

Guest Editorial

# Recent Developments on System Function/Matrix Representation, Hybrid Simulation Techniques, and Magnetic Actuation

Tobias Kluth<sup>a,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Center for Industrial Mathematics, University of Bremen, Bremen, Germany

\*Corresponding author, email: [tkluth@math.uni-bremen.de](mailto:tkluth@math.uni-bremen.de)

Published online 02 October 2020

© 2020 Kluth; licensee Infinite Science Publishing GmbH

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

## Abstract

The first issue of the sixth volume of the International Journal on Magnetic Particle Imaging presents four papers focusing on different aspects of the image reconstruction problem in magnetic particle imaging (MPI) and developments in magnetic actuation. The original research articles provide deeper insights into system function/matrix representation in terms of Chebyshev polynomials and they exploit a singular value decomposition (SVD) approach to reduce the size of the imaging problem. Introducing new experimental techniques enable gathering insights in the MPI methodology and magnetic actuation applications benefit from the development and analysis of new tools.

As an emerging imaging modality, magnetic particle imaging (MPI) provides a rich bag of current research directions. Many questions in the fields of system design, modeling, representation, and analysis, image reconstruction, and medical applications are still open. The first issue of the sixth volume includes four research papers addressing selected new and old questions in this context. One important prerequisite for accurate and efficient image reconstruction is a proper understanding of the system function/matrix in MPI. The first two articles of this issue particularly address the problem of system function/matrix representation from two different points of views.

Already in the early days of MPI research it was found for 1D excitation that the signal in Fourier domain corresponds to a certain Chebyshev polynomial when using the simplified "equilibrium" model based on the Langevin function [1]. In the same work the authors also

reported empirically on multi-dimensional sinusoidal excitation patterns which motivated the conjecture that the multi-dimensional case extends to tensor products of Chebyshev polynomials. The first article of the present issue [2] addresses this open question and provides the desired solution by deriving an explicit system function representation in terms of a series of tensor products of Chebyshev polynomials. It is further accompanied by empirical results on two approximation approaches exploiting this series expansion.

Another aspect in system matrix representation is its size which often results in large scale problem formulations for the image reconstruction problem, particularly for 3D imaging applications. Theoretical works indicate that the MPI image reconstruction problem can suffer from a high degree of ill-posedness [3–5]. But these findings also predict the high potential of low-rank approximations, such as sparse representations in certain bases

[6–8], optimized orthogonal transforms [9], or exploiting the singular value decomposition (SVD) [10]. The second article of this issue [11] proposes an efficient approach for system matrix representation of a frame-by-frame 1D excitation sequence (each frame corresponding to a different offset field, respectively position of the Cartesian excitation pattern). For any calibration measurement, the measured time signal (concatenated for all frames) is rearranged in a 2D frame-time matrix from which the SVD is carried out to obtain low-rank representations and their subsequent combination is used to solve the image reconstruction problem. Various heuristic rules for these steps are investigated by the authors illustrating the advantages of the proposed method in terms of reconstruction errors and computation times in a simulation study.

The third article [12] introduces a novel simulation technique to investigate the capabilities of MPI by introducing so-called "hybrid phantoms" which are in line with the hybrid system matrix approach [13–16]. The authors illustrate how a multi-dimensional MPS system can be exploited to emulate measurements of these hybrid phantoms. The phantoms benefit from superior properties of the MPS system, i.e., they yield high SNR measurement signals. Furthermore, another advantage of the hybrid phantoms is that they implicitly encode the physical behavior of the nanoparticles and thus allow more realistic simulations of phantom measurements in cases where model-based simulations are less accurate. Static 1D and 2D phantoms, and dynamic 3D phantoms are emulated in the article. Based on this approach effects on spatial resolution for 1D excitation (multiple vs. single receive coil) and 2D excitation (sine vs. cosine excitation) are investigated experimentally. In addition, an example for dynamic concentration reconstruction in 3D is provided which further illustrates the potential of hybrid phantoms.

Compared to the first three articles of the present issue, the fourth article [17] mainly addresses the topic of magnetic actuation to move magnetic swimmers in the field of view and uses MPI as a tool for the purpose of visualization, respectively potential tracking, only. In contrast to earlier works [18] where the swimmer has been coated by magnetic nanoparticles, the authors propose a new approach where the entire swimmer is made of 3D-printing material. These 3D-printed swimmers are then analyzed with respect to their material properties and steerability. In addition, its visualization by MPI is investigated further.

In summary, the articles of this issue include deeper insights into the MPI system function/matrix representation, new hybrid simulation techniques, and novel developments in magnetic actuation applications. The answers to the open questions in this issue will further guide image reconstruction and application research in MPI.

