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Abstract

Objective. Functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) is commonly used to measure brain activity through the blood oxygen level dependent (BOLD) signal mechanism, but this only provides an indirect proxy signal to neuronal activity. Magnetoencephalography (MEG) provides a more direct measurement of the magnetic fields created by neuronal currents in the brain, but requires very specialized hardware and only measures these fields at the scalp. Recently, progress has been made to directly detect neuronal fields with MRI using the stimulus-induced rotary saturation (SIRS) effect, but interference from the BOLD response complicates such measurements. Here, we describe an approach to detect nanotesla-level, low-frequency alternating magnetic fields with an ultra-low field (ULF) MRI scanner, unaffected by the BOLD signal.

Approach. A steady-state implementation of the stimulus-induced rotary saturation (SIRS) method is developed. The method is designed to generate a strong signal at ultra-low magnetic field as well as allowing for efficient signal averaging, giving a high contrast-to-noise ratio (CNR). The method is tested in computer simulations and in phantom scans.

Main results. The simulations and phantom scans demonstrated the ability of the method to measure magnetic fields at different frequencies at ULF with a stronger contrast than non-steady-state approaches. Furthermore, the rapid imaging functionality of the method reduced noise efficiently. The results demonstrated sufficient CNR down to 7 nT, but the sensitivity will depend on the imaging parameters.

Significance. A steady-state SIRS method is able to detect low-frequency alternating magnetic fields at ultra-low main magnetic field strengths with a large signal response and contrast-to-noise, presenting an important step in sensing biological fields with ULF MRI.

1. Introduction

Non-invasive functional neuroimaging methods fall into two classes: hemodynamically based approaches, including blood oxygenation level dependent (BOLD), arterial spin labeling (ASL), cerebral blood volume (CBV) and dynamic susceptibility contrast (DSC) methods, and electrophysiologically-based approaches, including electro- and magnetoencephalography (EEG and MEG respectively) source imaging. Such methods have seen more widespread use than more invasive techniques, such as radionuclide imaging of blood flow and chemical dynamics. The most widely used MRI-based functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) technique uses the BOLD relaxation effect as a proxy for neuronal activation as a means to obtain functional contrast in the brain [1–3]. Despite its profound impact as a tool for the advancement of neuroscience via the understanding of human brain activity, the latency of the hemodynamic response makes localization of signal sources above 1 Hz challenging using the signal from conventional BOLD fMRI [4]. In contrast, MEG provides functional brain imaging with high temporal resolution by direct measurement of magnetic fields produced by postsynaptic currents [5]. While having superior temporal resolution to fMRI, MEG measures these tiny biological magnetic fields at the scalp, typically with arrays of superconducting quantum interference device (SQUID) magnetometers. Obtaining
volumetric information of activated regions inside the brain requires complex numerical estimation of the field sources, limiting the spatial accuracy of the technique [6, 7].

Techniques that combine the direct magnetic detection of MEG with the spatial resolution of MRI have been developed, and are broadly referred to as neuronal current (NC) MRI. In these approaches, the magnetic fields induced by neuronal currents in the brain directly produce MRI contrast in an appropriately sensitive imaging sequence [8, 9]. While the currents from single neurons appear to be too weak to be detected, neuronal bundles have been estimated to produce fields of approximately 0.1–1 nT within a 1 mm² voxel, possibly strong enough for ensemble detection [10]. Various approaches to NC MRI have been explored [9, 11–19]. These have often involved imaging contrast from spin dephasing effects that result from the minuscule change in the net magnetic field during a burst of neuronal current.

