Title: Empirical limitations of current low-intensity focused ultrasound simulation platforms

Authors: Sierra D. Brandts[1#], Brooke R. Staveland[1#], Ananya Madhusudhan[1], Ryan T. Ash[2], Tommaso Di Ianni[2], Leo P. Sugrue[3], Andrew D. Krystal[2], Khaled Moussawi[1]*

Affiliations:

[1] Department of Neurology, University of California, San Francisco, 94158, USA

[2] Department of Psychiatry, University of California, San Francisco, 94158, USA

[3] Department of Radiology, University of California, San Francisco, 94158, USA

[#] Equal contributions

* Corresponding author:

Khaled Moussawi, MD, PhD
1651 4th Street, 612C
San Francisco, CA 94158
Tel: 415-502-6343
khaled.moussawi@ucsf.edu

Keywords: focused ultrasound, LIFU, k-Plan, BabelBrain, pseudo-CT, Brainsight

Abstract

Transcranial low-intensity focused ultrasound (LIFU) is an emerging tool for noninvasive neuromodulation, with potential therapeutic applications across a range of neuropsychiatric disorders. As the field advances toward clinical translation, individualized simulations of sonication parameters are critical for estimating dosing to ensure safety, efficacy, and reproducibility. Currently, *k-Plan* (Brainbox Ltd.) and *BabelBrain* (open-source) are two widely used software packages for sonication simulation, yet their outputs have not been empirically compared. In this study, we directly evaluated the consistency of simulation results produced by these two platforms when applied to the same individuals, trajectories, and sonication protocols. We further examined the impact of skull modeling, as accurate estimation of skull bone properties is essential for reliable simulation. While CT scans remain the gold standard for capturing fine anatomical details of the skull, their use carries radiation risk. As an alternative, algorithms generating MRI-based pseudo-CTs have been developed. To assess the validity of using pseudo-CTs for simulations, we compared simulation outputs generated using CT versus pseudo-CT inputs. Our results reveal substantial discrepancies both between software platforms (k-Plan vs. BabelBrain) and between skull modeling approaches (CT vs. pseudo-CT), with differences that were sensitive to individual trajectories. These findings underscore the urgent need for ground-truth validation of current sonication simulation software and highlight the importance of further optimization of pseudo-CT algorithms before widespread clinical adoption.

Main Text

Introduction

Transcranial low-intensity focused ultrasound (LIFU) is an emerging technology that enables noninvasive modulation of both superficial and deep brain structures, thereby overcoming a major limitation of other noninvasive neuromodulation tools [1-3]. LIFU has been applied to a variety of brain targets, including the anterior cingulate cortex, subgenual cingulate cortex, insula, amygdala, ventral striatum, and other deep brain structures, in both healthy volunteers and patients with neuropsychiatric disorders [4-11]. With the number of clinical trials steadily increasing, ensuring accurate and reproducible dosing has become a central challenge, especially in light of the recent report of a serious adverse event during the delivery of a presumed low-intensity focused ultrasound sonication protocol, underscoring the importance of accurately simulating in situ pressures and temperatures [12].

Accurate dosing is essential for safety, efficacy, and reproducibility. At sufficiently high intensities, ultrasound pressure waves may cause tissue damage through mechanisms such as thermal necrosis or cavitation. While the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has not yet issued guidelines specific to LIFU, most research groups follow existing diagnostic ultrasound safety guidelines and expert consensus recommendations (e.g., the International Transcranial Ultrasonic Stimulation Safety and Standards consortium (ITRUSST)) [13]. Key safety measures include the spatial-peak pulse-average intensity (I_{SPPA}), the mechanical index (MI), and the maximum allowable temperature rise. For a given sonication protocol, in-situ parameters are strongly influenced by the skull's biophysical properties, which vary considerably across individuals and across cranial regions within the same individual [14]. Such variability affects ultrasound propagation, focusing accuracy, and ultimately the delivered dose at the target.

To address these challenges, personalized simulations have become a cornerstone of LIFU research, a key step forward in safety and accuracy for the field of ultrasonic neuromodulation. These simulations estimate ultrasound propagation and focal pressure fields based on individual anatomical data, most commonly from CT imaging, which provides high-resolution characterization of skull thickness and density. However, because of radiation exposure, there is increasing interest in generating pseudo-CTs from MRI sequences to approximate skull properties without ionizing radiation [15]. Whether such approaches provide sufficient accuracy for clinical or research applications remains an open question.

Several computational tools have been developed to perform such personalized simulations. Two widely adopted platforms are k-Plan (BrainBox Ltd.) [16], a commercial software built on the *k-Wave* acoustic simulation toolbox and executed via cloud-based computing [17], and BabelBrain, an open-source platform recently integrated with the Rogue Research Brainsight neuronavigation system, which operates via local computation [18]. Despite their growing use, these two platforms have not been directly compared.

