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A B S T R A C T

Purpose: To develop and evaluate a novel 3D Cartesian sampling scheme which is well suited for time-resolved 3D MRI using parallel imaging and compressed sensing.

Methods: The proposed sampling scheme, termed GOlden-angle CArtesian Randomized Time-resolved (GOCART) 3D MRI, is based on golden angle (GA) Cartesian sampling, with random sampling of the kx-kz phase encode locations along each Cartesian radial spoke. This method was evaluated in conjunction with constrained reconstruction of retrospectively and prospectively undersampled in-vivo dynamic contrast enhanced (DCE) MRI data and simulated phantom data.

Results: In in-vivo retrospective studies and phantom simulations, images reconstructed from phase encodes defined by GOCART were equal to or superior to those with Poisson disc or GA sampling schemes. Typical GOCART sampling tables were generated in < 100 ms. GOCART has also been successfully utilized prospectively to produce clinically valuable whole-brain DCE-MRI images.

Conclusion: GOCART is a practical and efficient sampling scheme for time-resolved 3D MRI. It shows great potential for highly accelerated DCE-MRI and is well suited to modern reconstruction methods such as parallel imaging and compressed sensing.

© 2016 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Introduction

Time-resolved 3D MRI is an imaging technique that enables contrast-enhanced MR angiography (CE-MRA) and dynamic contrast enhanced (DCE) MRI. CE-MRA and DCE-MRI are both dynamic and utilize the same enhancement mechanism, but they have different goals. CE-MRA focuses on vascular signal, where contrast agent concentrations are very high, and high spatiotemporal resolution is critical. DCE-MRI, however, focuses on tissue signals, where contrast agent concentrations are lower, change more slowly, and these subtle changes allow one to quantify pharmacokinetics.

Various sampling and reconstruction techniques have been proposed to address and improve the spatial versus temporal resolution trade-off in CE-MRA and DCE-MRI. Early view-sharing methods such as keyhole [1] and time-resolved imaging of contrast kinetics (TRICKS) [2] filled the missing data from adjacent time frames. Since non-Cartesian sampling is more robust to motion and efficient for dynamic imaging, TRICKS was extended to use radial projections [3] and spirals [4]. Other non-Cartesian implementations include k-space weighted image contrast (KWIC) [5], golden angle stack-of-stars [6], vastly undersampled isotropic projection reconstruction (VIPR) [7], highly constrained back projection (HYPR) [8], and stack-of-spirals [9].

Non-Cartesian sequences are often limited by gradient errors and off-resonance artifacts. For this reason, many investigators have reverted to Cartesian sequences where the phase encode (PE) order provides variable density much like non-Cartesian approaches. Such sequences include Cartesian projection reconstruction (CAPR) [10], stochastic trajectories (TWIST) [11], interleaved variable density (IVD) [12], a multi-level radial profile ordering [13], differential subsampling with Cartesian ordering (DISCO) [14], variable-density Poisson ellipsoid [15] and an ordering that gradually improves spatial resolution [16].

Cartesian and non-Cartesian sequences have also been combined, starting with time resolved interleaved projection sampling with 3D Cartesian Phase and Slice encoding (TRIPPS) [17], which applied rasterized radials on the PE plane, and golden angle radial phase encoding (Golden-RPE) [18], which combined radial sampling and Cartesian readouts. TRIPPS and Golden-RPE were succeeded by golden angle (GA) variants [19], variable-density radial (VDRad) [20] and golden angle spiral variants [21].

Most of the aforementioned methods accelerate time-resolved MRI by undersampling in k-space, and used parallel imaging [22,23] and/or compressed sensing [24] for reconstruction. Poisson disc
sampling [25] has been a popular choice for undersampling since compressed sensing was introduced to MRI [24]. Numerous algorithms have been proposed for efficiently generating Poisson disc sampling patterns, including dart throwing [26], jittersampling [27], best candidate [28], and more recent O(N) boundary sampling [29] and modified dart throwing [30]. Of relevance to this work, Lebel et al. [15] proposed Poisson ellipsoid sampling based on dart-throwing for dynamic imaging by extending the 2D Poisson disc pattern to 3D $k_r$-$k_z$-$t$ space. This method provides excellent transform sparsity, is compatible with parallel imaging, and limits temporal redundancy. Unfortunately, it is computationally intensive, has many input variables, and is poorly suited to variable temporal resolution. In contrast, golden angle Cartesian sampling [19] provides more coherent sampling than the Poisson ellipsoid approach, but allows flexibility in the specification of temporal resolution during reconstruction and allows for fast on-line generation of the phase encode order. Here we denote PD to variable density Poisson ellipsoid sampling and GA to Cartesian golden angle radial sampling. We propose a modified GA approach that combines the benefits of PD and GA. We introduce a sampling probability, via pseudorandom number generation, to add additional incoherence to GA [31]. The proposed approach is termed as GOlden-angle CarTesian Randomized Time-resolved (GOCART) 3D MRI.

