






Applied Computational Electromagnetics Society Journal



Editor-in-Chief
Atef Z. Elsherbeni



July 2007
Vol. 22 No. 2
ISSN 1054-4887



GENERAL PURPOSE AND SCOPE: The Applied Computational Electromagnetics Society (*ACES*) Journal hereinafter known as the *ACES Journal* is devoted to the exchange of information in computational electromagnetics, to the advancement of the state-of-the art, and the promotion of related technical activities. A primary objective of the information exchange is the elimination of the need to “re-invent the wheel” to solve a previously-solved computational problem in electrical engineering, physics, or related fields of study. The technical activities promoted by this publication include code validation, performance analysis, and input/output standardization; code or technique optimization and error minimization; innovations in solution technique or in data input/output; identification of new applications for electromagnetics modeling codes and techniques; integration of computational electromagnetics techniques with new computer architectures; and correlation of computational parameters with physical mechanisms.

SUBMISSIONS: The *ACES Journal* welcomes original, previously unpublished papers, relating to applied computational electromagnetics. Typical papers will represent the computational electromagnetics aspects of research in electrical engineering, physics, or related disciplines. However, papers which represent research in applied computational electromagnetics itself are equally acceptable.

Manuscripts are to be submitted through the upload system of *ACES* web site <http://aces.ee.olemiss.edu> See “Information for Authors” on inside of back cover and at *ACES* web site. For additional information contact the Editor-in-Chief:

Dr. Atef Elsherbeni

Department of Electrical Engineering
The University of Mississippi
University, MS 386377 USA
Phone: 662-915-5382 Fax: 662-915-7231
Email: atef@olemiss.edu

SUBSCRIPTIONS: All members of the Applied Computational Electromagnetics Society who have paid their subscription fees are entitled to receive the *ACES Journal* with a minimum of three issues per calendar year and are entitled to download any published journal article available at <http://aces.ee.olemiss.edu>.

Back issues, when available, are \$15 each. Subscriptions to *ACES* is through the web site. Orders for back issues of the *ACES Journal* and changes of addresses should be sent directly to *ACES* Executive Officer:

Dr. Richard W. Adler

ECE Department, Code ECAB
Naval Postgraduate School
833 Dyer Road, Room 437
Monterey, CA 93943-5121 USA
Fax: 831-649-0300
Email: rwa@attglobal.net

Allow four week’s advance notice for change of address. Claims for missing issues will not be honored because of insufficient notice or address change or loss in mail unless the Executive Officer is notified within 60 days for USA and Canadian subscribers or 90 days for subscribers in other countries, from the last day of the month of publication. For information regarding reprints of individual papers or other materials, see “Information for Authors”.

LIABILITY. Neither *ACES*, nor the *ACES Journal* editors, are responsible for any consequence of misinformation or claims, express or implied, in any published material in an *ACES Journal* issue. This also applies to advertising, for which only camera-ready copies are accepted. Authors are responsible for information contained in their papers. If any material submitted for publication includes material which has already been published elsewhere, it is the author’s responsibility to obtain written permission to reproduce such material.

APPLIED COMPUTATIONAL ELECTROMAGNETICS SOCIETY JOURNAL

Editor-in-Chief
Atef Z. Elsherbeni

July 2007
Vol. 22 No. 2
ISSN 1054-4887

The ACES Journal is abstracted in INSPEC, in Engineering Index, DTIC, Science Citation Index Expanded, the Research Alert, and to Current Contents/Engineering, Computing & Technology.

The first, fourth, and sixth illustrations on the front cover have been obtained from the Department of Electrical Engineering at the University of Mississippi.

The third and fifth illustrations on the front cover have been obtained from Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

The second illustration on the front cover has been obtained from FLUX2D software, CEDRAT S.S. France, MAGSOFT Corporation, New York.

THE APPLIED COMPUTATIONAL ELECTROMAGNETICS SOCIETY

<http://aces.ee.olemiss.edu>

ACES JOURNAL EDITORS

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF/ACES/JOURNAL

Atef Elsherbeni

University of Mississippi, EE Dept.
University, MS 38677, USA

ASSOCIATE EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Erdem Topsakal

Mississippi State University, EE Dept.
Mississippi State, MS 39762, USA

MANAGING EDITOR

Richard W. Adler

833 Dyer Rd, Rm 437 EC/AB
NPS, Monterey, CA 93943-5121, USA

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

Mohamed Al Sharkawy

University of Mississippi, EE Dept.
University, MS 38677, USA

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

Matthew J. Inman

University of Mississippi, EE Dept.
University, MS 38677, USA

ASSOCIATE EDITOR-IN-CHIEF,
EMERITUS

Alexander Yakovlev

University of Mississippi, EE Dept.
University, MS 38677, USA

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF, EMERITUS

Allen Glisson

University of Mississippi, EE Dept.
University, MS 38677, USA

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF, EMERITUS

Ahmed Kishk

University of Mississippi, EE Dept.
University, MS 38677, USA

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF, EMERITUS

Robert M. Bevensee

Box 812
Alamo, CA 94507-0516, USA

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF, EMERITUS

Ducan C. Baker

EE Dept. U. of Pretoria
0002 Pretoria, South Africa

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF, EMERITUS

David E. Stein

USAF Scientific Advisory Board
Washington, DC 20330, USA

ACES JOURNAL ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Giandomenico Amendola

John Beggs

John Brauer

Magda El-Shenawee

Pat Foster

Cynthia M. Furse

Christian Hafner

Michael Hamid

Andy Harrison

Chun-Wen Paul Huang

Todd H. Hubing

Nathan Ida

Yasushi Kanai

Leo C. Kempel

Andrzej Krawczyk

Stanley Kubina

Samir F. Mahmoud

Ronald Marhefka

Edmund K. Miller

Krishna Naishadham

Giuseppe Pelosi

Vicente Rodriguez

Harold A. Sabbagh

John B. Schneider

Abdel Razek Sebak

Amr M. Sharawee

Norio Takahashi

JULY 2007 REVIEWERS

Ray J Perez

AbdelKader Hamid

Mousa Hussein

Elliott Hutchcraft

Nathan Ida

Douglas Taylor

John H. Beggs

Abbas Omar

Michael Chryssomallis

Steven L. Dvorak

Alan Taflove

Mohamed H. Bakr

Teixeira L. Fernando

Mohamed Al-Sharkawy

Cynthia Furse

George Hanson

Filippo Capolino

Michael Hamid

Christos Christopoulos

Mohamed Essaaidi

C. J. Reddy

Amelia Rubio Bretones

Bevan Bates

Nick Buris

Adalbert Beyer

Henri Bertoni

David Chen

Robert J. Burkholder

Malcolm Bibby

Eric Michielssen

Alexander Nosich

Gonul Turhan Sayan

Darko Kajfez

Veysel Demir

THE APPLIED COMPUTATIONAL ELECTROMAGNETICS SOCIETY
JOURNAL

Vol. 22 No. 2

July 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

“Numerical Examinations of the Stability of FDTD Subgridding Schemes” S. Wang.....	189
“Parallel ICCG Solvers for a Finite-Element Eddy-Current Analysis on Heterogeneous Parallel Computation Environment” T. Iwashita, M. Shimasaki, and J. Lu.....	195
“A New 3D Ray-Tracing Acceleration Technique for the Analysis of Propagation and Radiation in Complex Enviroments” I. González, C. Delgado, F. Saez de Adana, O. Gutiérrez, and M. F. Cátedra.....	201
“On the Convergence Properties of the Multiple Sweep Method of Moments” D. Çolak, R. J. Burkholder, and E. H. Newman.....	207
“Semi-analytical Approach to Sensitivity Analysis of Lossy Inhomogeneous Structures” S. M. Ali, N. K. Nikolova, and M. H. Bakr.....	219
“Model-Based Parameter Estimation (MBPE) for Metallic Photonic Crystal Filters” K. Tavzarashvili, C. Hafner, C. Xudong, R. Vahldieck, D. Karkashadze, and G. Ghvedashvili.....	228
“Scattering by PEMC (Perfect Electromagnetic Conductor) Spheres using Surface Integral Equation Approach” A. Sihvola, P. Ylä-Oijala, and I. V. Lindell.....	236
“Fast Frequency Sweep Scattering Analysis for Multiple PEC Objects” C. Mingsheng, W. Xianliang, S. Wei, and H. Zhixiang.....	250
“RCS Computation of Targets Using Three Dimensional Scalar Parabolic Equation” A. R. Mallahzadeh, J. Rashed-Mohassel, and M. Soleimani.....	254
“Application of Quasi-static Method of Moments for the Design of Microwave Integrated Circuits and Antennas” C. P. Huang, S. Hammadi, J. Sercu, J. Bao, and S. Kuran.....	260

“New Heating Characteristics of a Radio Frequency Rectangular Resonant Cavity Applicator Using Various Antennas for Hyperthermic Treatment” Y. Tange, Y. Kanai, Y. Saitoh, and T. Kashiwa.....	269
“RF Coil Design for MRI Using a Genetic Algorithm” J. R. Hadley, C. M. Furse, and D. Parker	277
“Modeling of Ground-Penetrating Radar for Detecting Buried Objects in Dispersive Soils” K. P. Prokopidis and T. D. Tsiboukis	287
“Inverse Scattering of Inhomogeneous Dielectric Cylinders Buried in a Slab Medium by TE Wave Illumination” C. H. Huang, C. C. Chiu, C. J. Lin, and Y. F. Chen	295
“A Wavefront Launching Model for Predicting Channel Impulse Response” M. Robinson.....	302

RF Coil Design for MRI Using a Genetic Algorithm

J. Rock Hadley¹, Cynthia M. Furse², and Dennis Parker¹

¹Utah Center for Advanced Imaging Research

²Electrical and Computer Engineering

University of Utah

50 S Campus Drive 3280 MEB

Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

cfurse@ece.utah.edu

www.ece.utah.edu/~cfurse

Abstract – In this work a Genetic Algorithm (GA) was used to optimize single and dual array Radio Frequency (RF) coils for imaging vasculature structures using Magnetic Resonance Imaging. Quasi-static equations were used to simulate sample noise and signal sensitivity profiles of the coil elements. Coil to sample and coil to coil interactions were taken into account, and the relative signal-to-noise ratio in the structure of interest was used as the cost function for the GA optimization.

