1	Coupled stack-up volume RF coils for low-field open MR			
2	imaging			
3	Yunkun Zhao ¹ , Aditya A Bhosale ¹ , Xiaoliang Zhang ^{1,2*}			
4	¹ Department of Biomedical Engineering, State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY,			
5	United States			
6	² Department of Electrical Engineering, State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY,			
7	United States			
8				
9	*Corresponding author:			
10				
11	Xiaoliang Zhang, Ph.D.			
12	Department of Biomedical Engineering			
13	State University of New York at Buffalo			
14	Bonner Hall 215E			
15	Buffalo, NY, 14226			
16	U.S.A.			
17				
18	Email: <u>xzhang89@buffalo.edu</u>			
19				
20	Word Count: 3,542			
21	Number of figures and tables: 10 figures and 1 table			

22 Abstract

23 Background: Low-field open magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) systems, typically operating at 24 magnetic field strengths below 1 Tesla, has greatly expanded the accessibility of MRI technology to meet a wide range of patient needs. However, the inherent challenges of low-field MRI, such 25 as limited signal-to-noise ratios and limited availability of dedicated radiofrequency (RF) coils, 26 27 have prompted the need for innovative coil designs that can improve imaging quality and 28 diagnostic capabilities. **Purpose:** In response to these challenges, we introduce the coupled stack-up volume coil, a 29 30 novel RF coil design that addresses the shortcomings of conventional birdcage in the context of 31 low-field open MRI. **Methods:** The proposed coupled stack-up volume coil design utilizes a unique architecture that 32 33 optimizes both transmit/receive efficiency and RF field homogeneity and offers the advantage of 34 a simple design and construction, making it a practical and feasible solution for low-field MRI 35 applications. This paper presents a comprehensive exploration of the theoretical framework, design considerations, and experimental validation of this innovative coil design. 36 **Results:** We demonstrate the superior performance of the coupled stack-up volume coil in 37 achieving 47.7% higher transmit/receive efficiency and 68% more uniform magnetic field 38 39 distribution compared to traditional birdcage coils in electromagnetic simulations. Bench tests 40 results show that the B1 field efficiency of coupled stack-up volume coil is 57.3% higher 41 compared with that of conventional birdcage coil. 42 **Conclusions:** The proposed coupled stack-up volume coil outperforms the conventional birdcage 43 coil in terms of B1 efficiency, imaging coverage, and low-frequency operation capability. This 44 design provides a robust and simple solution to low-field MR RF coil design.

45

46 Keywords

47 RF Coil, volume coil, low-field, stack-up coil, multimodal RF coil, head MR imaging

48 **1. Introduction**

49 Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) (1,2) has evolved into an indispensable tool for clinical diagnosis and basic biomedical research (3-5), offering non-invasive and high-resolution 50 51 visualization of anatomical structures (6-9), physiological processes (10-12), and functional (13-15) and metabolic (16-19) information within the human body. While high-field MRI (20-22) has 52 53 demonstrated a significant SNR gain (23-25) and dominated the field (26-28), low-field MRI 54 (below 1 Tesla) (29-32) has garnered significant attention in recent years due to its unique advantages and clinical utility (33,34), as well as recent advances in artificial intelligence (35-38). 55 The appeal of low-field open MRI lies in its capacity to cater to a diverse patient population, 56 57 including those with claustrophobia, obesity, and pediatric patients, who may find conventional closed-bore MRI systems challenging or uncomfortable (39). 58

59 Low-field MRI systems, characterized by magnetic field strengths below 1 Tesla, have gained significant attention due to their affordability, improved safety profile, and increased accessibility 60 61 (40). However, the shift to lower magnetic field strengths introduces challenges, particularly the inherently lower signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) (41,42). This reduction in SNR can compromise 62 image resolution and hinder the detection of subtle anatomical or pathological details, 63 underscoring the need for innovative solutions to maintain high imaging quality in low-field MRI. 64 65 Open MRI systems are generally low-field systems, offering a spacious, open architecture that enhances patient comfort and accessibility. These systems are especially beneficial for certain 66 67 patient populations, including those with claustrophobia, obesity, or pediatric patients, who may 68 find conventional closed-bore MRI systems challenging. Additionally, the open design facilitates a broader range of imaging scenarios, such as interventional procedures and imaging of larger 69 70 anatomical regions, making them a versatile tool in clinical practice. However, while these benefits

are significant, they also introduce specific challenges that must be addressed, particularly in the
 context of maintaining image quality at lower field strengths.

