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Main Ideas

- Computer guided laser treatment as a minimally invasive alternative to standard treatment of cancer

- Simple Idea: Subject all cells, including cancer cells, to temperatures outside normothermia range may damage and destroy cells

  ▶ Subject cells to hyperthermia/ablation temperature ranges
  ▶ Heat source provided by diffusing interstitial laser fiber or collimated external source

- Real-Time Thermal Imaging provides guidance to Real-Time computational prediction

- Target disease: tissues with a well-defined tumor
CyberInfrastructure

- hp adaptive FEM computations
- Compute Server
- Hp3D
- MRTI Data Transfer
- Feedback Control
- LBIIE Mesher
- Image processing and Mesh generation
- Visualization Server
- Volume Rover
- Houston: Surgery/Visualization Client
- MRI & MRTI Scans
Bioheat Transfer Model

The Non-Linear Pennes Model

\[
\rho c_p \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \nabla \cdot (k(u) \nabla u) + \omega(u)c_{blood}(u - u_a) = Q_{laser}(x, t) \text{ in } \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3
\]

\[-k(u)\nabla u \cdot n = h(u - u_\infty) \text{ on } \partial \Omega\]

\[u(x, 0) = u^0 \text{ in } \Omega\]

\[Q_{laser}(x) = 3P \mu_a \frac{\exp(-\mu_s \|x - x_0\|)}{4\pi \|x - x_0\|}\]
Optimizations

The three main problems in which we are interested in is the real-time solution of the following problems

- calibration of the model coefficients
- optimal control of the laser
- goal oriented error estimation
Optimization Framework

Find $q^* \in \mathbb{P}$ s.t.

$$Q(u(q^*), q^*) = \inf_{q \in \mathbb{P}} Q(u(q), q)$$

$u \in \mathcal{V}$, determined from variational PDE

$$C(u, q; v) = 0 \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{V}$$

$\mathcal{V}$ is the appropriately chosen Hilbert space, and $q$ is a parameter in the control space $\mathbb{P}$

$$\mathbb{P} \equiv \{ q \in \mathbb{P} : \exists! u \text{ s.t. } C(u, q; v) = 0 \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{V} \}$$
Adjoint Problem

\[-\rho c_p \frac{\partial p}{\partial t} - \nabla \cdot (k(u) \nabla p) + \frac{\partial k}{\partial u}(u, \beta) \nabla u \cdot \nabla p \]
\[+ \omega(u, \beta) p + \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial u}(u, \beta) p (u - u_a) \]
\[= (u - \phi(x)) \quad \text{in } \Omega \]

\[-k(u) \nabla p \cdot n = h \, p \quad \text{on } \partial \Omega \]

\[p(x, \tau) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \]
Adjoint Method

Gradient Computation

\[ \begin{bmatrix}
\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \frac{\partial k}{\partial k_0} (u, \beta) \nabla u \cdot \nabla p \, dxdt \\
\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \frac{\partial k}{\partial k_1} (u, \beta) \nabla u \cdot \nabla p \, dxdt \\
\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \frac{\partial k}{\partial k_2} (u, \beta) \nabla u \cdot \nabla p \, dxdt \\
\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \frac{\partial k}{\partial k_3} (u, \beta) \nabla u \cdot \nabla p \, dxdt \\
\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial \omega_0} (u, \beta)(u - u_a) \, p \, dxdt \\
\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial \omega_1} (u, \beta)(u - u_a) \, p \, dxdt \\
\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial \omega_2} (u, \beta)(u - u_a) \, p \, dxdt \\
\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial \omega_3} (u, \beta)(u - u_a) \, p \, dxdt
\end{bmatrix} \]
Adjoint Method

Gradient Computation

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \frac{\partial Q_{\text{laser}}}{\partial P} p \, dx \, dt \\
\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \frac{\partial Q_{\text{laser}}}{\partial \mu_a} p \, dx \, dt \\
\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \frac{\partial Q_{\text{laser}}}{\partial \mu_s} p \, dx \, dt \\
\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \frac{\partial Q_{\text{laser}}}{\partial x_0} p \, dx \, dt \\
\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \frac{\partial Q_{\text{laser}}}{\partial y_0} p \, dx \, dt \\
\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \frac{\partial Q_{\text{laser}}}{\partial z_0} p \, dx \, dt
\end{bmatrix}
\]
Adjoint Method

Goal Oriented Error Estimation

\( \mathcal{O}(p) \) for state variable, \( \mathcal{O}(p + 1) \) for adjoint variable

\[
\int_0^T \int_\Omega \left[ \rho c_p \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} p + k(u, \beta) \nabla u \cdot \nabla p + \omega(u, \beta) c_{\text{blood}} (u - u_a) p \right] dxdt \\
+ \int_0^T \int_{\partial \Omega_C} h(u - u_\infty) p dAdt - \int_0^T \int_\Omega Q_{\text{laser}}(x, \eta) p dxdt
\]
Registration

- Currently have capabilities for rigid body registration

- Using ITK for Registration.

- www.itk.org
Alternative objective functions

\[ Q(u(\beta), \beta) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{2} \| u(x, t) - u_{\text{ideal}}(x, t) \|^2_{L^2([0,\tau];L^2(\Omega))} \\
\frac{1}{2} \| D(u) - D_{\text{ideal}}(x) \|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
\frac{1}{2} \| H(u, t) - H_{\text{ideal}}(x, t) \|^2_{L^2([0,\tau];L^2(\Omega))} 
\end{cases} \]

- Colleagues in BME developing empirical models of HSP/Damage from in-vitro cellular data

- HSP/Damage-Based optimizations to provide ideal HSP/Damage field
Current Capabilities: 40-50sec prediction or $\approx 5$ gradient computations in 10sec
Data Transfer

- Houston to Austin
  - 34 anatomical images 131072 bytes each
  - 121*5 temp images 65535 bytes each
  - avg bandwidth was .2MB/s and the file size of one time instance is .32MB

- Lonestar to Maverick
  - 120 files sets use for vis of MRTI w/ fem.
  - 5.5 MB FEM Mesh 2.6 MB MRTI Vis
  - avg bandwidth: 1.7MB/s ( WORK FILE system )
  - avg bandwidth: 3.4MB/s ( /tmp on the comp node )
The possibility of reducing death due to cancer or enhancing the quality of life of patients may represent one of the great triumphs of Finite Element Methods and Computational Engineering.
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