Key words – Genetic Algorithm, Magnetic Resonance Imaging, phased array coils.

I. INTRODUCTION

Previous work has shown that substantial improvement in Magnetic Resonance (MR) image quality can be obtained using receiver coils that are specifically designed for the region of interest [1 - 46]. However, it is often difficult to fully optimize RF coils (eg. their sizes and positions) for specific objects or anatomies because of the complex nature of coil/sample and coil/coil interactions. Obtaining the exact geometric configuration that will optimize image quality over the region of interest is complicated. Also, the optimal geometric parameters can vary greatly depending on the sample volume or structure being imaged. There is a general rule that the coil diameter should be approximately equal to the depth of the voxel being imaged [38], but when that object is a large volume (such as the heart) or when the structure is a tortuous long and varies in depth like an artery, optimization is difficult. Many characteristics need to be taken into account when designing RF coils for specific anatomy such as object geometry (structure of interest, structure shape, and body surface geometry), coil coupling, coil sensitivity profile, interaction with the sample, relative positions of individual elements, patient comfort, parallel imaging factors, and image acquisition technique.

Stochastic optimization methods such as the genetic algorithm (GA) [47 - 49] are well suited for optimization problems of this nature, since they are able to find a global minimum when many local minima exist, they require no derivatives or gradients, and they are very flexible in their utility. Cost functions for GAs can be tailored to specific problems and can be implemented with other types of algorithms for accurate measurement or optimization purposes. GAs have previously been used to generate MRI related design parameters for various applications including split coil magnets, biplanar gradients, and some RF coil designs [50 - 55]. In this work, GA techniques are used to optimize coil parameters pertaining to single loop coil and phased array coil design for the purpose of imaging specific anatomic structures. The GA technique can provide optimum coil parameters including the number of coils in the array and the specific size and position of each element in the array for imaging the specific anatomy. The goal of this work is not to evaluate standard GA methods, as applied to RF coil design, nor to provide exact specifications for building application-specific coils. Rather the goal of this work is to show that the GA is well suited for optimizing coil design parameters and to define cost functions and methods to enable this optimization, allowing coil developers to assess trends and tradeoffs in relative signal-to-noise ratio (rSNR) during structure specific optimization.

II. THEORY

Genetic Algorithms

The genetic algorithm [47] is a search and optimization technique based on the concept of natural selection. This technique is particularly useful for optimization problems that have complicated cost functions with many local minima. GAs are also used in cases where it is difficult to formulate multiple derivatives of the cost function for use in algorithms such as the steepest descent algorithm. The GA computes a cost function for its individual

“chromosomes” or vectors of numbers that describe the optimization problem. The GA begins by computing the cost function for an initial population of chromosomes that are randomly chosen over the search space. The most favorable chromosomes are kept, and the worst chromosomes are discarded. Those chromosomes that are kept are “mated” with other “good” chromosomes to form “offspring” chromosomes that are then put into the population pool. There are multiple techniques for mating chromosomes and introducing mutations into the chromosome pool so that the GA is less likely to result in a local minimum when the global minimum is desired. Although there is no way to determine if the absolute global minimum has been obtained, GAs are typically more likely to find the global minimum for cost functions containing many local minima than standard minimum seeking algorithms.

Optimization Model

The model for these simulations consists of a large slab (80 cm × 80 cm × 40 cm) of a semi-conducting material with coils placed on the surface of the conducting model [38]. The slab is defined for $(-40 < x < 40, -40 < y < 40, -40 < z < 0)$, and the coils are placed on the surface of the slab at $z = 0$ as shown in Fig. 1. The y-axis of the slab is defined to be parallel to the main DC magnetic field of the MR scanner, B_0 . The sample has a conductivity of 0.3 S/m. Off-axis electromagnetic equations for rectangular coil elements are simulated using equations derived from the Biot-Savart law and presented by Smythe and Misakian [56], [57]. For a single loop, the dimensions are $a \times b$, representing the side lengths of a rectangular coil in the x and y directions, respectively. The coil position is defined as (x, y) as shown in Fig. 1. The anatomic object of interest is embedded in the sample and consists of any collection of points that represent the particular structure over which rSNR calculations are made. The objects of interest in this work primarily consist of representations of different vessel structures and a heart shaped object.

The impedance, Z , for an RF resonating loop receiver coil is composed of several terms including the sample losses, R_s , coil ohmic losses, R_c , the connecting wire or cable losses R_w , the amplifier impedances, R_a , and the reactive inductance and capacitance terms, X ,

$$Z_i = R_{s_i} + R_{c_i} + R_{w_i} + R_{a_i} + jX_i. \quad (1)$$

The i represents the i^{th} coil, $j = \sqrt{-1}$. The sample noise R_s , for such a coil is defined as the integral of the squared magnitude of the magnetic vector potential, A , created by a unit current in the coil [58], multiplied by the sample conductivity, σ , and the squared radian frequency, ω , over the volume of the coil sensitivity [38], [56]

$$R_{s_i} = \omega^2 \sigma \int A_i \cdot A_i \delta v. \quad (2)$$




Fig. 1. Coil dimension and position definitions for a single and dual coil system positioned over the optimization sample space.

For this equation, it is assumed that the conductivity tensor is isotropic and uniform over the sample volume, and that only a ϕ component of the magnetic vector potential exists in the sample [56]. This satisfies the boundary conditions for the electric field at the sample boundary. The coil ohmic losses for the rectangular loop are [59]

$$R_{c_i} = \frac{4(a_i + b_i)}{\pi d} \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 2\pi f}{2\sigma}}, \quad (3)$$

where μ_0 is the permeability of air, f is the frequency of the current in the conductor, and d is the diameter of the conductor. This work does not include the amplifier or cable losses based on the assumption that these losses are already minimized and are the same for all coils in the optimization algorithm. For a single loop, the reactive terms include the distributed capacitance and the loop self inductance terms that generally cancel out at resonant frequencies. However, the self inductance terms are useful in the coil optimization process. For a single rectangular loop coil of dimensions $a \times b$, with a round wire diameter ρ , the self inductance is [60],

$$L_i = 0.004(a_i \log(2a_i / \rho) + b_i \log(2b_i / \rho) + 2\sqrt{a_i^2 + b_i^2} - a_i \sinh^{-1}(a_i / b_i) - b_i \sinh^{-1}(b_i / a_i) - 2(a_i + b_i) + \frac{\mu}{4}(a_i + b_i)). \quad (4)$$

For the purposes of this work, the noise power, n , for a single coil is defined by equation (2) and equation (3) such that,

$$n_i = \text{Re}(Z_i) \approx R_{s_i} + R_{c_i}. \quad (5)$$

The relative MR signal or coil sensitivity for a point in the sample space r is defined from the theory of reciprocity [58] as the transverse magnetic field produced by the coil with a unit current flowing in the conductor elements,

$$s_i(r) = B_{\perp} \approx (B_x(r) + jB_z(r)). \quad (6)$$

For a two coil system, the second rectangular loop has the dimensions of $a_2 \times b_2$, with a position of $(x + \Delta x, y + \Delta y)$ as depicted in Fig. 1. The second coil also has its own self inductance described by equation (4). There is also a mutual inductance term that describes the flux linkage between the two coils. This term is largely dependant on the geometrical relationship between the two coils and is expressed by,

$$M_{ik} = \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \iint \frac{\partial s_i \cdot \partial s_k}{|r_i - r_k|}, \quad (7)$$

where, s_i is a unit element of the conductor of coil i , and $|r_i - r_k|$ is the distance between the unit elements of the i^{th} and k^{th} coil.