**Methods**

**Data acquisition phase encode ordering**

We have implemented continuous data acquisition by modifying a standard 3D Cartesian spoiled gradient echo sequence, where full Cartesian sampling is used along the standard frequency encoding direction $k_x$, and PE sampling in the $k_r$-$k_z$ plane can be freely sub-sampled and/or reordered.

Poisson disc sampling has been shown to be suitable for combined parallel imaging and compressed sensing. Poisson ellipsoid [15] expands Poisson disc to $k_r$-$k_z$-$t$ space with the constraint that samples do not coexist within an ellipsoid surrounding each sample. Variable density is achieved by subdividing the $k_r$-$k_z$ plane into a series of annuli with exponentially decreasing sampling density, and fully sampling central region with 15% of the total samples.

Golden angle sampling [32] supports flexible temporal resolution selection in reconstruction because it provides approximately uniform angular sampling for an arbitrary number of spokes. 3D Cartesian GA implementation [19] is applied in the $k_r$-$k_z$ plane, where Cartesian PEs are selected in order to form a close approximation to golden angle radial spokes.

Based on the GA scheme, we introduce a probability of sampling ($P$) for each PE, a central $k$-space region where $P$ always equals to 1, and a temporal window ($W$) within which the same PE is not repeated. Once a PE is chosen by a GA radial spoke going through it, the chance of acquisition is determined by $P$ ($P \in (0, 1]$), such that part of the PEs along the spoke is skipped. The logical next step is that we can acquire data from subsequent spokes by skipping some PEs in one spoke, and achieve more incoherent and uniform sampling. PE skipping is disabled ($P = 1$) within a predefined central region because the center of $k$-space is especially important for preserving low-frequency image information. Considering that each spoke starts from (or ends in) the center of $k$-space, the center is naturally oversampled, and excessive $k$-space center sampling density needs to be avoided. The temporal window $W$ prevents frequently repeated PEs, and the window width is defined as integer multiple of the TR. Finally, we do not acquire the corners of the $k_r$-$k_z$ plane.

Fig. 1 demonstrates the PEs for single time frames for PD, GOCART with $P$ equal to 0.1, 0.4, 0.7, and 1 (GA), when the reduction factor ($R$) equals to 35× (top row) and 100× (bottom row). The matrix size is 256 × 150, the $P = 1$ central regions account for approximately 15% of PEs, and the temporal window $W$ was empirically set to 70% of the undersampled temporal resolution to limit the PE redundancy. As $P$ decreases, the sampling pattern appears more random, and there are fewer large gaps in $k$-space.
35× is used in our current experimental DCE setup, and 100× is the highest R in this study. As P decreases, more sampling randomization is achieved, and the central region has better coverage.

**Constrained reconstruction**

We employed a sparse SENSE image model [33,34] with multiple constraints applied as l1-norm penalties. The image \( m \) is obtained by minimizing

\[
f(m) = \| F_y S m - y \|_2^2 + \lambda_1 \| T_r m \|_1 + \lambda_2 \| T_s m \|_1 + \lambda_3 \| \psi m \|_1
\]

where \( F_y \) is the undersampling Fourier operator, \( S \) is the sensitivity operator, \( y \) is the acquired k-space data, \( T_r \) is the temporal finite difference, \( T_s \) is spatial finite difference, and \( \psi \) is the spatial wavelet transform. \( \lambda \)'s were carefully chosen to avoid compression artifacts and maintain high data consistency. Once calibrated, \( \lambda \)'s were held constant for all other brain DCE-MRI studies. \( \lambda_2 \) and \( \lambda_3 \) were set to zero in in-vivo retrospective studies and phantom simulations to calibrate and validate the GOCART method. This was done to reduce uncertainties that may be induced from multiple constraints. Multiple constraints are used in in-vivo prospective studies to lessen the burden on individual constraints and minimize compression artifacts due to each transformation [15]. The cost function in Eq. (1) was minimized with an augmented Lagrangian method [35], alternating direction methods of multipliers (ADMM).

