Published in final edited form as:

Ultrason Imaging. 2018 March ; 40(2): 84–96. doi:10.1177/0161734617729159.

Analysis of two quantitative ultrasound approaches

P. Muleki-Seya¹, A. Han¹, M. P. Andre², J. W. Erdman Jr.³, and W. D. O'Brien Jr.¹

¹Bioacoustics Research Laboratory, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Illinois, 405 N. Mathews, Urbana, IL 61801

²Department of Radiology, University of California at San Diego, 9500 Gilman Drive, San Diego, CA 92093

³Department of Food Science and Human Nutrition, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 905 S. Goodwin, Urbana, IL. 61801

Abstract

There are two well-known ultrasonic approaches to extract sets of quantitative parameters: Lizzi-Feleppa (LF) parameters slope, intercept and midband and quantitative ultrasound (QUS)-derived parameters effective scatterer diameter (ESD) and effective acoustic concentration (EAC). In this study, the relation between the LF and QUS-derived parameters is studied theoretically and experimentally on *ex vivo* mouse livers. As expected from the theory, LF slope is correlated to ESD ($R^2 = 1.00$), and from experimental data, LF midband is correlated EAC ($R^2 = 0.76$). However, LF intercept is not correlated to ESD ($R^2 = 0.25$) nor EAC ($R^2 = 0.07$). The unexpected correlation observed between LF slope and EAC ($R^2 = 0.94$) results likely from the high correlation between ESD and EAC due to the inversion process. For a liver fat percentage estimation, an important potential medical application, the parameters presenting the better correlation are EAC ($R^2 = 0.78$) and LF midband ($R^2 = 0.70$).

Keywords

Quantitative ultrasound technique; QUS parameters; Lizzi-Feleppa parameters; Mouse livers

1 Introduction

Conventional diagnostic ultrasound B-mode images are made by generating a gray-scale map using the envelope-detected radio-frequency (RF) signal backscattered from the tissues. B-mode images qualitatively display the brightness of the RF echo signal. One of the first approaches to construct quantitative ultrasonic images was an image texture analysis by fitting probability density distributions on the envelop of the RF data. These distributions could be Rayleigh, Rice, K, Homodyne K, Nakagami or Generalized Gamma [1,2]. The parameters obtained with the image texture analysis are quantitative but system dependent. To obtain system-independent parameters, a calibration reference is needed. The frequency-dependent information of the RF data can yield estimates of attenuation coefficient (AC) and

normalized backscatter power spectrum (also denoted backscatter coefficient, BSC) both of which are intrinsic properties of tissue that are not dependent on the ultrasonic system or the operator [3,4].

The early work by Kuc [5–7] and Miller [8–10] provided significant background for the later quantitative ultrasound approaches. Two of these quantitative approaches to estimate parameters through frequency-dependent RF data were developed about the same time [3,11]. The basic methodology calls for acquiring from the region under study the echo RF signals, gate them as needed, and estimate an average power spectrum. To compensate for the system transfer function, the procedures are repeated for a known reference (planar or tissue-mimicking phantom) to generate a calibrated power spectrum. Then, normalize the average power spectrum by the calibrated power spectrum, apply an appropriate estimated ultrasonic attenuation correction and, as needed, a diffraction correction to yield the BSC.

The first approach estimates the Lizzi-Feleppa (LF) parameters from the linear fit of the BSC, and yields the slope, intercept and midband. The second approach relies on the BSC as a function of frequency and on scatterer parameters derived from the BSC. These parameters are estimated by fitting the BSC versus frequency space with a theoretical BSC using a scattering model which yields the effective scatterer diameter (ESD) and effective acoustic concentration (EAC).

Both of these quantitative ultrasound methods have been applied successfully. The most common application is tissue characterization [12–20] to detect cancer [21–29], to differentiate among cell lines [30–33] or to characterize red blood cell aggregation [34,35]. Quantitative ultrasound techniques are also used to detect fatty liver disease in animals [36, 37] and human patients [38,39]. Kemmerer, et al., [40–42] used quantitative ultrasound parameters to assess thermal therapy with high-intensity focused ultrasound (HIFU) in rat liver. Another application has been to monitor anti-cancer therapy by detecting cell death and especially apoptosis in cell pellet biophantoms [43–45], in mouse model *in vivo* [46,47] and in patients [48].

The goal of this study is to compare the LF (slope, intercept and midband) and QUS-derived parameters (ESD and EAC) to examine how they may be related. This relation is studied theoretically first and then experimentally using RF echo data from 40 *ex vivo* mouse livers. Normal and fatty mouse livers were chosen for this study because according to previous studies [36–39], an evolution of the frequency-dependent BSC and of the QUS-derived parameter is expected with the fat content.