A promising, alternative method for NC MRI is based on the stimulus-induced rotary saturation (SIRS) effect [20]. With this technique, proton magnetization is aligned in the transverse plane with a spin-lock (SL) pulse of amplitude $B_{SL}$, effectively putting the magnetization in a doubly rotating reference frame with Larmor frequency $\gamma B_{SL}$ [21]. The presence of a neuronal ‘stimulus’ magnetic field of frequency $f_{stim} = \gamma B_{stim}/2\pi$ will tip the magnetization away from the SL pulse. A preparation module, applying an SL pulse of length $T_{SL}$, will then result in a magnetization tipped by the angle $\alpha_{SL} = \gamma B_{stim} T_{SL}$, where $B_{stim}$ is the strength of the stimulus field. The preparation module can then be followed by a fast imaging acquisition, such as single-shot echo-planar imaging (EPI), giving a contrast difference in regions that experienced a stimulus field of the right frequency during the preparation.

SIRS and similar spin-lock based sequences have given a clear improvement on prior methods for NC MRI and hold great promise, giving good results in phantom experiments [22–26]. Positive in vivo experiments using SIRS have often proven challenging [27, 28], possibly due to the presence of magnetic susceptibility BOLD contrast within the region with neuronal current, dominating the smaller SIRS contrast, which is inherently small due to the low amplitude of the neuronal field. Recently, positive in vivo results have been reported where the BOLD effect is accounted for in post-processing [29]. However, a method which is not confounded by BOLD contrast would still be useful as it would not require such post-processing steps. This could potentially be achieved by performing SIRS at a very low magnetic field, where the BOLD effect is negligible [30].

In this work, we investigate the performance of SIRS at an ultra-low field (ULF) of 6.5 mT [31]. We apply the SIRS technique in a novel steady-state implementation which is designed for rapid imaging and results in an improved contrast-to-noise ratio (CNR). We demonstrate results from Bloch simulations and in phantoms, and describe possible in vivo experiments.

2. Methods

2.1. Sequence design

Schematics of the MRI sequence design and the resulting behavior of the magnetization are shown in figure 1. In the original SIRS implementation on a 3T scanner, a spin-lock (SL) preparation module, followed by a spoiler gradient, was implemented before a rapid 2D EPI scan, as shown in figure 1(a). To enable detection at ULF, our design goal was to maximize the contrast-to-noise ratio, $CNR = \delta/\sigma$, where $\delta$ is the difference in signal amplitude between acquisitions with and without stimulus, and $\sigma$ is the standard deviation of the background noise. The design also needed to account for the ULF system having a maximum gradient amplitude of 1 mT m⁻¹ [31], making fast k-space traversal and time-efficient high SNR 2D imaging challenging.

As a ULF alternative to 2D EPI SIRS, we leveraged the efficiency of steady-state imaging at ULF [31] and developed a new steady-state sequence using SIRS as shown in figure 1(b). The sequence consists of a rapid application of a SIRS module every repetition time (TR), which consist of a 90°-x pulse, an SL pulse along the y-axis, and a 90°-y pulse. If the spin is on resonance and no stimulus field is present, no tip will be experienced during the SL module, producing no transverse magnetization and therefore no signal will be generated. In the presence of a stimulus field of frequency $f_{stim} = \gamma B_{stim}/2\pi$ and magnitude $B_{stim}$, however, the SL module will effectively give a tip of angle $\alpha = \gamma B_{stim} T_{SL}$. The sequence will thus act as a balanced Steady-State Free Precession (bSSFP) sequence with flip angle $\alpha$. It is important to note that during the spin-lock pulse, the magnetization will rotate about the spin-lock axis with frequency $f_{SL}$. To prevent phase accumulation during the spin-lock, the spin-lock should ideally be applied for a duration of $T_{SL} = n/f_{SL}$, where $n$ is an integer.

