UC San Diego

UC San Diego Previously Published Works

Title

Comparison of optical and MR-based tracking.

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9xg1z3ff

Journal

Magnetic resonance in medicine, 74(3)

ISSN 0740-3194

Authors

Gumus, Kazim Keating, Brian White, Nathan <u>et al.</u>

Publication Date 2015-09-01

DOI

10.1002/mrm.25472

Peer reviewed

Comparison of Optical and MR-Based Tracking

Kazim Gumus,¹* Brian Keating,¹ Nathan White,² Brian Andrews-Shigaki,^{3,4} Brian Armstrong,⁵ Julian Maclaren,^{6,7} Maxim Zaitsev,⁶ Anders Dale,² and Thomas Ernst¹

Purpose: The goal of this study was to compare the accuracy of two real-time motion tracking systems in the MR environment: MR-based prospective motion correction (PROMO) and optical moiré phase tracking (MPT).

Methods: Five subjects performed eight predefined head rotations of $8^{\circ} \pm 3^{\circ}$ while being simultaneously tracked with PROMO and MPT. Structural images acquired immediately before and after each tracking experiment were realigned with SPM8 to provide a reference measurement.

Results: Mean signed errors (MSEs) in MPT tracking relative to SPM8 were less than 0.3 mm and 0.2° in all 6 degrees of freedom, and MSEs in PROMO tracking ranged up to 0.2 mm and 0.3°. MPT and PROMO significantly differed from SPM8 in y-translation and y-rotation values (P < 0.05). Maximum absolute errors ranged up to 2.8 mm and 2.1° for MPT, and 2.2 mm and 2.9° for PROMO.

Conclusion: This study presents the first in vivo comparison of MPT and PROMO tracking. Our data show that two methods yielded similar performances (within 1 mm and 1° standard deviation) relative to reference image registration. Tracking errors of both systems were larger than offline tests. Future work is required for further comparison of two methods in vivo with higher precision. **Magn Reson Med 74:894–902, 2015.** (© **2014 Wiley Periodicals, Inc.**

Key words: Moiré phase tracking; PROMO; prospective motion tracking; navigator; head motion

INTRODUCTION

Subject motion during brain MRI scans is a major cause of image artifacts, and hence results in inefficient use of scanner time due to the need to repeat scans. Such con-

¹John A. Burns School of Medicine, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA.

²Department of Radiology, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, California, USA.

³Department of Military & Emergency Medicine, Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, Bethesda, Maryland, USA.

⁴Department of Radiology and Radiological Sciences, Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, Bethesda, Maryland, USA.

⁵Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA.

⁶Department of Radiology, University Medical Center Freiburg, Freiburg, Germany.

⁷Department of Radiology, Stanford University, Stanford, California, USA.

Grant sponsor: National Institutes of Health; Grant numbers: 1R01DA021146 (to T.E.), U54 56883 (SNRP), K02-DA16991, R01EB000790; RC2DA29475, and G12-MD007601-26 (RCMI).

*Correspondence to: Kazim Gumus, Ph.D., Erciyes University, School of Medicine, Biophysics, Kayseri, Turkey, 38039. E-mail: kzgumus@erciyes.edu.tr

Received 12 February 2014; revised 30 August 2014; accepted 1 September 2014

DOI 10.1002/mrm.25472

Published online 24 September 2014 in Wiley Online Library (wileyonlinelibrary.com).

© 2014 Wiley Periodicals, Inc.

cerns are particularly acute in subjects who are uncooperative or unable to remain still, such as pediatric subjects or subjects who are in pain. Motion causes inaccurate encoding of k-space data and affects spinexcitation history, resulting in image artifacts such as ghosting or blurring.

A range of methods have been developed to measure rigid head motion in six degrees of freedom (6-DOF) and compensate for it during or after MR scanning. Retrospective motion correction approaches attempt to eliminate motion artifacts after data acquisition. They reconcile the inconsistencies in the data via coregistration of multiple image volumes or by using navigator data (1) or special trajectories (2). Retrospective approaches can mitigate in-plane motion artifacts, but often fail to correct the influence of through-plane motion on spin excitation history.

prospective Alternatively, motion correction approaches are based on continuous measurement of head motion and adjusting scan parameters in real-time (3). Head motion can be tracked by MR navigators (4–7), optical systems (8-12), or other methods (13). MR navigators involve customization of vendor sequences, require sufficient unused time in the host sequence, and are commonly acquired once per repetition time (TR) only. Optical systems utilize one (10,11) or more (8,14-16) cameras, and one or more markers affixed to the subject's head or jaw. Motion parameters are derived from the motion of the markers using a calibrated camera system. Optical systems are characterized by a high sampling rate (up to 100 frames per second) and do not interfere with the MR measurement process, but require careful calibration to register camera and MR coordinate systems.

The quality of prospective motion correction relies on the quality of the tracking data, but the tracking accuracy of MR-based and optical systems has not been compared previously. Both MR-based adaptive motion correction, specifically prospective motion correction (PROMO) (5,6,17) and optical tracking using moiré phase tracking (MPT) (10), became available recently on our scanner (6). Therefore, we performed a study to compare their motion detection accuracy in comparison with image registration (18,19).