2 Theoretical correlations of QUS and LF parameters

Scattering models are based on a 3-D spatial autocorrelation function describing the shape and distribution of scatterers in the medium [49,50]. By assuming that the scatterers have an impedance distribution and are spherical in shape, the 3-D spatial autocorrelation function leads to closed form solutions for the theoretical backscattered power spectrum. The form factor in the theoretical backscattered power spectrum describes the frequency dependence of scattering based on the size, shape, and mechanical properties of the scatterers. Using the

Gaussian form factor, which represents a distribution of continuously changing impedance with the surrounding tissues, the normalized theoretical backscattered power spectrum W_{theo} is given by (see Equation 2 in [29]):

$$W_{theo}(f) = \frac{185Lq^2a_{eff}^6\eta_z f^4}{1+2.66(qa_{eff}f)^2} e^{-12.3a_{eff}^2 f^2}, \quad (1)$$

where f is the frequency, L is the axial length of the range gated region (Hanning window), q is the ratio of the aperture radius to distance from the region of interest where the backscattered power spectrum is evaluated, a_{eff} is the effective scatterer radius and η_z is the effective acoustic concentration ($\eta_z = CQ^2$, the product of number of scatterers per unit volume and the square of the fractional difference of acoustic impedance between the scatterers and the medium). By taking $10\log(W_{theo})$, the equation of a straight line is obtained (see Equation 14 in [29]):

$$10\log(W_{theo}(f)) - 10\log(f^4) \approx 10\log[185Lq^2a_{eff}^6\eta_z] - 4.34[2.66(qa_{eff})^2 + 12.3a_{eff}^2]f^2. \quad (2)$$

The slope of this line is denoted m and depends on a_{eff} and the intercept of this line is denoted b and depends on a_{eff} and η_z .

$$10\log(W_{theo}(f)) - 10\log(f^4) \approx m(a_{eff})f^2 + b(a_{eff}, \eta_z), \quad (3)$$

where:

$$m = - (11.6q^2 + 53.4) a_{eff}^2 \quad (4)$$

and

$$b = 10\log[185Lq^2a_{eff}^6\eta_z]. \quad (5)$$

This theoretical description does not take into account the effect of the attenuation compensation of the tissue that is implemented for the estimate of BSC. There are different techniques to estimate tissue attenuation, as the broadband insertion-loss technique [51] generally uses a planar reference for *in vitro* or *ex vivo* measurements or as the spectral difference reference phantom method [52] generally uses a reference phantom for *in vivo* measurements. For the planar reference method, the attenuation coefficient is estimated from the log difference of the reflected power spectrum from a reference reflector with and

without the sample in place, and is computed as the linear slope of the frequency-dependent attenuation (in dB/cm), as developed by [12]:

$$\alpha_s(f) = \alpha_{saline}(f) + \frac{10}{2d} \log\left(\frac{S_r(f)}{S_s(f)}\right), \quad (6)$$

where $\alpha_s(f)$ and $\alpha_{saline}(f)$ are the attenuation of the sample and the reference liquid, usually saline, respectively, $S_r(f)$ is the power spectrum of the windowed scan line from the reference measurement, $S_s(f)$ is the power spectrum of the waveform reflected from the Plexiglas plate with the sample in place and d is the estimated sample thickness.

The spectral difference reference phantom method estimates the local attenuation using the backscattered difference in the spectral amplitude at increasing depth. The tissue within a small region of interest is assumed to be homogeneous and isotropic. The frequency-dependent attenuation (in dB/cm) can be estimated as:

$$\alpha_s(f) = \alpha_r(f) - \frac{\gamma(f)}{4 \times 8.686}, \quad (7)$$

where $\alpha_r(f)$ is the attenuation of the reference phantom, and $\gamma(f)$ is the slope of the straight line that fits the natural log ratio of tissue sample power spectrum as a function of depth.

In order to account for attenuation explicitly to estimate the LF and QUS-derived parameters, and their correlations, the attenuation compensation is applied to the normalized theoretical power spectrum W_{theo} by multiplying it by the attenuation compensation term $10^{2z[\alpha_s(f) - \alpha_{saline}(f)]/10}$. The product of these two terms is denoted W_{att} :

$$W_{att}(z, f) = W_{theo}(z, f) 10^{2z[\alpha_s(f) - \alpha_{saline}(f)]/10}, \quad (8)$$

where z is the distance between the transducer and the gated region. Note that $\alpha_0(f)$ is expressed in dB/cm:

$$\alpha_0(f) = \alpha_s(f) - \alpha_{saline}(f). \quad (9)$$

In tissue, the attenuation is generally defined as $\alpha_0(f) = \beta_0 f^n$, where β_0 is a constant in dB/cm-MHz and n is generally close to 1 for most soft tissues. Thus, incorporating attenuation compensation, equation 3 becomes:

$$10 \log(W_{att}(f)) - 10 \log(f^4) \approx m(a_{eff}) f^2 + b(a_{eff}, \eta_z) + 2z\beta_0 f^n, \quad (10)$$

or by denoted m_1 the slope m with the effect of attenuation:

$$10\log(W_{att}(f)) - 10\log(f^4) \approx m_1(a_{\text{eff}}, \beta_0 f^n) f^2 + b(a_{\text{eff}}, \eta_z). \quad (11)$$