73

Central to the success of any MRI system is the radiofrequency (RF) coil (43-45), a crucial 74 component responsible for transmitting and receiving MR signals during the imaging process. The 75 76 design and performance of the RF coil play a pivotal role in image quality, signal strength, noise level, and overall diagnostic accuracy (46-49). In the context of low-field open MRI, the current 77 78 RF coil configurations face the challenge of limited RF field (B1 field) transmit/receive efficiency 79 and field homogeneity, particularly along coil axis. To bridge this gap and harness the full potential 80 of low-field open MRI systems, we introduce a coupled stack-up volume coil, a novel RF coil 81 design specifically tailored for head imaging at a Larmor frequency of 21.3 MHz to address these challenges. Previous designs of stack-up coils have primarily focused on achieving decoupling 82 between the individual coils to minimize interference and optimize performance. In contrast, our 83 84 design intentionally allows the coils to be strongly coupled with each other, which enhances the overall B1 field efficiency and homogeneity within the imaging volume. To investigate and 85 86 demonstrate the proposed design, we have taken the 0.5T as an example field strength and designed 87 and constructed a prototype coupled stack-up volume coil operating in the 20 MHz range. This RF coil design can significantly improve RF field efficiency and also enhance the field 88 89 homogeneity along the coil axis (i.e. imaging coverage), ultimately elevating the performance of 90 low-field open MRI systems. The proposed design of the coupled stack-up coil was analyzed using 91 full-wave electromagnetic (EM) simulation and tested on the workbench with standard RF 92 measurement procedures. The performance is further validated through a comparison study with a 93 standard birdcage coil (46,50).

94

95 **2. Methods**

96 2.1 EM Simulation

Finite difference time-domain simulation software CST Studio Suite (Dassault Systèmes, Paris, 97 France) was used to obtain numerical results of the proposed designs. Figure 1A shows the layout 98 of the coupled stack-up volume coil. The coupled stack-up volume coil design consists of a stack 99 100 of seven identical and individual coils, meticulously arranged to create a cylindrical imaging area 101 with dimensions of 300 mm in diameter and 300 mm in length. Each coil unit is equipped with a 102 60 pF capacitance capacitor, carefully selected to optimize its resonance characteristics at the desired Larmor frequency of 21 MHz. The coil is driven via the central coil element in this stack 103 104 configuration, which provides efficient RF signal transmission and reception throughout the 105 imaging volume. The spacing between these individual coils was carefully arranged based on the 106 observation that in uniformly spaced coil arrays, the magnetic field strength tends to be weaker at 107 the sides of the coil compared to the center. To address this, we adjusted the gaps so that they are 108 smaller at the sides and larger at the center, thereby enhancing the field strength at the coil's edges. 109 The precise gap distances were determined through a process of trial and error, involving multiple 110 simulations and iterative adjustments, until the optimal configuration for maximum field efficiency 111 and homogeneity was achieved. The circuit diagram and coil spacing are shown in Figure 1B. Based on the number of coils, there are four resonant modes for the coupled stack-up coil, and the 112 113 lowest resonant mode is used for imaging because it has the highest field strength efficiency. A 114 traditional 8-leg low-pass birdcage coil and a 7-turn solenoid coil, both with the same size as the 115 coupled stack-up coil, have also been built for comparison. In a comparison study, a cylindrical

oil phantom (σ (conductivity) = 0 S/m ϵ r(relative permittivity) = 2.33, diameter = 20 cm, 116 117 length = 30 cm) was placed centrally along the axis of the coils, with the entire volume of the 118 phantom considered as the region of interest (ROI) for field strength and distribution evaluation. Scattering parameters and B1 field efficiency map were used to evaluate the performance of the 119 stacked coils in coupling and imaging. To determine the performance of the proposed design under 120 121 more realistic conditions, the coupled stack-up volume coil and birdcage coil were simulated on the human model Gustav for head imaging. Material properties of the human model at 21 MHz 122 123 were taken from CST Studio Suite. All magnetic and electric field plots were normalized to 1 W 124 accepted power, meaning that the field strength values were divided by the square root of the accepted power to ensure consistent comparison across different scenarios. 125

126 **2.2 Bench Test Model Assembly**

127 Figure 2A shows photographs and dimensions of bench test models of the coupled stack-up 128 volume coil and birdcage coil. The bench test models have the same dimensions as the simulation model. The electrical track of the coupled stack-up volume coil was built using 6.35 mm-wide 129 copper tape and mounted on a 3D-printed polylactide acid frame. Due to the width of the 3D-130 131 printed frame, the inner diameter is 260 mm and 40 mm shorter than the simulation mode. The 132 imaging resonant frequency was tuned to 21 MHz and matched to 50 ohms by careful selection of 133 the capacitance value on each individual coil. We used 7 identical fixed tuning capacitors with 39 pF capacitance. One capacitor with 330 pF connected in parallel to the feeding line was employed 134 135 for impedance matching. Except for three coils located at the center and two sides, the remaining four coils are movable, and their position may be adjusted to achieve a homogenous B-field under 136 137 different imaging objects. Most areas of the coil are hollow and can also be used to alleviate claustrophobia in patients. 138

For comparison, a low-pass birdcage coil has also been made. The birdcage coil model has the same dimensions as its simulation model and the coupled stack-up volume coil. It was built using 6.35 mm-wide copper tape on a cardboard structure. The birdcage coil has 8 legs with 8 tuning capacitors and was tuned to 21 MHz and matched to 50 ohms by tuning capacitors and a matching circuit.