METHODS

PROMO

PROMO uses a set of rapid, low-resolution, low-flip angle navigator images in conjunction with a Kalman filter algorithm to estimate head pose (5). Each navigator set consists of three orthogonal images, one each in the axial, transverse, and coronal orientations. Brain masks are applied to all navigator images before motion estimation. At the start of each scan, 18 "training" navigator sets are acquired to determine optimal placement of the masks. These training sets are automatically registered to a proton density-weighted brain atlas in order to accurately project the (predefined) brain masks onto the three navigator planes. The masks eliminate portions of the navigator image that can move nonrigidly with respect to the brain, such as the neck and jaw (5,6).

After the training portion was complete (~ 6 s), a single navigator set was designated as the reference set, and subsequent sets were registered to this reference. Navigator sets were acquired during unused time in the host sequence, typically "fill time" after data acquisition to allow for relaxation. Rigid-body parameters were estimated from each navigator set by an extended Kalman filter. This scheme was essentially a standard least-squares image registration, but with a tunable smoothing parameter (set to 1×10^{-10}) to account for dynamics (5). Our PROMO implementation acquired three navigator sets (i.e., three sets of three orthogonal spiral navigator images) for each TR to improve estimation accuracy (5). The navigators had 10×10 mm in-plane resolution with a slice thickness of 5 mm, and the flip angle was 7°. Each navigator set took approximately 47 ms to acquire. With an additional 125 ms per set for spiral reconstruction, motion estimation, and delivery of feedback, the effective sampling rate was approximately 2 Hz (1/516 ms).

Although PROMO can be used as a stand-alone sequence for testing purposes, we used an existing PROMO implementation as part of a double spin echo "point-resolved spectroscopy" (PRESS) sequence (TR/ echo time [TE] = 3000/30 ms; acquisition time [TA] = 48 s; voxel size = $20 \times 20 \times 20$ mm; 10 averages). This implementation ensures realistic time constraints and relaxation effects (20).

MPT

The MPT motion tracking system consists of a digital camera customized for the MR environment and a passive MPT target (10,21). The camera operates at 80 frames per second and includes a white LED for target illumination and a mirror (35×35 mm) inside a Delrin housing (Figure 1). The $15 \times 15 \times 1.2$ mm MPT target allows accurate tracking of 6-DOF motions with a single camera (Figure 1) (22,23).

To assess the accuracy of MPT outside the scanner, a two-axis precision rotary table was used to present controlled motion. The test included tracking hardware and software identical to that used in the MR scanner, and a camera-marker geometry comparable to the in-scanner geometry. A constellation of 242 poses spanning 360° of target axial rotation, 5°–35° of tilt out of the image plane, and 100 mm of translation were acquired. A total of 181 poses were used to calibrate the test-bench configuration, and 61 poses were used to measure MPT accuracy. These controlled motion experiments yielded MPT measurement accuracies of 0.001 mm, 0.106 mm, and 0.001 mm for the X, Y, and Z MRI coordinates, respectively, and better than 0.07° in all three rotations (one standard deviation).

Mirror Camera

FIG. 1. Experimental setup of the MPT system. a: The 15 \times 15 mm MPT target placed next to a nickel for size comparison. b: MR-compatible in-bore camera. c: Subject with an MPT marker attached to his forehead.

During the scan, the target was fixed to the subject's head using double-sided tape in the area above the eyebrows. Images collected by the camera were transmitted to a processor unit outside the scanner room and were analyzed to extract position and orientation information. The motion parameters were broadcast to the control unit of the scanner, where the position and orientation of the imaging volume were updated. The time from image capture to feedback reception (i.e., the "latency") was approximately 40 ms. The MR sequence requires an additional 2 ms to receive the feedback, convert them to MR frames, and update the scan parameters.

The MPT system requires an accurate transformation from the camera to the MRI coordinate frame. Therefore, a cross-calibration procedure that uses tracking data and prospective acquisition correction motion estimation (24) was performed prior to the experiment (12,25). Briefly, the procedure was performed as follows: An MPT marker was attached to a structural phantom. The phantom was imaged at approximately 10 different positions with relative orientations of $\sim 15^{\circ}$ between scans. Phantom motion was tracked by the MPT system, and the prospective acquisition correction algorithm (24) was used to compute the pose differences (movements) in the MR reference frame. A least-squares optimization algorithm was applied to the two sets of measurements to calculate the optimal transformation matrix between the two coordinate systems (camera and MRI). Errors in crosscalibration of the MPT system are estimated to be within 0.2 mm and 0.2°. Based on a first-order analysis of propagation of camera calibration errors (26), and given head movements of up to 8 mm and 8° for test scans, the upper bound for residual tracking errors (after motion correction) due to miscalibration was estimated to be 0.03° and 0.06 mm [using Equations 16 and 19 in Zahneisen et al. (26)].

Subjects and Experimental Setup for Simultaneous Tracking

Five healthy subjects provided verbal and written informed consent as approved by the local Institutional



FIG. 2. Motion trajectories for eight movements performed by one subject during PRESS acquisitions: four Z-rotations (top row) and four X-rotations (bottom row) are shown. In each cell, rotation (Rz or Rx) estimates of MPT (black crosses) and PROMO (blue squares) are compared with image registration parameters (red circles). MPT estimates of R_{x} and Ry at GRE centers are shown at times t = -16 s and t=49 s.