Note that in the case of equation 11, there is no analytic definition for the term m_1 in the general case (especially without defining the frequency dependence of the attenuation).

Experimental quantitative ultrasound parameters are usually reported for a narrow frequency bandwidth due to the nature of the backscatter echo signal. Therefore, the LF and QUS-derived parameters are estimated from this narrow frequency bandwidth, and other QUS parameters as mean BSC and mean AC are averaged on a narrow bandwidth around the center frequency f_c . Moreover, as experimental acquisition of the backscattered echo signal data is realized over a narrow frequency bandwidth, attenuation compensation is also estimated for the center frequency. In this case, with the constant f_c , equation 10 becomes:

$$10\log(W_{att}(f)) - 10\log(f^4) \approx m(a_{\text{eff}}) f^2 + b(a_{\text{eff}}, \eta_z) + 2z\beta_0 f_c^n, \quad (12)$$

or:

$$10\log(W_{att}(f)) - 10\log(f^4) \approx m(a_{\text{eff}}) f^2 + b_1(a_{\text{eff}}, \eta_z, \beta_0 f_c^n). \quad (13)$$

The QUS method consists of fitting a straight line over $10\log(W_{att}(f)) - 10\log(f^4)$ as a linear function of f^2 . The slope of this line, m is used to estimate ESD and the intercept b_1 is used to estimate EAC. The QUS-derived parameters ESD and EAC are defined as:

$$ESD = 2a_{\text{eff}} = 2 \sqrt{\frac{m}{11.6q^2 + 53.4}} \quad (14)$$

$$EAC = \eta_z = 64 \frac{10^{(b_1 - 2z\beta_0 f_c^n)/10}}{185Lq^2 ESD^6}. \quad (15)$$

The LF parameters are estimated by fitting a straight line over $10\log(W_{att}(f))$ as a linear function of frequency.

$$10\log(W_{att}(f)) \approx m(a_{\text{eff}}) f^2 + b_1(a_{\text{eff}}, \eta_z, \beta_0 f_c^n) + 10\log(f^4). \quad (16)$$

By fitting this equation to a straight line over f , a correction factor of $2f_c$ must be used on m to estimate the slope by a linear fit:

$$LE_{slope}=2f_c \left(-11.6q^2(ESD/2)^2 - 53.4(ESD/2)^2 + 17.4f_c^2 \right) \quad (17)$$

$$LE_{intercept}=10\log \left[185Lq^2(ESD/2)^6 EAC \right] + 2z\beta_0 f_c^n + 8.68 \quad (18)$$

$$LE_{midband}=2f_c \left(-11.6q^2(ESD/2)^2 - 53.4(ESD/2)^2 + 17.4f_c^2 \right) f_c + 10\log \left[185Lq^2(ESD/2)^6 EAC \right] + 2z\beta_0 f_c^n + 8.68, \quad (19)$$

The simplification in the LF parameter equations is valid for frequencies expressed in GHz (because numerically, $f \ll 1$).

If L , q and $\beta_0 f_c^n$ are known, then the correlation between the LF parameters slope, intercept and midband and the QUS-derived parameters ESD and EAC can be determined (equations 17–19). LF slope is correlated to ESD. LF intercept is correlated to ESD and EAC. LF midband is correlated to ESD and EAC. It is noted that ESD is needed to estimate EAC (eq 15), and thus their errors are correlated. Therefore, due to the inversion process, EAC could be correlated to ESD.

3 Materials and Methods

3.1 Animal protocol

The ultrasound data from this study were acquired from freshly excised livers of C57BL/6J mice. The 40 mice were fed with a control (n=25) or a high-fat (n=15) diet, as detailed in [36]. After the RF data acquisition, the liver fat percentage was determined by a biochemical method.