The second coil also has sample noise and ohmic noise described by equations (2) and (3), respectively. If the two coils are in close proximity, a portion of the sample noise can be correlated between coils. This correlated noise power or noise that is shared between the two coils, through the sample, is described by,

$$R_{s_{ik}} = \omega^2 \sigma \int A_i \cdot A_k \partial v, \quad (8)$$

which is the general form of equation (2), including the inner vector product of the magnetic vector potential from both coils at each point in the sample space. These additional noise terms from coil k affect the noise of the overall system and the resulting noise as seen by coil i is,

$$n_{ti} = R_{si} + R_{ci} + \sum_{i \neq k} R_{ik} + \sum_{i \neq k} \left| \frac{\omega M_{ik}}{Z_k} \right|^2 \text{Re}(Z_k^*), \quad (9)$$

where the subscript t represents the total noise from the i^{th} coil. The net signal or coil sensitivity for coil i , in the presence of coil k , then become,

$$s_i(r) = (Bx_i(r) + jBz_i(r)) + \sum_{i \neq k} \frac{M_{ik}}{L_i} (Bx_k(r) + jBz_k(r)). \quad (10)$$

The rSNR at any given point in the sample depends on combining the signals from coil i and coil k in the manner derived by Roemer [38]. Therefore, when the signals are combined to obtain maximized rSNR at every image point, the resulting maximum rSNR is,

$$rSNR = \sqrt{S^T \Psi^{-1} S^*}, \quad (11)$$

where S is the coil sensitivity vector, or the vector of coil sensitivities at the position for which the rSNR is being calculated. The T represents the matrix transpose, $*$ represents the complex conjugate, and Ψ is the noise correlation matrix which includes the noise power terms from equation (2) as the diagonal elements, and the noise power terms from equation (8) as the off diagonal elements of its matrix.

III. METHODS

Genetic Algorithm

The GA chromosomes that describe the one and two coil systems consist of the geometrical parameters that express the sizes of the coils and their positions with respect to the sample being imaged (see Fig. 1). The chromosome for the two coil system is:

$$[a_1, b_1, x, y, a_2, b_2, \Delta x, \Delta y]. \quad (12)$$

For this work, these chromosome variables were continuous, although it would be equally valid to allow a fixed set of choices, which might speed up the GA convergence. The ranges for a and b define limitations on the smallest and largest coil sizes allowed in the optimization, and the limits on x , and y determined the limits of the coil position. The coils in this study are limited to a maximum a and b of 10 cm, and the center position of the search space is a 20×20 cm surface.

An initial set of 16 to 48 random chromosomes were compared based on their cost function values. The best half of the chromosomes were kept for mating (parents) and the rest of the chromosomes were discarded. The mating routine produced the same number of additional offspring chromosomes, which were sorted with the parent chromosomes according to their cost function values (their ‘‘fitness’’). This iterative procedure was continued until convergence was achieved.

The cost function for each chromosome was computed as the average rSNR for the sample points in the object of interest,

$$\text{cost } t = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \cdot rSNR(r_i). \quad (13)$$

For this equation, rSNR is defined by equation (11), r_i defines the position of the sample, point, N is the total number of sample points that define the anatomic structure of interest, and w_i is the weighting value of specific sample points ($w_i = 1$ for this work). For each rSNR calculation, the coil sample and ohmic losses were interpolated from pre-computed look up tables, eliminating the computation of time consuming volume

integrals over the sample space for each iteration. The coil signal sensitivity at all sample points was also computed for each coil, or set of coils, and for each GA iteration.

The original implementation of the two coil GA code used the equations as stated above to compute the cost functions of the chromosomes. However, the GA would quickly converge to local minimum solutions where the mutual inductance between coils was zero, but for which the coil shapes and positioning were not practical or intuitive for imaging the object of interest. Using continuous variables for the chromosome elements caused the solution space to be so large that it was difficult to find another local minima once the first set of $M_{12} = 0$ coils were determined. Consequently, the first local minimum found was generally the final result for this algorithm. These $M_{12} = 0$ solutions were very dominant over all other solutions and many such solutions (local minima) existed in the search space. Therefore, it was determined that the search space should be limited to solutions where the mutual inductance between coils was zero. This is commonly done in coil design without the GA, and it is reasonable to assume that it is also ideal for GA-optimized coils. This work used a simple binary search algorithm to shift coil 2, along a specified angle with respect to coil 1, to determine the Δx and Δy chromosome elements that would result in $M_{12} = 0$ between the two coils. Consequently, Δx and Δy can quickly be determined. Once this algorithm is complete, the Δx and Δy components of the two coil chromosome were set, and the relative position of coil 2 with respect to coil 1 was fixed. At that point, the correlated noise terms between the two coils were calculated, the individual coil sample noise terms were obtained from the lookup table, and the noise correlation matrix, Ψ , was defined for the two coil system. The binary search algorithm essentially eliminated two of the eight chromosome elements in the original 2 coil chromosomes. The next step that aided in significantly speeding up the algorithm, was the use of a nested GA to optimize the (x, y) position of coil 1 such that the average rSNR of the fixed two coil system was optimized for the object of interest. This nested GA was fast, because the only calculations needed for each iteration were the magnetic field and rSNR calculations for the object points at each (x, y) coil pair position. This technique resulted in a 4 element GA in an outer loop and a two element GA in an inner loop, and significantly reduced the chromosome pool search space to include only chromosomes that were relevant and practical for imaging the object of interest. This technique provides significant improvements in the speed of convergence over a single GA for all eight elements of the chromosome. Other factors that speed up convergence of the GA were to restrict the relative

sizes of the two coils so that non-probable coil pairs were eliminated and the use of predetermined coil pair data that was used in a look up table as the initial pool of chromosomes. All that was needed for these initial chromosomes was the inside GA loop to optimally position the coil pairs for imaging the object of interest. Finally, the option to fine tune the top chromosome was included in the algorithm. This consists of adding chromosomes with incremental adjustments in the coil sizes and positions into the pool and helped to keep the GA from stagnating on a single chromosome for multiple iterations.

Coil Optimizations

Single coil GA simulations used a reduced chromosome length of 4 elements including the coil dimensions a and b , and the coil position x and y . Noise correlation and mutual inductance terms were not needed for these simulations, so convergence was quick. Single coil optimizations were performed to compare single and double coil rSNR results and to assess the relative improvements that can be gained by using two coils over a single coil for various vessel segments.

Several case studies were evaluated [79] and are discussed here. For each case a single and double coil GA optimization were performed. The case studies consisted of the following: case 1) a single sample point, representing a vessel segment of 1 cm length at a 3 cm depth, case 2) a single sample point at 5 cm depth, case 3) a single sample point at 8 cm depth, case 4) a longer vessel segment of 4 cm length at a continuous depth of 3 cm, case 5) a longer vessel segment of 10 cm length at a 5 cm depth, case 6) a long vessel structure with a linear depth profile, with a length of approximately 11 cm, a depth of 2.5 cm at one end, a depth of 5 cm at the center and a depth of 7.5 cm at the deepest end, and case 7) a heart model consisting of approximately 300 points distributed on a stretched spheroidal surface with a center depth of 9 cm, a length of 10 cm, and a diameter of 7 cm.

IV. RESULTS

The results for all the single and dual coil optimizations for the various cases are presented in Table 1. This table shows that for a single vessel point at 3 cm depth, the optimal coil radius is approximately 1.9×1.9 cm, and as a consequence of the vessel point being positioned at $(x, y, z) = (0, 0, -3)$ cm, the coil is positioned at $(x, y) = (0, 0)$ cm. This is about 25 % different from the rule of thumb that the coil diameter should be 3 cm for a 3 cm deep voxel. The rSNR for this single point using the optimal single coil is 81.6.

For the same vessel point, using a two coil array, the dimensions of each coil were 1.6×2 cm with a 2.72 cm x -directed, patient left/right, or transverse offset

between the two coils. This is similar to the designs presented by Hayes where the coils are offset in the transverse direction for optimal rSNR [22], [23], [61]. This configuration of coils provided a 14.8 % improvement in the rSNR (93.7) over the single coil. Hayes has described this phenomenon and attributes this to the phase of the coil sensitivity profile at the point of interest [62]. Similarly for cases 2 and 3, the dual coil array provides similar rSNR improvement with coil elements offset in the transverse direction. These results also show the intrinsic rSNR loss that naturally occurs as the sample point increases in depth. For example, increasing the depth of the single sample point from 3 to 5 cm decreases the available rSNR using the two coil array by 65 %, and increasing the depth from 5 to 8 cm decreases the available rSNR by an additional 65 %.

Table 1. GA optimization results for case studies.

Case #	# coils	depth	length	a/2	b/2	x	y	rSNR	% chg
1. point	1	3	1	1.9	1.9	0	0	81.6	14.8
	2	3	1	1.6	2	-1.37	0	93.7	
				1.6	2	1.37	0		
2. point	1	5	1	2.7	2.7	0	0	27.9	15.1
	2	5	1	2.3	3	1.9	0.2	32.1	
				2.3	3	-1.9	-0.17		
3. point	1	8	1	4	4	0	0	9.8	15.3
	2	8	1	3.4	4.5	-2.84	-0.28	11.3	
				3.4	4.5	2.87	0.28		
4. vessel	1	3	4	1.8	2.5	0	0	71.1	17.4
	2	3	4	1.6	2.6	1.29	-0.21	83.5	
				1.6	2.6	-1.31	0.23		
5. vessel	1	5	10	2.5	5	0	0	20.6	26.2
	2	5	10	2.7	3.1	0.15	2.69	26	
				2.7	3.1	-0.15	-2.68		
6. vessel	1	2.5 – 7.5	11	2	3	0	2.7	29.7	26.3
	2	2.5 – 7.5	11	1.8	2	0	3.8	37.5	
				3	3.2	0	-0.6		
7. heart	1	9	10	4	6	0	0	6.7	23.9
	2	9	10	3.7	6.5	-3	0.29	8.3	
				3.7	6.5	3	-0.29		

For case 4, the vessel object is again at a 3 cm depth, and the length is increased to 4 cm, typical for a carotid bifurcation. For this case, use of a dual coil array provides approximately 17.4 % rSNR improvement over the single coil (see Fig. 2). It is also interesting to note that by optimizing coils over a larger volume or vessel length, there is a nearly 11 % reduction in available rSNR compared to a single point at the same depth (compare with case 1). This coil design might be considered to be a good coil design for applications where the object of interest is a single point somewhere along the artificial design vessel, and the goal of the coil design is to have improved flexibility in coil positioning for a tradeoff of nearly 11 % in rSNR.




