

Effective electrode positions and stimulation patterns for head EIT

Yasin Mamatjan^{1,3}, Bartłomiej Grychtol², Andy Adler³

¹Zirve University, Gaziantep, Turkey

²German Cancer Research Center, Heidelberg, Germany

³Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada, mamatjan.yasin@zirve.edu.tr

Abstract: The objective of this study is to find an effective stimulation and measurement strategy to improve distinguishability for head EIT. To better understand the relationship between distinguishability and various strategies (stimulation/measurement patterns) for a set of electrodes, we evaluated a realistic head model and a range of common strategies.

1 Introduction

Electrical Impedance Tomography (EIT) of the head has the potential to image cerebral edema and stroke, and to assist the EEG inverse problem. To effectively utilize an EIT system for human head, there is a need for maximizing sensitivity and increasing detectability by choosing an appropriate stimulation pattern and electrode placement strategy. Fabrizi et al [1] conducted simulation study for brain imaging using a realistic finite element (FE) model of the head, but only a limited evaluation was carried out due to high computational cost, where only 14 protocols were tested for both homogeneous model and a realistic head model. The objective of this study is to find an effective strategy to use a given EIT system for head EIT by systematically assessing possible stimulation and measurement patterns.

2 Methods

This paper (i) implements a realistic head model with 73 electrodes in standard EEG positions, (ii) provides quantified values and demonstrates the specific relationship between distinguishability and target position for different stimulation / measurement strategies, and (iii) makes recommendations for 16, 32, 64 electrode systems using standard EEG caps. The results are analyzed using the distinguishability formulation proposed by [3].

A realistic FE mesh of an adult head with 73 electrodes in standard EEG positions was built based on the mesh SAH262 contributed to EIDORS by [2]. Using EIDORS's interfaces to Netgen and Gmsh, the scalp was re-meshed to include 73 circular electrodes with local mesh refinement [4]. After defining Nasion and Inion landmarks, the positions of the remaining 71 electrodes were calculated as an extension of the 10-20 standard.

We choose $N = 16, 32$ and 64 electrodes for simulations, numbering them front-to-back in a zig-zag fashion starting from the left-most electrode (Fp1). We denote the measurement strategy by Δs - m where the distance between the two stimulating electrodes is $s = 1, \dots, N$ and that between measuring electrodes is $m = 1, \dots, N$. Thus, the typical adjacent measurement and stimulation pattern is denoted by $\Delta 1$ -1. For each total number of electrodes, we evaluate all strategies where $s = m$ for only 64 electrodes due to high computation time.

Distinguishability is defined as the ability to distinguish between a hypothesis H_1 (conductivity change) and the null hypothesis H_0 (no conductivity change) within a region

of interest (ROI) according to measure m [3]. The maximum likelihood estimate [3] of the conductivity change $\arg \min \|\Delta \mathbf{d} - \mathbf{R} \Delta \sigma\| + P(\cdot)$ for the hypothesis m within an ROI of area A_R is $m = A_R \Delta \hat{\sigma}_R$. The probability that the null hypothesis is rejected is determined by the z -score [3]:

$$\bar{z} = \frac{\hat{m} - m_0}{\text{std}(m)} = \frac{A_R \Delta \hat{\sigma}_R}{(\mathbf{R}_R \Sigma_n \mathbf{R}_R^\top)^{\frac{1}{2}}} = A_R \Delta \hat{\sigma}_R \sqrt{\mathbf{J}_R^\top \Sigma_n^{-1} \mathbf{J}_R} \quad (1)$$

where \hat{m} is the maximum likelihood estimate for m , the null hypothesis is m_0 and $\text{std}(m)$ is the standard deviation of m .

2.1 Results

Fig. 1 shows \bar{z} distinguishability values for 16, 32 and 64 electrode systems and 8 different object positions from Nasion to Inion for the best and worst measurement strategies. $\Delta 25$ -25 with 64 electrode model produced highest \bar{z} values for different object positions, while the adjacent patterns $\Delta 1$ -1 produced lowest \bar{z} values for all 3 electrode configurations. For $\Delta 1$ -1, 32 electrodes performed better than both 16 and even 64 electrodes.




Figure 1: Distinguishability values for 16, 32 and 64 electrodes with 8 object positions for the stimulation and measurement patterns of $\Delta 1$ -1 (adjacent) and Δs - m with maximum average \bar{z} values.

3 Conclusions

Our results indicate that distinguishability increases throughout the model with average distance between the two stimulating/measuring electrodes. Future work will address the impact of changing electrode numbering and ways of finding optimum electrode positioning and measurement strategy to maximise distinguishability in a particular region of interest.

References

- [1] Fabrizi L, McEwan A, et al. *Physiol Meas* 30 85–101, 2009
- [2] Tizzard A and Bayford RH. *Physiol Meas* 28 163–182, 2007
- [3] Adler A, Gaggero P, Maimaitijiang Y. *Physiol Meas* 32 731, 2011
- [4] Grychtol B and Adler A. In *Proc IEEE EMBC 2013* 6429–32, 2013

Excerpted from:

Proceedings
of the
15th International Conference on
Biomedical Applications of
**ELECTRICAL IMPEDANCE
TOMOGRAPHY**

Edited by Andy Adler and Bartłomiej Grychtol

April 24-26, 2014
Glen House Resort
Gananoque, Ontario
Canada



This document is the collection of papers accepted for presentation at the 15th International Conference on
Biomedical Applications of Electrical Impedance Tomography.
Each individual paper in this collection: © 2014 by the indicated authors.
Collected work: © 2014 Andy Adler and Bartłomiej Grychtol.
All rights reserved.

Cover design: Bartłomiej Grychtol
Photo credit: ©1000 Islands Photo Art Inc. / Ian Coristine

Printed in Canada

ISBN 978-0-7709-0577-4

Systems and Computer Engineering
Carleton University, 1125 Colonel By Drive
Ottawa, Ontario, K1S 5B6, Canada
adler@sce.carleton.ca
+1 (613) 520-2600

www.eit2014.org