Monogenic Signal for Cardiac Motion Analysis from Tagged Magnetic Resonance Image Sequences
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Abstract

This paper presents a novel algorithm for the analysis of heart motion from tagged magnetic resonance images. The displacement is estimated from the monogenic phase and is therefore robust to possible variations of the local image energy. A local affine model accounts for the typical contraction, torsion and shear of myocardial tissue. An effective B-spline multiresolution strategy automatically selects the scale returning the most consistent velocity estimate. The multiresolution strategy together with a least-squares estimate of the monogenic orientation make the algorithm robust under image noise. Results on realistic simulated images show the proposed algorithm to return more accurate velocity estimates than the SinMod algorithm, itself shown more accurate and robust than the state-of-the-art Harp method.

1. Introduction

Tagged MRI (tMRI) is currently the gold-standard technique for quantification of myocardial contractility [1, 2]. With this technique, cardiac tissue is marked with magnetically saturated tagging lines or grids that deform with the underlying tissue during the cardiac cycle, thus providing details on the myocardial motion.

With time elapsing, the grid loses contrast and sharpness. This is why state-of-the-art techniques for motion estimation from tMRI sequences exploit the image phase rather than the less trustworthy pixel intensity. The popular algorithms HARP (harmonic phase) [1] and SinMod (sine-wave modeling) [2] belong to this family of methods. In particular, SinMod was shown to outperform HARP in [1]. Both methods make use of a directional bandpass filter bank to build first-order harmonic images. From the latter, the displacement is estimated with Fourier-based disparity measures. The limit of directional filtering is that it assumes tags direction and spacing to be constant on all the sequence while, in practice, these values may change locally due to the heart deformation. In this context, we propose here a novel motion estimation algorithm based on a more sophisticated and flexible image processing tool, called monogenic signal.

The monogenic signal extends the analytic signal concept to multiple dimensions [3]. Locally, it decomposes the image into the structural features of phase and orientation and in its local amplitude. These features are computed by locally approximating the image as a 1D monochromatic wave propagating in the direction of maximum image energy variation. Interestingly, due to the periodic patterns, the monochromatic wave model provides a realistic representation for the structure of tMRI images. This makes the monogenic signal an excellent framework for developing techniques dedicated to their analysis. To our knowledge this is the first study investigating this possibility.

Our algorithm computes the displacement by tracking variations in the monogenic phase. The computation is made locally on a spatially moving window. A local affine model accounts for the typical contraction, torsion and shear components of myocardial tissue. An effective B-spline multiresolution strategy automatically selects the scale returning the most consistent velocity estimate. The multiscale window choice together with an unconventional least-squares orientation estimate improves the robustness under image noise. Besides that the employment of the phase reduces the sensitivity to brightness variations.

The paper proceeds as follows. In Section 2 the monogenic signal analysis of tagged MRI images

2. Monogenic signal analysis of tagged MRI images

The monogenic signal provides an extension of the standard analytic signal for 2D gray-scale images. The adopted image model is [4]:

\[ I(x) = A(x) \cos(\varphi(x)), \]

(1)
where \( x = [x, y] \) is the spatial coordinate vector, \( A(x) \) is the local amplitude and \( \varphi(x) \) is the local phase. Additionally, intrinsic dimensionality one is assumed, i.e., the local variations of \( I \) are concentrated along a single direction, defined by the local orientation \( \theta(x) \). Amplitude, phase and orientation are computed from the responses to three 2D spherical quadrature filters (SQFs) \([4]\) obtained likewise: one even rotation invariant bandpass \( b_e(x) \) filter and two odd bandpass filters \( b_o1(x) \) and \( b_o2(x) \). The odd filters are computed from the Riesz transform of the even filter, see \([3, 4]\) for details. Several SQFs families exist in the literature. Here, the difference of Poisson (DoP) kernel is adopted \([4]\).

Monogenic features are obtained as:

\[
\theta(x) = \arctan \left( \frac{q_2(x)}{q_1(x)} \right),
\]

\[
\varphi(x) = \arctan \left( \frac{|q(x)|}{p(x)} \right),
\]

and \( A(x) = \sqrt{p^2(x) + |q(x)|^2} \), where \( p(x) = (I \ast b_e(x), q_1(x) = (I \ast b_o1)(x), q_2(x) = (I \ast b_o2)(x), q(x) = [q_1(x), q_2(x)]^T \) and “\( \ast \)” denotes 2D convolution. Monogenic phase and orientation can be conveniently combined in the phase vector \( r(x) = [r_1(x), r_2(x)] = \varphi(x) \cdot n(x) \), with \( n(x) = [\cos(\theta(x)), \sin(\theta(x))]^T \)