Review Board. Scanning was performed on a 3T TIM TRIO (Siemens Healthcare, Erlangen, Germany) scanner with a 12-channel head coil. The protocol comprised eight PROMO-supplemented PRESS scans (TR = 3000 ms; TA = 48 s) interleaved with isotropic T1-weighted structural images (gradient echo) (TR/TE = 7/3.77 ms; TA = 26 s; flip angle = 15°; field of view = 256 \times 256 mm; matrix = 128 \times 128; partial Fourier [slice/ phase] = 6/8; slice thickness = 2 mm).

During each PRESS scan, subjects performed one of eight movements (speed < 1 mm/s and < 1° /s): 1) head rotation toward the subject's right, $\sim 5^{\circ}$ (scanner Z-rotation); 2) reverse Z-rotation; 3) head rotation toward subject's left, $\sim 5^{\circ}$; 4) reverse Z-rotation; 5) head nodding toward chest, $\sim 5^{\circ}$ (X rotation); 6) reverse X-rotation; 7) head nodding toward subject's superior, $\sim 5^{\circ}$; and 8) reverse X-rotation. Subjects were instructed to stay motionless between scans. PROMO and MPT tracking data were collected simultaneously during each PRESS scan. Moreover, MPT tracking was enabled throughout the experiment to detect possible subject motion during the gradient echo (GRE) scans. The MPT sampling rate was 80 Hz. PROMO motion estimates were obtained every TR. Temporal synchronization of the two data sets was realized by tagging MPT data packets at the beginning of each PROMO navigator, using the trigger signal from the scanner. MPT data coinciding with the last PROMO navigator in each TR cycle constituted MPT tracking. Representative examples showing MPT and PROMO tracking are shown in Figures 2–4.

Head poses at the k-space centers of pre- and post-GRE scans were estimated using MPT tracking data. The unintentional motion between the center of the GRE acquisition and the PRESS acquisition was determined. If it was larger than 1 mm or 1 degree in any of the 6-DOF, image registration results were considered unreliable, and the affected data were discarded. Due to sub-

stantial motion during GRE scans, five X-rotation data were not included in the statistical analysis. The average motions during the remaining GRE acquisitions were 0.18 ± 0.18 , 0.14 ± 0.11 , and 0.21 ± 0.19 for X-, Y-, and Z-translation, respectively, and 0.23 ± 0.22 , 0.14 ± 0.12 , and 0.18 ± 0.14 for X-, Y-, and Z-rotation, respectively. In Figures 2-4, MPT measures of head position and orientation at the centers of pre- and post-GRE acquisitions are shown 16 s before time zero (t = -16 s) and 10 s after the end of the PRESS acquisition (t = 49 s) to illustrate residual motions. The asymmetry in k-space centers results from acquiring GRE scans with partial Fourier (6/ 8). The measurement at t = 49 s in Figures 2–5 represents the net motion from pre-GRE center to post-GRE center based on MPT data and is shown for better interpretation of the results, since the net motion would tend to match the SPM8 measurement if unintentional motion happened during GRE acquisitions. This is because motion estimation by realignment of motion-corrupted GREs is expected to match MPT estimation of motion from pre-GRE center to post-GRE center, unless other potential errors dominate.

The GRE images were skull-stripped using the FSL (27) to improve registration and were registered using the SPM8 (18) realign function, which applies a least-squares method and rigid-body spatial transformation. The default parameters were chosen for realignment, which includes a Gaussian smoothing kernel of 5 mm and second-degree B-spline interpolation to the images before the transformation estimation. The registration parameters produced by SPM8 yielded a pose difference that was converted to MR coordinates and used as a reference for comparison with PROMO and MPT estimates of the head motion. Tracking errors for PROMO and MPT were calculated by comparing six motion parameters at the end of the spectroscopy scan with those of the SPM8 registration parameters. The mean-signed-error



FIG. 3. Motion trajectories for a representative Z-rotation movement performed by one subject. Three translation measurements (top row) and three rotation measurements (bottom row) of MPT (black crosses) and PROMO (blue squares) are compared with image registration parameters (red circles). MPT estimates of pose at GRE centers are shown at times t = -16 s and t = 49 s.

(MSE), mean-absolute-error (MAE), maximum-absoluteerror (MaxAE), and standard deviation (STD) for each motion parameter were calculated for each experiment. One-sample t tests were used to determine whether

signed tracking errors (relative to SPM8) and the MPT and PROMO difference (MPT-PROMO) differed significantly from zero. Paired t tests were performed on the signed tracking errors of MPT and PROMO to determine



FIG. 4. Motion trajectories for a representative X-rotation performed by one subject. Three translation (top row) and three rotation measurements (bottom row) of MPT (black crosses) and PROMO (blue squares) are compared with image registration parameters (red circles). MPT estimates of pose at GRE centers are shown at times t = -16 s and t = 49 s. This figure illustrates involuntary motion during pre- and post-GRE acquisitions resulting in overestimation of MPT in R_x measurement. The MPT measurement from pre-GRE center to post-GRE center (black x at t = 49 s) matches better than MPT measurement at t = 39s with SPM8 (red circles).