3.2 QUS methodology

3.2.1 RF data acquisition for mice *ex vivo*—Mouse livers were extracted immediately after euthanasia. Each liver was placed in a saline bath at ambient temperature for scanning. The RF data were acquired using a 40-MHz single-element transducer (NIH High-frequency Transducer Resource Center at the University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, diameter = 3 mm, f-number = 3.0, –10 dB bandwidth = [22–55] MHz, focus distance = 9.2 mm, –6 dB depth of field = 2.4 mm) excited by an UT340 Pulser-Receiver System (Utex, Science Instrument Inc., Mississauga, Canada) connected to a PC A/D acquisition card with 1 GHz sampling rate. Transducer position was controlled using a Daedal positioning system (Daedal, Inc., Harrisburg, PA) connected to a PC running custom LabView (National Instruments, Austin, TX) software. For each image, a Field of Interest (FOI) containing the most homogeneous part of the liver, avoiding features representing vessels on the B-mode

image, was defined. The FOI contained at least 50 independent RF lines for depths included in the -6 dB depth of field of the transducer. For each liver, RF data were collected from 11 scan planes with a step size around $500\ \mu\text{m}$ to estimate the BSC. The spectral estimates from the successive scans are independent.

3.2.2 Attenuation and BSC measurements for mice *ex vivo*—The attenuation for each liver was obtained using a broadband insertion-loss technique [6,51] with a 40-MHz f/3 focused transducer, with methodology described in [36]. The attenuation was estimated from 36 independent lateral locations across the sample and averaged to obtain the mean attenuation (dB/cm) versus frequency curve over the -10 dB bandwidth 25 – 55 MHz. The BSC was estimated using the planar reference technique [53], as described in [36]: the BSC was estimated for each sub-ROI (equivalent to 15×15 wavelengths at 40 MHz), and all the BSC estimates from the data of one sample were averaged together to yield the mean BSC versus frequency curve over the -10 dB bandwidth 25 – 55 MHz.

3.2.3 LF and QUS-derived parameters estimation—The LF and QUS-derived parameters were estimated using a fit of the BSC as a function of frequency after attenuation compensation.

The LF parameters were estimated for each mean BSC of each mouse liver. The best linear fit was estimated on $10\log(\text{BSC})$ versus linear frequency and the LF parameters were extracted: slope, intercept at 0 MHz and midband fit (amplitude in dB at the 40-MHz central frequency).

The QUS-derived parameters correspond to scatterer parameters and were extracted by fitting the BSC with a theoretical BSC using a given scattering model. As the LF method is based on a Gaussian theory, to be consistent in this study, a Gaussian form factor is used. The method to obtain the scatterer estimates (ESD and EAC) is presented in [29].

The parameter units are summarized in the Table 1.

4 Results

4.1 LF-QUS parameters correlations

The correlations between LF and QUS-derived parameters obtained from mouse liver data are presented in Figure 1, with the best linear or second order polynomial fits. The correlation coefficients are summarized in Table 2. The LF slope is very well correlated to ESD ($R^2=1.00$) and EAC ($R^2=0.94$) with second order polynomial fits. The LF midband is moderately correlated to ESD ($R^2=0.65$) and EAC ($R^2=0.76$) with linear fits. The LF intercept is not correlated to ESD ($R^2=0.25$) or EAC ($R^2=0.07$).

The correlations among LF parameters and between ESD and EAC are presented in Figure 2, with the best linear or second order polynomial fits. The correlation coefficients are summarized in Table 2. The LF and QUS- derived parameters are not independent; the LF slope is moderately correlated to LF midband ($R^2=0.55$) and ESD and EAC are strongly correlated ($R^2=0.98$) with a second order polynomial fit. However, only a low correlation is

observed between LF slope and LF intercept ($R^2=0.31$) and no correlation between LF midband and LF intercept ($R^2=0.03$).

4.2 Correlations between LF and QUS-derived parameters and fat percentage

The correlation between fat percentage and the LF and QUS-derived parameters for *ex vivo* mouse livers is presented in Figure 3. The correlation coefficients for the best linear fit are summarized in Table 3. EAC presents a good correlation with fat percentage ($R^2=0.78$), as well as LF midband ($R^2=0.70$). ESD and LF slope present a moderate correlation with fat percentage ($R^2=0.62$ and 0.61 , respectively). The parameter LF intercept presents a lower correlation with fat percentage than the other parameters ($R^2=0.49$).

5 Discussion

This study focused on the theoretical and experimental correlations between LF (slope, intercept and midband) and QUS-derived (ESD and EAC) parameters, with experimental data from *ex vivo* mouse livers.

5.1 Comparison of experimental correlations between LF and QUS parameters with the theory

Our theoretical expressions for LF slope and intercept (eq 17–18) were in agreement with Lizzi, et al., [54] observations. Indeed, Lizzi, et al., [54] showed that ESD was the predominant factor for the estimation of LF slope and intercept, that EAC influenced LF intercept, but not LF slope, and that a large variation of EAC was necessary to change LF intercept. In our study, the LF slope depends on ESD (eq 17) and LF intercept depends on $(ESD/2)^6$ and EAC (eq 18).

