



43rd Annual Ultrasonic Industry Association Symposium

23-25 April, 2014

Madrid, Spain

HIFU Induced Heating Modeling by using the Finite Element Method

R. Martínez, A. Vera and L. Leija







- Introduction
- Objective
- Methods
- Results
- Discussion
- Conclusion

Introduction



What is HIFU*?





- Ellipsoidal shaped focal zone.
- Focus location depends on tranducer geometry and operating frequency.
- Acoustic energy concentrartion at the focus.
- Quick temperature elevation over 56°C which produces coagulative necrosis.
- Treatment of benign and malign tumors
- Non-invasive technique.
- Exposure time < 10 s.

Heating modeling

- Exposure time to HIFU for lesion formation.
- Tissue/phantom thermal properties temperature dependence.
- Temperature gradient around focal region.
- Media changes due to HIFU and heating.







To model the HIFU induced heating by means of Finite Element Method as a function of the applied electric potential to the transducer.



Methods



HIFU transducer electric impedance measurement







HIFU acoustic field characterization







HIFU transducer FEM electric impedance modeling





System equations

$$\sigma = c_{E}\varepsilon - e^{T}E$$
$$D = e\varepsilon + \varepsilon_{0}\varepsilon_{rT}E$$

where,

σ, stress tensor c_E , elasticity matrix e_T , electro-mechanic coupling matrix **E**, electric field **D**, displacement vector e, deformed tensor \mathcal{E}_0 , vaccum permitivity \mathcal{E}_{rT} , relative permitivity



HIFU transducer FEM electric impedance modeling





Element material: **PZT-8** Boundary constrains:

- I, axial symmetry
- 2, fixed
- 3 and 4, free

Electric boundary conditions:

- I and 2, zero charge/symmetry
- 3, ground
- 4, electric potential of 500 mV

Mesh:

• 2794 triangular elements

Frequency response:

• 100 kHz to 4 MHz



HIFU transducer electric impedance



Electric impedance in transducer face

 $I = \int_{S} \mathbf{J} \cdot d\mathbf{A}$ $Z_{e} = V_{B-A} / I$

where,

J, current density in transducer's face

A, transducer face area

 $V_{B\text{-}A}$, electric potential between both electrodes A and B I, current

 $\boldsymbol{Z_e}$, electric impedance



2D axisymmetric FEM equations



Wave equation for timeharmonic analysis

Reduced Bio-heat equation for transient response

$$\nabla^2 p - \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2 p}{\partial t^2} = 0$$

$$\rho_0 C \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} - \overline{k} \nabla^2 T = Q_{ext}$$

Acoustic pressure and heat relation

$$Q_{ext} = \frac{\alpha p^2}{\rho_0 c} \left[\frac{W}{m^3} \right]$$





HIFU field FEM modeling





HIFU induced heating modeling





Boundary conditions Axial symmetry: 1, 2 and 3 Continuity: 4, 5, 6, and 9 Temperature: 7, 8 and 10 Thermal insulation: 13

Subdomain properties Water: Density: 1000 kg/m^3 Sound speed: 1500 m/s Phantom: Density: 1045 kg/m^3 Sound speed: 1540 m/s

> 5494 triangular elements 39589 quad elements



HIFU induced heating modeling







Phantom thermal conductivity



- Fixed: 0.5 W/(m*K)
- Temperature dependent **



** Guntur S. R., Lee K. I., et al, "Temperature-dependent thermal properties of ex vivo liver undergoing thermal ablation". Ultrasound in Med. & Biol., Vol. 39, No. 10, pp. 1771-17184, 2013

Results

HIFU transducer electric impedance measurement and modeling









HIFU field modeling









HIFU field modeling





Heating modeling @ 5 Vp excitation







Heating modeling @ 10 Vp excitation







Heating modeling @ 15 Vp excitation







Heating modeling @ 20 Vp excitation











- Nonlinearity propagation was neglected.
- Inclusion of temperature dependent tissue/phantom properties.
- Electric power loss: transducer efficiency.
- Pressure acoustic propagation at beam path difference with measured data.
- Heat model validation with measurements in phantom.







- Concave radiator electric impedance model show great concordance with measurements in both air and water media.
- Focused acoustic field depend on piezoelectric element properties which vary according on its fabrication.
- As nonlinearity propagation was neglected, pressure distribution along beam path and the acoustic field did not showed differences.
- Maximum temperature increment was expected on heating modeling with thermal conductivity as a function of temperature.
- Normalized heating along beam path with thermal conductivity as a function of temperature showed a bigger heating area than heating with constant thermal conductivity.
- Model improvement.





Thanks for your attendance

<u>rmartinez@cinvestav.mx</u>, <u>laremus@cinvestav.mx</u>