FIG. 5. Scatter plots of 6-DOF measurements for the X-rotation experiments (left half) and Z-rotation experiments (right half), with linear fit. Correlation coefficients (*R*) and linear fit function (with intercept fixed at 0) are shown.

| Degrees of | MPT-SPM8 | | | PROMO-SPM8 | | | MPT-PROMO | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|
| freedom | $MSE\pmSD$ | $MAE\pmSD$ | MaxAE | $MSE\pmSD$ | $MAE\pmSD$ | MaxAE | $MSE\pmSD$ | $MAE\pmSD$ | MaxAE |
| T _x (mm) | 0.01 ± 0.50 | $\textbf{0.38} \pm \textbf{0.31}$ | 1.19 | $\textbf{0.10} \pm \textbf{0.50}$ | $\textbf{0.39} \pm \textbf{0.33}$ | 1.50 | -0.09 ± 0.64 | $\textbf{0.48} \pm \textbf{0.42}$ | 1.45 |
| T _y (mm) | $-0.23^{a} \pm 0.53$ | $\textbf{0.46} \pm \textbf{0.35}$ | 1.38 | $\textbf{0.17} \pm \textbf{0.74}$ | $\textbf{0.53} \pm \textbf{0.53}$ | 2.21 | $-0.40^{ab} \pm 0.78$ | $\textbf{0.72} \pm \textbf{0.49}$ | 1.81 |
| T _z (mm) | -0.01 ± 1.10 | $\textbf{0.85} \pm \textbf{0.71}$ | 2.76 | 0.01 ± 0.51 | $\textbf{0.39} \pm \textbf{0.31}$ | 1.10 | -0.02 ± 1.25 | $0.87^{	ext{b}} \pm 0.89$ | 3.71 |
| R _x (°) | $\textbf{0.05} \pm \textbf{0.68}$ | $\textbf{0.51} \pm \textbf{0.48}$ | 1.68 | $\textbf{0.11} \pm \textbf{0.97}$ | $\textbf{0.63} \pm \textbf{0.74}$ | 2.92 | -0.07 ± 1.19 | $\textbf{0.88} \pm \textbf{0.80}$ | 2.95 |
| R _y (°) | $\textbf{0.04} \pm \textbf{0.85}$ | $\textbf{0.67} \pm \textbf{0.52}$ | 2.08 | $-0.23^{a} \pm 0.63$ | $\textbf{0.48} \pm \textbf{0.47}$ | 1.96 | 0.27 ^a ± 1.03 | $\textbf{0.85} \pm \textbf{0.63}$ | 2.43 |
| R _z (°) | -0.13 ± 0.53 | 0.44 ± 0.30 | 1.24 | -0.03 ± 0.56 | $\textbf{0.43} \pm \textbf{0.35}$ | 1.26 | -0.10 ± 0.59 | $\textbf{0.43} \pm \textbf{0.41}$ | 1.72 |

MSE, MAE, MaxAE, and Standard Deviations (SD) of MPT and PROMO Tracking Errors and Their Differences Across 40 Experiments

^aP < 0.05, one sample *t* tests.

^bP < 0.05, paired t tests.

whether the two methods differ in accuracy. Moreover, correlation coefficients and linear regression parameters were calculated to compare the 6-DOF motion parameters measured by MPT and PROMO with the corresponding parameters measured by SPM8 for X-rotation and Z-rotation experiments separately.

RESULTS

Table 1

Table 1 summarizes the MSE, MAE, MaxAE, and standard deviations of MPT and PROMO tracking errors relative to the SPM8 registration. MSEs of MPT tracking were less than 0.3 mm and 0.2° in all 6-DOF, whereas MSEs of PROMO tracking ranged up to approximately 0.2 mm and 0.3° . One-sample t tests on MPT tracking errors relative to SPM8 yielded significant differences in T_v, whereas PROMO tracking errors (relative to SPM8) were significant for the R_v measurements (P < 0.05). Differences between MPT and PROMO errors were significant in T_v (Table 1). Likewise, paired t tests between MPT and PROMO showed a significant difference in the T_v measurement (P < 0.05). MAEs for both MPT and PROMO tracking errors were within 1 mm and 1°. MaxAEs ranged up to approximately 2.8 mm and 2.1° for MPT and 2.2 mm and 2.9° for PROMO. Paired t tests between MAEs of MPT and PROMO yielded significance in the T_z measurement.

Figures 2–4 show simultaneously acquired motion trajectories of PROMO (blue square) and MPT (black cross) and reference SPM8 measurement of net motion (red circle). The black crosses at approximately 16 s before the zero point and 10 s after the PRESS acquisition are MPT measurements corresponding to the centers of pre- and post-GRE acquisitions. MPT values at pre- and post-GRE centers were expected to match with MPT values at the beginning (t = 0) and the end (t = 39 s) of PRESS if there was no unintentional motion during GRE acquisitions. The measurement (black cross) at t = 49 s indicates the net motion from pre-GRE center to post-GRE center based on MPT data.

Figure 2 shows the trajectories for the eight movements performed by one subject. The top row shows the results of four Z-rotations; the bottom row shows the results of four X-rotations. In this example, MPT and PROMO agreed with SPM8 to within 1 mm and 1° for the four Z-rotations. No unintentional motion was observed during pre- or post-GRE acquisitions in Zrotations according to MPT. On the other hand, MPT overestimated the rotation in comparison with SPM8 in the first and third X-rotations, whereas PROMO matched it well. However, PROMO underestimated the motion, whereas MPT performed relatively better in the second and fourth Z-rotations. Some involuntary motion was observed during the post-GRE scan for the first X-rotation and during pre-GRE scans for the second and fourth X-rotations. Net motion from the center of pre-GRE acquisition to the center of post-GRE acquisition by MPT (black cross at t=49 s) was a better match than MPT data (t=39 s) at the end of the PRESS acquisition.