144

145 **2.3 3-D Magnetic and Electric Field Mapping**

A sniffer positioning system combined with a magnetic and electric field measurement setup, 146 shown in Figure 3, was used to visualize the B and E field distribution in the bench test. The system 147 148 consists of a Genmitsu PROVerXL 4030 router (SainSmart, Lenexa, United States) as a positioning system, a Keysight E5061 Vector Network Analyzer (Keysight, Santa Rosa, United 149 150 States) for data reception and analysis, and a B/E field sniffer to receive field strength data. The 151 positioning system was programmed to measure the B or E field strength at a level above the coils with a data step of 0.5 mm. The design of the B and E field sniffers is also shown in Figure 3. The 152 B field sniffer is a coaxial cable loop that can measure the magnetic flux flow through the center 153 154 of the loop, and the E field sniffer is a coaxial cable with the outer conductor and medium removed 155 at the tip. During the measurement, the coil assembly is connected to port 1 of the VNA, and the sniffer is connected to port 2. The S21 value is recorded by the VNA, and the final field strength 156 157 is calculated using the following equation:

158

159
$$log(B) = \frac{1}{20} * (Pout - X - 20 * log(F))$$
(1)

161 Where *B* is the magnetic flux density in Tesla, *F* is the frequency of the received signal in 162 megahertz, *Pout* is the probe output power into 50 ohms in dBm, and *X* is a scale factor from 163 calibration. The calibration was taken place using the result from the magnetostatics method and 164 finite-difference time-domain (FDTD) method on a 5cm diameter circular RF coil with one tuning 165 and one matching capacitor and built with 16 AWG copper wire. Three calculation results were 166 used, including the numerical solution and analytical solution of the Biot-Savart law:

167

168

$$B(\mathbf{r}) = a_z \frac{\mu_0 I b^2}{2(z^2 + b^2)^{3/2}}$$

169

The Biot-Savart law is used to find the magnetic flux density at a point on the axis of a circular loop of radius *b* that carries a direct current *I* to verify the magnetic field. The result from FDTD methods generated by the electromagnetic simulation model from simulation software CST Studio Suite has been used to verify electric measurement results. All three calculated and simulated results verified our measurement system is correct and accurate.

(2)

175

176 **3. Results**

177 **3.1 Simulated Resonant Frequency and Field Distribution**

Simulated scattering parameters versus frequency of the stacked coils are shown in Figure 4A. As shown in the figure, strong coupling is created between the coils, resulting in split resonant peaks. Four resonant frequencies were generated, with the lowest frequency at 21 MHz and the highest at 37.6 MHz. Figure 4B presents the normalized field distribution for four different resonant modes of the coupled stack-up volume coil. Among these modes, only the lowest mode

183 exhibits the strongest B1 field efficiency and a uniform field direction, making it the most suitable 184 for MR imaging applications. The other modes show less efficient and less uniform field 185 distributions, which are not ideal for imaging purposes. For mode 1, the unloaded Q factor is 381.41 and loaded Q is 51.06. Figure 5 shows simulated Y-Z, X-Z, and X-Y plane B field 186 187 efficiency maps inside phantom generated by coupled stack-up volume coils, in which both planes 188 are at the center of the axis. A set of the multiple X-Y plane slices with different distances from 189 the phantom center B field efficiency maps inside the phantom generated by coupled stack-up 190 volume coil has also been shown. The simulation result shows the coupled stack-up volume coil 191 has great field homogeneity, which can be used for MR imaging.

192

3.2 Measured Scattering Parameters and Field Distribution

Figure 6A shows that the S-parameter vs. frequency plots of the coupled stack-up coil are in good agreement with the simulation results. Four resonant modes with 20.1 MHz, 28.2 MHz, 31.8 MHz, and 34.4 MHz were formed. Figure 6B shows the B field efficiency distribution map on the Y-Z plane measured with a 3-D magnetic field mapping system. Coupled stack-up volume coil shows significant homogeneity and strong B field efficiency on the Y-Z plane and is in accordance with the simulation result, which also indicates that the simulation results are accurate and reliable.

3.3 Field Distribution and Efficiency Evaluation

To comprehensively evaluate the performance of our proposed design, we compared three different coil setups: the coupled stack-up volume coil, the equal gap coupled coil, and a 7-turn solenoid coil. Each configuration was designed with the same dimensions to ensure a fair comparison. The coupled stack-up volume coil was designed with variable gaps between the

individual coils to enhance field homogeneity, while the equal gap coupled coil features evenly
spaced coils along its length. The solenoid coil, commonly used in low-field MRI due to its ability
to generate a uniform magnetic field along the B1 direction, was included as a benchmark.

