

An In-Silico Testbed for Fast and Accurate MR Labeling of Orthopaedic Implants

Reviewed Preprint

Published from the original preprint after peer review and assessment by eLife.

About eLife's process

Reviewed preprint posted

September 15, 2023 (this version)

Posted to bioRxiv

July 18, 2023

Sent for peer review

July 6, 2023

Gregory M Noetscher , Peter J. Serano, Marc Horner, Alexander Prokop, Jonathan Hanson, Kyoko Fujimoto, James E. Brown, Ara Nazarian, Jerome Ackerman, Sergey N Makaroff

Electrical & Computer Eng. Dept. Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester MA 01609-2280 USA • Ansys, Inc., 2600 Ansys Drive, Canonsburg, PA 15317 USA • Dassault Systèmes Deutschland GmbH, Bad Nauheimer Str. 19, 64289 Darmstadt, Germany • Neva Electromagnetics, LLC, 1010 Main St., Holden, MA 01520 • GE HealthCare, 500 W Monroe Street, Chicago, IL, 60661 USA • Micro Systems Engineering, Inc., an affiliate of Biotronik, 6024 Jean Road, Lake Oswego, OR 97035 USA • Musculoskeletal Translational Innovation Initiative, Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center and Harvard Medical School, 330 Brookline Ave, RN123, Boston, MA, 02215 USA • Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA 02115 USA • Athinoula A Martinos Center for Biomed. Imaging, Massachusetts General Hospital 149 13, St. Charlestown, MA 02129 USA

 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open_access

 <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Abstract

Abstract

One limitation on the ability to monitor health in older adults using Magnetic Resonance (MR) imaging is the presence of implants, where the prevalence of implantable devices (orthopedic, cardiac, neuromodulation) increases in the population, as does the pervasiveness of conditions requiring MRI studies for diagnosis (musculoskeletal diseases, infections, or cancer). The present study describes a novel multiphysics implant modeling testbed using the following approaches with two examples:

- - an in-silico human model based on the widely available Visible Human Project (VHP) cryo- section dataset; *in-silico* human model based on the widely available Visible Human Project (VHP) cryo- section dataset;
- - a finite element method (FEM) modeling software workbench from Ansys (Electronics Desktop/Mechanical) to model MR radio frequency (RF) coils and the temperature rise modeling in heterogeneous media.

The *in-silico* VHP Female model (250 parts with an additional 40 components specifically characterizing embedded implants and resultant surrounding tissues) corresponds to a 60-year-old female with a body mass index (BMI) of 36. The testbed includes the FEM-compatible *in-silico* human model, an implant embedding procedure, a generic parameterizable MRI RF birdcage two-port coil model, a workflow for computing heat sources on the implant surface and in adjacent tissues, and a thermal FEM solver directly linked to the MR coil simulator to determine implant heating based on an MR imaging study protocol. The primary target is MR labeling of large orthopaedic implants. The testbed has very recently been approved by the

eLife assessment

This manuscript will provide a **valuable** method to evaluate the safety of MR in patients with orthopaedic implants, which is required in clinics. A strength of the work is that the in-silicon testbed is **solid**, based on the widely available human project, and validated. In addition, the toolbox will be open for clinical practice.

1. Introduction

One limitation on the ability to monitor health in older adults using Magnetic Resonance (MR) imaging studies is the presence of implants, where the prevalence of implantable devices (orthopedic, cardiac, neuromodulation) increases in the population, as does the pervasiveness of conditions requiring MRI studies for diagnosis (musculoskeletal conditions, infections, or cancer). In 2020, 26% of the US population over 65 was estimated to carry a large joint or spinal implant [1]. Simultaneously, 12.6 million patients over 65 who carry orthopedic or cardiac implants will need an MR study within 10 years, according to an estimate in 2020 [1] with this number expected to rise. Similarly, over 70% of the estimated 3 million pacemakers in the US are implanted in patients older than 65 [2], [3], where approximately 20% of these patients will need an MR study within 12 months of device implantation [4].