Figures 3 and 4 show three translations and three rotations for representative Z- and X-rotations performed by the same subject. For Z-rotation (Figure 3), MPT and PROMO yielded results that matched SPM8 to within 1 mm/degree for all 6-DOF. PROMO overestimated T_x and T_v measurements, whereas MPT underestimated them. Unintentional motion (within 1 mm) was observed in post-GRE acquisition in T_x and T_v measurements. MPT estimation of net motion between GRE acquisition centers did not agree with SPM8. Figure 4 shows that PROMO was in agreement with image registration to within 1° for R_x , while MPT overestimated it by about 1.2°. However, involuntary motion was observed during pre-GRE and particularly post-GRE acquisitions. MPT estimation of net motion between the centers of pre- and post-GRE acquisition (black cross at t = 49 s) better matched the SPM8 measurement of net motion in all degrees of freedom.

Table 2 presents the correlation coefficients and the slopes of linear regressions for all 6-DOF. For Z-rotation experiments, a linear fit of MPT versus SPM8 in R_z yielded a slope of 0.98; for PROMO versus SPM8, the slope was 1.01 (Fig. 5). The relationship between the two tracking methods and SPM8 in Rx was more divergent for the X-rotation experiments, with slopes of 1.05 (MPT versus SPM8) and 0.84 (PROMO versus SPM8) (Fig. 5). Similarly, the R_x slopes in Z-rotation experiments were 1.20 and 0.84 for MPT and PROMO. Motion measurements of MPT and PROMO were generally highly correlated with the SPM8 measurements (Table 2). However, both tracking systems yielded low correlations against SPM8 for R_v measurements during Xrotations and Tz measurements during Z-rotations, most likely because the ranges of R_v and T_z motions in the associated experiments were small (within $\sim 1^{\circ}$).

DISCUSSION

Two primary conclusions can be derived from this comparison study of MPT and PROMO. First, both methods

| | | X-rotation | | | | Z-rotation | | | |
|--------------------|------|------------|-------|-------|------|------------|-------|-------|--|
| | MPT | | PROMO | | MPT | | PROMO | | |
| Degrees of freedom | CC | Slope | CC | Slope | CC | Slope | CC | Slope | |
| T _x | 0.94 | 0.95 | 0.96 | 1.06 | 0.99 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.04 | |
| T _v | 0.89 | 1.28 | 0.69 | 1.06 | 0.96 | 0.82 | 0.95 | 0.93 | |
| Tz | 0.75 | 0.93 | 0.92 | 1.04 | 0.57 | 1.16 | 0.86 | 0.85 | |
| R _x | 1.00 | 1.05 | 0.99 | 0.84 | 0.93 | 1.20 | 0.94 | 0.84 | |
| R _v | 0.33 | 0.38 | 0.59 | 0.65 | 0.90 | 0.73 | 0.97 | 1.12 | |
| R _z | 0.95 | 1.05 | 0.93 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.98 | 1.00 | 1.01 | |

Table 2 Correlation Coefficients (CC) and Slopes of the Linear Regressions for a Given Tracking Method and SPM8

provide sub-millimeter and better than 1° tracking accuracies when image registration is used as a reference (Table 1, mean absolute errors). Second, the tracking errors of both systems are notably larger for in vivo scans than off-line tests and simulations would suggest (Table 1, maximum absolute errors).

Because subjects performed Z-rotation (head shaking) and X-rotation (head nodding), this discussion focuses on the primary rotation angles: R_z and R_x that represent the largest motion. The three measurements (SPM8, MPT, and PROMO) agreed well on the Z-rotation experiments, particularly in R_z (slope 0.98, Table 2) and T_x (slope 0.97, Table 2), which is associated largely with Z-rotations. However, there were some discrepancies in the other degrees of freedom (Table 2), primarily due to low range of motion (Fig. 5). The discrepancies in T_x and T_y in Figure 3 might be a combination of involuntary translation during post-GRE acquisition, low range of motion (particularly for T_y), and other effects.

Conversely, MPT, PROMO, and image registration showed larger discrepancies for the X-rotation experiments. The primary rotation angle (R_x) measured by MPT and PROMO differed from SPM8 by approximately 5% and -16%, respectively (Table 2). Given that MPT shows 0.1 mm and 0.1° accuracy on benchmark tests, and simulations with PROMO indicate a 0.3-mm steadystate accuracy, this suggests several practical difficulties with prospective motion correction. The discrepancies among three methods, particularly overestimation by MPT during nodding motion, can be due to the residual involuntary motion during the "before" or "after" structural scan. During X-rotation experiments, subjects rotated their heads in the superior or inferior direction by approximately 10°. However, the rotated head orientation was relatively difficult to maintain perfectly compared with Z-rotation. Based on MPT tracking, most subjects moved back slightly toward the original orientation during GRE acquisition (Fig. 2, first and third Xrotations). We discarded five X-rotation experiments due to larger involuntary movements (>1 mm/degree) during GRE scans, thereby confining the involuntary motion to approximately 0.2 ± 0.2 mm/degrees. Unintentional motion during post-GRE acquisition is shown in Figure 4. Of note, MPT estimation of net motion between the acquisition centers of pre- and post-GRE scans (black cross at t=49 s) matched well with image registration (red circle). The involuntary motion may explain the significant deviations in T_y (Table 1, P < 0.05; Table 2, MPT slope = 1.28) and T_z (Table 1) measurements by MPT and PROMO, since an error in X-rotation largely affects T_y and T_z measures while having almost no effect on T_x.