As expected from the theory (eq 17–19), the LF slope was very well correlated to ESD and LF midband was correlated to ESD and EAC (Figure 1 and Table 2).

However, no correlation between LF intercept with ESD and EAC was apparent experimentally (Figure 1 and Table 2). An unexpected correlation was observed between LF slope and EAC (Figure 1 and Table 2). This unexpected correlation may be explained by the very good correlation between LF slope and ESD and between ESD and EAC (Figure 2). ESD and EAC should not be correlated according to their definitions. However, as ESD is needed to extract EAC (eq 15), their errors are correlated, which may contribute to the correlation between ESD and EAC.

For the important fat monitoring application, LF midband and EAC may be the more appropriate of the LF-QUS-derived parameters as they present the better correlation with fat percentage for these *ex vivo* mouse liver data (Figure 3 and Table 3).

5.2 Effect of the attenuation

In the general case, tissue attenuation has an effect on the BSC slope (m_1 in eq 11). For the LF method, an error in the attenuation compensation would lead to an error in the estimation of the LF slope and LF midband. For the QUS method, an error in the attenuation

compensation would lead to an error in the estimation of ESD but also EAC (because the value of ESD is used to estimate EAC).

For most experimental cases, the attenuation compensation is estimated using the center frequency and has an effect on the BSC intercept (b_1 in eq 13). For the LF method, an error in the attenuation compensation in this case would lead to an error in the estimation of the LF intercept and LF midband. For the QUS method, an error in the attenuation compensation would lead to an error in the estimation of EAC. This kind of error may explain the lack of correlation observed between LF intercept with ESD and EAC (Figure 1 and Table 2).

The use of an accurate attenuation technique may ensure a controlled experiment for this LF-QUS-derived parameters correlation study for tissue mimicking phantoms or *ex vivo* tissue. When estimating the LF-QUS- derived parameters in *in vivo* tissue, additional errors may arise from the presence of interposed tissue between skin and liver and motion artifacts from vessel pulsing.

6 Conclusion

In this study, the relation between the LF (slope, intercept and midband) and QUS-derived parameters (ESD and EAC) was investigated theoretically and experimentally for *ex vivo* mouse livers. As expected from the theory, LF slope is very well correlated to ESD and LF midband is correlated to ESD and EAC. However, no correlation was observed between the LF intercept with ESD and EAC. An unexpected correlation was observed between LF slope and EAC, likely resulting from the very high correlation between ESD and EAC due to the inversion process.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank J. R. Kelly, MS, and R. J. Miller, DVM, from the Bioacoustics Research Laboratory for the mouse liver preparation. This study was supported by NIH grants R37EB002641 and R01DK106419.

References

1. Oelze, ML. Quantitative ultrasound in soft tissues. Springer; 2013. Statistics of scatterer property estimates; p. 43-69.
2. Destrepes, F., Cloutier, G. Review of envelope statistics models for quantitative ultrasound imaging and tissue characterization In: Quantitative ultrasound in soft tissues. Springer; 2013. p. 219-274.
3. Lizzi FL, Greenebaum M, Feleppa EJ, Elbaum M, Coleman DJ. Theoretical framework for spectrum analysis in ultrasonic tissue characterization. The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America. 1983; 73(4):1366–1373. [PubMed: 6853848]
4. Insana MF, Hall TJ. Parametric ultrasound imaging from backscatter coefficient measurements: image formation and interpretation. Ultrasonic Imaging. 1990; 12(4):245–267. [PubMed: 1701584]
5. Kuc, R., Schwartz, M., Micsky, LV. 1976 Ultrasonics Symposium. IEEE; 1976. Parametric estimation of the acoustic attenuation coefficient slope for soft tissue; p. 44-47.
6. Kuc R, Schwartz M. Estimating the acoustic attenuation coefficient slope for liver from reflected ultrasound signals. IEEE Transactions on Sonics and Ultrasonics. 1979; 26(5):353–361.

