

ANIMGN11 / ANIMGN20: Advanced Imaging

[View Online](#)

1

Attwell D, Iadecola C. The neural basis of functional brain imaging signals. Trends in Neurosciences 2002;**25**:621–5. doi:10.1016/S0166-2236(02)02264-6

2

Buxton RB, Uludağ K, Dubowitz DJ, et al. Modeling the hemodynamic response to brain activation. NeuroImage 2004;**23**:S220–33. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2004.07.013

3

Logothetis NK. What we can do and what we cannot do with fMRI. Nature 2008;**453**:869–78. doi:10.1038/nature06976

4

Edelman RR, Hesselink JR, Zlatkin MB. MRI: clinical magnetic resonance imaging volume 1. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: : Saunders 1996.

5

Logothetis NK. What we can do and what we cannot do with fMRI. Nature 2008;**453**:869–78. doi:10.1038/nature06976

6

Dynamic magnetic resonance imaging of human brain activity during primary sensory stimulation. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of

America 15AD;**89**.<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC49355/>

7

Norris DG. Principles of magnetic resonance assessment of brain function. Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging 2006;**23**:794–807. doi:10.1002/jmri.20587

8

Jezzard P, Matthews PM, Smith SM. Functional magnetic resonance imaging: an introduction to methods. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2001.

9

Buxton RB. Introduction to Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging: Principles and Techniques. Cambridge: : Cambridge University Press 2002.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511549854>

10

Huettel SA, Song AW, McCarthy G. Functional magnetic resonance imaging. Third edition. Sunderland, Massachusetts, U.S.A.: : Sinauer Associates, Inc., Publishers 2014.

11

Human Brain Function. <http://www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm/doc/books/hbf1/>

12

Triantafyllou C, Hoge RD, Krueger G, et al. Comparison of physiological noise at 1.5 T, 3 T and 7 T and optimization of fMRI acquisition parameters. NeuroImage 2005;**26**:243–50. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2005.01.007

13

Wiggins GC, Triantafyllou C, Potthast A, et al. 32-channel 3 Tesla receive-only phased-array head coil with soccer-ball element geometry. Magnetic Resonance in Medicine 2006;**56**:216–23. doi:10.1002/mrm.20925

14

Weiskopf N, Hutton C, Josephs O, et al. Optimal EPI parameters for reduction of susceptibility-induced BOLD sensitivity losses: A whole-brain analysis at 3 T and 1.5 T. *NeuroImage* 2006;**33**:493–504. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2006.07.029

15

Glover GH, Li T-Q, Ress D. Image-based method for retrospective correction of physiological motion effects in fMRI: RETROICOR. *Magnetic Resonance in Medicine* 2000;**44**:162–7. doi:10.1002/1522-2594(200007)44:1<162::AID-MRM23>3.0.CO;2-E

16

Jezzard P, Balaban RS. Correction for geometric distortion in echo planar images from B0 field variations. *Magnetic Resonance in Medicine* 1995;**34**:65–73. doi:10.1002/mrm.1910340111

17

Andersson JLR, Hutton C, Ashburner J, et al. Modeling Geometric Deformations in EPI Time Series. *NeuroImage* 2001;**13**:903–19. doi:10.1006/nimg.2001.0746

18

Friston KJ, Harrison L, Penny W. Dynamic causal modelling. *NeuroImage* 2003;**19**:1273–302. doi:10.1016/S1053-8119(03)00202-7

19

Stephan KE. On the role of general system theory for functional neuroimaging. *Journal of Anatomy* 2004;**205**:443–70. doi:10.1111/j.0021-8782.2004.00359.x

20

Kahan J, Foltynie T. Understanding DCM: Ten simple rules for the clinician. *NeuroImage* 2013;**83**:542–9. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.07.008

21

Stephan KE, Penny WD, Moran RJ, et al. Ten simple rules for dynamic causal modeling. *NeuroImage* 2010;**49**:3099–109. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2009.11.015