Fig. 2. Case 4 dual coil results show that the coils are still overlapped in the transverse direction and that there is a 17.4 % increase in rSNR compared to the single coil results.

The GA solution for case 5 indicates that the optimal dual coil configuration consists of two coils that are nearly the same size as an optimal single element coil for a single point at the design depth (see Fig. 3). However, rather than positioning the coils such that they are overlapped in the transverse direction, they are overlapped in the longitudinal direction, or patient superior/inferior direction. This configuration is known to have a subtle rSNR decrease under the overlap of the two coils as opposed to the known increase in rSNR under the overlap for coils overlapped in the transverse direction [62]. However, for the cost function used in this study, the net rSNR for the longitudinally overlapped pair is greater than for designs using the transverse overlapped pair. The GA technique can aid in determining where this break point might be found in determining the best approach for coil overlap for the imaging of specific structures. This case also demonstrates, as before, that designing a coil to cover such a long structure decreases the available rSNR of any one point on the structure by 19 % compared to a coil designed for a single point at the same depth (compare with case 2). However, this coil design is likely to be more flexible in positioning along the length of the structure.




Fig. 3. Case 5: dual coil results show that the optimal overlap for this case is in the longitudinal direction. The dual coil provides a 26.2 % increase in rSNR over the single coil results.

The results for case 6 (see Fig. 4) give an indication of how the appropriate coil array should be designed to image structures that change in depth along the length of the structure. It would be difficult to use intuition alone to design a coil for such a purpose, however, using the GA to optimize the coils for this vessel structure provides a result that is intuitive and gives relative estimates of the dimensions and positions of a dual coil array that might be used to image a structure such as this. It is interesting to note how much rSNR improvement ($\sim 26\%$) the GA indicates can be achieved using two coils rather than a single coil for these long vessel cases. This result also indicates that it may be important to use coils of arbitrary shape for the imaging of specific structures rather than standard circular or rectangular shaped coils.




Fig. 4. Case 6: dual coil results show the benefit of using arbitrary shaped coils for imaging structures of this nature. The dual coil for this case provides a 26.3 % increase in rSNR compared to the single coil for this case.

The results for the heart model, case 7, provide insight into the optimal coil design for larger volumes and structures. The sample points used to calculate the average rSNR over the surface of this structure range from 12.5 cm to 5.5 cm depth with a slightly larger sample point density at the superior and inferior ends of the model, near its central axis (see Fig. 5). Because of the long length of this structure, it might be expected that coils overlapped in the longitudinal direction would again provide the highest rSNR over its surface. However, because the sample points nearest the surface have the largest intrinsic rSNR, their contribution to the overall cost function is great, and result in an optimal coil design where the coils are overlapped in a transverse manner with respect to B_0 . Comparing case 7 with case 3, it can be seen that the coil width radius, $a/2 = 3.7$ cm, is just slightly larger than that for the single point at 8 cm depth, $a/2 = 3.4$ cm, accounting for the extra centimeter of the average heart depth. However, in order to account for the length of the heart at such a depth, the coil radius for the longitudinal direction is considerably longer than for the result in case 3. Finally, these results indicate an rSNR increase of approximately 24 % using a dual coil array compared to a single coil.




Fig. 5. Case 7: dual coil results show that, for the average rSNR cost function, the coils are still overlapped in the transverse direction even though the structure is long. The dual coil for this case provides a 23.9 % increase in rSNR over the single coil for this case.

The results for the single coil optimizations are in line with intuition and with expected results. Results for the single coil GA are achieved quickly, and can be performed on a standard PC in a matter of minutes. Using the techniques described above on a Dual AMD Opteron, dual core 270 with 4 GB of RAM, case 4 converged in approximately 2.5 hours, and case 7 in approximately 9.55 hours, making these simulations practical to use for specific design applications.

V. DISCUSSION

The purpose of this work was to develop a GA tool that could be used for finding coil geometries and positions that give the highest rSNR for a specific anatomy, and evaluate its usefulness. Modifications were made to the standard GA methods that limit the coil parameter search space to solutions that are practical for imaging the object of interest. Although these simulations were performed for only two coils, it would be natural to extend this work to multi-element arrays. There are challenges in obtaining minimum mutual inductance for three or more coil elements. However, with the use of passive decoupling circuits [28], [63 - 66] and appropriate image reconstruction techniques [65], [67], zero mutual inductance between all adjacent, coils may not be required. With the ability to simulate and optimize multiple coil elements using the GA tool, the number of coil elements that might be used in an array for imaging a specific structure might also be optimized.

In addition to optimizing the number of elements used in a coil array, many other interesting coil design characteristics might be optimized using the GA techniques such as individual coil sizes and relative positions for phased array coil elements, g-factors, and coil element spacing for parallel imaging applications, and any other coil dimension or relative coil position. Cost functions can also be modified to include other

anatomic structure specifications or image acquisition parameters. Recently, Breuer and Griswold have shown that phased array designs may be optimized for specific parallel image acquisition schemes that use different data gridding techniques. [68], [69] Therefore, the results of this study indicate that the use of the GA for optimization of coil design parameters is useful and promising.

The purpose simulating these different cases was to evaluate coil design trends and the effects on rSNR for different imaging applications, providing answers to fundamental coil design questions concerning coil size, position, direction of overlap, etc. These different case studies were also designed to provide insight into the results of designing RF coils for various objects of interest and to better understand how the optimal coil should be configured for these different geometries. It can be seen that coils or arrays of coils that are optimized for a specific point in the sample can provide significantly more rSNR for that point than if the point is only a part of some greater volume or structure that is being imaged with a coil designed for the entire volume.

There are several limitations to this study. First, particularly for complicated anatomies such as the carotid bifurcation, the simple vessel models may be insufficient. More realistic models would include accurate representation of the head, neck and shoulders and full wave solutions to account for all the complicated boundaries of such a model. Such a model would also provide the appropriate sample and correlated loss terms, whereas the infinite half plane model used in these studies may represent a much more dominant load than that of the head, neck and shoulders.

Second, these simulations are based on quasi-static electromagnetic field simulations where it is assumed that the electric and magnetic fields are not coupled and that the magnetic field in the sample is primarily due to the current in the coil conductor. Simulations using these equations combined with the effectively infinite slab model are subject to error, because they do not take into account important effects such as the boundary conditions of actual human anatomy, sample loading, conductive shielding of the fields from the sample, etc. Wright has computed the rSNR for several different coils at 64 MHz and has shown that the results using the quasi-static solutions tend to show all appropriate trends and features of the coils compared to actual measurements [44]. Many other authors have used quasi-static calculations to obtain reasonable estimates of real measurements [9], [20], [38], [56], [70-78]. These simulations seem to work well for situations where the current distributions around the coils are known to be relatively constant across the coil. As the coil dimensions or the frequency increases the changes in phase of the current in the coil become more

significant, and these simulations may be inaccurate in predicting appropriate rSNR trends and characteristics.

Finally, it is also important to note that these simulation results are based on a cost function that is computed as the average rSNR over all sample points that define the structure of interest. The cost function also assumes the use of Roemer's full reconstruction algorithm (equation (11)) [38]. These results might be significantly different if the sample points were weighted to emphasize different sections of the structure or if different reconstruction algorithms were used to combine data from multiple coils.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

This work demonstrates that the GA can be used as a coil design tool to study rSNR characteristics for imaging applications of specific anatomic structures, where relative trends and tradeoffs of various coil configurations can be understood. Although GAs typically require large amounts of computing power, modifications can be made to decrease the parameter search space and improve the speed of RF coil GA optimizations. Cost functions for the GA coil optimization can be modified to include larger numbers of array elements as well as other interesting coil parameters such as g-factor and array element spacing for parallel imaging applications, as well as size, shape, and total number of elements in an array for optimal rSNR imaging.