In this study, we address these gaps by systematically evaluating the consistency of simulation outputs between k-Plan and BabelBrain when applied to the same individuals, sonication trajectories, and protocol parameters. We further assess the impact of input modality by comparing simulations derived from CT versus pseudo-CT skull models. By identifying discrepancies and potential sources of variability, our findings aim to inform best practices for LIFU sonication planning, highlight the need for standardized validation methods, and guide optimization of pseudo-CT algorithms for safer and more reproducible neuromodulation.

Methods

Sample Demographics

De-identified CT and MRI scan data were obtained from eight subjects with essential tremor who were scheduled to undergo high-intensity MRI-guided ultrasound ablation to treat their tremor. The Institutional Review Board at the University of California, San Francisco approved the research protocol.

Image Acquisition

Structural MRI (GE SIGNA Premier scanner), including T1- and T2-weighted sequences, and CT imaging were acquired from all eight subjects; ZTE sequences were obtained from five of these subjects. The ZTE sequences were only used for comparing the simulation outputs between ZTE and CT images and were not used when comparing the different simulation platforms. The CT slice thickness was 0.625 to 1.0 mm and pixel spacing ranged from 0.48 to 0.59 mm. All scans were reconstructed using bone windows and the BONEPLUS convolution kernel, ensuring high bone anatomical detail. ZTE parameters consisted of TR/TE = 530/0.01 s, 1° flip angle, a pixel bandwidth of 244 Hz/pixel, and single echo. The PURE/SCENIC setting was applied for chemical shift reduction and signal homogenization.

Image preprocessing

All raw MRI and CT images were first converted from DICOM to NIfTI format. This preprocessing pipeline is illustrated in Figure 1. An isotropic voxelization was then performed at 1 mm resolution on the T1-weighted (T1w) and T2-weighted (T2w) images using FSL FLIRT (version 6.0.7.13). To ensure consistent spatial orientation across k-Plan and the Brainsight neuronavigation system [19], the T1w and

T2w images were resliced. Reslicing is required to prevent the transducer and target positions from being misaligned across platforms; without reslicing, Brainsight reformats and reorients images to be squared within each viewing plane, whereas k-Plan displays the images in their acquired orientation. T1w and T2w images were segmented and reconstructed using the SimNIBS head modeling *charm* tool [20], which generates anatomical head models used as the inputs for BabelBrain simulations [21]. CT and ZTE NIfTI files were not preprocessed prior to simulations in order to preserve the skull mask and avoid smoothing effects introduced by isotropic resampling or normalization during co-registration. Changes to the skull mask and smoothing alter the Hounsfield units (HU) across voxels and therefore impact simulation accuracy. The CT images were retained at their native acquired resolution (0.48–0.59 × 0.48–0.59 × 0.625–1.0 mm^3).

Target Planning

Target planning for both BabelBrain and k-Plan simulations was performed using Brainsight (version 2.5.5). A SimNIBS project was generated for each subject, and the ventral striatum (VS) was selected as the target region of interest. The VS was identified as the part of the striatum where the caudate and putamen converge ventrally, anterior to the anterior commissure.

To examine how skull geometry and incidence angle influence simulation results, four distinct trajectories from the scalp to the VS were defined and simulated for each subject. Trajectories A and B were selected to be reproducible across subjects regardless of individual skull anatomy by anchoring the transducer at fixed orientations relative to the midsagittal plane (90° for Trajectory A and ~60° for Trajectory B; Figure 2A–B). These standardized placements ensured consistent skull entry locations across subjects, but they often intersected subject-specific regions of bone irregularity, frequently producing diffracted focal beams. Trajectories C and D were individualized for each subject by using

their CT-derived skull masks to identify the most orthogonal paths relative to the skull surface. Because energy loss from reflection and absorption increases with greater incidence angles relative to the skull [22], BabelBrain and k-Plan may produce more consistent predictions when the transducer is more orthogonal to the skull. Thus, Trajectory C was chosen to represent the most orthogonal ipsilateral trajectory to target. However, in all subjects, a more optimal contralateral Trajectory D could be identified as more orthogonal than Trajectory C (Figure S1), and as such this was included in our comparisons. Trajectories were optimized and verified using Brainsight's Inline and Inline-90 visualization views.

BabelBrain expects trajectories to be anchored to the brain target, whereas k-Plan expects a trajectory to be defined with respect to the apex of transducer. To ensure consistent target planning across both platforms, we defined a common trajectory based on the spatial positions of both the target and the transducer. The distance between the target and the transducer along this trajectory is parameterized using three offsets. The first offset, d_a, represents the target-to-scalp distance. The second offset, d_b, represents the distance between the scalp and the transducer exit plane and accounts for any coupling medium such as a gel pad or water bladder. The third offset, d_c, represents the distance from the transducer exit plane to the apex of the transducer's curvature (Figure 1).