22

Marreiros AC, Kiebel SJ, Friston KJ. Dynamic causal modelling for fMRI: A two-state model. *NeuroImage* 2008;**39**:269–78. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2007.08.019

23

Stephan KE, Kasper L, Harrison LM, et al. Nonlinear dynamic causal models for fMRI. *NeuroImage* 2008;**42**:649–62. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2008.04.262

24

Li B, Daunizeau J, Stephan KE, et al. Generalised filtering and stochastic DCM for fMRI. *NeuroImage* 2011;**58**:442–57. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.01.085

25

Daunizeau J, Lemieux L, Vaudano AE, et al. An electrophysiological validation of stochastic DCM for fMRI. *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience* 2013;**6**. doi:10.3389/fncom.2012.00103

26

Friston K, Penny W. Post hoc Bayesian model selection. *NeuroImage* 2011;**56**:2089–99. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.03.062

27

Rosa MJ, Friston K, Penny W. Post-hoc selection of dynamic causal models. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods* 2012;**208**:66–78. doi:10.1016/j.jneumeth.2012.04.013

28

Razi A, Kahan J, Rees G, et al. Construct validation of a DCM for resting state fMRI. *NeuroImage* 2015;**106**:1–14. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.11.027

29

Jones DK. Diffusion MRI: theory, methods, and applications. New York: : Oxford University Press 2011.

30

Johansen-Berg H, Behrens TEJ, editors. Diffusion MRI: from quantitative measurement to in vivo neuroanatomy. Second edition. Amsterdam: : Academic Press 2014.
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/book/9780123964601>

31

Le Bihan D. Looking into the functional architecture of the brain with diffusion MRI. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 2003;**4**:469–80. doi:10.1038/nrn1119

32

Questions and Answers in MRI. <http://mri-q.com/index.html>

33

Artifacts in Diffusion MRI. http://stbb.nichd.nih.gov/pdf/9780195369779_Jone-Pierpaoli.pdf

34

Golay, Xavier PhD*. Perfusion Imaging Using Arterial Spin Labeling. *Topics in Magnetic Resonance Imaging*; **15**:10–27. <http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&CSC=Y&NEWS=N&PAGE=fulltext&AN=0002142-200402000-00003&LSLINK=80&D=ovft>

35

Parkes LM, Detre JA. ASL: Blood Perfusion Measurements Using Arterial Spin Labelling. In: Tofts P, ed. Quantitative MRI of the Brain. Chichester, UK: : John Wiley & Sons, Ltd 2003. 455–73. doi:10.1002/0470869526.ch13

36

Johnson G. Absolute Beginners Guide to Perfusion MRI.
<http://cds.ismrm.org/ismrm-2008/files/Syllabus-036.pdf>

37

John Detre's slides on ASL fMRI. <https://cfn.upenn.edu/perfusion/index.htm>

38

Tofts P, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. Quantitative MRI of the brain: measuring changes caused by disease. Chichester, West Sussex: : Wiley 2003. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/0470869526>

39

By:van Buchem, MA (van Buchem, MA); Tofts, PS (Tofts, PS). Magnetization transfer imaging. NEUROIMAGING CLINICS OF NORTH AMERICA NEUROIMAGING CLINICS OF NORTH AMERICA 2000;**10**
[.http://apps.webofknowledge.com/full_record.do?product=UA&search_mode=GeneralSearch&qid=3&SID=S12r93sw8L3b7Blnz7B&page=1&doc=1](http://apps.webofknowledge.com/full_record.do?product=UA&search_mode=GeneralSearch&qid=3&SID=S12r93sw8L3b7Blnz7B&page=1&doc=1)

40

Schmitz C, Hof PR. Design-based stereology in neuroscience. Neuroscience 2005;**130**:813–31. doi:10.1016/j.neuroscience.2004.08.050