Figure 7A shows the simulation models of the equal gap coupled coil and the solenoid coil. In 209 210 Figure 7B, the simulated B1 field efficiency comparison is presented, while Figure 7C shows the 211 simulated E field efficiency comparison. Figure 7D provides a 1-D profile of the field efficiency along the dashed line in Figure 7B. The results indicate that the equal-gap coupled coil and the 212 213 solenoid coil exhibit relatively similar B1 field efficiencies, with both showing strong efficiency 214 at the center of the coil. However, the coupled stack-up volume coil, while slightly lower in field 215 efficiency at the center, demonstrates superior field homogeneity across the imaging area. This 216 advantage in homogeneity makes the coupled stack-up volume coil more adaptable for real-world 217 applications, where varying the layout of the coils can further optimize performance.

In terms of E field efficiency, which generally correlates with noise in SNR calculations, the coupled stack-up volume coil significantly outperforms the solenoid coil, exhibiting much lower E field values. This suggests that the coupled coil design could potentially generate less noise in actual imaging, leading to improved image quality and overall performance in low-field MRI systems.

To further validate our findings, we conducted additional simulations with a CST Studio biomodel loaded into the coils. Figure 8A presents the simulated B1 field efficiency comparison, while Figure 8B shows the simulated E field efficiency comparison. Finally, Figure 8C illustrates the simulated specific absorption rate (SAR) comparison between the different coil setups. The results from the bio-model simulations are consistent with those obtained using the oil phantom. The coupled stack-up volume coil continues to demonstrate superior field homogeneity compared

to the solenoid and equal gap coupled coils. In terms of E field efficiency, the coupled stack-up volume coil maintains significantly lower values, reinforcing its potential to reduce noise and enhance image quality in actual imaging scenarios.

Moreover, the SAR comparison in Figure 8C highlights a critical advantage of the coupled stack-up volume coil: it exhibits significantly lower SAR levels compared to the solenoid coil. This suggests that the coupled stack-up volume coil not only offers better homogeneity and lower noise but also ensures safer operation by minimizing power deposition, making it particularly suitable for prolonged imaging sessions in clinical applications.

237 Figure 9 compares the simulated B1 field efficiency between the coupled stack-up coil and 238 birdcage coil on three different planes with the B1 field efficiency distribution map. Table 1 also compares the relative standard deviation and average B1 field efficiency of the B1 field strength 239 inside the phantom between the field generated by the coupled stack-up coil, solenoid coil, and 240 birdcage coil. The result shows that the coupled stack-up coil has significantly higher B1 field 241 242 efficiency and B1 field homogeneity compared with the birdcage coil. With an average of 10.82 243 μ T/ \sqrt{W} throughout the entire volume of the phantom, which serves as the region of interest 244 (ROI), the B1 field efficiency of the coupled stack-up volume coil is 47.6% higher than the average 245 B1 field efficiency of birdcage coil. As for homogeneity, the standard deviation of B1 field 246 generated by the coupled stack-up volume coil is also 218.75% lower than that of the birdcage coil. Figure 10 shows the comparison of the simulated B1 field efficiency between the coupled 247 248 stack-up volume coil and conventional birdcage coil with human head bio model as load. At around 21MHz, the B1 field distributions of both coils are not significantly affected by the load, with the 249 250 B1 field distribution inside the human phantom remaining essentially consistent with that when an

oil phantom is used inside the coil. The B1 field efficiency of the coupled stack-up volume coilstill significantly exceeds that of the birdcage coil.

Figure 11 compares the B1 field efficiency of the bench test model of the coupled stack-up 253 volume coil and birdcage coil. The measured B1-field efficiency distribution is shown in Figures 254 9A and 9B. The measured magnetic field efficiency plot is consistent with the simulation results. 255 256 Figures 9C and 9D show the B1 field efficiency plot at the center line along the X-Z plane, Y-Z plane, and X-Y plane. Not only does the coupled stack-up volume coil have higher B field 257 258 efficiency, but the rate of decreasing of the B1 field from the center to the sides of the birdcage 259 coil is much higher. The B field efficiency of the coupled stack-up volume coil, with the highest 260 field efficiency of 11.48 $\mu T/\sqrt{W}$, only reduces by 11.4% when reaching the edge of the coil with a minimum value of 10.20 $\mu T/\sqrt{W}$. On the other side, the B1 field efficiency of the birdcage coil 261 decreases by 49.20% from a maximum field efficiency of 7.30 $\mu T/\sqrt{W}$ at the center to a minimum 262 of 3.73 μ T/ \sqrt{W} at two edges. The B1 field efficiency of the coupled stack-up volume coil is 57.30% 263 264 higher compared with the birdcage coil. The measured result validates that the coupled stacked 265 coil has a strong and homogeneous field within the imaging area compared with the birdcage coil. 266

3.5 Effect of Increasing the Number of Rings

Figure 12 illustrates the impact of increasing the number of rings in the coupled stack-up volume coil on B1 field efficiency. Similar to the solenoid coil, the B1 field efficiency increases as the number of rings is increased. However, due to the width of the copper tape used to form the rings, it becomes increasingly challenging to find sufficient space to adjust the gaps between the rings. This limitation makes it more difficult to achieve a homogeneous field distribution, highlighting a trade-off between field efficiency and field homogeneity as the number of rings is increased.