The case studies presented in this work demonstrate important characteristics of various coil designs optimized to image specific anatomic structures, and provide answers to fundamental questions concerning the design of RF coils for MRI.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Alecci, C. M. Collins, J. Wilson, W. Liu, M. B. Smith, and P. Jezzard, "Theoretical and experimental evaluation of detached endcaps for 3 T birdcage coils," *Magn. Reson. Med.*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 363 - 370, 2003.
- [2] E. Atalar, P. A. Bottomley, O. Ocali, L. C. Correia, M. D. Kelemen, J. A. Lima, and E. A. Zerhouni, "High resolution intravascular MRI and MRS by using a catheter receiver coil," *Magn. Reson. Med.*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 596 - 605, 1996.
- [3] E. Atalar, P. A. Bottomley, and E. A. Zerhouni, *A Flexible Catheter Coil for Imaging and Spectroscopy of Atherosclerotic Plaques*, Nice, p. 988, 1995.
- [4] L. Axel and C. Hayes, "Surface coil magnetic resonance imaging," *Arch. Inst. Physiol. Biochim.*, vol. 93, no. 5, pp. 11-18, 1985.

- [5] F. Bernstein, G. Slavin, R. A. Day, F. Macaluso, and S. D. Wolff, *A Phased Array Coil Optimized for Carotid Artery Imaging*, Philadelphia, p. 163, 1999.
- [6] D. Beyer, W. Steinbrich, G. Friedmann, and J. W. Ermers, "Use of surface coils in magnetic resonance imaging of orbit and knee," *Diagn. Imaging Clin. Med.*, vol. 55, no. 1-2, pp. 84 - 91, 1986.
- [7] P. A. Bottomley, C. H. Lugo Olivieri, and R. Giaquinto, "What is the optimum phased array coil design for cardiac and torso magnetic resonance?," *Magn. Reson. Med.*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 591 - 599, 1997.
- [8] M. J. Chelsky, M. D. Schnall, E. J. Seidmon, and H. M. Pollack, "Use of endorectal surface coil magnetic resonance imaging for local staging of prostate cancer," *J. Urol.*, vol. 150 (2 Pt 1), pp. 391 - 395, 1993.
- [9] C. D. Constantinides, C. R. Westgate, W. G. O'Dell, E. A. Zerhouni, and E. R. McVeigh, "A phased array coil for human cardiac imaging," *Magn. Reson. Med.*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 92 - 98, 1995.
- [10] J. A. de Zwart, P. J. Ledden, P. van Gelderen, J. Bodurka, R. Chu, and J. H. Duyn, "Signal-to-noise ratio and parallel imaging performance of a 16-channel receive-only brain coil array at 3.0 Tesla," *Magn. Reson. Med.*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 22 - 26, 2004.
- [11] D. D. Do-Dai and R. A. Youngberg, "MRI of the hip with a shoulder surface coil in off-coronal plane," *J. Comput. Assist. Tomogr.*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 336 - 338, 1995.
- [12] J. Doornbox, H. A. Grimbergen, P. E. Booijen, L. te Strake, J. L. Bloem, G. J. Vielvoeye, and E. Boskamp, "Application of anatomically-shaped surface coils in MRI at 0.5 T.," *Magn. Reson. Med.*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 270-281, 1986.
- [13] M. Erlichman, "Surface/specialty coil devices and gating techniques in magnetic resonance imaging," *Health Technol. Assess. Rep.*, vol. 3, pp. 1-23, 1990.
- [14] A. Ettl, J. Kramer, A. Daxer, and L. Koornneef, "High resolution magnetic resonance imaging of neurovascular orbital anatomy," *Ophthalmology*, vol. 104, no. 5, pp. 869-877, 1997.
- [15] T. H. Farmer, G. P. Cofer, and G. A. Johnson, "Maximizing contrast to noise with inductively coupled implanted coils," *Invest. Radiol.*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 552-558, 1990.
- [16] S. H. Faro, S. Vinitzki, H. V. Ortega, F. B. Mohamed, C. Y. Chen, A. E. Flanders, C. F. Gonzales, and R. A. Zimmerman, "Carotid magnetic resonance angiography: Improved image quality with dual 3-inch surface coils," *Neuroradiology*, vol. 38, no. 5, pp. 402-408, 1996.
- [17] O. P. Gandhi and X. B. Chen, "Specific absorption rates and induced current densities for an anatomy-based model of the human for exposure to time-varying magnetic fields of MRI," *Magn. Reson. Med.*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 816-823, 1999.
- [18] J. R. Hadley, B. E. Chapman, J. A. Roberts, D. C. Chapman, K. C. Goodrich, H. R. Buswell, A. L. Alexander, J. S. Tsuruda, and D. L. Parker, "A three-coil comparison for MR angiography," *J. Magn. Reson. Imaging*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 458-468, 2000.
- [19] J. R. Hadley and D. L. Parker, *A Coil Coupling Model for Optimization Algorithms*, Toronto, Ontario, 2003.
- [20] J. R. Hadley and D. L. Parker, "Relative RF coil performance in carotid imaging," *Magn. Reson. Imaging*, vol. 23, pp. 629-639, 2005.
- [21] C. J. Hardy, P. A. Bottomley, K. W. Rohling, and P. B. Roemer, "An NMR phased array for human cardiac 31P spectroscopy," *Magn. Reson. Med.*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 54-64, 1992.
- [22] C. E. Hayes, C. M. Mathis, and C. Yuan, "Surface coil phased arrays for high-resolution imaging of the carotid arteries," *J. Magn. Reson. Imaging*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 109-112, 1996.
- [23] C. E. Hayes, J. S. Tsuruda, and C. M. Mathis, "Temporal lobes: Surface MR coil phased-array imaging," *Radiology*, vol. 189, no. 3, pp. 918-920, 1993.
- [24] L. E. Hendrix, J. A. Strandt, D. L. Daniels, L. P. Mark, J. A. Borne, L. F. Czervionke, V. M. Haughton, and A. L. Williams, "Three-dimensional time-of-flight MR angiography with a surface coil: Evaluation in 12 subjects," *AJR Am. J. Roentgenol.*, vol. 159, no. 1, pp. 103-106, 1992.
- [25] N. Hosten and A. J. Lemke, "A special surface coil for high-resolution ocular MRI," *Front Radiat. Ther. Oncol.*, vol. 30, pp. 20-25, 1997.
- [26] R. Jones, *Twelve Antenna Element Lower Extremity/Pelvic Array for MRI(A)*, Sydney, p. 440, 1998.
- [27] R. Kier, R. J. Herfkens, R. A. Blinder, G. S. Leight, J. A. Utz, and P. M. Silverman, "MRI with surface coils for parathyroid tumors: Preliminary investigation," *AJR Am. J. Roentgenol.*, vol. 147, no. 3, pp. 497-500, 1986.
- [28] J. H. A. Klinge, S. C. Davis, D. D. Gangahedkar, S. A. Lindsay, L. Blawat, and E. B. Boskamp, *An 8 Channel Cardiac SENSE Array*, Honolulu, p. 904, 2002.
- [29] K. Y. Kojima, J. Szumowski, and R. C. Sheley, "Lower extremities: MR angiography with a unilateral telescopic phased-array coil," *Radiology*, vol. 196, pp. 871-875, 1995.