41

Hobbs NZ, Pedrick AV, Say MJ, et al. The structural involvement of the cingulate cortex in premanifest and early Huntington's disease. Movement Disorders 2011;**26**:1684–90. doi:10.1002/mds.23747

42

Chupin M, Mukuna-Bantumbakulu AR, Hasboun D, et al. Anatomically constrained region deformation for the automated segmentation of the hippocampus and the amygdala: Method and validation on controls and patients with Alzheimer's disease. *NeuroImage* 2007;**34**:996–1019. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2006.10.035

43

Ashburner J, Friston KJ. Voxel-Based Morphometry—The Methods. *NeuroImage* 2000;**11**:805–21. doi:10.1006/nimg.2000.0582

44

Barnes J, Foster J, Boyes RG, et al. A comparison of methods for the automated calculation of volumes and atrophy rates in the hippocampus. *NeuroImage* 2008;**40**:1655–71. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2008.01.012

45

Fischl B, Dale AM. Measuring the thickness of the human cerebral cortex from magnetic resonance images. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2000;**97**:11050–5. doi:10.1073/pnas.200033797

46

FIRST - FslWiki. <http://fsl.fmrib.ox.ac.uk/fsl/fslwiki/FIRST>

47

Ashburner J, Klöppel S. Multivariate models of inter-subject anatomical variability. *NeuroImage* 2011;**56**:422–39. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.03.059

48

Mechelli A. Structural Covariance in the Human Cortex. *Journal of Neuroscience* 2005;**25**:8303–10. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0357-05.2005

49

Wright IC, McGuire PK, Poline J-B, et al. A Voxel-Based Method for the Statistical Analysis of Gray and White Matter Density Applied to Schizophrenia. *NeuroImage* 1995;**2**:244–52. doi:10.1006/nimg.1995.1032

50

Ashburner J, Friston KJ. Voxel-Based Morphometry—The Methods. *NeuroImage* 2000;**11**:805–21. doi:10.1006/nimg.2000.0582

51

Good CD, Johnsrude IS, Ashburner J, et al. A Voxel-Based Morphometric Study of Ageing in 465 Normal Adult Human Brains. *NeuroImage* 2001;**14**:21–36. doi:10.1006/nimg.2001.0786

52

Ashburner J, Friston KJ. Unified segmentation. *NeuroImage* 2005;**26**:839–51. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2005.02.018

53

Mechelli A, Price C, Friston K, et al. Voxel-Based Morphometry of the Human Brain: Methods and Applications. *Current Medical Imaging Reviews* 2005;**1**:105–13. doi:10.2174/1573405054038726

54

Ashburner J. A fast diffeomorphic image registration algorithm. *NeuroImage* 2007;**38**:95–113. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2007.07.007

55

Ashburner J, Friston KJ. Computing average shaped tissue probability templates. *NeuroImage* 2009;**45**:333–41. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2008.12.008

56

Ashburner J. Computational anatomy with the SPM software. Magnetic Resonance Imaging 2009;**27**:1163–74. doi:10.1016/j.mri.2009.01.006

57

Studholme C, Hill DLG, Hawkes DJ. An overlap invariant entropy measure of 3D medical image alignment. Pattern Recognition 1999;**32**:71–86. doi:10.1016/S0031-3203(98)00091-0

58

Pennec X, Cachier P, Ayache N. Understanding the "Demon's Algorithm": 3D Non-rigid Registration by Gradient Descent. In: Taylor C, Colchester A, eds. Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention – MICCAI'99. Berlin, Heidelberg: : Springer Berlin Heidelberg 1999. 597–605. doi:10.1007/10704282_64

59

Rueckert D, Sonoda LI, Hayes C, et al. Nonrigid registration using free-form deformations: application to breast MR images. IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging 1999;**18**:712–21. doi:10.1109/42.796284

60

Rohlfing T. Image Similarity and Tissue Overlaps as Surrogates for Image Registration Accuracy: Widely Used but Unreliable. IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging 2012;**31**:153–63. doi:10.1109/TMI.2011.2163944