Terms to be used to label MR information for medical devices – implants – include *MR safe*, *MR conditional*, and *MR unsafe* [5], [6], [7], [8]. *MR safe items are nonconducting, nonmetallic, and nonmagnetic items, such as a plastic Petri dish* [8]. *MR unsafe items include in particular ferromagnetic materials* [8]; they should not enter the MR scanner room [6]. All other devices that contain any metallic components, such as titanium, (regardless of ferromagnetism) are *MR conditional* and will need to be evaluated and labeled for RF-induced heating, image artifact, force, and torque [5]. For the corresponding labeling icons, see [6].

MR conditional implants may safely enter the MR scanner room only under the very specific conditions provided in the labeling. Patients should not be scanned unless the device can be positively identified as MR conditional and the conditions for safe use are met [6]. When present, information about expected temperature rise and artifact extent may inform the risk/benefit decision of whether or not a patient should undergo an MR examination [6].

Given the large numbers of implants subject to conditional labeling, the number of cleared FDA 510(k) submissions for orthopedic implantable devices with MR labeling has been growing exponentially since 2014 [9], approaching 100 in 2019 [9]. However, practical testing is limited by constraints related to cost and resources, including testing tools [9]. As a result, a number of implants have been labeled “*MR Not Evaluated*”, which precludes patients’ access to MR imaging procedures [9]. Other implants may be labeled too restrictively [1], limiting patient access to MR imaging [10]. When estimating combined data from [1], [9], [10], [12], up to two million elderly patients in the US are potentially affected by MR labeling uncertainty.

Presumably, the most important consequence of this uncertainty is restricting general access to MR imaging studies for patients with implants. This also prevents the use of MR imaging for better soft tissue monitoring in the vicinity of implants. A prime example of the latter is periprosthetic

joint infection following total hip replacement surgery, which occurs in only 1%–2% of primary arthroplasties [14], [15] but in up to 30% of revision arthroplasties [15]. This form of infection occurs due to mechanical loosening and dislocation, currently the most common causes for revision of total hip arthroplasty in the United States [16]. Periprosthetic joint infection related mortality is approaching 5–8% at one year [14]. Presently, X-rays and other methods are used for diagnosis [17], but results of MR imaging with metal artifact reduction were recently shown to be the most accurate tool in the diagnosis of several biomarkers of periprosthetic hip joint infection [15], [18].

One major safety concern, relevant to both passive and active implants, is implant heating within MR radiofrequency and gradient coils [5]. Along with the required yet not entirely anatomical ASTM phantom test [5], [19], numerical simulations with virtual human models generate accurate predictions of temperature rise [20], [21], [22], [23], [24], [25], [26] accepted by the FDA [26]. The electromagnetic and thermal simulation algorithms based on finite element, finite difference, and boundary element methods are reasonably well developed [27], [28], [31], [32]. However, accessible, full body, detailed anatomical virtual human models reflecting major age, sex, race, and obesity variations are severely lacking. Their creation is a long, tedious, and labor-intensive process. Even today, it requires manual and semiautomatic supervised segmentation of full body MR images, surface mesh reconstruction, mesh intersection resolution, software compatibility and robustness testing, and finally examination of hundreds of different body compartments by anatomical experts.

An excellent collection of *in-silico* human body models intended for this purpose is the Virtual Population, a product of the IT'IS Foundation [26], [29] widely used in both industrial and academic applications. While this population has many highly detailed body models, it is relatively homogeneous: reasonably fit, younger Caucasian European subjects, representing a comparatively limited subsection of human anatomy and physiology. Although three obese models were added in 2023 [30], two of the three are not truly anatomical and were obtained via morphing (the 'Fats' model being the exception). Also, while models are available for purchase and for research purposes, no background MRI data enabling independent tissue structure verification have been made publicly available for this population set.

The present study describes a complete ready-to-use implant modeling testbed for RF heating based on

1. an *in-silico* human model constructed from the widely available Visible Human Project (VHP) [34], [35] cryo-section dataset;
2. a FEM modeling software workbench from Ansys HFSS (Electronics Desktop) to model the physical phenomena of a MR RF coil and corresponding temperature rise in heterogeneous media.