7. Kuc R. Clinical application of an ultrasound attenuation coefficient estimation technique for liver pathology characterization. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*. 1980; (6):312–319. [PubMed: 7390528]
8. O'Donnell M, Bauwens D, Mimbs JW, Miller JG. Broadband integrated backscatter: An approach to spatially localized tissue characterization in vivo. *1979 Ultrasonics Symposium*. 1979:175–178.
9. Thomas LJ, Wickline SA, Perez JE, Sobel BE, Miller JG. A real-time integrated backscatter measurement system for quantitative cardiac tissue characterization. *IEEE transactions on ultrasonics, ferroelectrics, and frequency control*. 1986; 33(1):27–32.
10. Thomas LJ, Barzilai B, Perez JE, Sobel BE, Wickline SA, Miller JG. Quantitative real-time imaging of myocardium based on ultrasonic integrated backscatter. *IEEE transactions on ultrasonics, ferroelectrics, and frequency control*. 1989; 36(4):466–470.
11. Madsen EL, Insana MF, Zagzebski JA. Method of data reduction for accurate determination of acoustic backscatter coefficients. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*. 1984; 76(3): 913–923. [PubMed: 6491053]
12. d'Astous FT, Foster FS. Frequency dependence of ultrasound attenuation and backscatter in breast tissue. *Ultrasound in medicine & biology*. 1986; 12(10):795–808. [PubMed: 3541334]
13. Insana MF, Hall TJ, Fishback JL. Identifying acoustic scattering sources in normal renal parenchyma from the anisotropy in acoustic properties. *Ultrasound in medicine & biology*. 1991; 17(6):613–626. [PubMed: 1962364]
14. Noritomi T, Sigel B, Swami V, Justin J, Gahtan V, Chen X, et al. Carotid plaque typing by multiple-parameter ultrasonic tissue characterization. *Ultrasound in medicine & biology*. 1997; 23(5):643–650. [PubMed: 9253812]
15. Lee DJ, Sigel B, Swami VK, Justin JR, Gahtan V, O'Brien SP, et al. Determination of carotid plaque risk by ultrasonic tissue characterization. *Ultrasound in Medicine & Biology*. 1998; 24(9): 1291–1299. [PubMed: 10385951]
16. Takiuchi S, Rakugi H, Honda K, Masuyama T, Hirata N, Ito H, et al. Quantitative ultrasonic tissue characterization can identify high- risk atherosclerotic alteration in human carotid arteries. *Circulation*. 2000; 102(7):766–770. [PubMed: 10942745]
17. Vered Z, Barzilai B, Mohr GA, Thomas LJ, Genton R, Sobel BE, et al. Quantitative ultrasonic tissue characterization with real-time integrated backscatter imaging in normal human subjects and in patients with dilated cardiomyopathy. *Circulation*. 1987; 76(5):1067–1073. [PubMed: 3311450]
18. Kolecki RV, Sigel B, Justin J, Feleppa EJ, Parsons RE, Kitamura H, et al. Determining the acuteness and stability of deep venous thrombosis by ultrasonic tissue characterization. *Journal of Vascular Surgery*. 1995; 21(6):976–984. [PubMed: 7776478]
19. Turnbull DH, Wilson SR, Hine AL, Foster FS. Ultrasonic characterization of selected renal tissues. *Ultrasound in medicine & biology*. 1989; 15(3):241–253. [PubMed: 2662552]
20. Insana MF, Wood JG, Hall TJ, Cox GG, Harrison LA. Effects of endothelin-1 on renal microvasculature measured using quantitative ultrasound. *Ultrasound in medicine & biology*. 1995; 21(9):1143–1151. [PubMed: 8849829]
21. Feleppa EJ, Lizzi FL, Coleman DJ, Yaremko MM. Diagnostic spectrum analysis in ophthalmology: a physical perspective. *Ultrasound in medicine & biology*. 1986; 12(8):623–631. [PubMed: 3532476]
22. Silverman RH, Folberg R, Rondeau MJ, Boldt HC, Lloyd HO, Chen X, et al. Spectral parameter imaging for detection of prognostically significant histologic features in uveal melanoma. *Ultrasound in Medicine & Biology*. 2003; 29(7):951–959. [PubMed: 12878240]
23. Feleppa EJ, Liu T, Kalisz A, Shao MC, Fleshner N, Reuter V, et al. Ultrasonic spectral-parameter imaging of the prostate. *International journal of imaging systems and technology*. 1997; 8(1):11–25.
24. Feleppa EJ, Ennis RD, Schiff PB, Wu CS, Kalisz A, Ketterling J, et al. Spectrum-analysis and neural networks for imaging to detect and treat prostate cancer. *Ultrasonic Imaging*. 2001; 23(3): 135–146. [PubMed: 11958585]
25. Feleppa EJ, Porter CR, Ketterling J, Lee P, Dasgupta S, Urban S, et al. Recent developments in tissue-type imaging (TTI) for planning and monitoring treatment of prostate cancer. *Ultrasonic imaging*. 2004; 26(3):163–172. [PubMed: 15754797]