This sequence can generate a large contrast $\delta$ even though $\alpha$ will typically be very small. It is well known from bSSFP theory that even a small tip angle can result in a large steady-state signal assuming little or no phase difference accumulates between the magnetization and the excitation pulses during each repetition time TR [32]. Furthermore, the rapid imaging and steady-state nature of the sequence allows for efficient signal averaging which is a requirement at ULF, resulting in a smaller $\sigma$ and thus a larger CNR. Additionally, as bSSFP generally creates a larger signal when $T_1/T_2$ is small, the steady-state sequence has particularly good efficiency in a ULF scanner as $T_1/T_2$ can approach unity at very low fields [33].
2.2. Signal simulations

The steady-state SIRS sequence was simulated in MATLAB using Bloch simulations over a range of values for the stimulus field strength $B_{\text{stim}}$ and frequency $f_{\text{stim}}$, with the sequence sensitized to an SL frequency of $f_{\text{SL}} = 40$ Hz with an SL duration of 25 ms. The simulation parameters are shown in table 1. The stimulus field was applied during the whole SL pulse. The Bloch equations used in the doubly rotating frame are as follows [20]:

$$\frac{dM}{dt} = \gamma M \times \left[ B_{\text{total}} \left( 1 - \frac{2\pi f_{\text{stim}}}{\gamma |B_{\text{total}}|} \right) + B_{\text{stim}} \right] - R \left( M - M_\rho \right),$$

where

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{T_1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{T_2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{T_{\rho}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

$M_\rho$ is the equilibrium magnetization in the rotating frame, which can be assumed to be very small and in this work was assumed to be zero for simplicity. The $B_{\text{total}}$ field includes both the main magnetic field $B_0$ as well as any field changes included to model off-resonance. Furthermore, in our analysis of the signal behavior at ULF, assumptions were made of $T_2^* = T_2$ and $T_{\rho} = 2/(1/T_1 + 1/T_2)$ [34].

2.3. Experimental design

Experiments were performed on our 6.5 mT ULF scanner [31] using a phantom as shown in figure 2.

This 20 cm diameter spherical phantom was 3D printed (figure 2(a)) from polycarbonate (Stratasys Fortus 360 mc). An insulated, 20-gauge, $5 \times 39 \times 42$ AWG FEP insulated litz wire (New England Wire Technologies, Lisbon, NH, USA) was wound in grooves on the surface of the phantom to form a single channel transmit–receive coil, which was capacitively tuned to a frequency of 276 kHz, corresponding to a 6.5 mT magnetic field, with a Q factor of 30 and matched to 50 Ohms. This modest Q at our low Larmor frequency allows for a readout bandwidth of about 10 kHz. The phantom was filled with CuSO$_4$·H$_2$O solution at a
concentration that resulted in a measured $T_1$ and $T_2$ of 630 ms and 625 ms in a 6.5 mT field, respectively. A smaller ‘stimulus coil’ (figure 2(b)), made of 19-gauge insulated magnet wire (MWS Wire Industries), was inserted into the phantom to serve as a proxy neuronal current (NC). This stimulus coil is a 10-turn circular loop with a 4 cm diameter, oriented such that the field produced by the stimulus coil is parallel to the scanner $B_0$ axis. The location of the stimulus coil within the phantom was determined with a reference bSSFP scan. The stimulus coil was connected to a frequency synthesizer (Stanford Research Systems DS345) through a low-noise voltage preamplifier (Ithaco 1201) and a variable attenuator. Using this setup, a sinusoidal current could be passed through the stimulus coil and the amplitude and frequency could be varied. The phantom was placed in the ULF scanner, which was located inside a Faraday cage. A common-mode choke on the coaxial transmission line to the stimulus coil before it entered the scan room eliminated any unwanted environmental noise. The relationship between the voltage amplitude generated by the wave generator and the magnetic field produced by the coil was calibrated by doing a series of measurements with a 3-axis flux gate magnetometer (Bartington Mag-03MCT1000). The results matched numerical calculations from the Biot-Savart law very closely. As in the simulations, the phantom scans were run with multiple values of $B_{stim}$ and $f_{stim}$, as shown in table 1. To further evaluate the measured signal at off-resonance frequencies, additional measurements were performed using a lower resolution of a $32 \times 32 \times 19$ imaging matrix over a $28 \times 28 \times 20$ cm FOV and TR = 54 ms, TSL = 41 ms, TFP = 13.3 ms, $f_{SL} = 100$ Hz, $N_{av} = 120$, $f_{stim} = 80–120$ Hz and $B_{stim} = 15$ nT and 75 nT at $\Delta f = -25$ Hz off-resonance and compared to simulations.