**Experiments**

**Point spread function analysis**

The sampling probability \( P \) is a key feature of GOCART and analyzing image-space point spread functions (PSF) provides an intuitive metric for optimizing this parameter. The aim is to reduce coherent side lobes, which is expected to improve compatibility with compressed sensing [24]. The PD sampling tables were always generated separately for different temporal resolutions, while GA and GOCART sampling tables were retrospectively segmented from single generations, respectively. The PSFs were obtained by taking inverse Fourier transforms along the \( k_y-k_z \) dimensions. All the PSFs were normalized to the peaks, and displayed at the same linear scale.

**Retrospective in-vivo studies**

Fully sampled DCE data from five brain tumor patients were acquired on a clinical 3 T scanner (HDxt, GE Healthcare, Waukesha, WI) using an 8-channel head coil and T1-weighted spoiled gradient echo sequence with 15° flip angle and 6 ms TR. Each subject was screened and provided informed consent in accordance with institutional policy. The conventional DCE data had two sizes: A) three datasets with 256 × 186 × 10 matrix size and 24 × 24 × 6 cm\(^3\) FOV, and B) two datasets with 256 × 150 × 10 matrix size and 22 × 22 × 6 cm\(^3\) FOV. All the data had 35 time frames with approximately 10 s temporal resolution.

In our 3D undersampling sequence, the readout direction \( k_x \) is always fully sampled, and constrained reconstruction is effectively recovering samples in the \( k_y-k_z \) plane. Therefore, we fabricated \( k_y-k_z-t \) data from fully sampled \( k_x-k_y-t \) data acquired from conventional DCE protocol, and performed retrospective studies using the \( k_y-k_z-t \) data. In this way, we obtained a fully sampled reference scan with sufficient temporal resolution. A single slice from each conventional DCE dataset was used to synthesize \( k_y-k_z-t \) data. The data were retrospectively downsampling using PD, GA and GOCART schemes at 20 different R’s evenly distributed between 5× and 100×. To prevent bias, we generated 50 sampling patterns for each scheme by altering the pseudorandom generator seeds (PD, GOCART) and/or initial angles (GA, GOCART). The pharmacokinetic (PK) parameter \( K^{\text{trans}} \) was calculated for tumor ROIs, and the agreement of \( K^{\text{trans}} \) was assessed using concordance correlation coefficients (CCCs) and Bland–Altman plots. The results of tumor and vessel regions of interest (ROI) were quantitatively assessed using normalized root-mean-squared-error (nRMSE) between the reconstructed and fully sampled reference images.

**Phantom simulation studies**

We manually segmented post-contrast whole-brain DCE-MRI data [15] from a brain tumor patient into five non-overlapping regions: vessels, tumor boundary, tumor core, cerebrospinal fluid (CSF), and other tissue. \( K^{\text{trans}} \) of tumor boundary and tumor core was
0.1 and 0.02 min\(^{-1}\), respectively, which mimicked our in-vivo estimates. Other PK parameters, including \(v_p\), \(v_e\) and tissue \(T_1\), were given literature values for each region\[36,37\]. A population-based arterial input function (AIF) \[38\], a two-compartment exchange model \[36\], and the steady state spoiled gradient signal equation, were used to generate the time intensity curves and fabricate dynamic images. We then multiplied coil sensitivities, took the Fourier transform, and added realistic noises. Coil sensitivity maps, noise covariance matrix and signal-to-noise ratio were estimated from the in-vivo data. \(B_1^+\) variation and \(T_2^*\) decay were not modeled, but could be included later.