## References

- [1] J. Rahmer, J. Weizenecker, B. Gleich, and J. Borgert. Signal encoding in magnetic particle imaging: properties of the system function. *BMC Medical Imaging*, 9:4, 2009, doi:[10.1186/1471-2342-9-4](https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2342-9-4).
- [2] M. Maass and A. Mertins. On the Representation of Magnetic Particle Imaging in Fourier Space. *International Journal on Magnetic Particle Imaging*, 6(1), 2019, doi:[10.18416/IJMPI.2019.1912001](https://doi.org/10.18416/IJMPI.2019.1912001).
- [3] T. März and A. Weinmann. Model-based reconstruction for magnetic particle imaging in 2D and 3D. *Inverse Problems and Imaging*, 10(4):1087–1110, 2016, doi:[10.3934/ipi.2016033](https://doi.org/10.3934/ipi.2016033).
- [4] W. Erb, A. Weinmann, M. Ahlborg, C. Brandt, G. Bringout, T. M. Buzug, J. Frikel, C. Kaethner, T. Knopp, T. März, M. Möddel, M. Storath, and A. Weber. Mathematical analysis of the 1D model and reconstruction schemes for magnetic particle imaging. *Inverse Problems*, 34(5):055012, 2018, doi:[10.1088/1361-6420/aab8d1](https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6420/aab8d1).
- [5] T. Kluth, B. Jin, and G. Li. On the degree of ill-posedness of multi-dimensional magnetic particle imaging. *Inverse Problems*, 34(9):095006, 2018, doi:[10.1088/1361-6420/aad015](https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6420/aad015).
- [6] J. Lampe, C. Bassoy, J. Rahmer, J. Weizenecker, H. Voss, B. Gleich, and J. Borgert. Fast reconstruction in magnetic particle imaging. *Physics in Medicine and Biology*, 57(4):1113–1134, 2012, doi:[10.1088/0031-9155/57/4/1113](https://doi.org/10.1088/0031-9155/57/4/1113).
- [7] T. Knopp and A. Weber. Local System Matrix Compression for Efficient Reconstruction in Magnetic Particle Imaging. *Advances in Mathematical Physics*, 2015:1–7, 2015, doi:[10.1155/2015/472818](https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/472818).
- [8] S. Ilbey, C. B. Top, A. Gungor, T. Cukur, E. U. Saritas, and H. E. Guven. Fast System Calibration with Coded Calibration Scenes for Magnetic Particle Imaging. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, pp. 1–1, 2019, doi:[10.1109/TMI.2019.2896289](https://doi.org/10.1109/TMI.2019.2896289).
- [9] M. Maass, K. Bente, M. Ahlborg, H. Medimagh, H. Phan, T. M. Buzug, and A. Mertins. Optimized Compression of MPI System Matrices Using a Symmetry-Preserving Secondary Orthogonal Transform. *International Journal on Magnetic Particle Imaging*, 2(1), 2016, doi:[10.18416/IJMPI.2016.1607002](https://doi.org/10.18416/IJMPI.2016.1607002).
- [10] T. Kluth and B. Jin. Enhanced reconstruction in magnetic particle imaging by whitening and randomized SVD approximation. *Physics in Medicine & Biology*, 64(12):125026, 2019, doi:[10.1088/1361-6560/ab1a4f](https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6560/ab1a4f).
- [11] Y. Ono and Y. Ishihara. Magnetic Particle Imaging Using Discrete Sampling and Image Reconstruction with Few Orthogonal Bases Obtained by Singular Value Decomposition of Selected Delta Responses. *International Journal on Magnetic Particle Imaging*, 6(1), 2020, doi:[10.18416/IJMPI.2020.2003003](https://doi.org/10.18416/IJMPI.2020.2003003).
- [12] A. von Gladiss, M. Graeser, A. Cordes, A. C. Bakenecker, A. Behrends, X. Chen, and T. M. Buzug. Investigating Spatial Resolution, Field Sequences and Image Reconstruction Strategies using Hybrid Phantoms in MPI. *International Journal on Magnetic Particle Imaging*, 6(1), 2020, doi:[10.18416/IJMPI.2020.2003004](https://doi.org/10.18416/IJMPI.2020.2003004).
- [13] M. Gruettner, M. Graeser, S. Biederer, T. F. Sattel, H. Wojtczyk, W. Tenner, T. Knopp, B. Gleich, J. Borgert, and T. M. Buzug. 1D-image reconstruction for magnetic particle imaging using a hybrid system function, in *2011 IEEE Nuclear Science Symposium Conference Record*, 2545–2548, 2011, doi:[10.1109/NSSMIC.2011.6152687](https://doi.org/10.1109/NSSMIC.2011.6152687).
- [14] A. Halkola, T. Buzug, J. Rahmer, B. Gleich, and C. Bontus. System Calibration Unit for Magnetic Particle Imaging: Focus Field Based System Function, in *Magnetic Particle Imaging. A Novel SPIO Nanoparticle Imaging Technique*, 2012, ch. Modelling, 27–31, doi:[10.1007/978-3-642-24133-8\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-24133-8_5).
- [15] D. Schmidt, M. Graeser, A. von Gladiss, T. M. Buzug, and U. Steinhoff. Imaging Characterization of MPI Tracers Employing Offset Measurements in a two Dimensional Magnetic Particle Spectrometer. *International Journal on Magnetic Particle Imaging*, 1(2), 2016, doi:[10.18416/IJMPI.2016.1604002](https://doi.org/10.18416/IJMPI.2016.1604002).
- [16] A. von Gladiss, M. Graeser, P. Szwargulski, T. Knopp, and T. M. Buzug. Hybrid system calibration for multidimensional magnetic particle imaging. *Physics in Medicine and Biology*, 62(9):3392–3406, 2017, doi:[10.1088/1361-6560/aa5340](https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6560/aa5340).

- [17] A. C. Bakenecker, A. von Gladiss, T. Friedrich, and T. M. Buzug. 3D-Printing with Incorporated Iron Particles for Magnetic Actuation and MPI. *International Journal on Magnetic Particle Imaging*, 6(1), 2020, doi:[10.18416/IJMPL.2020.2003001](https://doi.org/10.18416/IJMPL.2020.2003001).
- [18] A. C. Bakenecker, A. von Gladiss, T. Friedrich, U. Heinen, H. Lehr, K. Lüdtke-Buzug, and T. M. Buzug. Actuation and visualization of a magnetically coated swimmer with magnetic particle imaging. *Journal of Magnetism and Magnetic Materials*, 473:495–500, 2019, doi:[10.1016/j.jmmm.2018.10.056](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmmm.2018.10.056).