2.4. Neuronal field generation and sequence timing

The steady-state SIRS pulse sequence provided a trigger signal to the synthesizer at the start of each
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**Figure 2.** (a) The phantom used in the SIRS experiments, placed inside the ultra-low field scanner. (b) The small stimulus coil placed inside the phantom in panel a. (c) A schematic of the phantom setup. An alternating current of frequency $f_{stim}$ is generated in the stimulus coil. Common mode noise is blocked by a choke. (d) A sample steady-state SIRS sequence (output from oscilloscope). The bottom (pink) plot shows the RF pulse envelope while the upper three plots show the gradient waveforms, $G_x$, $G_y$, and $G_z$ (from top). (e) The generated stimulus wave (output from oscilloscope). A trigger signal from the sequence (green) generates a waveform from the generator (yellow) which is filtered and amplified by the preamplifier (blue).
spin-lock pulse to output a sinusoidal wave with an integer number of wavelengths at frequency $f_{\text{stim}}$. This number was set to the minimum such that the wave lasted throughout the spin-lock pulse. In the steady-state SIRS sequence, maximum signal is achieved when no phase difference accumulates between the magnetization and the stimulus wave over multiple TRs. This is similar to a normal bSSFP sequence, which gives signal ‘spikes’ at low flip angles and no phase accrual. In the phantom experiments, this was achieved by timing the spin lock pulse such that $T_{\text{SL}} = n/f_{\text{SL}}$, where $n$ is an integer. The magnetization then accumulates a phase of $\phi_M = 2\pi f_{\text{SL}} T_{\text{SL}} = \pi n$ during the spin-lock by precessing around the SL axis, and ideally no phase outside the spin-lock assuming it is on-resonance, and will therefore be in phase with the next RF pulse generated by the console (Tecmag Redstone).

2.5. Image analysis
A difference image was created by subtracting the SIRS image acquired with no stimulus from the SIRS image acquired with a stimulus current on. The contrast $\delta$ was defined as the average amplitude difference of a $3 \times 3$-pixel ROI in the center of the stimulus coil, while the noise standard deviation $\sigma$ was calculated from a similar ROI away from the stimulus coil and computing the standard deviation of its pixels. This enabled calculation of the CNR = $\delta/\sigma$.

2.6. Simulated comparison to other SIRS contrast mechanisms
Computer simulations were performed to compare the generated signal from the proposed steady-state method to that generated by a non-steady-state approach under the same imaging conditions and a long stimulus wave. Such approaches would generate one large tip during the stimulus, and utilize either the component orthogonal or parallel to the spin-lock pulse for imaging. As described, during the spin-lock pulse, the magnetization gets tilted away from the spin-lock axis by the angle $\alpha = \gamma B_{\text{stim}} T_{\text{SL}}$. At the same time, the magnetization component along this axis, $M_\parallel$, is decaying with time constant $T_{1p}$ while the magnetization perpendicular to the spin-lock axis $M_\perp$ is decaying with time constant $T_2 > T_1 > T_{1p}$. In a ULF scanner, we can make the approximation that both components are decaying with $T_{1p}$, which then serves as a conservative estimate of the decay time. The magnetization during the spin-lock will then decay by the factor $e^{-T_{\text{SL}}/T_{1p}}$. In the original implementation of the SIRS technique [20], the signal contrast is the parallel difference $\Delta M_\parallel = e^{-T_{\text{SL}}/T_{1p}} (1 - \cos(\gamma B_{\text{stim}} T_{\text{SL}})) M_0$. This can easily be shown to be maximized when $T_{\text{SL}} \approx 2T_{1p}$ with a maximum of $\Delta M_{\parallel,\text{max}} \approx 2(e^{-\gamma B_{\text{stim}} T_{1p}})^2 M_0$. Another approach is to use the $M_\perp$ component, resulting in a contrast of $\Delta M_\perp = e^{-T_{\text{SL}}/T_{1p}} \sin(\gamma B_{\text{stim}} T_{\text{SL}}) M_0$ which has a maximum of $\Delta M_{\perp,\text{max}} \approx e^{-1} \gamma B_{\text{stim}} T_{1p} M_0$ when $T_{\text{SL}} \approx T_{1p}$. These maxima can be viewed as the upper theoretical limits of the two signal components, in the case of a uniform decay of $T_{1p}$ and a long stimulus wave. These upper signal limits were compared to the signal generated by the steady-state sequence, computed with Bloch simulations.