26. Noritomi T, Machi J, Feleppa EJ, Yanagihara E, Shirouzu K. In vitro investigation of lymph node metastasis of colorectal cancer using ultrasonic spectral parameters. *Ultrasound in medicine & biology*. 1998; 24(2):235–243. [PubMed: 9550182]
27. Mamou J, Coron A, Oelze ML, Saegusa-Beecroft E, Hata M, Lee P, et al. Three-dimensional high-frequency backscatter and envelope quantification of cancerous human lymph nodes. *Ultrasound in medicine & biology*. 2011; 37(3):345–357. [PubMed: 21316559]
28. Tateishi T, Machi J, Feleppa EJ, Oishi R, Jucha J, Yanagihara E, et al. In vitro diagnosis of axillary lymph node metastases in breast cancer by spectrum analysis of radio frequency echo signals. *Ultrasound in Medicine & Biology*. 1998; 24(8):1151–1159. [PubMed: 9833584]
29. Oelze ML, Zachary JF, O'Brien WD Jr. Characterization of tissue microstructure using ultrasonic backscatter: Theory and technique for optimization using a Gaussian form factor. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*. 2002; 112(3):1202–1211. [PubMed: 12243165]
30. Mamou J, Oelze ML, O'Brien WD Jr, Zachary JF. Perspective on biomedical quantitative ultrasound imaging. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*. 2006; 23(3):112–116.
31. Mamou J, Oelze ML, O'Brien WD Jr, Zachary JF. Ultrasound characterization of three animal mammary tumors from three-dimensional acoustic tissue models. *Proceedings of the 2005 IEEE Ultrasonics Symposium*. 2005:866–869.
32. Oelze ML, O'Brien WD Jr. Application of three scattering models to characterization of solid tumors in mice. *Ultrasonic imaging*. 2006; 28(2):83–96. [PubMed: 17094689]
33. Oelze ML, O'Brien WD Jr, Blue JP, Zachary JF. Differentiation and characterization of rat mammary fibroadenomas and 4T1 mouse carcinomas using quantitative ultrasound imaging. *IEEE transactions on medical imaging*. 2004; 23(6):764–771. [PubMed: 15191150]
34. Franceschini E, Yu FTH, Destrepes F, Cloutier G. Ultrasound characterization of red blood cell aggregation with intervening attenuating tissue-mimicking phantoms. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*. 2010; 127(2):1104–1115. [PubMed: 20136231]
35. Saha RK, Franceschini E, Cloutier G. Assessment of accuracy of the structure-factor-size-estimator method in determining red blood cell aggregate size from ultrasound spectral backscatter coefficient. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*. 2011; 129(4):2269–2277. [PubMed: 21476682]
36. Han, A., Erdman, JW., Jr, Simpson, DG., Andre, MP., O'Brien, WD, Jr. 2014 IEEE International Ultrasonics Symposium. IEEE; 2014. Early detection of fatty liver disease in mice via quantitative ultrasound; p. 23632366
37. Ghoshal G, Lavarello RJ, Kemmerer JP, Miller RJ, Oelze ML. Ex vivo study of quantitative ultrasound parameters in fatty rabbit livers. *Ultrasound in medicine & biology*. 2012; 38(12):2238–2248. [PubMed: 23062376]
38. Andre, MP., Han, A., Heba, E., Hooker, J., Loomba, R., Sirlin, CB., et al. 2014 IEEE International Ultrasonics Symposium. IEEE; 2014. Accurate diagnosis of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease in human participants via quantitative ultrasound; p. 2375-2377.
39. Lin SC, Heba E, Wolfson T, Ang B, Gamst A, Han A, et al. Noninvasive Diagnosis of Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease and Quantification of Liver Fat Using a New Quantitative Ultrasound Technique. *Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology*. 2015; 13(7):1337–1345.e6. [PubMed: 25478922]
40. Kemmerer, J., Ghoshal, G., Oelze, M. 2010 IEEE International Ultrasonics Symposium. IEEE; 2010. Quantitative ultrasound assessment of HIFU induced lesions in rodent liver; p. 1396-1399.
41. Kemmerer JP, Oelze ML. Ultrasonic assessment of thermal therapy in rat liver. *Ultrasound in medicine & biology*. 2012; 38(12):2130–2137. [PubMed: 23062365]
42. Kemmerer JP, Ghoshal G, Karunakaran C, Oelze ML. Assessment of high-intensity focused ultrasound treatment of rodent mammary tumors using ultrasound backscatter coefficients. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*. 2013; 134(2):1559–1568. [PubMed: 23927196]
43. Kolios MC, Czarnota GJ, Lee M, Hunt JW, Sherar MD. Ultrasonic spectral parameter characterization of apoptosis. *Ultrasound in Medicine & Biology*. 2002; 28(5):589–597. [PubMed: 12079696]

