Are your MRI contrast agents cost-effective?
Learn more about generic Gadolinium-Based Contrast Agents.
FRESENIUS KABI
caring for life

AJNR

This information is current as of April 17, 2024.

Toward Improving Fidelity of Computational Fluid Dynamics Simulations: Boundary Conditions Matter

Christof Karmonik

AJNR Am J Neuroradiol 2014, 35 (8) 1549-1550
doi: https://doi.org/10.3174/ajnr.A3984
http://www.ajnr.org/content/35/8/1549

Toward Improving Fidelity of Computational Fluid Dynamics Simulations: Boundary Conditions Matter

In their paper entitled "Generalized versus Patient-Specific Inflow Boundary Conditions in Computational Fluid Dynamics Simulations of Cerebral Aneurysmal Hemodynamics," Jansen et al[1] compare results from computational fluid dynamics (CFD) simulations performed with 2 different kinds of boundary conditions: a spatiotemporal inflow waveform measured with 2D phase-contrast MR imaging in the individual patient and a generalized inflow velocity profile previously described in the literature. In their comparison, Jansen et al focus on wall shear stress (WSS) and, derived from it, the oscillatory shear index as well as intra-aneurysmal flow patterns. In agreement with previously published results,[2-5] they report statistically significant differences for the 2 approaches.

Simulating hemodynamics in cerebral aneurysms with CFD techniques is a relatively new approach translating a well-established engineering technology into clinical research. Essentially, a computational model as an approximation of the real world is created and the governing equations for blood flow (Navier Stokes equations) are numerically solved based on this mathematic construct. The output of these simulations includes the velocity fields and the values of other hemodynamic parameters such as WSS or pressure.

The fidelity of the results depends on the kinds of approximations or simplifications made when creating the computational model. For instance, early simulations using 2D models with simple geometric approximations were able to demonstrate low WSS at the aneurysm dome[6]; however, because of inherent limitations, these models could not provide any information about the 3D distribution of the flow or WSS. In many studies to date, 3D volumetric information derived from medical image data specific to the individual patient is used, often from 3D digital subtraction angiography but also from CT angiography or MR angiography. Boundary conditions are approximated by generalized waveforms. These simulations succeed in providing a true 3D description of the spatial and temporal distributions of hemodynamic parameters. As there are no variations in the inflow boundary condition, differences in the simulation results between individual aneurysms originate from the aneurysm geometries alone. With this approach it was demonstrated that CFD can visualize and quantify hemodynamic differences between ruptured and unruptured aneurysms.[7-9]

As Jansen et al[1] demonstrate, simulations may be further refined by incorporating patient-derived flow information into the model as the exact shape of the inflow waveform may exert significant effects on at least some of the calculated hemodynamic parameters. However, physiologic waveforms may also vary. For instance, intense physical efforts or emotional excitement typically result in a sudden change in heart rate and blood pressure. A CFD study investigating the effects of increase in cardiac frequency found significant changes in the overall intra-aneurysmal flow patterns (eg, vortex formation and translation) and an increase in WSS.[10] These effects may also need to be considered for an accurate assessment of hemodynamics in cerebral aneurysms with CFD techniques.

CFD simulations are the results of mathematic constructs and validation of their results is necessary. Validation studies comparing virtual angiograms (derived from CFD) with acquired angiograms[11-14] and comparing simulated intra-aneurysmal flow patterns with those measured with 2D phase-contrast MR imaging[15-18] or 4D phase-contrast MR imaging[19,20] reported generally good agreement and thereby encourage the continued advancement of CFD. Still, a better understanding of the limitations of CFD simulations is warranted.[21-23]

Computational simulations will play an increased role in the future for enhancing and complementing the information in medical images. Furthermore, such simulations will not be limited to studies of hemodynamics in cerebral aneurysms. As an indicative example, CFD studies have been recently performed for investigating CSF flow in Chiari malformations.[24,25] Further validation and optimization of CFD techniques as well as streamlining the simulation process itself, eg, by using dedicated CFD simulation and visualization systems,[26] may foster further integration of this exciting technology into clinical research.

REFERENCES

1. Jansen IG, Schneiders JJ, Potters WV, et al. **Generalized versus patient-specific inflow boundary conditions in computational fluid**