3. Results
Simulation results of the signal behavior in the steady-state SIRS sequence are shown in figure 3 for a range of $B_{\text{stim}}/f_{\text{stim}}$ and off-resonance values $\Delta f$ as shown in table 1. The results indicate a frequency response with a main lobe centered on $f_{\text{SL}}$ and giving a zero value at $2/T_{\text{SL}}$, followed by smaller side-lobes. Without a stimulus field, figure 3(b) shows a band of low signal intensity for reasonably small values of the off-resonance $\Delta f$. With significant off-resonance, the magnetization will not only precess around the spin-lock axis, but around the vector sum $B_{\text{total}} = 2\pi/\gamma (f_{\text{SL}} + \Delta f)$ during the spin-lock pulse, and around $2\pi/\gamma \Delta f$ outside the spin-lock. This results in a non-zero tip during each TR, giving a steady-state signal response in the upper and lower regions of figures 3(a)–(b).

Sample images acquired in the phantom are shown in figure 4. The images show a dark band with very low signal across the phantom, similar to the low-intensity band in figures 3(a)–(b). In this region, the spins are very nearly on-resonance with the transmit frequency, which together with the spin-lock frequency being $f_{\text{SL}} = 1/T_{\text{SL}}$ results in no net phase accrual during the TR and thus no NMR signal. With perfect field homogeneity, the whole phantom would be dark, while in our experiment the dark band can be thought of as an effective field of view with the desired signal behavior. With the stimulus field present, the magnetization is tipped away from the spin-lock axis by $\alpha = \gamma B_{\text{stim}} T_{\text{SL}}$ every TR, resulting in a net steady-state signal.

The phantom results for various $B_{\text{stim}}$ and $f_{\text{stim}}$ values, described in table 1, are shown in figure 5. The measurements with varying $f_{\text{stim}}$ (figures 5(a), (c)) demonstrate a signal peak when $f_{\text{stim}} = f_{\text{SL}}$. The signal response curves are narrower than their corresponding simulations, with a full width at half maximum (FWHM) of about 20–30 Hz. Additionally, the measured signal response curves do not show any clear indication of sidelobes. The $B_{\text{stim}}$ measurements (figures 5(b), (d)) demonstrate an approximately linear response as a function of stimulus field magnitude. For both stimulus frequencies, the slope of the trend line of CNR as a function of stimulus field is about 0.14 nT$^{-1}$.

Figure 6 shows a comparison of the signal magnitude generated by our steady-state method to non-steady-state approaches in the presence of
Figure 3. (a) The steady-state SIRS response with $f_{SL} = 40$ Hz, $B_{stim} = 40$ nT, over a range of $f_{stim}$ and off-resonance frequencies $\Delta f$. (b) The same simulations with no stimulus field. (c) The difference between panels a and b. (d) Cross sections of the surface in panel a. The different colors represent off-resonance frequencies $\Delta f$. (e) The signal response of a steady-state SIRS sequence with $f_{SL} = 40$ Hz and $f_{stim} = 40$ Hz over a range of stimulus field strengths $B_{stim}$ for several off-resonance frequencies $\Delta f$.