The phantom had a 256 × 256 × 100 matrix size and a 24 × 24 × 19 cm\(^3\) FOV, identical to those of the acquisition protocol for experimental prospective in-vivo data. We simulated a TR by TR acquisition with TR = 6 ms for a 10-min period (100,000 TRs). One single axial slice of size 256 × 100 was used to synthesize \(k_p\), \(k_e\), and \(T_1\) data acquired using PD, GA and GOCART at \(R = 35\) and \(R = 100\). PD has no flexible temporal resolution in the reconstruction, therefore, the PE ordering of PD at \(R = 100\) was separately generated. nRMSE was also used to quantitatively compare the results.

Prospective in-vivo studies

Two prospective GOCART undersampled data were acquired from brain tumor patients. Informed consent was obtained from patients prior to MRI scans. Our institutional review board approved these studies.

Patient data were acquired using an 8-channel head coil and an axial \(T_1\)-weighted spoiled gradient echo sequence with 15° flip angle and 6 ms TR. The data had 256 × 256 × 100 matrix size and 22 × 22 × 19 cm\(^3\) FOV. Prior to each scan, \(T_1\) maps were acquired using a variable flip angle DESPOT1 method \[39\]. Multiple constraints (Eq. (1)) with empirical \(\lambda\) values were employed \[15\]. After image reconstruction, a Patlak model \[40\] was used to estimate PK parameters. The AIF was generated from a population-averaged analytic equation \[38\].

\[\text{Fig. 3. Mean nRMSE of (a) tumor ROI, and (b) vessel ROI with contours outlining equivalent nRMSE. The two axes are reduction factor R and sampling probability (P) ranging from 5× to 100× and 0 to 1, respectively. PD is plotted as P = 0 for the convenience of comparison. GOCART is advantageous with large R (arrows). The mean and standard deviation comparison of PD, GA and GOCART (P = 0.3) with respect to R are shown for (c) tumor ROI and (d) vessel ROI. On the tumor, GOCART outperforms PD and GA with R > 35; on the vessel, GOCART beats GA in all cases, and outperforms PD with R > 75. The standard deviations are small (<3%) compared with the means.}\]
Results

Fig. 2 shows the PSFs of the sampling patterns in Fig. 1. In general R = 100 has higher side lobes than R = 35. PD has the lowest amplitude lobes while GA (which is GOCART with P = 1) has clearly visible coherent streaks. With GOCART, this coherent streaking diminishes as P decreases (arrows), essentially converging to PD as P approaches 0. All these three methods performed similarly well with the tumor, except PD yielded slightly higher error when R = 100 (lower arrows).

Fig. 4. A single time frame during peak enhancement from a meningioma patient. Tumor and vessel regions are identified in the fully sampled reference image. Results of PD, GA and GOCART (P = 0.3) are shown at R equals 35× and 100× (as labeled). The second row displays the difference images between the reference and reconstructed undersampled images (intensity scaled by 3). GA results in higher errors in vessels than PD and GOCART especially when R = 100 (upper arrows). All these three methods performed similarly well with the tumor, except PD yielded slightly higher error when R = 100 (lower arrows).

Fig. 5. (a) CCCs of the same dataset changes as a function of R. All three techniques perform similarly when R < 50, and GOCART outperform PD and GA when R > 50. (b-g) Bland–Altman plots and 95% confidence intervals within two red lines. CCCs at R = 100 in general have larger bias and variance than CCCs at R = 35. PD, GA and GOCART produce similar confidence intervals at R = 35, and PD results in larger variance but smaller bias than GA and GOCART at R = 100. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)
Artifacts are visually apparent and no reduction in effective GOCART (P = 0.3) at R = 35 and 100 (labeled). No residual aliasing reference data but retrospectively undersampled with PD, GA and from a meningioma patient. The tumor and vessel ROIs are shown in sampled images (intensity scaled by 3) indicate that the errors difference images between the reference and reconstructed undersampled images (intensity scaled by 3) indicate that the errors mainly occur in vessels with abrupt spatial/temporal signal changes. GA results in higher error in vessels than PD or GOCART, especially when R = 100 (upper arrows). All three methods performed well within the tumor, but GOCART yielded slightly lower error at R = 100 than the other methods (lower arrows), as predicted in Fig. 3. Fig. 5(a) demonstrates CCCs of the same dataset changes as a function of R. As R increases from 5 to 100, CCCs of PD, GA and GOCART decrease from above 0.85 to below 0.55. All three techniques perform similarly when R < 50, and GOCART outperform PD and GA when R > 50. Fig. 5(b-g) presents Bland–Altman plots with horizontal axis presenting true $K_{\text{trans}}$ values, and vertical axis presenting $K_{\text{trans}}$ differences. The blue line in the middle is the average value of the differences, and the two red lines provide 95% confidence intervals (within average $\pm 1.96$ standard deviation of the differences). CCCs at R = 100 in general have larger bias and variance than CCCs at R = 35. PD, GA and GOCART produce similar confidence intervals at R = 35, and PD resulted in larger variance but smaller bias than GA and GOCART at R = 100. Fig. 6 shows the time-intensity curves (TIC) of reconstructed results of the data in Fig. 4. The TICs of reference, R = 35 and R = 100 were averaged from tumor and vessel ROI (as labeled). Data fidelity is maintained better at 35× compared to 100×. GOCART yielded peak signals that are closest to reference, except in tumor with R = 100 (Figure 6 lower left subfigure). GOCART peak is slightly (0.3%) lower than PD peak. Overall, GOCART provided the highest temporal fidelity in the comparison group.