The *in-silico* VHP Female model (250 anatomical structures with additional 40 components specifically characterizing embedded implants [31]) characterizes a 60-year-old female subject with a body mass index (BMI) of 36. The open-source version of this model [13] has over 600 registered users from both industry and academia worldwide. The testbed includes the *in-silico* model, an implant embedding procedure, a generic parameterizable MR RF birdcage two-port coil model, a workflow for computing heat sources on the implant surface and neighboring tissues, and a thermal FEM solver directly linked to the MR coil simulator to estimate implant heating based on an MR imaging protocol. The primary target is MR labeling of large orthopaedic implants. The testbed has recently been approved by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) as a medical device development tool (MDDT) [11] for 1.5 T orthopaedic implant examinations.

We also present two simple application examples pertinent to choosing an appropriate MR imaging protocol for a particular orthopaedic implant as well as validation against measurements of the heading of an ablation needle in bovine liver.

2. Materials AND Methods

2.1 *In silico*-human model and implant embedding procedure

Fig. 1 [↗](#) shows surface CAD meshes for the VHP-Female model [27 [↗](#)],[31 [↗](#)] (with some muscles removed for clarity) and examples of passive femoral implants embedded into the model. The corresponding physical femoral implants are shown on the top right of the figure.

The implant registration enforces an anatomically correct implant position, and a certain part of the bone matter (cortical and/or trabecular) to be removed as necessary. A semiautomatic implant registration algorithm requiring limited user intervention has been employed based on the principal idea to use at least two anchor nodes per implant: a fixed node and a floating node. The floating anchor node is a vertex of the implant mesh belonging to a certain curve, say, the long axis of the bone. The fixed anchor node is a joint coincident vertex of the femur mesh and the implant mesh. These nodes define the proper implant position given the bone model and a cost function, with a “best fit” based on a mesh intersection check and the signed normal distances between implant/bone boundaries. An additional criterion involves the minimum required thickness of the cortical bone matter with an embedded implant.

2.2 Computation of heat sources due to microwave absorption in MR RF coils

A generic, parameterized, and tunable MR RF birdcage two-port coil model (high-, low-, or bandpass), at 64 MHz (1.5 T) with a variable number of rungs was implemented in Ansys Electronics Desktop (Ansys HFSS, **Fig. 2a** [↗](#)). This model is used to compute heat sources – either specific absorption rate (SAR) in W/kg, or power loss density (PLD) in W/m³ at any point in the body, including on the surface of the implants (**Figs. 2b** [↗](#) and **c** [↗](#) [33 [↗](#)]). The *in-silico* model with the implant(s) can be positioned at any appropriate landmark.

2.3 Determination of implant temperature rise as a function of scan time

An Ansys FEM transient thermal solver was employed to determine tissue temperature rise close to the implant caused by the heat sources. It requires knowing the relevant thermal properties of the tissues. The solver may approximately model blood perfusion, which is less important for bone, but is important for cardiac implants and other soft tissue implants [36 [↗](#)].

The entire testbed has been integrated into Ansys Workbench, which allows the combination of different multiphysics modules within a single environment, as shown in **Fig. 3** [↗](#).

In this way, the output of the electromagnetic solver (**Figs. 3A** [↗](#) and **B** [↗](#)) is the input to the thermal solver (**Fig. 3D** [↗](#)). Both accurate FEM solvers utilize the same human model geometry throughout, but with different material properties (thermal vs electromagnetic).




Fig 1.

Left a) – surface CAD meshes for the VHP-Female model (with some muscles removed for purposes of visualization); and right – examples of passive femoral implants embedded into the model. **Figs. 1b-d** at top right – physical femoral implants; **Figs. 1e-g** at center and bottom – anatomically justified CAD realization within the virtual human VHP-Female. An Austin Moore implant is shown in **Fig. 1b**; a short proximal femoral nail with the proximal hip (a large femoral neck screw) is given in **Fig. 1c**; a long proximal femoral nail with the proximal hip is presented in **Fig. 1d**.




Fig 2.

Left - VHP-Female computational phantom positioned within a 1.5 T MRI birdcage coil at the abdominal landmark. Right - power loss density in W/m^3 in the coil for the b) Austin Moore and c) femoral nail implants.




Fig 3.

Ansys Workbench modeling workflow consisting of the HFSS (electromagnetic) module labeled as A and B, and the transient thermal module labeled D. Thermal material properties are contained in module C.