\([4]\). Then, as-suming all points translate of the same quantity \( v \), we compute displacement \( d \) in terms of the phase vector \( r(x) \) \([4]\). Then, assuming all points translate of the same quantity \( d \) within a local window \( w \) centered in \( x_0 = [x_0, y_0] \), the following linear system of equations is obtained:

\[
\begin{bmatrix} J \end{bmatrix}_w d_0 = -\langle r \rangle_w , \quad J = \omega_0 n^T \]

Figure 1. (a) tMRI image with horizontal tags. The computed orientation is represented as green arrows. The blue segment defines a 1D neighborhood selected by the local orientation. (b) The blue line shows the image intensity profile along the blue segment of figure (a). The local tags spacing is of 12 pixels, very well estimated by the monogenic frequency \((l = 1/f = 11.72 \text{ pixels})\).

The tMRI image model \((6)\) is closely related to the monogenic image model in \((1)\). In particular, it directly satisfies the assumption of local dimensionality one. This allows to establish a direct correspondence between the previously introduced monogenic features and the geometrical properties of tMRI images. Namely, monogenic orientation computes the local tags direction while monogenic frequency estimates the local tags spacing (cf. Fig. 1). These structural features will be exploited in the derivation of a robust motion estimation algorithm in the next section.

3. Proposed motion estimation algorithm

Following \([4]\), we compute displacement \( d = [d_1, d_2] \) between two frames assuming the conservation of the image phase over time, i.e., \( \varphi(x, t + 1) = \varphi(x - d, t) \). Since, according to \((6)\), \( \varphi(x, t) = \omega_0 n^T x \), the equation for the displacement becomes \(-\varphi_t(x) = \omega_0 n^T d \), where we have called \( \varphi_t(x) = \varphi(x, t + 1) - \varphi(x, t) \). By pre-multiplying both terms by \( n \), we obtain the phase conservation expressed in terms of the phase vector \( r(x) \) \([4]\). Then, assuming all points translate of the same quantity \( d \) within a local window \( w \) centered in \( x_0 = [x_0, y_0] \), the following linear system of equations is obtained:

\[
\begin{bmatrix} J \end{bmatrix}_w d_0 = -\langle r \rangle_w , \quad J = \omega_0 n^T \]

where \( \langle v \rangle_w \) denotes the weighted average \( \int_w w(x - x_0)v(x)dx \). In \((7)\), \( \omega_0 = 2\pi f \), where \( f \) is computed as in \((4)\) and \( n \) is defined by the monogenic orientation \( \theta \). The term \( r_t \) is computed from the SQFs responses as in \((4)\):

\[
r_t = \frac{p_1 q_2 - q_1 p_2}{|p_1 q_2 - q_1 p_2|} = \arctan \left( \frac{|p_1 q_2 - q_1 p_2|}{p_1 p_2 + q_1 q_2} \right)
\]

where subscripts 1 and 2 denote the time instant \( t \) and \( t + 1 \) respectively.
We conclude this section by noting that the maximum displacement that our algorithm can compute is equal to one half the tags spacing \(l_0/2\). Beyond that value, due to the periodicity of the pattern, the velocity cannot be determined unambiguously.

### 3.1. Affine model

Clearly, the simple translation model employed by Felsberg [4] is too restrictive in a general context. Also, its validity is heavily dependent on the choice of the size of \(w\). The solution we propose is to replace the constant motion assumption with an affine model. A part of translations, this accounts for rotation, expansion, compression and shear. Considering a window \(w\) centered at \((x_0, y_0) = (0, 0)\), the affine model is written:

\[
d(x) = B(x)u, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & x & y & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & x & y \end{bmatrix},
\]

where \(u = [d_{t10}, d_{t20}, d_{x1}, d_{y1}, d_{x2}, d_{y2}]^T\) is the new unknown vector; \(d_{t10}\) and \(d_{t20}\) correspond to the translation of the window center and \(d_{ik} = \partial u d_i\).

Plugging (9) into (7) leads to an underdetermined system of equations. The solution is then obtained by pre-multiplying both terms by \(B^T\), i.e. \(\{M\}_w u = \{b\}_w\), with \(M = B^T J B\) and \(b = -B^T r_f\).

### 3.2. Multiscale choice of window size

The choice of the window size is a tedious issue connected with local techniques: the assumed motion model (translational or affine) may not hold when the window is too big, otherwise, the adoption of an excessively small window may result in the well known aperture problem. To circumvent this issue, in [6] Sühling et al. proposed a multiscale strategy for locally choosing the most consistent window size. This is based on the possibility of computing the image moments, i.e., the entries of the system matrix \(M\) and the vector \(b\), at multiple scales, by using an efficient B-spline coarse-to-fine strategy. In particular, they are obtained from window functions \(w\) that are progressively scaled and subsampled by a factor 2 in each dimension. More precisely, at scale \(j\), the window \(w^j((x-x_0)/2^j)\) is employed, where \(w\) is written as the separable product of two B-spline functions.