- [30] M. E. Kooi, K. B. J. M. Cleutjens, M. J. A. P. Daemen, P. J. E. H. M. Kitslaar, G. J. Kemerink, and J. M. A. van Engelshoven, *In-vivo and In-vitro MRI of the Carotid Artery Wall Using a Small Diameter Surface Coil*, Denver, p. 1657, 2000.
- [31] J. F. Le Bas, M. Hassler, H. Reutenauer, M. Decorps, J. P. Camuset, G. Crouzet, and A. L. Benabid, "MRI of the cervical spine. Creation of a surface coil. Technical and clinical results," *J. Radiol.*, vol. 68, no. 10, pp. 579-586, 1987.
- [32] A. Liffers, H. H. Quick, C. U. Herborn, H. Ermert, and M. E. Ladd, "Geometrical optimization of a phased array coil for high-resolution MR imaging of the carotid arteries," *Magn. Reson. Med.*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 439-443, 2003.
- [33] L. Malmgren, B. Geijer, S. Holtas, and F. Stahlbert, *A Two-Channel Phased Array Coil for MR-Angiography of the Extracranial Part of Carotid Artery*, Nice, p. 982, 1995.
- [34] W. D. Middleton, S. Macrander, T. L. Lawson, J. B. Kneeland, J. D. Cates, G. M. Kellman, G. F. Carrera, W. D. Foley, A. Jesmanowicz, and J. S. Hyde, "High resolution surface coil magnetic resonance imaging of the joints: Anatomic correlation," *Radiographics*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 645-683, 1987.
- [35] J. W. Monroe, P. Schmalbrock, and D. G. Spigos, "Phased array coils for upper extremity MRA," *Magn. Reson. Med.*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 224-229, 1995.
- [36] J. R. Porter, S. M. Wright, and A. Reykowski, "A 16-element phased-array head coil," *Magn. Reson. Med.*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 272-279, 1998.
- [37] M. Rivera, J. J. Vaquero, A. Santos, J. Ruiz-Cabello, and F. Del Pozo, "MRI visualization of small structures using improved surface coils," *Magn. Reson. Imaging*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 157-166, 1998.
- [38] P. B. Roemer, W. A. Edelstein, C. E. Hayes, S. P. Souza, and O. M. Mueller, "The NMR phased array," *Magn. Reson. Med.*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 192-225, 1990.
- [39] B. Roger, M. Laval-Jeantet, N. Delepine, G. Delepine, and F. Tobolski, "Magnetic resonance imaging of tumors of the knee using surface coils," *Rev. Chir. Orthop. Reparatrice Appar. Mot.*, vol. 72, no. 4, pp. 253-258, 1986.
- [40] P. Schmalbrock, J. Pruski, L. Sun, A. Rao, and J. W. Monroe, "Phased array RF coils for high-resolution MRI of the inner ear and brain stem," *J. Comput. Assist. Tomogr.*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 8-14, 1995.
- [41] M. Wiger, K. P. Pruessmann, C. Leussler, P. Roschmann, and P. Boesiger, "Specific coil design for SENSE: A six-element cardiac array," *Magn. Reson. Med.*, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 495-504, 2001.
- [42] R. M. Wilk, S. E. Harms, and L. M. Wolford, "Magnetic resonance imaging of the temporomandibular joint using a surface coil," *J. Oral Maxillofac. Surg.*, vol. 44, no. 12, pp. 935-943, 1986.
- [43] M. L. Workman, M. Christensen, H. J. Griffiths and B. L. Cunningham, "Magnetic resonance imaging of the nose with surface coils: A new technique to evaluate functional and aesthetic problems," *Plast. Reconstr. Surg.*, vol. 91, no. 6, pp. 1154 - 1158, 1993.
- [44] S. M. Wright and L. L. Wald, "Theory and application of array coils in MR spectroscopy," *NMR Biomed.*, vol. 10, no. 8, pp. 394 - 410, 1997.
- [45] X. Zhang, K. Ugurbil, and W. Chen, "Microstrip RF surface coil design for extremely high-field MRI and spectroscopy," *Magn. Reson. Med.*, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 443 - 450, 2001.
- [46] R. A. Zimmerman, L. T. Bilaniuk, M. Yanoff, J. F. Schenck, H. R. Hart, T. H. Foster, W. A. Edelstein, P. A. Bottomley, R. W. Redington, and C. J. Hardy, "Orbital magnetic resonance imaging," *Am. J. Ophthalmol.*, vol. 100, no. 2, pp. 312-317, 1985.
- [47] R. L. Haupt and S. E. Haupt, *Practical Genetic Algorithms*, John Wiley & Sons Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey, 2004.
- [48] D. E. Goldberg, *Genetic Algorithms in Search, Optimization and Machine Learning*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1989.
- [49] L. Davis, *Handbook of Genetic Algorithms*, Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York, 1991.
- [50] V. Cavaliere, A. Formisano, R. Martone, and M. Primizia, "A genetic algorithm approach to the design of split coil magnets for MRI," *IEEE T. Appl. Supercon.*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 1376-1379, 2000.
- [51] B. J. Fisher, N. Dillon, T. A. Carpenter, and L. D. Hall, "Design of a biplanar gradient coil using a genetic algorithm," *Magn. Reson. Imaging*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 369-376, 1997.
- [52] D. Yau and S. Crozier, "A genetic algorithm/method of moments approach to the optimization of an RF coil for MRI applications – theoretical considerations," *PIER (Progress in Electromagnetics Research)*, vol. 39, pp. 177-192, 2003.
- [53] P. Andris and I. Frollo, "Optimization of NMR coils by genetic algorithms," *Measurement Science Review*, vol. 2, sec. 2, pp. 13-22, 2002.
- [54] B. J. Fisher, N. Dillon, T. A. Carpenter, and L. D. Hall, "Design by genetic algorithm of a z gradient set for magnetic resonance imaging of the human brain," *Measurement Science and Technology*, vol. 6, pp. 904-909, 1995.
- [55] N. Lu, J. Jin, E. Michielssen, and R. L. Magin, *Optimization of RF Coil Design Using Genetic*

- Algorithm and Simulated Annealing Method*, Nice, p. 1002, 1995.
- [56] W. R. Smythe, *Static and Dynamic Electricity*, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, pp. 290-291, 1968.
- [57] M. Misakian, "Equations for the magnetic field produced by one or more rectangular loops of wire in the same plane," *J. Res. Natl. Inst. Stan.*, vol. 105, no. 4, pp. 557-564, 2000.
- [58] D. I. Hoult, "The principle of reciprocity in signal strength calculations – A mathematical guide," *Concepts in Magnetic Resonance*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 173-187, 2000.
- [59] W. L. Stutzman and G. A. Thiele, *Antenna Theory and Design*, John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, pp. 102-103, 1981.
- [60] F. W. Grover, *Inductance Calculations: Working Formulas and Tables*, D. Van Nostrand Company Inc., New York, 1946.
- [61] C. E. Hayes, N. Hattes, and P. B. Roemer, "Volume imaging with MR phased arrays," *Magn. Reson. Med.*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 309-319, 1991.
- [62] C. E. Hayes and P. B. Roemer, "Noise correlations in data simultaneously acquired from multiple surface coil arrays," *Magn. Reson. Med.*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 181-191, 1990.
- [63] E. B. Boskamp, L. Blawat, K. F. King, J. Lorbiecki, and A. B. Tiwari, *A 16-Channel Neurovascular SENSE Array*, Honolulu, p. 852, 2002.
- [64] D. J. Weyers and E. B. Boskamp, *An 8-Channel Volume RF Transmit Coil*, Honolulu, p. 901, 2002.
- [65] R. F. Lee, R. O. Giaquinto, and C. J. Hardy, "Coupling and decoupling theory and its application to the MRI phased array," *Magn. Reson. Med.*, vol. 48, pp. 203-213, 2002.
- [66] K. P. McGee, J. P. Debbins, E. B. Boskamp, L. Blawat, L. Angelos, and K. F. King, "Cardiac magnetic resonance parallel imaging at 3.0 Tesla: Technical feasibility and advantages," *J. Magn. Reson. Imaging*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 291-297, 2004.
- [67] G. R. Duensing, H. R. Brooker, and J. R. Fitzsimmons, "Maximizing signal-to-noise ratio in the presence of coil coupling," *J. Magn. Reson. B.*, vol. 111, no. 3, pp. 230-235.
- [68] F. A. Breuer, M. Blaimer, M. F. Mueller, R. M. Heidemann, M. A. Griswold, and P. M. Jakob, *Finding the Optimal Sampling Pattern in 2D Parallel Imaging for a Given Receiver Coil Configuration*, Miami, Florida, Morning categorical course, 2005.
- [69] M. A. Griswold, *RF Coils for Parallel Imaging*, Miami, Florida, Morning categorical course, 2005.
- [70] N. Famili, S. M. Wright, and J. R. Porter, "MR flow measurement using RF phase gradients in receiver coil arrays," *IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng.*, vol. 40, no. 12, pp. 1243-1249, 1993.
- [71] S. M. Wright, R. L. Magin, and J. R. Kelton, "Arrays of mutually-coupled receiver coils: theory and application," *Magn. Reson. Med.*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 252-268, 1991.
- [72] R. Pascone, T. Vullo, J. Farrelly, and P. T. Cahill, "Explicit treatment of mutual inductance in eight-column birdcage resonators," *Magn. Reson. Imaging*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 401-410, 1992.
- [73] R. J. Pascone, B. J. Garcia, T. M. Fitzgerald, T. Vullo, R. Zipagan, and P. T. Cahill, "Generalized electrical analysis of low-pass and high-pass birdcage resonators," *Magn. Reson. Imaging*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 395-408, 1991.
- [74] R. Pascone, T. Vullo, J. Farrelly, R. Mancuso, and P. T. Cahill, "Use of transmission line analysis for multi-tuning of birdcage resonators," *Magn. Reson. Imaging*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 705-715, 1993.
- [75] T. J. Lawry, M. W. Weiner, and G. B. Matson, "Computer modeling of surface coil sensitivity," *Magn. Reson. Med.*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 294-302, 1990.
- [76] J. Jin, G. Shen, and T. Perkins, "On the field inhomogeneity of a birdcage coil," *Magn. Reson. Med.*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 418-422, 1994.
- [77] J. Jin, *Electromagnetic Analysis and Design in Magnetic Resonance Imaging*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, 1999.
- [78] T. Vullo, R. Pascone, R. Mancuso, R. Zipagan, and P. T. Cahill, "Transmission line analysis of noncylindrical birdcage resonators," *Magn. Reson. Imaging*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 785-797, 1994.
- [79] J. R. Hadley, *Design of Optimal Radio Frequency Coil Arrays for Magnetic Resonance Angiography*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, 2005.