3. Results

3.1 What is heating-related MR labeling of implants?

For the implantable devices that are categorized as MR Conditional, the labeling includes scan and rest times at a given whole-body SAR or $B_{1,rms}^+$ (“root mean square” value of B_1^+ averaged over a period of 10 seconds). This is described in the FDA’s guidance document [5] (cf. also examples in [8]) where devices are to be labeled for a 1-hour MR session, including both scan and rest times. The guidance states a certain interleaving combination of scan (e.g., 5 min) and rest (e.g., 15 min) times that guarantees implant heating is less than 5 °C or another specified number [5]. The FDA-required procedure is a measurement test in an ASTM gel-based homogeneous phantom [5],[19]. When performing relevant numerical modeling, the pulse sequences and scan times should be converted to equivalent CW (continuous wave) operation, which is easier to model.

However, the response of the ASTM phantom is quite different from that of a real body, which includes bones and other tissues of varying electrical and thermal conductivities, as well as blood circulation and perfusion. In several test cases, our testbed prototype predicted a higher maximum temperature rise (up to 40% higher) at the implant tips versus *in-vitro* experiments with a simplified gel phantom. In other cases, and for other implants, however, the heating was substantially lower (by 50% or so). Therefore, the *in-silico* testbed will augment the ASTM measurements with accurate multiphysics modeling. Additionally, this modeling can assist with implant design in an efficient manner.

We note that this work is solely focused on the RF safety aspects of MR labeling. The results expressed herein should be considered supplemental to existing published guidelines.

3.2 Example: labeling long femoral titanium nail

Fig. 4 shows an example of testing results for a long titanium femoral nail subject to three cycles of 15 min with a 2.3 W/kg average equivalent SAR exposure followed by 5 minutes of rest, resulting in a 1-hour total exposure in a 1.5 T MRI coil. The model predicts that the temperature near the implant reaches 41 °C after the first exposure with its final value approaching 45 °C, a total increase of about 10 °C which is clearly unacceptable! Further simulations show that 4 min exposures followed by 16 min of rest would be a safe solution. In the testbed, the exposure time is arbitrary and can be rapidly tested and adjusted (within 5-7 min) to meet the FDA requirements [5] and construct the proper MR exposure protocol.

3.3 Comparison with experiment for a long resonant metal conductor with a sharp tip

The most challenging and important cases correspond to testing large and potentially resonant metal implants [19] with relatively sharp tips or terminations since detecting resonance requires accurate high-frequency modeling. One extreme example was studied in Ref. [37], where a simulated percutaneous RF ablation surgical procedure using MR heating was performed in *ex-vivo* bovine liver in a 1.5 T scanner. The device under study was a bent long wire ‘antenna’ made resonant at the scanner Larmor frequency with an adjustable series capacitor. The antenna, a 26 AWG (0.40 mm) Teflon-insulated silver-plated copper wire taped around the edge of the patient table, was terminated in a simulated RF ablation needle (a 15 cm long 16 AWG/1.30 mm diameter bare copper wire), the tip of which was embedded into the liver to simulate the percutaneous ablation of a solid hepatic tumor. The parametrized testbed coil model was used to replicate the RF antenna and needle geometry of Ref. [37], using standard electrical properties of human liver tissue. The peak tissue temperature increase imaged in Ref. [37] by the proton




Fig 4.

Top – long femoral nail subject to three repetitions of 15 minutes exposure followed by 5 minutes of rest for 1 hour in total. Center – temperature contour plot in a cut plane roughly bisecting the embedded femoral implant at the end of the last heating cycle. Bottom – temperature rise profile at the temperature probe. Only the bone is shown but the computations are performed for the entire model.

resonance frequency shift (PRFS) method (20 °C) and a 22 °C increase recorded by a fiber optic temperature sensor at the needle tip agreed well with our modeled prediction of a 23 °C increase using the modeling testbed.