Figure 4. Typical results from phantom scans at 40 Hz. (a) A reference bSSFP image of the water-filled phantom (voxel size: 3.6 mm × 3.6 mm × 9.9 mm). The outline of the stimulus coil can be seen. (b) A steady-state SIRS image with a stimulus with $B_{stim} = 40$ nT and $f_{stim} = f_{SL} = 40$ Hz. Note that as the spins get further off-resonance, we see a sharp transition from a signal void to a high signal, similar to figures 3(a)–(b) (a dark band). With perfect field homogeneity, the whole phantom would be dark. (c) The same acquisition as in panel b, but with no stimulus current applied.

4. Discussion

In this work, we have explored using the SIRS mechanism for detecting small oscillating magnetic fields in a ULF scanner. The method is based on a novel steady-state implementation of SIRS, designed to provide an optimal response in a ULF scanner with low gradient strength. The method has been shown to give a strong contrast at the targeted stimulus frequencies, as well as being rapid enough to allow for efficient signal averaging to overcome low Boltzmann polarization at ULF and reduce noise. This results in a high contrast-to-noise ratio. The method was
Figure 5. (a) Steady-state SIRS measurements with $f_{\text{SL}} = 40 \text{Hz}$, $B_{\text{stim}} = 40 \text{nT}$, and $f_{\text{stim}}$ between 25–120 Hz. The data shows a peak at $f_{\text{stim}} = f_{\text{SL}}$. (b) Steady-state SIRS measurements with $f_{\text{stim}} = f_{\text{SL}} = 40 \text{Hz}$ and $B_{\text{stim}}$ between 0 and 40 nT. (c)–(d) The same measurements as in panels (a)–(b), but with $f_{\text{SL}} = 50 \text{Hz}$.

Figure 6. Simulated comparison of the maximum signal amplitude at ULF of the proposed steady-state method (solid line), to the non-steady-state signal using the component orthogonal to the SL axis (dashed), and the parallel component (dotted), for the phantom used (blue) and human white matter (green). For all sequences, $f_{\text{SL}} = f_{\text{stim}} = 40 \text{Hz}$. For steady-state SIRS, $T_{\text{SL}} = 25 \text{ms}$. For orthogonal and parallel component SIRS, $T_{\text{SL}} = T_{1p}$ and $2T_{1p}$ respectively, giving the maximum response. For the phantom, $T_1 = T_2 = T_{1p} = 0.6 \text{s}$. For white matter, $T_1 = 130 \text{ms}$, $T_2 = 80 \text{ms}$, in accordance with prior measurements at ultra-low field [31], and $T_{1p} = 2(T_1^{-1} + T_2^{-1})^{-1}$.

tested in simulations and in phantom scans. While bSSFP has been combined with spin-lock techniques before [35], the presently described implementation is specifically designed for highly SNR-efficient current detection, combining the high SNR efficiency of bSSFP and the sensitivity of SIRS to sense small external magnetic fields.

Our method utilizes several advantages of the ULF system, one being its low specific absorption rate (SAR). For example, in the scans with $f_{\text{SL}} = 40 \text{Hz}$, the spin lock pulse had a duration of 25 ms, applied every TR with an approximate duration of 42 ms. An on-resonance 40 Hz spin lock pulse of this duration and duty cycle can be shown to risk exceeding FDA SAR limits at a 3T (128 MHz) system [36], while for a ULF system at 276 kHz the SAR is negligible, as it scales with the square of the main field. This difference would become even more pronounced with
faster imaging gradients, giving shorter TR. Furthermore, the sequence requires the magnetization to be no more than about ±5 Hz off-resonance, as can be seen in figure 3(a). At 3T, this corresponds to a fractional $B_0$ homogeneity of about ±0.04 ppm, a challenging engineering constraint for any magnet, let alone the inevitable effects of magnetic susceptibility gradients in vivo. At the 6.5 mT ULF system, however, this corresponds to a rather relaxed ±18 ppm fractional homogeneity requirement on the scanner magnetic field. Another benefit of the ULF system is that smaller interfering fields will be created by induced currents in vessels such as arterioles that pulsate in the magnetic field. While we estimate this effect to be small even under clinical field strengths and would only result in interference at the vascular pulsating frequency, it is of even less concern at ULF, where we estimate it to be approximately 6 orders of magnitude below desired sensitivity levels. Additionally, the open design of the ULF system allows the patient to be scanned under different angles relative to the $B_0$ field. This can be beneficial, as the SIRS method is only sensitive to fields parallel to the main field.