2007 INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

AUSTRALIAN DEFENCE LIBRARY
Northcott Drive
Canberra, A.C.T. 2600 Australia

BAE SYSTEMS
W. Hanningfield Road
Technology Center Library
Great Baddow, Chelmsford
UK CM2 8HN

BEIJING BOOK COMPANY, INC
701 E Lindon Ave.
Linden, NJ 07036-2495

DARTMOUTH COLL-FELDBERG LIB
6193 Murdough Center
Hanover, NH 03755-3560

DSTO-DSTORL EDINBURGH
Jets AU/33851-99, PO Box 562
Milsons Point, NSW
Australia 1565

DTIC-OCP/LIBRARY
8725 John J. Kingman Rd. Ste 0944
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6218

ELLEDIEMME SRL
C.P. 69 Poste S. Silvestro
Roma, Italy 00187

ELSEVIER
Bibliographic Databases
PO Box 2227
Amsterdam, Netherlands 1000 CE

ENGINEERING INFORMATION, INC
PO Box 543
Amsterdam, Netherlands 1000 Am

ETSE TELECOMUNICACION
Biblioteca, Campus Lagoas
Vigo, 36200 Spain

FGAN-FHR
Neuenahrerstrasse 20
Wachtberg, Germany 53343

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIV
10555 W. Flagler Street
Miami, FL 33174

GEORGIA TECH LIBRARY
225 North Avenue, NW
Atlanta, GA 30332-0001

HANYANG UNIVERSITY
Paiknam Academic Info. Ctr Library
17 Haengdang-Dong
Seongdong-Ku
Seoul, South Korea 133-791

HRL LABS, RESEARCH LIBRARY
3011 Malibu Canyon
Malibu, CA 90265

IEE INSPEC/Acquisitions Section
Michael Faraday House
6 Hills Way
Stevenage, Herts UK SG1 2AY

INSTITUTE FOR SCIENTIFIC INFO.
Publication Processing Dept.
3501 Market St.
Philadelphia, PA 19104-3302

IPS RADIO & SPACE SERVICES
PO Box 1386
Haymarket NSW Australia 1240

ISRAEL AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIES
Ben-Gurion Airport
70100 Israel

LEMA-EPFL
ELB-ECUBLEMS
Lausanne, Switzerland
CH-1020

LIBRARY – DRDC OTTAWA
3701 Carling Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0Z4

LIBRARY of CONGRESS
Reg. Of Copyrights
Attn: 40T Deposits
Washington DC, 20559

LINDA HALL LIBRARY
5109 Cherry Street
Kansas City, MO 64110-2498

MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIV LIBRARY
PO Box 9570 Mississippi State, MS
39762

MIT LINCOLN LABORATORY
Periodicals Library
244 Wood Street
Lexington, MA 02420

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
Attn:J. Rozdal/411 Dyer Rd./ Rm 111
Monterey, CA 93943-5101

NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY
Code 3516
4555 Overlook Avenue SW
Washington, DC 20375-5334

NDL KAGAKU
C/O KWE-ACCESS
PO Box 300613 (JFK A/P)
Jamaica, NY 11430-0613

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
1320 Kinnear Road
Columbus, OH 43212

OVIEDO LIBRARY
PO BOX 830679
Birmingham, AL 35283

PENN STATE UNIVERSITY
126 Paterno Library
University Park, PA 16802-1808

PHILIPS RESEARCH LABORATORY
Cross Oak Lane, Stella Cox
Salfords, Redhill
UK RH1 5HA

RENTON TECH LIBRARY/BOEING
PO BOX 3707
SEATTLE, WA 98124-2207

SOUTHWEST RESEARCH
INSTITUTE
6220 Culebra Road
San Antonio, TX 78238

SWETS INFORMATION SERVICES
160 Ninth Avenue, Suite A
Runnemed, NJ 08078

TECHNISCHE UNIV. DELFT
Mekelweg 4, Delft, Holland, 2628 CD
Netherlands

TELSTRA
TRL/M2/770 Blackburn Road
Clayton, Victoria, Australia 3168

TIB & UNIV. BIB. HANNOVER
DE/5100/G1/0001
Welfengarten 1B
Hannover, Germany 30167

TU DARMSTADT
Schlossgartenstrasse 8
Darmstadt, Hessen
Germany D-64289

UNIV OF CENTRAL FLORIDA LIB.
4000 Central Florida Boulevard
Orlando, FL 32816-8005

UNIV OF COLORADO LIBRARY
Campus Box 184
Boulder, CO 80309-0184

UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI
John Davis Williams Library
PO Box 1848
University, MS 38677-1848

UNIV OF MISSOURI-ROLLA LIB.
1870 Miner Circle
Rolla, MO 65409-0001

UNIV POL DE CARTAGENE
PO Box 830470
Birmingham, AL 35283

USAE ENG. RES. & DEV. CENTER
Attn: Library/Journals
72 Lyme Road
Hanover, NH 03755-1290

ACES COPYRIGHT FORM

This form is intended for original, previously unpublished manuscripts submitted to ACES periodicals and conference publications. The signed form, appropriately completed, MUST ACCOMPANY any paper in order to be published by ACES. PLEASE READ REVERSE SIDE OF THIS FORM FOR FURTHER DETAILS.

TITLE OF PAPER:

RETURN FORM TO:

Dr. Atef Z. Elsherbeni
University of Mississippi
Dept. of Electrical Engineering
Anderson Hall Box 13
University, MS 38677 USA

AUTHORS(S)

PUBLICATION TITLE/DATE:

PART A - COPYRIGHT TRANSFER FORM

(NOTE: Company or other forms may not be substituted for this form. U.S. Government employees whose work is not subject to copyright may so certify by signing Part B below. Authors whose work is subject to Crown Copyright may sign Part C overleaf).

The undersigned, desiring to publish the above paper in a publication of ACES, hereby transfer their copyrights in the above paper to The Applied Computational Electromagnetics Society (ACES). The undersigned hereby represents and warrants that the paper is original and that he/she is the author of the paper or otherwise has the power and authority to make and execute this assignment.

Returned Rights: In return for these rights, ACES hereby grants to the above authors, and the employers for whom the work was performed, royalty-free permission to:

1. Retain all proprietary rights other than copyright, such as patent rights.
2. Reuse all or portions of the above paper in other works.

3. Reproduce, or have reproduced, the above paper for the author's personal use or for internal company use provided that (a) the source and ACES copyright are indicated, (b) the copies are not used in a way that implies ACES endorsement of a product or service of an employer, and (c) the copies per se are not offered for sale.

4. Make limited distribution of all or portions of the above paper prior to publication.

5. In the case of work performed under U.S. Government contract, ACES grants the U.S. Government royalty-free permission to reproduce all or portions of the above paper, and to authorize others to do so, for U.S. Government purposes only.

ACES Obligations: In exercising its rights under copyright, ACES will make all reasonable efforts to act in the interests of the authors and employers as well as in its own interest. In particular, ACES REQUIRES that:

1. The consent of the first-named author be sought as a condition in granting re-publication permission to others.
2. The consent of the undersigned employer be obtained as a condition in granting permission to others to reuse all or portions of the paper for promotion or marketing purposes.

In the event the above paper is not accepted and published by ACES or is withdrawn by the author(s) before acceptance by ACES, this agreement becomes null and void.

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

TITLE (IF NOT AUTHOR)

EMPLOYER FOR WHOM WORK WAS PERFORMED

DATE FORM SIGNED

Part B - U.S. GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE CERTIFICATION

(NOTE: if your work was performed under Government contract but you are not a Government employee, sign transfer form above and see item 5 under Returned Rights).

This certifies that all authors of the above paper are employees of the U.S. Government and performed this work as part of their employment and that the paper is therefor not subject to U.S. copyright protection.

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

TITLE (IF NOT AUTHOR)

NAME OF GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

DATE FORM SIGNED

PART C - CROWN COPYRIGHT

(NOTE: ACES recognizes and will honor Crown Copyright as it does U.S. Copyright. It is understood that, in asserting Crown Copyright, ACES in no way diminishes its rights as publisher. Sign only if ALL authors are subject to Crown Copyright).

This certifies that all authors of the above Paper are subject to Crown Copyright. (Appropriate documentation and instructions regarding form of Crown Copyright notice may be attached).

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

TITLE OF SIGNEE

NAME OF GOVERNMENT BRANCH

DATE FORM SIGNED

Information to Authors

ACES POLICY

ACES distributes its technical publications throughout the world, and it may be necessary to translate and abstract its publications, and articles contained therein, for inclusion in various compendiums and similar publications, etc. When an article is submitted for publication by ACES, acceptance of the article implies that ACES has the rights to do all of the things it normally does with such an article.

In connection with its publishing activities, it is the policy of ACES to own the copyrights in its technical publications, and to the contributions contained therein, in order to protect the interests of ACES, its authors and their employers, and at the same time to facilitate the appropriate re-use of this material by others.

The new United States copyright law requires that the transfer of copyrights in each contribution from the author to ACES be confirmed in writing. It is therefore necessary that you execute either Part A-Copyright Transfer Form or Part B-U.S. Government Employee Certification or Part C-Crown Copyright on this sheet and return it to the Managing Editor (or person who supplied this sheet) as promptly as possible.

CLEARANCE OF PAPERS

ACES must of necessity assume that materials presented at its meetings or submitted to its publications is properly available for general dissemination to the audiences these activities are organized to serve. It is the responsibility of the authors, not ACES, to determine whether disclosure of their material requires the prior consent of other parties and if so, to obtain it. Furthermore, ACES must assume that, if an author uses within his/her article previously published and/or copyrighted material that permission has been obtained for such use and that any required credit lines, copyright notices, etc. are duly noted.

AUTHOR/COMPANY RIGHTS

If you are employed and you prepared your paper as a part of your job, the rights to your paper initially rest with your employer. In that case, when you sign the copyright form, we assume you are authorized to do so by your employer and that your employer has consented to all of the terms and conditions of this form. If not, it should be signed by someone so authorized.