The second explanation for the discrepancies in nodding type motion, and particularly for PROMO's underestimation (Table 2) as illustrated in the second Xrotation in Figure 2, might be the motion-by-magnetic field interactions causing distortions in PROMO navigator images. Specifically, motion-induced susceptibility changes in the sinus region can alter the appearance of susceptibility-induced signal loss artifacts. Given that PROMO navigator voxels are 1 cm, even a subtle change in the intensity of a few voxels may affect PROMO estimates. Because an X-rotation changes the orientation of air-tissue interfaces relative to B0, we expect larger motion-associated PROMO image distortions (and hence errors) in X-rotation experiments compared with Zrotation experiments (28). Of note, underestimation by PROMO is not seen in the first and third X-rotations in Figure 2, although it is reported to be about -16% in Table 2. However, the X-rotation was rather low in these examples ($\sim 5^{\circ}$), which would tend to attenuate the absolute error. Moreover, the significance in PROMO tracking errors in T_v (Table 1, P < 0.05) can be the result of aforementioned reasons and the low range of R_v (within 2°), as seen in Figure 5.

There are two types of potential error sources in MPT tracking that might account for the discrepancies with image registration. The first one is the cross-calibration (26). Unlike PROMO, MPT data are intrinsically obtained in the camera coordinate frame and are transformed into the scanner frame using a calibration; therefore, errors in the transformation matrix may lead to tracking errors. However, with estimated upper bounds of 0.03° and 0.06 mm, residual tracking errors are most likely not the predominant source of inconsistencies between MPT and image registration. Of note, to minimize the effects of cross-calibration errors and possibly eliminate the need for the cross-registration step, Aksoy et al. (29) proposed a combination of prospective optical motion correction with retrospective entropy-based autofocusing (30). Incorporation of this procedure could improve optimization of the cross-calibration. The second potential source of error in MPT tracking (or in fact any system that uses a marker) is the fixation of the target. The literature shows a variety of fixation techniques, including mouthpieces (9), sports goggles (10), and headbands (11,31); however, all of these techniques can have fixation issues.

In this study, we taped the target directly to the subject's head above the eyebrows. The MPT target was well tolerated by subjects, in part due to its light weight. The marker is assumed to have a fixed position relative to the skull and brain, but this may not hold true during facial movements. Furthermore, friction between the back of the head and the coil may subtly shift the scalp relative to the brain during motion. Because this study was performed on motivated volunteers who were instructed to keep their faces motionless, we believe that the effect of unwanted skin motion was minimal, but such effects are difficult to assess quantitatively. However, it is difficult to discern how slight, presumably random alterations in marker fixation would cause a systematic discrepancy of 5% between MPT and SPM8 measures. These considerations highlight the fact that practical difficulties make the tracking errors of both systems markedly larger in realistic in vivo scans than offline tests and simulations would suggest.

Tracking of head motion based on PROMO presents a separate set of problems. Because the tracking quality of PROMO relies on the quality of the navigator images, effects such as scanner instabilities or motion-dependent off-resonance effects that degrade the navigator images may also corrupt rigid-body motion estimates. The overestimation of PROMO in the second and fourth Zrotations in Figure 2 might be related to quality of navigator images in such relatively large motions ($\sim 10^{\circ}$). Moreover, sudden motions cannot be accurately detected by PROMO due to its low sampling rate. The higher sampling rate of MPT compared with PROMO allows for more accurate motion detection in cases of fast motions. Additionally, the Kalman filter used by PROMO to reduce measurement noise may further smooth out sudden changes in motion parameters. The PROMO measurement errors presented here are somewhat larger than those reported by White et al (5). This may be due to the use of five navigator sets in the original PROMO implementation, which may result in more stable motion estimation. Additionally, the accuracy of PROMO in realworld situations will depend in a complicated way on the nature of the host sequence, and on the amount of available free time (which restricts the allowable PROMO imaging parameters).

Although optical tracking may suffer from errors such as cross-calibration or difficulties with target fixation, the MPT system also offers unique advantages for motion estimation compared with PROMO and other MR-based tracking systems. First, its high sampling rate allows detection of faster movements. Second, the MPT system (and potentially other external tracking systems) demands only a few milliseconds time in the sequence to update gradients and radiofrequency pulses, and does not interfere with the MR measurement. Therefore, it can be implemented with essentially all available MR sequences. Third, the number of measurements and adjustments within a single MR excitation is not restricted to one. Herbst et al. (32) reported that a quasicontinuous update of gradients using MPT tracking data is possible, allowing correction of motion-induced gradient moment errors during diffusion imaging. Likewise, Gumus et al. demonstrated that motion-induced gradient

moment errors in DTI scans can be eliminated by dynamically applying small correction gradients immediately prior to the readout (21). Fourth, the MPT tracking updates can be placed anywhere in the pulse sequence without interfering with the imaging experiment or relaxation status of the spins. Conversely, the major advantages of MR-based tracking systems, such as PROMO, is that they do not necessitate additional equipment such as a camera or target, and directly track the tissue of issue (i.e., MR navigators do not suffer from marker fixation issues).