A very fine FEM mesh resolution is required to accurately resolve temperature rise close to a sharp lead tip with a diameter of 1.3 mm – cf. **Fig. 5** [\[39\]](#). This is achieved using local automated adaptive FEM mesh refinement, which is a unique property of the present testbed. **Fig. 5** [\[39\]](#) shows the corresponding testbed setup along with the lesion. A few relevant field movies are available as supplementary materials [\[39\]](#).

4. Discussion AND Conclusion

The temperature rise in the surrounding tissues of a large orthopedic metallic implant subject to MR imaging is a significant point of concern and a potential barrier for the development of better implants. Numerical electromagnetic and thermal modeling offers a way to solve this complex problem with a sufficient degree of accuracy. We developed a complete testbed for realistic implant modeling, which includes a detailed FEM-compatible obese human female model, a parameterized tunable generic MR coil model, a method for implant embedding, and an accurate radio frequency solver directly coupled with a transient thermal solver.

In the testbed, the MR exposure time is arbitrary and can be readily adjusted and rapidly tested (typically within ~5-7 min). This enables the user to meet regulatory requirements [\[5\]](#) and to construct a proper MR exposure protocol. A cross-platform compatibility of the *in-silico* model has been established previously [\[38\]](#). Further validation of cross-platform electromagnetic and thermal coupling performance is currently underway with Dassault Systèmes CST Studio Suite software package. The testbed along with the open-source version of the human model VHP-Female College [\[13\]](#) is available online [\[39\]](#).

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health grants R01AR075077 and R01EB029818.




Fig 5.

Liver experiment setup: E-field distribution in the plane of the resonant loop and SAR distribution within liver in a plane passing through the tip of the lead. Bottom left – lesion in a section of *ex-vivo* bovine liver created with heating at the tip of a 16 gauge (1.3 mm) bare copper wire needle in about 1.5 min [37].

References

- [1] Kanal E, Brown G., de Bruin PW, Kugel H. (2015) **Scanning patients with MR conditional implants. Philips Professional Healthcare**
- [2] Lim WY, Prabhu S, Schilling RJ (2019) **Implantable Cardiac Electronic Devices in the Elderly Population** *Arrhythm Electrophysiol Rev* 8:143–146 <https://doi.org/10.15420/aer.2019.3.4>
- [3] Puette JA, Malek R, Ellison MB (2022) **Puette JA, Malek R, Ellison MB. Pacemaker.** [Updated 2022 Sep 12]. In: StatPearls [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing Co; 2022 Jan-. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK526001/>
- [4] Brown JE, Qiang R, Stadnik PJ, et al., Makarov S, Horner M, Noetscher G (2019) **Calculation of MRI RF-Induced Voltages for Implanted Medical Devices Using Computational Human Models** *Brain and Human Body Modeling: Computational Human Modeling at EMBC 2018 [Internet]* https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-21293-3_1
- [5] (2021) **Testing and Labeling Medical Devices for Safety in the Magnetic Resonance (MR) Environment.** U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Food and Drug Administration, Center for Devices and Radiological Health. May 20th 2021. Online: <https://www.fda.gov/media/74201/download>.
- [6] (1970) **Understanding MRI Safety Labeling.** U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Summary, online: <https://www.fda.gov/media/101221/download>
- [7] American College of Radiology (2020) **ACR Manual on MR Safety**
- [8] Shellock FG, Woods TO, Crues JV (2009) **MR labeling information for implants and devices: explanation of terminology** *Radiology* 253:26–30 <https://doi.org/10.1148/radiol.2531091030>
- [9] Fujimoto K, Smith A, Angelone LM, Dwivedi V, Rajan SS, Showalter BL, McMinn NL (2020) **Retrospective Analysis of Radio-frequency Safety of Orthopedic Passive Implantable Device**
- [10] (1970) **Medical Device Development Tool MDDT Q170004 Communications with FDA Center for Devices and Radiological Health, US Food and Drug Administration (FDA)**
- [11] FDA MDDT: Computational Tool Comprising Visible Human Project® Based Anatomical Female CAD Model and Ansys HFSS/Mechanical® FEM Software for Temperature Rise Prediction near an Orthopedic Femoral Nail Implant during a 1.5 T MRI Scan. 03/30/32 (1970) **FDA MDDT: Computational Tool Comprising Visible Human Project® Based Anatomical Female CAD Model and Ansys HFSS/Mechanical® FEM Software for Temperature Rise Prediction near an Orthopedic Femoral Nail Implant during a 1.5 T MRI Scan. 03/30/32.** Neva Electromagnetics, LLC. Online: <https://www.fda.gov/media/166724/download>. xU.S. Food and Drug Administration Bulletin of 03/30/2023. Online: <https://content.govdelivery.com/accounts/USFDA/bulletins/351ef58?reqfrom=share>
- [12] (1970) **FDA 510(k)/De Novo Clearance and Premarket Approval Applications:** <https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/search/default.cfm>, accessed Jan. 2023.