By doing so, at each scale \(J_f \leq j \leq J_c\) \((J_f \geq 0)\) a solution \(u^j\) can be computed. Among the scales considered, the \(u^j\) producing the smallest residual error \(||M u^j - b||^2 / ||w||^2\) is retained as the final displacement estimate. Whenever necessary, bi-cubic interpolation is employed to obtain a dense motion field. With this strategy, the scale providing the most consistent motion estimate is selected.

### Table 1. Endpoint Error \((\mu \pm \sigma)\) in pixels on 8 simulated sequences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQUENCE</th>
<th>ALGORITHM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D30</td>
<td>0.152 ± 0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D30F20</td>
<td>0.082 ± 0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D30R10T01P0</td>
<td>0.264 ± 0.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D30R20T01P0</td>
<td>0.462 ± 0.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D30R20T01P0F20</td>
<td>0.209 ± 0.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R20F20</td>
<td>0.244 ± 0.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10</td>
<td>0.161 ± 0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R20</td>
<td>0.104 ± 0.072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3. Iterative displacement refinement

The hypothesis of small displacements employed in differential techniques may be inadequate whenever the displacement is substantial or the image intensity profile is non-linear. A possible way to deal with this limitation is to implement a form of Gauss-Newton optimization: the current estimate is used to undo the motion, and then the estimator is reapplied to the warped images to find the residual displacement [7]. When applied iteratively, this procedure can improve the estimation accuracy considerably. We employed the aforementioned refinement scheme in the algorithm presented.

### 4. Implementation details

The number of iterations of the refinement scheme of Section 3.3 was 3 in all the experiments. The center frequency of the SQFs was chosen close to the image first harmonic, given by \(1/l_0\) \((l_0 \approx 6\) pixels in our experiments). The multiscale window choice was implemented by considering fifth-order B-splines and scales \(j = \{2, 3, 4, 5\}\). A value \(\sigma = 2\) was used for the robust computation of the monogenic orientation. The proposed algorithm has been implemented in MATLAB (R2011b, The MathWorks, Natick, MA).

### 5. Results

The algorithm was tested on realistic simulated cardiac tMRI sequences with grid patterns for which the benchmark motion was known and the performance was compared to the one of SinMod [2]. Synthetic sequences were generated with the ASSESS software [8]. The characteristic tag-fading effect, not considered in ASSESS, was also taken into account in this study. The effect was obtained by adjusting the image’s histogram limits on each frame so as to match those of a real sequence taken as a template.

The estimation error was assessed with the endpoint error \(EE = ||d - \bar{d}||^2\), measured in pixels, where \(\bar{d}\) denotes...
the estimated displacement and $\bar{d}$ the benchmark displacement.

The results obtained on 8 simulated sequences are summarized in Table 1. For each algorithm the parameters were optimized to return the smallest average error on the sequence D30R20T01P0F20. The name of each sequence reflects the values of the parameters used for its generation, namely: contraction/expansion ($D$), rotation ($R$), thickening ($T$), frame-rate ($F$) and healthy ($P0$) or pathological ($P3$) state. Greater detail on their meaning can be found in [8]. These results show that the proposed algorithm systematically returns the estimate with the smallest mean value and variance, which is a proof of precision and reliability.

The algorithm performance on each frame of a simulated sequence is reported in Fig. 2. The figure shows that the obtained estimates are constantly more precise than the ones returned by SinMod. The behavior is similar on all the considered sequences.

The sensitivity to noise was also evaluated. To this end, we contaminated the frames of sequence R20F20 with additive Rician noise [9]. Fig. 3 reports the endpoint error variation for decreasing values of SNR. The results are based on 15 independent noise realizations. These results show that the performance of the proposed algorithm remains virtually unchanged. The robustness against noise stems from two factors: the multiscale window choice and the robust monogenic orientation. The first guarantees that the integration scale is optimized locally so as to minimize the noise effect on the velocity determination, while the second ensures a more robust computation of the monogenic features.

The computational time for the optimal parameters set was of 0.55 s/image (image size, $256 \times 256$ pixels$^2$) for the adopted unoptimized MATLAB implementation.

6. Discussions and conclusion

We have described a novel algorithm for the analysis of heart motion from tMRI images. On considered data, the algorithm has been shown to be more accurate than the recent SinMod algorithm.

We conclude by noting that the model (6) is perfectly suited for line-tags. In the case of the grid-tags, a second wave perpendicular to the first should be included in the image model. This would suggest investigating the use of 2D extensions of the monogenic signal as the one in [10]. Nonetheless, the results presented here show that, even in the most common grid-tag case, the monogenic-phase-based algorithm presented still produces relevant estimates.
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