This study has two limitations. First, the tracking results reported are the accuracies of PROMO and MPT in comparison to SPM8 image registration for steadystate head pose. Thus, possible inaccuracies in the SPM8 registration algorithm set a limitation for the evaluation of both methods. The SPM realignment algorithm (19) was reported to be highly accurate (with an error below 0.5 mm in three directions) (33), yielding better motion estimation than the alternative automatic image registration algorithm (34). To increase the accuracy of SPM8 realignment, we also used isotropic resolution (2 \times 2 \times 2 mm) in GRE acquisitions. The second limitation of this study is the residual subject motion during GRE scans. To avoid subject motion during structural scans, we kept the scan time for the reference GRE scans as short as possible (26 s). Additionally, we used MPT data during GRE scans to detect large motions and eliminated data sets with large involuntary motion during GRE scans, confining the involuntary motion to 0.2 ± 0.2 mm/ degrees. After these efforts, we defined image registration as the gold standard for our experiments. However, inadvertent motion during structural scans can impair the registration accuracy of SPM8. Thus, the discrepancy between the tracking systems and image registration can be due in part to the imperfect realignment of structural scans corrupted by residual unwanted subject motion. Of note, instead of discarding the data with unwanted motion, we also had the option of freezing the motion during GREs using MPT data. However, this approach might introduce bias toward eliminating errors relative to MPT and was therefore not implemented. Likewise, the use of MPT to detect motion during structural scans might be objectionable, since the purpose of the study was to compare MPT with PROMO. However, this is not a real limitation because MPT data during GRE acquisitions were only used to discard motion-corrupted data, whereas subjects were supposed to be stationary. Therefore, the effect of this action is same on both MPT and PROMO and aided to select quality structural data for the MPT and PROMO comparison.

This study highlights the fact that an independent method to evaluate prospective motion correction in the MR environment is needed. The motion simulator approach by Prieto et al. (35) could be an extremely useful tool in making reproducible movements in the MR environment and provide a gold standard for real-time motion tracking studies. However, PROMO was designed to track the human brain and may not perform best in phantom experiments, since it particularly uses initial acquisitions to mask the brain and exclude nonrigid parts such as jaw or neck. Therefore, the ideal comparison of PROMO and MPT correction may involve their relative improvements on image or spectral quality. However, the design of such an experiment is challenging, because reproducible motion is required to fairly compare both systems, and it is difficult for even welltrained subjects to perform exactly the same movement twice. Therefore, we compared the tracking accuracy of the two systems.

In conclusion, we simultaneously tested two very different approaches to real-time motion tracking on human subjects in the MRI environment and found that both methods yielded similar performance in terms of accuracy (sub-millimeter and less than 1°) when image registration was used as a reference. Tracking errors were measured larger than off-line tests indicating the effect of practical difficulties in real-life experiments. This study provides the first in vivo comparison of optical and navigator-based tracking systems described in the literature. Future work is required to further compare the two methods with higher precision.

REFERENCES

- Welch EB, Manduca A, Grimm RC, Ward HA, Jack CR Jr. Spherical navigator echoes for full 3D rigid body motion measurement in MRI. Magn Reson Med 2002;47:32–41.
- Welch EB, Rossman PJ, Felmlee JP, Manduca A. Self-navigated motion correction using moments of spatial projections in radial MRI. Magn Reson Med 2004;52:337–345.
- Maclaren J, Herbst M, Speck O, Zaitsev M. Prospective motion correction in brain imaging: a review. Magn Reson Med 2013;69:621–636.
- van der Kouwe AJ, Benner T, Dale AM. Real-time rigid body motion correction and shimming using cloverleaf navigators. Magn Reson Med 2006;56:1019–1032.
- White N, Roddey C, Shankaranarayanan A, Han E, Rettmann D, Santos J, Kuperman J, Dale A. PROMO: Real-time prospective motion correction in MRI using image-based tracking. Magn Reson Med 2010;63:91–105.
- Keating B, Deng W, Roddey JC, White N, Dale A, Stenger VA, Ernst T. Prospective motion correction for single-voxel 1H MR spectroscopy. Magn Reson Med 2010;64:672–679.
- Alhamud A, Tisdall MD, Hess AT, Hasan KM, Meintjes EM, van der Kouwe AJ. Volumetric navigators for real-time motion correction in diffusion tensor imaging. Magn Reson Med 2012;68:1097–1108.
- Zaitsev M, Dold C, Sakas G, Hennig J, Speck O. Magnetic resonance imaging of freely moving objects: prospective real-time motion correction using an external optical motion tracking system. Neuroimage 2006;31:1038–1050.
- Speck O, Hennig J, Zaitsev M. Prospective real-time slice-by-slice motion correction for fMRI in freely moving subjects. MAGMA 2006; 19:55–61.
- Andrews-Shigaki BC, Armstrong BS, Zaitsev M, Ernst T. Prospective motion correction for magnetic resonance spectroscopy using single camera Retro-Grate reflector optical tracking. J Magn Reson Imaging 2011;33:498–504.
- Aksoy M, Forman C, Straka M, Skare S, Holdsworth S, Hornegger J, Bammer R. Real-time optical motion correction for diffusion tensor imaging. Magn Reson Med 2011;66:366–378.
- Maclaren J, Armstrong BS, Barrows RT, et al. Measurement and correction of microscopic head motion during magnetic resonance imaging of the brain. PLoS One 2012;7:e48088.
- Kober T, Gruetter R, Krueger G. Prospective and retrospective motion correction in diffusion magnetic resonance imaging of the human brain. Neuroimage 2012;59:389–398.
- Qin L, van Gelderen P, Derbyshire JA, Jin F, Lee J, de Zwart JA, Tao Y, Duyn JH. Prospective head-movement correction for high-

resolution MRI using an in-bore optical tracking system. Magn Reson Med 2009;62:924–934.