- [13] (1970) NEVA Electromagnetics, LLC. VHP-Female 2.2 (College). Online download page: <https://www.nevaelectromagnetics.com/vhp-female-2-2>
- [14] Fischbacher A, Borens O. (2019) **Prosthetic-joint Infections: Mortality Over The Last 10 Years** *J Bone Jt Infect* **4**:198–202 <https://doi.org/10.7150/jbji.35428>
- [15] Zanetti M. (2020) **The Expanding Role of MRI in the Evaluation of Periprosthetic Hip Joint Infection** *Radiology* **296**:109–110 <https://doi.org/10.1148/radiol.2020201419>
- [16] Li M, Glassman AH (2018) **What's New in Hip Replacement** *J Bone Joint Surg Am* **100**:1616–1624 <https://doi.org/10.2106/JBJS.18.00583>
- [17] Sheth Neil P., Foran Jared R.H., Peace William J. (2023) **Joint Replacement Infection**
- [18] Galley J, Sutter R, Stern C, Filli L, Rahm S, Pfirrmann CWA (2020) **Diagnosis of Periprosthetic Hip Joint Infection Using MRI with Metal Artifact Reduction at 1.5 T** *Radiology* **296**:98–108 <https://doi.org/10.1148/radiol.2020191901>
- [19] Song T, Xu Z, Iacono MI, Angelone LM, Rajan S. (2018) **Retrospective analysis of RF heating measurements of passive medical implants** *Magn Reson Med* **80**:2726–2730 <https://doi.org/10.1002/mrm.27346>
- [20] Al-Dayeh L, Rahman M, Venook R. (2020) **Practical Aspects of MR Imaging Safety Test Methods for MR Conditional Active Implantable Medical Devices** *Magn Reson Imaging Clin N Am* **28**:559–571 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mric.2020.07.008>
- [21] Arduino A, Baruffaldi F, Bottauscio O, Chiampi M, Martinez JA, Zanovello U, Zilberti L. (2022) **Computational dosimetry in MRI in presence of hip, knee or shoulder implants: do we need accurate surgery models?** *Phys Med Biol* **15** <https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6560/aca5e6>
- [22] Arduino A, Zanovello U, Hand J, Zilberti L, Brühl R, Chiampi M, Bottauscio O. (2021) **Heating of hip joint implants in MRI: The combined effect of RF and switched-gradient fields** *Magn Reson Med* **85**:3447–3462 <https://doi.org/10.1002/mrm.28666>
- [23] Bassen H, Zaidi T. (2022) **Parameters Affecting Worst-Case Gradient-Field Heating of Passive Conductive Implants** *J Magn Reson Imaging* **56**:1197–1204 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmri.28321>
- [24] Wooldridge J, Arduino A, Zilberti L, Zanovello U, Chiampi M, Clementi V, Bottauscio O. (2021) **Gradient coil and radiofrequency induced heating of orthopaedic implants in MRI: influencing factors** *Phys Med Biol* **23** <https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6560/ac3eab>
- [25] Winter L, Seifert F, Zilberti L, Murbach M, Ittermann B. (2021) **MRI-Related Heating of Implants and Devices: A Review** *J Magn Reson Imaging* **53**:1646–1665 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmri.27194>
- [26] Oberle M. (2021) **MDDT Summary of Evidence and Basis of Qualification Decision for IMANALYTICS with MRXVIP1.5T/3.0T and BCLIB**
- [27] Makarov SN, Noetscher GM, Yanamadala J, Piazza MW, Louie S, Prokop A, Nazarian A, Nummenmaa A. (2017) **Virtual Human Models for Electromagnetic Studies and Their Applications** *IEEE Rev Biomed Eng* **10**:95–121 <https://doi.org/10.1109/RBME.2017.2722420>