dynamics simulations of cerebral aneurysmal hemodynamics. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2014;35:1543–48
2. Karmonik C, Yen C, Diaz O, et al. **Temporal variations of wall shear stress parameters in intracranial aneurysms–importance of patient-specific inflow waveforms for CFD calculations.** *Acta Neurochir (Wien)* 2010;152:1391–98; discussion 1398
3. Karmonik C, Yen C, Grossman RG, et al. **Intra-aneurysmal flow patterns and wall shear stresses calculated with computational flow dynamics in an anterior communicating artery aneurysm depend on knowledge of patient-specific inflow rates.** *Acta Neurochir (Wien)* 2009;151:479–85; discussion 485
4. Venugopal P, Valentino D, Schmitt H, et al. **Sensitivity of patient-specific numerical simulation of cerebal aneurysm hemodynamics to inflow boundary conditions.** *J Neurosurg* 2007;106:1051–60
5. Marzo A, Singh P, Larrabide I, et al. **Computational hemodynamics in cerebral aneurysms: the effects of modeled versus measured boundary conditions.** *Ann Biomed Eng* 2011;39:884–96
6. Burleson AC, Strother CM, Turitto VT. **Computer modeling of intracranial saccular and lateral aneurysms for the study of their hemodynamics.** *Neurosurgery* 1995;37:774–82; discussion 782–84
7. Byrne G, Mut F, Cebral J. **Quantifying the large-scale hemodynamics of intracranial aneurysms**. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2014; 35:333–38
8. Cebral JR, Mut F, Weir J, et al. **Association of hemodynamic characteristics and cerebral aneurysm rupture.** *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2011;32:264–70
9. Jou LD, Lee DH, Morsi H, et al. **Wall shear stress on ruptured and unruptured intracranial aneurysms at the internal carotid artery.** *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2008;29:1761–67
10. Jiang J, Strother C. **Computational fluid dynamics simulations of intracranial aneurysms at varying heart rates: a "patient-specific" study.** *J Biomech Eng* 2009;131:091001
11. Ford MD, Stuhne GR, Nikolov HN, et al. **Virtual angiography for visualization and validation of computational models of aneurysm hemodynamics.** *IEEE Trans Med Imag* 2005;24:1586–92
12. Endres J, Kowarschik M, Redel T, et al. **A workflow for patient-individualized virtual angiogram generation based on CFD simulation.** *Comput Math Methods Med* 2012;2012:306765
13. Sun Q, Groth A, Bertram M, et al. **Phantom-based experimental validation of computational fluid dynamics simulations on cerebral aneurysms.** *Med Phys* 2010;37:5054–65
14. Sun Q, Groth A, Aach T. **Comprehensive validation of computational fluid dynamics simulations of in-vivo blood flow in patient-specific cerebral aneurysms.** *Med Phys* 2012;39:742–54
15. Karmonik C, Klucznik R, Benndorf G. **Blood flow in cerebral aneurysms: comparison of phase contrast magnetic resonance and computational fluid dynamics–preliminary experience.** *Rofo* 2008; 180:209–15
16. Karmonik C, Klucznik R, Benndorf G. **Comparison of velocity patterns in an AComA aneurysm measured with 2D phase contrast MRI and simulated with CFD.** *Technol Health Care* 2008;16:119–28
17. Boussel L, Rayz V, Martin A, et al. **Phase-contrast magnetic resonance imaging measurements in intracranial aneurysms in vivo of flow patterns, velocity fields, and wall shear stress: comparison with computational fluid dynamics.** *Magn Reson Med* 2009; 61:409–17
18. Rayz VL, Boussel L, Acevedo-Bolton G, et al. **Numerical simulations of flow in cerebral aneurysms: comparison of CFD results and in vivo MRI measurements.** *J Biomed Eng* 2008;130:051011
19. Berg P, Stucht D, Janiga G, et al. **Cerebral blood flow in a healthy circle of Willis and two intracranial aneurysms: computational fluid dynamics versus 4D phase-contrast magnetic resonance imaging.** *J Biomed Eng* 2014;136:041003
20. Jiang J, Johnson K, Valen-Sendstad K, et al. **Flow characteristics in a canine aneurysm model: a comparison of 4D accelerated phase-contrast MR measurements and computational fluid dynamics simulations.** *Med Phys* 2011;38:6300–12
21. Cebral JR, Meng H. **Counterpoint: realizing the clinical utility of computational fluid dynamics–closing the gap.** *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2012;33:396–98
22. Kallmes DF. **Point: CFD–computational fluid dynamics or confounding factor dissemination.** *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2012; 33:395–96
23. Strother CM, Jiang J. **Intracranial aneurysms, cancer, x-rays, and computational fluid dynamics.** *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2012; 33:991–92
24. Hentschel S, Mardal KA, Lovgren AE, et al. **Characterization of cyclic CSF flow in the foramen magnum and upper cervical spinal canal with MR flow imaging and computational fluid dynamics.** *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2010;31:997–1002
25. Linge SO, Mardal KA, Haughton V, et al. **Simulating CSF flow dynamics in the normal and the Chiari I subarachnoid space during rest and exertion.** *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2013;34:41–45
26. Karmonik C, Chintalapani G, Redel T, et al. **Hemodynamics at the ostium of cerebral aneurysms with relation to post-treatment changes by a virtual flow diverter: a computational fluid dynamics study.** *Conf Proc IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc* 2013;2013:1895–98

Christof Karmonik
Departments of Neurosurgery and Translational Imaging
Houston Methodist Hospital Research Institute
Houston, Texas
Weill Medical College of Cornell University
New York, New York

http://dx.doi.org/10.3174/ajnr.A3984