- Yancey SE, Rotenberg DJ, Tam F, Chiew M, Ranieri S, Biswas L, Anderson KJ, Baker SN, Wright GA, Graham SJ. Spin-history artifact during functional MRI: potential for adaptive correction. Med Phys 2011;38:4634–4646.
- Schulz J, Siegert T, Reimer E, Labadie C, Maclaren J, Herbst M, Zaitsev M, Turner R. An embedded optical tracking system for motion-corrected magnetic resonance imaging at 7T. MAGMA 2012; 25:443–453.
- Keating B, Ernst T. Real-time dynamic frequency and shim correction for single-voxel magnetic resonance spectroscopy. Magn Reson Med 2012;68:1339–1345.
- Friston KJ, Holmes AP, Worsley KJ, Poline J-B, Frith C, Frackowiak RSJ. Statistical parametric maps in functional imaging: a general linear approach. Hum Brain Mapp 1995;2:189–210.
- Friston KJ, Ashburner J, Frith CD, Poline JB, Heather JD, Frackowiak RSJ. Spatial registration and normalization of images. Human Brain Mapping 1995;3:165–189.
- Bottomley PA. Spatial localization in NMR spectroscopy in vivo. Ann N Y Acad Sci 1987;508:333–348.
- Gumus K, Keating B, Poser BA, Armstrong B, Chang L, Maclaren J, Prieto T, Speck O, Zaitsev M, Ernst T. Prevention of motion-induced signal loss in diffusion-weighted echo-planar imaging by dynamic restoration of gradient moments. Magn Reson Med 2014;71:2006– 2013.
- Weinhandl JT, Armstrong BS, Kusik TP, Barrows RT, O'Connor KM. Validation of a single camera three-dimensional motion tracking system. J Biomech 2010;43:1437–1440.
- 23. Armstrong BS. Optical Markers and Detection Accuracy. ISMRM Workshop on Current Concepts of Motion Correction for MRI & MRS, Kitzbuhel, Austria, 2010.
- Thesen S, Heid O, Mueller E, Schad LR. Prospective acquisition correction for head motion with image-based tracking for real-time fMRI. Magn Reson Med 2000;44:457–465.
- Kadashevich I, Appu D, Speck O. Automatic motion selection in one step cross-calibration for prospective MR motion correction. ESMRMB 2011:266.
- Zahneisen B, Keating B, Ernst T. Propagation of calibration errors in prospective motion correction using external tracking. Magn Reson Med 2014;72:381–388.
- Smith SM. Fast robust automated brain extraction. Hum Brain Mapp 2002;17:143–155.
- Wu DH, Lewin JS, Duerk JL. Inadequacy of motion correction algorithms in functional MRI: role of susceptibility-induced artifacts. J Magn Reson Imaging 1997;7:365–370.
- Aksoy M, Forman C, Straka M, Cukur T, Hornegger J, Bammer R. Hybrid prospective and retrospective head motion correction to mitigate cross-calibration errors. Magn Reson Med 2012;67:1237–1251.
- Atkinson D, Hill DL, Stoyle PN, Summers PE, Keevil SF. Automatic correction of motion artifacts in magnetic resonance images using an entropy focus criterion. IEEE Trans Med Imaging 1997;16:903–910.
- Ooi MB, Krueger S, Thomas WJ, Swaminathan SV, Brown TR. Prospective real-time correction for arbitrary head motion using active markers. Magn Reson Med 2009;62:943–954.
- Herbst M, Maclaren J, Weigel M, Korvink J, Hennig J, Zaitsev M. Prospective motion correction with continuous gradient updates in diffusion weighted imaging. Magn Reson Med 2012;67:326–338.
- 33. Zamburlini M, de la Fuente-Fernandez R, Stoessl AJ, Ruth TJ, Sossi V. Impact of different realignment algorithms on the SPM analysis of [C-11]raclopride PET studies. 2002 IEEE Nuclear Science Symposium, Conference Record, Volumes 1–3, 2003. p 1080–1084.
- Woods RP, Grafton ST, Holmes CJ, Cherry SR, Mazziotta JC. Automated image registration: I. General methods and intrasubject, intramodality validation. J Comput Assist Tomogr 1998;22:139–152.
- 35. Prieto T, Armstrong B, Brzeski M, Barrows R, Kusik T, Zaitsev M, Speck O, Ernst T. A Mechanism to Produce Translational and Rotational Motion of a Phantom Inside an MR Scanner. In Proceedings of the 19th Annual Meeting of ISMRM Montreal, Canada, 2011. p 1087.