- [28] Noetscher G., Serano P., Nazarian A., Makarov S., Makarov S., Noetscher G., Nummenmaa A. (2023) **Computational Tool Comprising Visible Human Project® Based Anatomical Female CAD Model and Ansys HFSS/Mechanical® FEM Software for Temperature Rise Prediction Near an Orthopedic Femoral Nail Implant During a 1.5T MRI Scan** *Brain and Human Body Modelling* 2021 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-15451-5_9
- [29] Gosselin MC, Neufeld E, Moser H, Huber E, Farcito S, Gerber L, Jedensjö M, Hilber I, Di Gennaro F, Lloyd B, Cherubini E, Szczerba D, Kainz W, Kuster N. (2014) **Development of a new generation of high-resolution anatomical models for medical device evaluation: the Virtual Population 3.0** *Phys Med Biol* **59**:5287–303 <https://doi.org/10.1088/0031-9155/59/18/5287>
- [30] IT'IS Foundation (2023) **IT'IS Foundation. Three Class III Obese ViP Models for Improved Patient Coverage. Jan. 31st 2023. Online:** <https://itis.swiss/news-events/news/virtual-population/class-iii-obese-models/>
- [31] Noetscher GM, Serano P, Wartman WA, Fujimoto K, Makarov SN (2021) **Visible Human Project® female surface based computational phantom (Nelly) for radio-frequency safety evaluation in MRI coils** *PLoS One* **16** <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0260922>
- [32] Noetscher G.M., Makarov S.N., Noetscher G.M., Nummenmaa A. (2021) **The CAD-Compatible VHP-Male Computational Phantom** *Brain and Human Body Modeling* 2020 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45623-8_19
- [33] Kozlov M, Noetscher GM, Nazarian A, Makarov SN (2015) **Comparative analysis of different hip implants within a realistic human model located inside a 1.5T MRI whole body RF coil** *Annu Int Conf IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc* :7913–6 <https://doi.org/10.1109/EMBC.2015.7320227>
- [34] Spitzer V., Ackerman M. J., Scherzinger A. L., Whitlock D. W. (1996) **“The visible human male: A technical report.** *J. Amer. Medical Informatics Assoc* **3**:118–130
- [35] Ackerman M. J. (1998) **The Visible Human Project** *Proc* :504–511
- [36] Winter L, Seifert F, Zilberti L, Murbach M, Ittermann B. (2021) **MRI-Related Heating of Implants and Devices: A Review** *J Magn Reson Imaging* **53**:1646–1665 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmri.27194>
- [37] Hue YK, Guimaraes AR, Cohen O, Nevo E, Roth A, Ackerman JL (2018) **Magnetic Resonance Mediated Radiofrequency Ablation** *IEEE Trans Med Imaging* **37**:417–427 <https://doi.org/10.1109/TMI.2017.2753739>
- [38] Yanamadala J, Noetscher GM, Louie S, Prokop A, Kozlov M, Nazarian A, Makarov S. (2016) **Multi-Purpose VHP-Female Version 3.0 Cross-Platform Computational Human Model** *Proceedings of the 10th European Conference on Antennas and Propagation* :10–15
- [39] (2023) **Online Dropbox link: In-Silico Testbed for MR Labeling of Orthopaedic Implants based on open-source VHP-Female 2.2 College.** June 2023.

Author information

Gregory M Noetscher

Electrical & Computer Eng. Dept. Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester MA 01609-2280 USA

For correspondence: gregn@wpi.edu
ORCID iD: [0000-0001-9786-7206](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9786-7206)

Peter J. Serano

Ansys, Inc., 2600 Ansys Drive, Canonsburg, PA 15317 USA, Electrical & Computer Eng. Dept.
Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester MA 01609-2280 USA

Marc Horner

Ansys, Inc., 2600 Ansys Drive, Canonsburg, PA 15317 USA

Alexander Prokop

Dassault Systèmes Deutschland GmbH, Bad Nauheimer Str. 19, 64289 Darmstadt, Germany