4. Discussion

Critical to the success of the coupled stack-up volume coil design is the meticulous arrangement of its individual coils or resonant elements. The magnetic field strength at each coronal plane within the phantom should be most affected by the coil closest to it. By moving the coupled coil closer to the edge of the phantom where the B1 field strength is weaker, the local B1 field can be improved to match the B1 field strength at the center of the coil, thus improving the overall field homogeneity.

In the realm of low-field open MRI systems at 0.5 Tesla, the pursuit of enhanced image quality, diagnostic accuracy, and patient comfort has led to innovative approaches and technologies. This study has introduced the coupled stack-up volume coil, a novel RF coil design engineered to address the challenges inherent in 0.5T open MRI systems, particularly with respect to transmit/reception efficiency and field homogeneity. Through a research framework encompassing electromagnetic simulations and benchtop characterizations, we have illuminated the substantial advantages offered by this innovative coil design.

The adjustable nature of the coupled stack-up volume RF coil design could significantly 288 enhance the versatility and performance of low-field MRI systems. By improving B1 field 289 290 efficiency and homogeneity, this coil design addresses some of the inherent challenges associated 291 with low-field imaging, such as lower signal-to-noise ratios. Moreover, the principles of this coil could be adapted to create flexible body coils, which are increasingly important in modern MRI 292 293 applications. Flexible coils can conform better to the patient's anatomy, leading to improved image 294 quality and patient comfort. The ability to adjust the coil for different body parts would make it a versatile tool in clinical settings, particularly for imaging anatomically complex regions or for use 295 296 in scenarios where patient movement is a concern. This adaptability could further extend the

clinical applications of low-field MRI, making it a more viable option in various diagnosticscenarios.

299 Despite the advancements introduced by the coupled stack-up volume RF coil, several challenges remain. One of the primary challenges is the need to further optimize the coil for 300 different body parts and imaging scenarios, particularly in the context of flexible designs. 301 302 Additionally, while the current design demonstrates significant improvements in field efficiency 303 and homogeneity, there is still room for further enhancement, particularly in reducing the 304 complexity of the design without sacrificing performance. Future design approaches might explore 305 the integration of advanced materials or novel coil geometries to further improve the coil's 306 adaptability and efficiency. Moreover, conducting extensive in vivo testing and developing more robust models for predicting coil performance across a range of conditions will be critical for 307 advancing the clinical utility of these designs. 308

309 **5. Conclusion**

In conclusion, the coupled stack-up volume coil is successfully designed, constructed, and 310 311 tested for low-field MR imaging. The proposed work represents a transformative development in 312 the field of low-field MRI, particularly open MRI. Its innovative design, carefully arranged coil spacing, and optimized capacitance parameters converge to deliver a solution that outperforms the 313 314 conventional birdcage coil in the aspects of B1 field efficiency, imaging coverage, and easy design and construction. It not only addresses the challenges posed by low-field MRI but also enhances 315 its capabilities. The ability to achieve superior transmit/receive efficiency and field homogeneity 316 317 positions this design as a promising avenue for advancing low-field MRI's diagnostic precision 318 and clinical utility.

319 Acknowledgments

- 320 This work is supported in part by the NIH under a BRP grant U01 EB023829 and by the State
- 321 University of New York (SUNY) under SUNY Empire Innovation Professorship Award.