44. Vlad RM, Alajez NM, Giles A, Kolios MC, Czarnota GJ. Quantitative Ultrasound Characterization of Cancer Radiotherapy Effects In Vitro. *International Journal of Radiation Oncology*Biology*Physics*. 2008; 72(4):1236–1243.
45. Vlad RM, Saha RK, Alajez NM, Ranieri S, Czarnota GJ, Kolios MC. An Increase in Cellular Size Variance Contributes to the Increase in Ultrasound Backscatter During Cell Death. *Ultrasound in Medicine & Biology*. 2010; 36(9):1546–1558. [PubMed: 20800181]
46. Banihashemi B, Lee J, Giles A, Papanicolau N, Kolios M, Czarnota GJ. Novel Low-frequency Ultrasound Monitoring of Tumor Cell Death in Response to Therapy. *International Journal of Radiation Oncology*Biology*Physics*. 2008; 72(1, Supplement):S684. Proceedings of the American Society for Therapeutic Radiology and Oncology 50th Annual Meeting American Society for Therapeutic Radiology and Oncology 50th Annual Meeting.
47. Vlad RM, Brand S, Giles A, Kolios MC, Czarnota GJ. Quantitative ultrasound characterization of responses to radiotherapy in cancer mouse models. *Clinical cancer research*. 2009; 15(6):2067–2075. [PubMed: 19276277]
48. Sadeghi-Naini A, Papanicolau N, Falou O, Zubovits J, Dent R, Verma S, et al. Quantitative ultrasound evaluation of tumor cell death response in locally advanced breast cancer patients receiving chemotherapy. *Clinical Cancer Research*. 2013; 19(8):2163–2174. [PubMed: 23426278]
49. Insana MF, Wagner RF, Brown DG, Hall TJ. Describing small-scale structure in random media using pulse-echo ultrasound. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*. 1990; 87(1):179–192. [PubMed: 2299033]
50. Lizzi FL, Astor M, Liu T, Deng C, Coleman DJ, Silverman RH. Ultrasonic spectrum analysis for tissue assays and therapy evaluation. *International Journal of Imaging Systems and Technology*. 1997; 8(1):3–10.
51. Wear KA, Stiles TA, Frank GR, Madsen EL, Cheng F, Feleppa EJ, et al. Interlaboratory comparison of ultrasonic backscatter coefficient measurements from 2 to 9 MHz. *Journal of ultrasound in medicine*. 2005; 24(9):1235–1250. [PubMed: 16123184]
52. Yao LX, Zagzebski JA, Madsen EL. Backscatter coefficient measurements using a reference phantom to extract depth-dependent instrumentation factors. *Ultrasonic Imaging*. 1990; 12(1):58–70. [PubMed: 2184569]
53. Chen X, Phillips D, Schwarz KQ, Mottley JG, Parker KJ. The measurement of backscatter coefficient from a broadband pulse-echo system: A new formulation. *IEEE transactions on ultrasonics, ferroelectrics, and frequency control*. 1997; 44(2):515–525.
54. Lizzi FL, Ostromogilsky M, Feleppa EJ, Rorke MC, Yaremko MM. Relationship of ultrasonic spectral parameters to features of tissue microstructure. *IEEE transactions on ultrasonics, ferroelectrics, and frequency control*. 1987; 34(3):319–329.

Figure 1.

Correlation of LF slope, intercept and midband with ESD and EAC. In red are plotted the best second order polynomial or linear fit. The correlation coefficients against the null hypothesis provided p-values <0.001.

Figure 2.

Correlation of LF slope, intercept and midband among each other and correlation between ESD and EAC. In red are plotted the best second order polynomial or linear fit. The correlation coefficients against the null hypothesis provided p-values <0.001 .

Figure 3.

LF slope, intercept and midband and QUS ESD and EAC as a function of fat percentage. In red is plotted the best linear fit. The correlation coefficients against the null hypothesis provided p-values <0.001 .

Table 1

Summary of the units of the LF and QUS parameters.

Parameter	Unit
LF slope	dB/MHz
LF intercept	dB
LF midband	dB
ESD	μm
EAC	dB/mm ³

Table 2

Correlation coefficients of the LF-QUS parameters for *ex vivo* mouse livers.

<i>R</i> ²	ESD	EAC	LF slope	LF intercept	LF midband
ESD		0.98*	1.00*	0.25	0.65
EAC	0.98*		0.94*	0.07	0.76
LF slope	1.00*	0.94*		0.31	0.52
LF intercept	0.25	0.07	0.31		0.03
LF midband	0.65	0.76	0.52	0.03	

* denotes that a second order polynomial fit instead of a linear fit was used.

Table 3
Correlation coefficients of the LF-QUS parameters with fat percentage for *ex vivo* mouse livers.

<i>R</i> ²	ESD	EAC	LF slope	LF intercept	LF midband
fat percentage	0.62	0.78	0.61	0.49	0.70