Fig. 3(a,b) illustrates the mean nRMSE of tumor and vessel ROIs, respectively. nRMSE was averaged from 50 datasets over five patients, and the equivalent results were connected into contour lines (isolines). The two axes are R and P ranging from 5× to 100× and 0 to 1, respectively. Here we plotted PD as $P = 0$ for the convenience of comparison. Reconstruction error in large, multivoxel tumors and small vessels was insensitive to sampling schemes with acceleration rates below 20×. GOCART is advantageous over PD or GA because it has lower nRMSE at higher acceleration rates (arrows). Tumors with structures and smooth signal variation were most accurately reconstructed with the moderate randomization obtained with P between 0.3 and 0.5; small, tiny vessels with rapidly changing signal were most accurately recuperated with additional randomization using 0.1 < P < 0.3. As such, P = 0.3 was selected as a compromise and was used for subsequent experiments. The mean and standard deviation comparison of PD, GA and GOCART (P = 0.3) with respect to R is shown for tumor and vessel ROIs in Fig. 3(c,d), respectively. On the tumor, GOCART outperforms PD and GA with R > 35; on the vessel, GOCART overtakes GA in all cases, and outperforms PD with R > 75. The standard deviations are small (<3%) compared to the means in all cases.

Fig. 4 contains a single time frame during peak enhancement from a meningioma patient. The tumor and vessel ROIs are shown in the reference image. These results were reconstructed from the same reference data but retrospectively undersampled with PD, GA and GOCART (P = 0.3) at R = 35 and 100 (labeled). No residual aliasing artifacts are visually apparent and no reduction in effective resolution is seen, as evidenced by images on the first row. Difference images between the reference and reconstructed undersampled images (intensity scaled by 3) indicate that the errors mainly occur in vessels with abrupt spatial/temporal signal changes. GA results in higher error in vessels than PD or GOCART, especially when R = 100 (upper arrows). All three methods performed well within the tumor, but GOCART yielded slightly lower error at R = 100 than the other methods (lower arrows), as predicted in Fig. 3. Fig. 5(a) demonstrates CCCs of the same dataset changes as a function of R. As R increases from 5 to 100, CCCs of PD, GA and GOCART decrease from above 0.85 to below 0.55. All three techniques perform similarly when R < 50, and GOCART outperform PD and GA when R > 50. Fig. 5(b-g) presents Bland–Altman plots with horizontal axis presenting true $K_{\text{trans}}$ values, and vertical axis presenting $K_{\text{trans}}$ differences. The blue line in the middle is the average value of the differences, and the two red lines provide 95% confidence intervals (within average $\pm 1.96$ standard deviation of the differences). CCCs at R = 100 in general have larger bias and variance than CCCs at R = 35. PD, GA and GOCART produce similar confidence intervals at R = 35, and PD resulted in larger variance but smaller bias than GA and GOCART at R = 100.

Fig. 6 shows the time-intensity curves (TIC) of reconstructed results of the data in Fig. 4. The TICs of R = 35 and R = 100 were averaged from tumor and vessel ROI (as labeled). Data fidelity is maintained better at 35× compared to 100×. GOCART yielded peak signals that are closest to reference, except in tumor with R = 100 (Figure 6 lower left subfigure), GOCART peak is slightly (0.3%) lower than PD peak. Overall, GOCART provided the highest temporal fidelity in the comparison group.