While the phantom results agree with the simulation results in important ways, some discrepancies are also apparent by comparing figures 3 and 5. The $f_{\text{stim}}$ response lobe is narrower in the phantom and does not exhibit clear sidelobes, and the $B_{\text{stim}}$ response appears increasing and mostly linear, while the simulations show a response that tapers off at high values of $B_{\text{stim}}$. These effects could be the result of the large voxel size used in the scan, which could make $B_0$, $B_1$, $B_{\text{SL}}$, and $B_{\text{stim}}$ nonuniform within the voxel. In particular, the voxel is large in the slice dimension (roughly 1 cm), which means that large parts of the voxel are distant from the plane of the coil and experience lower $B_{\text{stim}}$. Furthermore, even though an effort was made to make the coil plane perpendicular to $B_0$, there will inevitably be some misalignment between the two. This results in a lower effective field, as only the $B_{\text{stim}}$ component parallel to $B_0$ contributes to the SIRS effect.

As described, in the phantom scans the pulse sequence triggers the synthesizer that drives $B_{\text{stim}}$, and the synthesizer generated a number of wavelengths at the desired frequency, as shown in figure 2. Alternatively, the sequence could measure a continuous wave. In this case, the sequence should ideally be timed such that the phase $\phi_{\text{stim}} = 2\pi f_{\text{stim}} TR$ accumulated by the stimulus wave over the TR satisfies $\phi_{\text{stim}} = \phi_M + n 2\pi$, where $\phi_M$ is the phase accumulated by the magnetization. This is achieved if $f_{\text{stim}} = f_{\text{SL}}$, $T_{\text{SL}} = n/f_{\text{SL}}$, and the time in between SL modules is $T_{\text{FP}} = m/f_{\text{stim}}$, where $n$ and $m$ are integers, and no additional phase is acquired by the magnetization due to off-resonance effects.

The simulations and measurements appeared to agree equally well on-and off-resonance. Figures 3(a) and 7 demonstrate that our sequence can produce a negative contrast in the presence of a stimulus field when run with a slight shift $\Delta f$ away from resonance. Although this contrast can be quite strong, it is not as useful as the positive contrast mechanism as it gives maximum contrast slightly away from the spin-lock
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**Figure 7.** (a) Sample image acquired with a 32 × 32 × 19 acquisition matrix over a 28 cm × 28 cm × 20 cm FOV, TR = 54 ms, $T_{\text{SL}} = 41$ ms, $f_{\text{SL}} = f_{\text{stim}} = 100$ Hz, $B_{\text{stim}} = 75$ nT. (b) The same acquisition but without a stimulus. (c) Negative contrast for $f_{\text{SL}} = 100$ Hz, $B_{\text{stim}} = 75$ nT, and a range of $f_{\text{stim}}$ frequencies. (d) Similar measurements as in panel c but with $B_{\text{stim}} = 15$ nT.
frequency $f_S$, while also having a large ripple response away from the maximum contrast. Furthermore, the agreement between measurements and simulations did not depend on the stimulus coil size. This is demonstrated in supplementary figure S1, showing the response from a smaller stimulus coil with an 8 mm diameter, giving a very similar response as the larger 40 mm coil described in the Methods section. This larger coil was preferred for the experiments due to the ease of measuring its center field and thus calibrating the coil.

