[±]UCL

ASL Modelling and Quantification

David Thomas

UCL Institute of Neurology Queen Square, London, UK d.thomas@ucl.ac.uk

Overview of talk

- Brief review of ASL
- Describe the 2 main ASL quantification models
 T1 model
 - General kinetic model
- Pros and cons of multi-TI and single-TI
- Quantification methods using single-TI
- Assumptions of the models
- · Consensus approach to ASL quantification



































≜UCL

Pros of multi-TI acquisition

- · Allows fitting of ASL data to kinetic model
- · Allows measurement of other haemodynamic parameters (e.g. bolus arrival time $\Delta t)$ as well as CBF

Journal of Cerebral Blood Flow & Metabolism (2014) 34, 34–42; doi:10.1038/jcbfm.2013.161; published online 18 September 2013 ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Cerebral arterial bolus arrival time is prolonged in multiple sclerosis and associated with disability

David Paling¹, Esben Thade Petersen², Daniel J Tozer¹, Daniel R Altmann^{1,3}, Claudia AM W David H Miller¹ and Xavier Golay⁶

Pros of multi-TI acquisition

UCL

· Allows fitting of ASL data to kinetic model Allows measurement of other haemodynamic parameters (e.g. bolus arrival time Δt) as well as CBF

Controls



UCL

Cons of multi-TI acquisition

- · Requires the acquisition of a series of images for single measurement
 - Low temporal resolution
 - Not suitable for dynamic acquisitions e.g. fMRI
- · Can have poor measurement efficiency if
- sampling TIs where SNR is low e.g. $TI < \Delta t$
- So, can we quantify using a single TI?















UCL



UCL

Useful References

- Detre et al MRM 23:37-45 (1992)
- Alsop and Detre JCBFM 16:1236-49 (1996)
- Buxton et al MRM 40:383-396 (1998)
- Wong et al MRM 39:702-709 (1998)
- Golay et al Top Magn Reson Imaging 15:10–27 (2004)
- JMRI 22(6) perfusion review edition (2005)
- COST AID <u>http://www.aslindementia.org/</u>
- ASL White Paper DOI: 10.1002/mrm.25197