Fig. 7 demonstrates the phantom experiment outcomes. Fig. 7(a) is the manually segmented phantom, and the time-varying vessel, tumor boundary and tumor core are labeled. Fig. 7(b,c) demonstrates the reconstructed TICs of these three ROIs. The ground truth (reference) is shown with a smooth blue line because it has 6 ms temporal resolution, and the temporal resolution of R = 35 and
R = 100 was 4.39 s and 1.54 s, respectively. The vessel nRMSE of PD, GA and GOCART at R = 35 were 0.90%, 1.16% and 0.89%, respectively, and at R = 100 were 3.91%, 2.08% and 0.85%, respectively. There was no apparent difference in reconstructed images of tumors, where the signals were slowly varying. The reconstructed signal peaks of vessel and tumor boundaries are enlarged for visualization. Notice that the corresponding enlarged regions have exactly the same display rage for R = 35 and R = 100. GOCART most accurately recuperated the varying signals, especially when R was large and the signals had abrupt changes.

The DCE-MRI was reconstructed with a net acceleration factor of 35× and temporal resolution of 4.5 s, the same as current clinical protocol. Fig. 8 shows representative GOCART results with 4 temporal phases obtained on (a) a left posterior fossa meningioma patient and (b) a right-sided acoustic schwannoma patient, respectively. The tumors are arrowed in the last figures where the tumor enhancement was maximal. The temporal evolutions of these two tumors are provided in two Supplementary videos.

Fig. 9(a,b) presents permeability $K_{trans}$ maps calculated from GOCART prospective results from the left posterior fossa meningioma patient and right-sided acoustic schwannoma patient, respectively (raw images in Fig. 8). The $K_{trans}$ maps appear as expected: higher blood brain barrier is observed in the tumor tissues (arrows), and acoustic schwannoma has significant BBB permeability. No leakage is observed in the healthy parenchyma.

The CE-MRA was reconstructed with net acceleration factor of 100× to demonstrate the flexibly temporal resolution of GOCART. Our retrospective in-vivo studies (Fig. 6) and phantom simulations (Fig. 7) have indicated that GOCART is most advantageous at highly accelerated vascular imaging. Fig. 10 demonstrates maximum intensity projection (MIP) of right-sided acoustic schwannoma patient on (a) sagittal and (b) axial planes. Four representative time
frames from 33 s, 41 s, 86 s and 131 s illustrate the dynamic pass of the contrast agent in the intracranial vessels. The acoustic schwannoma can be clearly visualized in the axial MIP (arrows). Rotating MIP maps as time progress are provided in Supplementary videos.

Fig. 11 contains axial post-gadolinium T1-weighted images of the right-sided acoustic schwannoma, from inferior to superior. These images are the last time frame reconstructed from prospective GOCART undersampled data. The tumor has been fully enhanced by the contrast bolus. The high resolution GOCART imaging protocol evidently depicts the shape and fine details of the acoustic schwannoma, as pointed out by the arrows.

Discussion

GOCART is a novel sparse sampling scheme for time-resolved 3D Cartesian MRI. GOCART combines the best components of GA and PD: GOCART samples the center of k-space very frequently, distributes PEs uniformly throughout the sampling domain (via the ergodic nature of GA), and locally randomizes sampling locations. We have performed retrospective validation on fully sampled in-vivo data and phantom simulation, where the ground truth can be defined for image quality assessment. We have demonstrated that GOCART is favorable for 3D DCE-MRI using constrained reconstruc-
We have shown the strengths of GOCART and its potential impact on brain DCE MRI. GOCART has five important advantages: 1) GOCART allows fast, flexible, and reproducible case-dependent view-order generation. It required 0.097 s for GOCART and 31 s for PD to generate sampling patterns for a 10 min DCE scan on a single 2.5 GHz CPU. GOCART is therefore suitable to real-time selection of imaging parameters such as the FOV and spatial resolution. With a suitable pseudo-random number generator, the sampling pattern can be readily re-generated during image reconstruction, eliminating storage and transfer of an external look-up table. 2) GOCART maintains or improves reconstruction accuracy and temporal resolution relative to alternative methods. In no case did GOCART overly degrade reconstructed image quality and in some cases, specifically very high acceleration rates, outperformed PD and GA. These have been demonstrated in both retrospective in-vivo studies and phantom simulation studies. 3) As it is based on a radial acquisition, GOCART has intrinsic variable density sampling. The underlying sampling density is inversely proportional to kr, the radial distance to the k-space center. The center of k-space has higher sampling density, which is beneficial for sparse reconstruction [15,24]. 4) GOCART inherits the flexible temporal resolution intrinsic to GA. The optimal temporal resolution for a dynamic MRI scan is often unknown a priori and depends on the PK parameters of the tissue. The phantom simulation also suggested a variable temporal resolution reconstruction that assigns a higher temporal resolution to significantly changing signals. This is possible with GOCART. 5) Although not shown in this work, GOCART is compatible with multi-level sampling patterns that leverage...
asymptotic structure in CS and are tailored to the object [41]. Specifically, a $k$-dependent sampling probability mask can be employed, instead of a uniform sampling probability.