The measurement technique described in this work is sensitive primarily to the magnetic field generated by the primary currents in the dendrites of pyramidal cells of the cortex, that due to their parallel alignment and synchronous population in the tens if not hundreds of thousands of neurons provide dipolar magnetic fields of the strength detectible by our techniques. In that regard our technique is very similar to magnetoencephalography (MEG) [6]. MEG suffers a cancellation scenario due to volume currents when the dipole is radial in a conducting sphere. The technique proposed in this work is not affected by this, as we are detecting inside the conducting medium. There is another scenario, where volume currents could affect our measurements, when the sources are extremely close to conductivity boundaries. On the scale of any mammalian brain the number of locations affected by this would be negligible [17]. The proposed technique detects magnetic fields of the primary dipole, and the magnetic field of the volume return currents, especially at distal regions has no significant effect on our measurements.

The ultimate goal of magnetic field detection with methods such as SIRS is to measure biological magnetic fields in the brain. Results from the literature estimate that sensitivity to fields in the range of 0.1–1 nT is necessary with an MRI imaging scale of about 1 mm [10, 37–39]. For the ultra-low field scanner, the average magnetic field from a neuronal bundle within a voxel would likely be smaller due to the larger voxel size. A method to detect human brain activity would therefore very likely need to be sensitive to fields no larger than 0.1 nT. For a $3 \times 3$-pixel ROI like the one used in this work, a CNR = 1 has been estimated as necessary for clear contrast, based on the Rose model [40, 41]. Figure 5 shows the steady-state SIRS method at ultra-low field giving CNR = 1 at about $B_{\text{sim}} = 7$ nT. Furthermore, as is demonstrated in the simulations in figure 6, the lower values of $T_1$ and $T_2$ in white matter would likely reduce the generated signal amplitude by approximately a factor of 5. This indicates that our method is likely to be insufficiently sensitive for in vivo imaging in the described ULF setting. Running the method at a higher field, yielding better SNR, or with increased gradient strength, allowing shorter TR, could make the method sufficiently sensitive to measure biological-strength fields.

The field could likely be increased by an order of magnitude while retaining insensitivity to BOLD effects and without reaching SAR limits. The CNR can also be improved with more signal averaging but this can increase scan time to unacceptable durations. With enough sensitivity, the method could potentially be tested by playing an auditory stimulus to a subject in the form of a ‘click train’. Such a stimulus has been shown to result in an auditory steady-state response, being particularly sensitive to frequencies around 40 Hz [42–44]. This would likely be the most feasible way of testing the method on human subjects, but care would need to be taken to use pneumatic headphones that do not produce interfering electromagnetic fields close to the subject.

Our method has certain limitations. As already described, the sequence requires phase coherence in the stimulus wave at the start of each spin-lock period. This can either be achieved with coherent wave bursts or with a long, synchronous wave. Additionally, the sequence is inherently sensitive to errors in $B_0$ and $B_1$ which require careful measurements and calibration of these parameters. As described, the magnetic field homogeneity required for the method is difficult to achieve in a clinical high-field scanner but feasible at the ultra-low field scanner used. However, this scanner was sensitive to external field interference, such as from large metal objects in the external environment of the scanner shimming the magnet. An effort was made to keep any effects from such external shimming (e.g. cars parked nearby) to a minimum.

5. Conclusion

We have developed a steady-state implementation of the SIRS mechanism, designed to give strong CNR at ultra-low fields with limited gradient strengths. Simulations and phantom scans demonstrated a strong signal response. With operation at larger magnetic field (but still in the low-field regime) or incorporation of higher gradient amplitudes, the method could potentially provide sensitivity to biological fields.

Acknowledgments

DARPA 2016D006054

ORCID iD

Bragi Sveinsson https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8109-0404

References

mapping with magnetic resonance imaging Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 89 3951–5
[41] Palmer A R and Russell J I 1986 Phase-locking in the cochlear nerve of the guinea-pig and its relation to the receptor potential of inner hair-cells Hear Res. 24 1–15