



Pitfalls in Acoustic Transducer Modeling for Focused Ultrasound (FUS)

Pasquinelli, Cristina; Montanaro, Hazael; Neufeld, Esra; Poni, Redi; Kuster, Niels; Thielscher, Axel

Publication date:
2018

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

Citation (APA):

Pasquinelli, C., Montanaro, H., Neufeld, E., Poni, R., Kuster, N., & Thielscher, A. (2018). Pitfalls in Acoustic Transducer Modeling for Focused Ultrasound (FUS). Abstract from 32nd Annual Meeting of the European Society for Hyperthermic Oncology, .

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

056**Pitfalls in Acoustic Transducer Modeling for Focused Ultrasound (FUS)**Pasquinelli C. ¹, Montanaro H. ², Neufeld E. ³, Poni R.³, Kuster N. ², Thielscher A. ¹¹DTU, Kongens Lyngby, Denmark²ITIS / ETHZ, Zurich, Switzerland³ITIS, Zurich, Switzerland**Introduction**

When modeling therapeutic applications of FUS, the transducer is typically modelled by modeling the transducer surface geometry and imposing a pressure or velocity boundary condition (depending on the solver type). However, during experimental validation of transcranial FUS modeling, dramatic deviations between simulated and measured pressure distributions were observed that were shown to originate from transducer modeling.

Objectives

A systematic study was performed to investigate the impact of factors to be considered to obtain realistic models of acoustic exposure by US transducers.

Materials & methods

Acoustic pressure fields generated by curved single-element focused transducers (0.5 MHz) in the presence and absence of skull obstacles (pig, sheep, and lamb; characterized by CT and precisely positioned) have been measured using a 3D-scannable, calibrated hydrophone and compared to acoustic simulations of corresponding setup models. Initially the source was modelled as pressure boundary condition imposed on the transducer surface according to the manufacturer specifications. Subsequently, the model was adapted to consider the actually measured geometry, the internal structure of the transducer (planar piezoelectric disk below a shaped matching material), uncertainty about the internal transducer geometry and material properties, and an aperture function accounting for the mechanical impact of, e.g., the transducer wall.

Results

The pressure field sensitivity to the above factors was investigated and after careful model adaptation, good agreement between the simulated and measured fields was obtained in the absence of skulls. Significant deviations are still observed in the presence of skulls and current work focuses on establishing whether they originate from transducer modeling, or from the employed mapping of CT data to acoustic property distributions.

Conclusion

Careful transducer modeling and experimental validation is crucial to reliably simulate FUS fields and common approaches are found to be unsuitable for extended, curved or complex transducers.

Figure 1