322

323 **References**

- 1. Lauterbur PC. Image Formation by Induced Local Interaction: Examples employing Nuclear
- 325 Magnetic Resonance. Nature 1973;241:190-1.
- 326 2. Garroway AN, Grannell PK, Mansfield P. Image formation in NMR by a selective irradiative
- 327 process. J Phys C: Solid State Phys 1974;7:L457-L62.
- 328 3. Ugurbil K, Adriany G, Andersen P, Chen W, Garwood M, et al. Ultrahigh field magnetic
- resonance imaging and spectroscopy. Magn Reson Imaging 2003;21:1263-81.
- 4. Adriany G, Van de Moortele PF, Wiesinger F, Moeller S, Strupp JP, et al. Transmit and
- receive transmission line arrays for 7 Tesla parallel imaging. Magn Reson Med 2005;53:434-45.
- 5. Zhang J, Tan Q, Yin H, Zhang X, Huan Y, et al. Decreased gray matter volume in the left
- hippocampus and bilateral calcarine cortex in coal mine flood disaster survivors with recent
 onset PTSD. Psychiatry Res 2011;192:84-90.
- 6. Qi S, Mu YF, Cui LB, Zhang J, Guo F, et al. Anomalous gray matter structural networks in
- recent onset post-traumatic stress disorder. Brain Imaging Behav 2018;12:390-401.
- 337 7. Wei Z, Chen Q, Han S, Zhang S, Zhang N, et al. 5T magnetic resonance imaging: radio
- frequency hardware and initial brain imaging. Quant Imaging Med Surg 2023;13:3222-40.
- 8. Li Y, Chen Q, Wei Z, Zhang L, Tie C, et al. One-Stop MR Neurovascular Vessel Wall
- Imaging With a 48-Channel Coil System at 3 T. IEEE Trans Biomed Eng 2020;67:2317-27.
- 341 9. Meng Y, Mo Z, Hao J, Peng Y, Yan H, et al. High-resolution intravascular magnetic
- resonance imaging of the coronary artery wall at 3.0 Tesla: toward evaluation of atherosclerotic
 plaque vulnerability. Quant Imaging Med Surg 2021;11:4522-9.
- 10. Aranguren XL, McCue JD, Hendrickx B, Zhu XH, Du F, et al. Multipotent adult progenitor
- cells sustain function of ischemic limbs in mice. J Clin Invest 2008;118:505-14.
- 346 11. Zhu XH, Qiao H, Du F, Xiong Q, Liu X, et al. Quantitative imaging of energy expenditure in
 human brain. Neuroimage 2012;60:2107-17.
- 348 12. Liu LP, Cui LB, Zhang XX, Cao J, Chang N, et al. Diagnostic Performance of Diffusion-
- 349 weighted Magnetic Resonance Imaging in Bone Malignancy: Evidence From a Meta-Analysis.
- 350 Medicine (Baltimore) 2015;94:e1998.
- 13. Ogawa S, Lee TM, Kay AR, Tank DW. Brain magnetic resonance imaging with contrast
- dependent on blood oxygenation. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 1990;87:9868-72.
- 353 14. Zhu X, Zhang X, Tang S, Ogawa S, Ugurbil K, et al. Probing fast neuronal interaction in the
- human ocular dominate columns based on fMRI BOLD response at 7 Tesla. Proceedings of the
- 355 9th Annual Meeting of ISMRM, Glasgow, Scotland; 2001.

- 15. Kwong KK, Belliveau JW, Chesler DA, Goldberg IE, Weisskoff RM, et al. Dynamic
- 357 magnetic resonance imaging of human brain activity during primary sensory stimulation. Proc
- 358 Natl Acad Sci U S A 1992;89:5675-9.
- 359 16. Du F, Cooper AJ, Thida T, Sehovic S, Lukas SE, et al. In vivo evidence for cerebral
- 360 bioenergetic abnormalities in schizophrenia measured using 31P magnetization transfer
- 361 spectroscopy. JAMA Psychiatry 2014;71:19-27.
- 362 17. Kurhanewicz J, Vigneron DB, Ardenkjaer-Larsen JH, Bankson JA, Brindle K, et al.
- 363 Hyperpolarized (13)C MRI: Path to Clinical Translation in Oncology. Neoplasia 2019;21:1-16.
- 18. Dafni H, Larson PE, Hu S, Yoshihara HA, Ward CS, et al. Hyperpolarized 13C spectroscopic
- imaging informs on hypoxia-inducible factor-1 and myc activity downstream of platelet-derivedgrowth factor receptor. Cancer Res 2010;70:7400-10.
- 367 19. Zhu XH, Zhang Y, Tian RX, Lei H, Zhang N, et al. Development of (17)O NMR approach
- for fast imaging of cerebral metabolic rate of oxygen in rat brain at high field. Proc Natl Acad
 Sci U S A 2002;99:13194-9.
- 20. Ugurbil K, Garwood M, Ellermann J, Hendrich K, Hinke R, et al. Imaging at high magnetic
- fields: initial experiences at 4 T. Magn Reson Q 1993;9:259-77.
- 21. Zhou X, Cofer GP, Suddarth SA, Johnson GA. High-field MR microscopy using fast spin-
- 373 echoes. Magn Reson Med 1993;30:60-7.
- 22. Abduljalil AM, Kangarlu A, Zhang X, Burgess RE, Robitaille P-ML. Acquisition of Human
- 375 Multislice MR Images at 8 Tesla. Journal of Computer Assisted Tomography 1999;23.
- 23. Hoult DI. Sensitivity and power deposition in a high-field imaging experiment. J Magn
- 377 Reson Imaging 2000;12:46-67.
- 24. Qiao H, Zhang X, Zhu X-H, Du F, Chen W. In vivo 31P MRS of human brain at
- 379 high/ultrahigh fields: a quantitative comparison of NMR detection sensitivity and spectral
- resolution between 4 T and 7 T. Magnetic Resonance Imaging 2006;24:1281-6.
- 381 25. Ugurbil K. Magnetic resonance imaging at ultrahigh fields. IEEE Trans Biomed Eng
- 382 2014;61:1364-79.
- 26. Ladd ME, Bachert P, Meyerspeer M, Moser E, Nagel AM, et al. Pros and cons of ultra-high-
- field MRI/MRS for human application. Progress in Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy
 2018;109:1-50.
- 27. Qi S, Mu Y, Liu K, Zhang J, Huan Y, et al. Cortical inhibition deficits in recent onset PTSD
 after a single prolonged trauma exposure. Neuroimage Clin 2013;3:226-33.
- 388 28. Duyn JH. The future of ultra-high field MRI and fMRI for study of the human brain.
- 389 Neuroimage 2012;62:1241-8.
- 29. Liu Y, Leong ATL, Zhao Y, Xiao L, Mak HKF, et al. A low-cost and shielding-free ultra-
- 391 low-field brain MRI scanner. Nat Commun 2021;12:7238.
- 392 30. Kladny B, Gluckert K, Swoboda B, Beyer W, Weseloh G. Comparison of low-field (0.2
- 393 Tesla) and high-field (1.5 Tesla) magnetic resonance imaging of the knee joint. Arch Orthop
- 394 Trauma Surg 1995;114:281-6.
- 395 31. Sepponen RE, Sipponen JT, Sivula A. Low field (0.02 T) nuclear magnetic resonance
- imaging of the brain. J Comput Assist Tomogr 1985;9:237-41.
- 397 32. Marques JP, Simonis FFJ, Webb AG. Low-field MRI: An MR physics perspective. J Magn
- 398 Reson Imaging 2019;49:1528-42.
- 399 33. Webb A, O'Reilly T. Tackling SNR at low-field: a review of hardware approaches for point-
- 400 of-care systems. MAGMA 2023;36:375-93.