Jonathan Hanson

Neva Electromagnetics, LLC, 1010 Main St., Holden, MA 01520

Kyoko Fujimoto

GE HealthCare, 500 W Monroe Street, Chicago, IL, 60661 USA

James E. Brown

Micro Systems Engineering, Inc., an affiliate of Biotronik, 6024 Jean Road, Lake Oswego, OR 97035 USA

Ara Nazarian

Musculoskeletal Translational Innovation Initiative, Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center and Harvard Medical School, 330 Brookline Ave, RN123, Boston, MA, 02215 USA

Jerome Ackerman

Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA 02115 USA, Athinoula A Martinos Center for Biomed. Imaging, Massachusetts General Hospital 149 13, St. Charlestown, MA 02129 USA

Sergey N Makaroff

Electrical & Computer Eng. Dept. Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester MA 01609-2280 USA, Athinoula A Martinos Center for Biomed. Imaging, Massachusetts General Hospital 149 13, St. Charlestown, MA 02129 USA

Editors

Reviewing Editor

Peng Liu

Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, United States of America

Senior Editor

Aleksandra Walczak

École Normale Supérieure - PSL, France

Reviewer #1 (Public Review):

Summary:

In this work, the authors are trying to satisfy a real need in MR safety, when concerns can

arise about the thermal increase due to metallic materials in patients carrying orthopedic implants. The "MR conditional" labeling of the implant obtained by ASTM in-vitro tests may help to plan the MR scan, but it is normally limited to a single specific MR sequence and a B0 value, and it is not always available. The adoption of an in-silico simulation testbed overcomes this limitation, providing a fast and reliable prediction of temperature increase from RF, in real-life scan conditions on human-like digital models. The FDA is pushing this approach.

Strengths:

The presented in-silico testbed looks valuable and validated. It is based on the widely available Visible Human Project (VHP) datasets, and the testbed is available online. The approval of the testbed by the FDA as a medical device development tool (MDDT) is a good premise for the large-scale adoption of this kind of solution.

Weaknesses:

There are a couple of limitations in the study that must be clearly highlighted to the readers.

While the RF-related heating is very well modeled, the gradients-related heating is out of the scope of this paper and not considered. Readers must be warned that RF causes only a part of the heating, and literature is reporting cases where also gradient switching can contribute, as correctly mentioned in this work. A cautious attitude should consider this as a significant limitation of the study.

Moreover, the way the implant is embedded in the VHP model is shortly documented in the materials and methods and mostly focuses on implant registration on bone tissue. It is not clear how to manage the empty space and the soft tissue stretching/reshaping generated by the simulated surgery (for example, by the cut of the femoral head in total hip arthroplasty). It is reported by literature that the level of accuracy in the simulated surgery can impact in some cases (RF vs. gradients heating, massive vs. thin or elongated implants) on temperature predictions.

Reviewer #2 (Public Review):

Summary:

In this article, the authors provide a method of evaluating the safety of orthopedic implants in relation to radiofrequency-induced heating issues. The authors provide an open-source computational heterogeneous human model and explain computational techniques in a finite element method solver to predict the RF-induced temperature increase due to an orthopedic implant while being exposed to MRI RF fields at 1.5 T.

Strengths:

The open-access computational human model along with their semiautomatic algorithm to position the implant can help realistically model the implant RF exposure in patients avoiding over- or under-estimation of RF heating measured using rectangular box phantoms such as ASTM phantom. Additionally, using numerical simulation to predict radiofrequency-induced heating will be much easier compared to the experimental measurements in an MRI scanner, especially when the scanner availability is limited.

Weaknesses:

The proposed method only used radiofrequency (RF) field exposure to evaluate the heating around the implant. However, in the case of bulky implants, the rapidly changing gradient field can also produce significant heating due to large eddy currents. So the gradient-induced heating still remains an issue to be evaluated to decide on the safety of the patient. Moreover, the method is limited to a single human model and might not be representative of patients with different age, sex, and body weights. Additionally, the authors compare the temperature rise predicted by their method to an earlier study. However, there is no information about

how they controlled the input power in their simulation testbed compared to the earlier study in showing validation of the method.