GOCART bears similarities and thus shares some of the aforementioned advantages with recently proposed methods such as TWIST [11], IVD [12], DISCO [14] and VDrad [20], which have been used in other contrast enhanced applications. For instance, $1/k$ variable density undersampling is similar to IVD and VDrad, and predefining a $P = 1$ central region is similar to TWIST and DISCO. Besides, TWIST, IVD, DISCO and VDrad combine adjacent frames to form a fully sampled footprint; GOCART can generate similar footprint, although fully sampling is not always guaranteed. GOCART has enhanced variable temporal resolution ability from more uniform samples. A wider range of temporal resolution selections facilitates exploring optimal experiment designs for different PK performances and capturing the signal peaks, perhaps making GOCART better suited for brain DCE-MRI.

The classical temporal finite difference was chosen because of its simplicity (convex optimization, single tuning parameter, appropriateness for DCE-MRI). We agree that data-driven reconstruction algorithms such as $k$-t SLR [42], and blind compressed sensing [43] may offer improved reconstruction performance. However, these were not considered in this study, as these schemes are associated with increased complexity (non-convex optimization, non-trivial tuning of free parameters, convergence not guaranteed and will depend on the sampling pattern).

Our experiment design has a number of limitations. In the retrospective in-vivo studies, the reference data with approximately 10 s temporal resolution were used as snapshot, which is not ideal especially for fast varying signals. In addition, the retrospective in-vivo data suffered from some inflow artifacts. In the phantom simulation studies, data at 6 ms temporal resolution were generated and scanner data acquisition was simulated. However, we could have achieved such high acceleration factors because the phantom lacked sufficient anatomical detail. Furthermore, the calibrated $\lambda$s were different in retrospective in-vivo studies and phantom simulation studies, and we empirically chose $\lambda$s from retrospective in-vivo studies for prospective in-vivo studies. Neither of the experiments was able to test the effect of eddy currents, which may be more noticeable as the sampling probability decreases. Acquiring radial spokes from the edge of k-space toward the center rather than center out may mitigate this effect.

One potential improvement may be achieved by taking full advantage of head coil geometry with parallel imaging. The 8 elements of our head coil provide maximum diversity in the axial plane, which was the phase encoding plane in the prospective whole-brain DCE-MRI experiments. Although not specifically done in this work, it is possible to optimize GOCART for parallel imaging by incorporating structured undersampling along spokes, as seen in IVD [12] or DISCO [14]. This is also true for PD and GA.

GOCART outperformed PD and GA in both retrospective in-vivo studies and phantom simulation studies. However, PD generally outperformed GA in the former studies but was overtaken in the later ones. This is likely due to the fact that GA samples the center of k-space more frequently within temporal windows.

We have compared GOCART with PD and GA through retrospective analysis and phantom simulation, and have shown prospective in-vivo clinical results. Our results demonstrate that GOCART has combined the advantages of both PD and GA, and outperforms both techniques in highly undersampled cases. We provide the source code for GOCART on http://mrel.usc.edu/sharing/GOCART.zip, which includes both Matlab and C implementations, and has additional optional features such as golden angle adjustment for anisotropic FOV and angular perturbation that were not used in this study.

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mri.2015.12.030.
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