- 401 34. Yuen MM, Prabhat AM, Mazurek MH, Chavva IR, Crawford A, et al. Portable, low-field
- 402 magnetic resonance imaging enables highly accessible and dynamic bedside evaluation of
 403 ischemic stroke. Sci Adv 2022;8:eabm3952.
- 404 35. Yang Q, Zhang H, Xia J, Zhang X. Evaluation of magnetic resonance image segmentation in
- 405 brain low-grade gliomas using support vector machine and convolutional neural network. Quant
- 406 Imaging Med Surg 2021;11:300-16.
- 407 36. Li H, Liang Z, Zhang C, Liu R, Li J, et al. SuperDTI: Ultrafast DTI and fiber tractography
- 408 with deep learning. Magn Reson Med 2021;86:3334-47.
- 409 37. Huang W, Yang H, Liu X, Li C, Zhang I, et al. A Coarse-to-Fine Deformable Transformation
- 410 Framework for Unsupervised Multi-Contrast MR Image Registration with Dual Consistency
- 411 Constraint. IEEE Trans Med Imaging 2021;40:2589-99.
- 412 38. Man C, Lau V, Su S, Zhao Y, Xiao L, et al. Deep learning enabled fast 3D brain MRI at
- 413 0.055 tesla. Sci Adv 2023;9:eadi9327.
- 414 39. Kimberly WT, Sorby-Adams AJ, Webb AG, Wu EX, Beekman R, et al. Brain imaging with
- 415 portable low-field MRI. Nat Rev Bioeng 2023;1:617-30.
- 416 40. Campbell-Washburn AE, Keenan KE, Hu P, Mugler JP, 3rd, Nayak KS, et al. Low-field
- 417 MRI: A report on the 2022 ISMRM workshop. Magn Reson Med 2023;90:1682-94.
- 418 41. Hoult DI, Richards RE. The signal-to-noise ratio of the nuclear magnetic resonance
- 419 experiment. J Magn Reson 1976;24:71-85.
- 420 42. Li Y, Pang Y, Vigneron D, Glenn O, Xu D, et al. Investigation of multichannel phased array
- 421 performance for fetal MR imaging on 1.5T clinical MR system. Quant Imaging Med Surg
 422 2011;1:24-30.
- 423 43. Li Y, Yu B, Pang Y, Vigneron DB, Zhang X. Planar quadrature RF transceiver design using
- 424 common-mode differential-mode (CMDM) transmission line method for 7T MR imaging. PLoS
 425 One 2013;8:e80428.
- 426 44. Rutledge O, Kwak T, Cao P, Zhang X. Design and test of a double-nuclear RF coil for (1)H
- 427 MRI and (13)C MRSI at 7T. J Magn Reson 2016;267:15-21.
- 428 45. Chen Q, Xie G, Luo C, Yang X, Zhu J, et al. A Dedicated 36-Channel Receive Array for
- 429 Fetal MRI at 3T. IEEE Trans Med Imaging 2018;37:2290-7.
- 430 46. Wang C, Li Y, Wu B, Xu D, Nelson SJ, et al. A practical multinuclear transceiver volume
- 431 coil for in vivo MRI/MRS at 7 T. Magn Reson Imaging 2012;30:78-84.
- 432 47. Pang Y, Xie Z, Li Y, Xu D, Vigneron D, et al. Resonant Mode Reduction in Radiofrequency
- 433 Volume Coils for Ultrahigh Field Magnetic Resonance Imaging. Materials (Basel) 2011;4:1333-
- 434 44.
- 435 48. Subburaj K, Pang Y, Scott S, Amirbekian B, Souza RB, et al. A Flexible Microstrip
- 436 Transceiver Coil for Imaging Flexed Human Knee Joints at 7 Tesla. Proc Intl Soc Mag Reson
- 437 Med 2011;19:3821.
- 438 49. Pang Y, Xie Z, Xu D, Kelley DA, Nelson SJ, et al. A dual-tuned quadrature volume coil with
- 439 mixed lambda/2 and lambda/4 microstrip resonators for multinuclear MRSI at 7 T. Magn Reson
 440 Imaging 2012;30:290-8.
- 441 50. Hayes CE, Edelstein WA, Schenck JF, Mueller OM, Eash M. An Efficient, Highly
- 442 Homogeneous Radiofrequency Coil for Whole-Body NMR Imaging at 1.5 T. Journal of
- 443 Magnetic Resonance 1985;63:622-8.
- 444

