhD

Postdoctoral Scholar - Chan Zuckerberg Imaging Scientist

Laboratory of Neuro Imaging

USC Stevens Neuroimaging and Informatics Institute

Keck School of Medicine of USC

University of Southern California

2025 Zonal Ave.

Los Angeles, CA 90033

Tel: (323) 44-BRAIN

Email: rcabeen@loni.usc.edu

Web: cabeen.io

From: **Thedens** | dan-thedens@uiowa.edu

To: **Ryan Cabeen** | Ryan.Cabeen@loni.usc.edu

Thursday, Mar 25, 9:53 AM

I have uploaded a rat MRI study to the Pilot Stage 2, labelled "IR0001" (Iowa rat 0001). This is a

Day 2 post-surgery.

The protocol I used was identical to the mouse protocol except that the field of view was increased to 25.6 mm (from 19.2) and the slice thickness was increased to 0.8mm (from 0.5mm). Matrix sizes were kept at 128x128 to keep the scan time the same. Voxel sizes are thus larger than in the mouse. I also added a second RARE_anatomy_192 scan that increased the matrix size to 192 x 192 in-plane and reduced averages from 4 to 3. This resulted in a very similar scan time and should have approximately the same SNR as in the mouse images.

Comments on this initial run:

- Overall image quality was good for RARE and T2 map sequences. This is not surprising given that the voxel volume is nearly 3x larger.
- The DWI scans are probably unusable in this set as there is a large amount of motion artifact. I can think of variety of causes, including vibration in the fixture, respiratory motion arising from sub-optimal positioning and restraint, or even reduced warm airflow causing the animal to shiver. I will need to investigate.
- The higher resolution RARE scan looks considerably more 'crisp' with the same duration.
- There is a decent amount of phase wrap in the images at this field of view, though it does not affect the brain. Still, in larger animals it might be excessive. I have historically done this with phase in the L/R direction, but I don't think there would be an issue swapping and it might alleviate the problem.
- It may be desirable to increase the matrix on the T2 and DWI, but since these are run at 1 average, this is very likely to require additional time unless we do anisotropic resolution in-plane (say 192 x 128).

Cenk, if you want to see the images and it's more convenient, I can put these at an externally accessible link for download.

--

Dan Thedens

dan-thedens@uiowa.edu

Notice: This UI Health Care e-mail (including attachments) is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. 2510-2521 and is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete or destroy all copies of the original message and attachments thereto. Email sent to or from UI Health Care may be retained as required by law or regulation. Thank you.

From: **Ryan Cabeen** | ryan.cabeen@loni.usc.edu

Thursday, Mar 25, 10:25 AM

To: **Karen Crawford** | karen.crawford@loni.usc.edu

Hi Karen,

Hope you're doing well, just wanted to touch base about this change to the SPAN protocol since I'm not sure if they've coordinated with you yet.

They've added rats to stage 2, and I think they will also be scanning mice concurrently. So, I was wondering if we may need to tag the species in the IDA, since they will probably need different pipelines. What do you think?

Thanks,
Ryan

Ryan P. Cabeen, PhD
Postdoctoral Scholar - Chan Zuckerberg Imaging Scientist
Laboratory of Neuro Imaging
USC Stevens Neuroimaging and Informatics Institute
Keck School of Medicine of USC
University of Southern California
2025 Zonal Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90033
Tel: (323) 44-BRAIN
Email: rcabeen@loni.usc.edu
Web: cabeen.io

From: To: **Ryan Cabeen** | ryan.cabeen@loni.usc.edu

Thursday, Mar 25, 9:53 AM

Hi Karen,

Hope you're doing well, just wanted to touch base about this change to the SPAN protocol since I'm not sure if they've coordinated with you yet.

They've added rats to stage 2, and I think they will also be scanning mice concurrently. So, I was wondering if we may need to tag the species in the IDA, since they will probably need different pipelines. What do you think?

Thanks,
Ryan

From: **Karen Crawford** | Karen.Crawford@loni.usc.edu

Thursday, Mar 25, 10:31 AM

To: **Ryan Cabeen** | Ryan.Cabeen@loni.usc.edu

Hi Ryan,

Yes, we are aware of that change and will be adding species as a variable to be collected at time of upload. We're just waiting for finalization of the REDCap forms so we can configure matching Stage 2 visits in the IDA.

Karen Crawford
Laboratory of Neuro Imaging
Mark and Mary Stevens Neuroimaging and Informatics Institute
Keck School of Medicine of USC
University of Southern California
2025 Zonal Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90033
Tel: (323) 44-BRAIN

From: **Ryan Cabeen** | ryan.cabeen@loni.usc.edu

Thursday, Mar 25, 10:34 AM

To: **Karen Crawford** | Karen.Crawford@loni.usc.edu

Great, thank you!

Ryan P. Cabeen, PhD
Postdoctoral Scholar - Chan Zuckerberg Imaging Scientist
Laboratory of Neuro Imaging
USC Stevens Neuroimaging and Informatics Institute
Keck School of Medicine of USC
University of Southern California
2025 Zonal Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90033
Tel: (323) 44-BRAIN
Email: rcabeen@loni.usc.edu
Web: cabeen.io

From: **Ayata, Cenk, M.D.** | CAYATA@mgh.harvard.edu

Thursday, Mar 25, 6:17 PM

To: **Thedens, Daniel R** | dan-thedens@uiowa.edu

Cc: **Ryan Cabeen** | Ryan.Cabeen@loni.usc.edu, **Fahmeed Hyder** | fahmeed.hyder@yale.edu, **Huang, Shuning** | Shuning.Huang@uth.tmc.edu, **Joe Mandeville** | jbm@nmr.mgh.harvard.edu, **Arbab, Ali** | AARBAB@augusta.edu, **Adnan Bibic** | adnan.bibic@jhmi.edu, **Basavaraju Ganganna** | basavaraju.ganganna@yale.edu, **Mihailovic, Jelena** | jelena.mihailovic@yale.edu

Thanks, Dan, this is very helpful. I am cc'ing the MRI group for their thoughts and comments, and it would indeed be helpful if you can share the images with all cc'ed here. Ryan and I will take a look at the uploaded images as well. I suspect this will be a core discussion at the April 2 and 6 zooms.

Regards,

Cenk

The information in this e-mail is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed. If you believe this e-mail was sent to you in error and the e-mail contains patient information, please contact the Mass General Brigham Compliance HelpLine at www.massgeneralbrigham.org/complianceline . If the e-mail was sent to you in error but does not contain patient information, please contact the sender and properly dispose of the e-mail.

Please note that this e-mail is not secure (encrypted). If you do not wish to continue communication over unencrypted e-mail, please notify the sender of this message immediately. Continuing to send or respond to e-mail after receiving this message means you understand and accept this risk and wish to continue to communicate over unencrypted e-mail.