NOTE RE RETURNED RIGHTS: Just as ACES now requires a signed copyright transfer form in order to do "business as usual", it is the intent of this form to return rights to the author and employer so that they too may do "business as usual". If further clarification is required, please contact: The Managing Editor, R. W. Adler, Naval Postgraduate School, Code EC/AB, Monterey, CA, 93943, USA (408)656-2352.

Please note that, although authors are permitted to re-use all or portions of their ACES copyrighted material in other works, this does not include granting third party requests for reprinting, republishing, or other types of re-use.

JOINT AUTHORSHIP

For jointly authored papers, only one signature is required, but we assume all authors have been advised and have consented to the terms of this form.

U.S. GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Authors who are U.S. Government employees are not required to sign the Copyright Transfer Form (Part A), but any co-authors outside the Government are.

Part B of the form is to be used instead of Part A only if all authors are U.S. Government employees and prepared the paper as part of their job.

NOTE RE GOVERNMENT CONTRACT WORK: Authors whose work was performed under a U.S. Government contract but who are not Government employees are required so sign Part A-Copyright Transfer Form. However, item 5 of the form returns reproduction rights to the U. S. Government when required, even though ACES copyright policy is in effect with respect to the reuse of material by the general public.

January 2002

INFORMATION FOR AUTHORS

PUBLICATION CRITERIA

Each paper is required to manifest some relation to applied computational electromagnetics. **Papers may address general issues in applied computational electromagnetics, or they may focus on specific applications, techniques, codes, or computational issues.** While the following list is not exhaustive, each paper will generally relate to at least one of these areas:

- 1. Code validation.** This is done using internal checks or experimental, analytical or other computational data. Measured data of potential utility to code validation efforts will also be considered for publication.
- 2. Code performance analysis.** This usually involves identification of numerical accuracy or other limitations, solution convergence, numerical and physical modeling error, and parameter tradeoffs. However, it is also permissible to address issues such as ease-of-use, set-up time, run time, special outputs, or other special features.
- 3. Computational studies of basic physics.** This involves using a code, algorithm, or computational technique to simulate reality in such a way that better, or new physical insight or understanding, is achieved.
- 4. New computational techniques** or new applications for existing computational techniques or codes.
- 5. “Tricks of the trade”** in selecting and applying codes and techniques.
- 6. New codes, algorithms, code enhancement, and code fixes.** This category is self-explanatory, but includes significant changes to existing codes, such as applicability extensions, algorithm optimization, problem correction, limitation removal, or other performance improvement. **Note: Code (or algorithm) capability descriptions are not acceptable, unless they contain sufficient technical material to justify consideration.**
- 7. Code input/output issues.** This normally involves innovations in input (such as input geometry standardization, automatic mesh generation, or computer-aided design) or in output (whether it be tabular, graphical, statistical, Fourier-transformed, or otherwise signal-processed). Material dealing with input/output database management, output interpretation, or other input/output issues will also be considered for publication.
- 8. Computer hardware issues.** This is the category for analysis of hardware capabilities and limitations of various types of electromagnetics computational requirements. Vector and parallel computational techniques and implementation are of particular interest.

Applications of interest include, but are not limited to, antennas (and their electromagnetic environments), networks, static fields, radar cross section, inverse scattering, shielding, radiation hazards, biological effects, biomedical applications, electromagnetic pulse (EMP), electromagnetic interference (EMI), electromagnetic compatibility (EMC), power transmission, charge transport, dielectric, magnetic and nonlinear materials, microwave components, MEMS, RFID, and MMIC technologies, remote sensing and geometrical and physical optics, radar and communications systems, sensors, fiber optics, plasmas, particle accelerators, generators and motors, electromagnetic wave propagation, non-destructive evaluation, eddy currents, and inverse scattering.

Techniques of interest include but not limited to frequency-domain and time-domain techniques, integral equation and differential equation techniques, diffraction theories, physical and geometrical optics, method of moments, finite differences and finite element techniques, transmission line method, modal expansions, perturbation methods, and hybrid methods.

Where possible and appropriate, authors are required to provide statements of quantitative accuracy for measured and/or computed data. This issue is discussed in “Accuracy & Publication: Requiring, quantitative accuracy statements to accompany data,” by E. K. Miller, *ACES Newsletter*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 23-29, 1994, ISBN 1056-9170.

SUBMITTAL PROCEDURE

All submissions should be uploaded to ACES server through ACES web site (<http://aces.ee.olemiss.edu>) by using the upload button, journal section. Only pdf files are accepted for submission. The file size should not be larger than 5MB, otherwise permission from the Editor-in-Chief should be obtained first. Automated acknowledgment of the electronic submission, after the upload process is successfully completed, will be sent to the corresponding author only. It is the responsibility of the corresponding author to keep the remaining authors, if applicable, informed. Email submission is not accepted and will not be processed.

PAPER FORMAT (INITIAL SUBMISSION)

The preferred format for initial submission manuscripts is 12 point Times Roman font, single line spacing and single column format, with 1 inch for top, bottom, left, and right margins. Manuscripts should be prepared for standard 8.5x11 inch paper.

EDITORIAL REVIEW

In order to ensure an appropriate level of quality control, papers are peer reviewed. They are reviewed both for

technical correctness and for adherence to the listed guidelines regarding information content and format.

PAPER FORMAT (FINAL SUBMISSION)

Only camera-ready electronic files are accepted for publication. The term “**camera-ready**” means that the material is neat, legible, reproducible, and in accordance with the final version format listed below.

The following requirements are in effect for the final version of an ACES Journal paper:

1. The paper title should not be placed on a separate page. The title, author(s), abstract, and (space permitting) beginning of the paper itself should all be on the first page. The title, author(s), and author affiliations should be centered (center-justified) on the first page. The title should be of font size 16 and bolded, the author names should be of font size 12 and bolded, and the author affiliation should be of font size 12 (regular font, neither italic nor bolded).
2. An abstract is required. The abstract should be a brief summary of the work described in the paper. It should state the computer codes, computational techniques, and applications discussed in the paper (as applicable) and should otherwise be usable by technical abstracting and indexing services. The word “Abstract” has to be placed at the left margin of the paper, and should be bolded and italic. It also should be followed by a hyphen (–) with the main text of the abstract starting on the same line.
3. All section titles have to be centered and all the title letters should be written in caps. The section titles need to be numbered using roman numbering (I. II.)
4. Either British English or American English spellings may be used, provided that each word is spelled consistently throughout the paper.
5. Internal consistency of references format should be maintained. As a guideline for authors, we recommend that references be given using numerical numbering in the body of the paper (with numerical listing of all references at the end of the paper). The first letter of the authors’ first name should be listed followed by a period, which in turn, followed by the authors’ complete last name. Use a coma (,) to separate between the authors’ names. Titles of papers or articles should be in quotation marks (“ ”), followed by the title of journal, which should be in italic font. The journal volume (vol.), issue number (no.), page numbering (pp.), month and year of publication should come after the journal title in the sequence listed here.
6. Internal consistency shall also be maintained for other elements of style, such as equation numbering. As a guideline for authors who have no other preference, we suggest that equation numbers be placed in parentheses at the right column margin.

7. The intent and meaning of all text must be clear. For authors who are not masters of the English language, the ACES Editorial Staff will provide assistance with grammar (subject to clarity of intent and meaning). However, this may delay the scheduled publication date.
8. Unused space should be minimized. Sections and subsections should not normally begin on a new page.

ACES reserves the right to edit any uploaded material, however, this is not generally done. It is the author(s) responsibility to provide acceptable camera-ready pdf files. Incompatible or incomplete pdf files will not be processed for publication, and authors will be requested to re-upload a revised acceptable version.

COPYRIGHTS AND RELEASES

Each primary author must sign a copyright form and obtain a release from his/her organization vesting the copyright with ACES. Copyright forms are available at ACES, web site (<http://aces.ee.olemiss.edu>). To shorten the review process time, the executed copyright form should be forwarded to the Editor-in-Chief immediately after the completion of the upload (electronic submission) process. Both the author and his/her organization are allowed to use the copyrighted material freely for their own private purposes.

Permission is granted to quote short passages and reproduce figures and tables from and ACES Journal issue provided the source is cited. Copies of ACES Journal articles may be made in accordance with usage permitted by Sections 107 or 108 of the U.S. Copyright Law. This consent does not extend to other kinds of copying, such as for general distribution, for advertising or promotional purposes, for creating new collective works, or for resale. The reproduction of multiple copies and the use of articles or extracts for commercial purposes require the consent of the author and specific permission from ACES. Institutional members are allowed to copy any ACES Journal issue for their internal distribution only.

PUBLICATION CHARGES

All authors are allowed for 8 printed pages per paper without charge. Mandatory page charges of \$75 a page apply to all pages in excess of 8 printed pages. Authors are entitled to one, free of charge, copy of the journal issue in which their paper was published. Additional reprints are available for a nominal fee by submitting a request to the managing editor or ACES Secretary.

Authors are subject to fill out a one page over-page charge form and submit it online along with the copyright form before publication of their manuscript.

ACES Journal is abstracted in INSPEC, in Engineering Index, DTIC, Science Citation Index Expanded, the Research Alert, and to Current Contents/Engineering, Computing & Technology.