445

447

450

446 Figure legends



448 **Figure 1.** (A) Simulation model of coupled stack-up volume coil. (B) Circuit diagram of coupled

449 stack-up volume coil. The distance between individual coils has been labeled in the figure.



Figure 2. A photograph (A) of the bench test coupled stack-up volume coil model for imaging at
0.5T, corresponding resonant frequency of 21 MHz. For comparison, a custom-built 21 MHz lowpass birdcage coil (B) was used in this paper.



454

Figure 3. (A) Experimental setup of the sniffer-positioning system combined magnetic field
measurement for the coupled stack-up volume coil. The FOV of the measuring system is 200 mm
* 150 mm * 80 mm, and the resolution is 0.5 mm * 0.5 mm. (B) Data processing flow for the 3-D
magnetic field mapping system.



460 Figure 4. (A) Simulated S11 vs. frequency of the coupled stack-up volume coils. (B) Normalized

461 B1 field distribution for each mode.



Figure 5. (A) Simulated unloaded Y-Z, X-Z, and X-Y plane B field efficiency maps inside oil
phantom generated by coupled stack-up volume coils. Both planes are at the center of the axis. (B)
A set of the multiple X-Y plane slices with different distances from the phantom center B field
efficiency maps inside the phantom generated by coupled stack-up volume coil.





Figure 6. (A) Scattering parameters vs. frequency of the bench test model of coupled stack-up
volume coils. (B) Measured unloaded B field efficiency maps on the Y-Z plane of coupled stackup volume coil.



Figure 7. (A) Simulation models of the equal gap coupled coil and the 7-turn solenoid coil. (B)
Simulated unloaded B1 field efficiency comparison among the coupled stack-up volume coil, the
equal gap coupled coil, and the solenoid coil. (C) Simulated unloaded E field efficiency
comparison between the three coils. (D) 1-D profile of the field efficiency along the center line of
the coils (dashed line in Figure 7B), showing the field distribution along the coil axis.



478 **Figure 8.** (A) Simulated loaded B1 field efficiency comparison with a CST Studio bio-model

- 479 loaded into the coils. (B) Simulated loaded E field efficiency comparison with the bio-model. (C)
- 480 Simulated SAR comparison between the three coils.



Figure 9. Simulated B1 efficiency and field distribution in three orthogonal planes: Comparison between the (A) proposed coupled stack-up volume coil and the (B) birdcage coil loaded with an oil phantom. (C)1-D profiles of the simulated B1 fields plotted along the axis of the coils, i.e. the dashed lines indicated in Y-Z plane and X-Z plane in inset (A) and (B). (D)1-D profiles of the simulated B1 fields of the coils plotted along the dashed lines shown in X-Y plane in inset (A) and (B).





Figure 10. Simulated B1 efficiency and field distribution in three orthogonal planes: Comparison
between the (A) proposed coupled stack-up volume coil and the (B) birdcage coil loaded with a
human head phantom.



Figure 11. Measured unloaded B1 fields of the proposed coupled stack-up volume coil (A) and the same-sized birdcage coil (B). 1D profiles of B1 fields of the two coils plotted along the center line of the X-Z plane and Y-Z plane (black dashed lines in (A) and (B)) are shown in (C). 1D profiles of B1 fields of the two coils plotted along the center line of the X-Y plane (red dashed lines in (A) and (B)) are shown in (D). These results demonstrate the improved B1 efficiency and homogeneity of the coupled stack-up volume coil over the birdcage coil at 0.5T.



499

500 **Figure 12.** 1-D profile comparison of the B1 field efficiency for the coupled stack-up volume coil

501 with an increased number of rings.

502

503 Tables

	Coupled Stack-up Volume Coil	Solenoid Coil	Birdcage Coil
Average B Field Efficiency $(\mu T/\sqrt{W})$	10.82	10.48	7.33
Field Homogeneity (Relative standard deviation)	4.81%	10.02%	15.30%

505 **Table 1.** Simulated average B1 field efficiency and standard deviation inside the phantom of 506 coupled stack-up volume coil, solenoid coil, and birdcage coil. The average B field efficiency and 507 relative standard deviation are calculated by the simulation result inside the phantom. Field 508 efficiency is collected and analyzed in a 2.5 mm step size inside the phantom. 509