For BabelBrain simulations, we defined a trajectory ($\vec{\boldsymbol{T}}$) in Brainsight by selecting the target location (t) and then adjusting the anterior–posterior and lateral sliders to establish the desired trajectory between the target and transducer. This trajectory is then exported to the BabelBrain interface, which then calculates the distance between target (t) and the apex of the transducer (t') using the three offsets. The d_a parameter is automatically computed by BabelBrain and is displayed in the "Transducer Power Output (TPO) Distance" field. d_b is manually specified (e.g., 0 mm or an offset reflecting the coupling

medium) using the 'TPO distance' and 'Distance to Tx outplane skin' fields. d_c is predefined based on the selected transducer model and does not require user input.

For k-Plan simulations, we use the same trajectory. However, k-Plan expects a trajectory anchored to the transducer apex, which we call $\vec{T'}$. To create $\vec{T'}$ in Brainsight, we take $\vec{T}$ and manually add d_a, d_b, and d_c using Brainsight's *crosshair offset* slider. d_a is pulled from BabelBrain's "Transducer Power Output (TPO) Distance" field, d_b is set manually, and d_c is found in the transducer manual. This trajectory, which is now anchored to the apex of the transducer, is then exported to the k-Plan interface. Within k-Plan, we then set the 'Focal Distance' field to the sum of d_a and d_b. As with BabelBrain, d_c is automatically accounted for by selecting the appropriate transducer file. This approach, outlined in Figure 1, converts BabelBrain's target-based trajectory into a geometrically equivalent transducer-based trajectory for use in k-Plan.

<u>BabelBrain Simulations</u>

Simulations were performed using BabelBrain version 4.1. The DPX-500-4CH four-channel annular array transducer (active diameter: 64 mm; maximum focal depth: 150 mm) was used for all simulations at the default grid resolution of six points per wavelength. Each simulation domain encompassed the entire head, resulting in a patient-specific grid size. The sonication protocol included a fundamental frequency of 500 kHz, 5% duty cycle, pulse repetition frequency of 100 Hz, and a 30-second on/off cycle for a total duration of 10 minutes [7]. Protocol parameters were stored in YAML format for BabelBrain input. Structural CT and ZTE scans were registered to the corresponding T1w images directly in BabelBrain using Adaptive Stochastic Gradient Descent, and used to generate a bone mask for the simulations (Figure 1). As stated above, in simulations that included a coupling gel pad, an

170 additional 10-mm offset (d_b) was applied in BabelBrain by (1) increasing the 'TPO distance' field by 10
171 mm and (2) setting the 'Distance to Tx outplane to skin' field to 10 mm to ensure the added distance was
172 applied outward from the scalp rather than intracranially. Where indicated, simulations included
173 mechanical adjustments to maximize engagement of the intended target. BabelBrain does this by
174 creating a new trajectory that aims at a shifted target, t_2. However, by "aiming" the beam at t_2, the
175 maximum acoustic energy is delivered at or near the original target t. As such, we call our true target t
176 the "optimized-target", and we denote t_2 as the "nonoptimized-target". Simulations were run in
177 BabelBrain such that we could compare pressures at both the optimized-target and non-optimized target.
178 We evaluated both targets across simulation platforms because discrepancies between modeling
179 approaches may vary as a function of spatial offset from the focal beam center. Assessing pressure at
180 both locations therefore allows us to determine whether platform-specific differences are uniform near
181 the focus or increase with distance from the region of maximal acoustic energy. BabelBrain simulations
182 report the following metrics: maximum I_{SPPA}, spatial-peak temporal-average intensity (I_{SPTA}; a
183 diagnostic ultrasound safety metric), and mechanical index within the brain; I_{SPPA} and I_{SPTA} at the target;
184 I_{SPPA} in water; and estimates of temperature and cumulative equivalent minutes (CEM) at the target,
185 brain, skull, and scalp.

186

187 <u>k-Plan Simulations</u>

188 Simulations were performed using k-Plan version 1.2.0. To ensure that the difference in the results was
189 not due to the registration of the CT / pseudo-CT to the MRI, the T1w images generated from SimNIBS
190 segmentation were imported into k-Plan, along with the registered CT / pseudo-CT volumes generated
191 in BabelBrain (Figure 1). The DPX-500-4CH transducer was selected for all simulations, with a grid
192 resolution of six points per wavelength. Each simulation covered the full head, generating patient-

specific grid sizes. As described in the target planning section, we used BabelBrain's mechanically adjusted trajectory, $\overrightarrow{\boldsymbol{T}}$, to generate a geometrically matching trajectory, $\overrightarrow{\boldsymbol{T'}}$, in k-Plan (Figure 1) and combined d_a and d_b values were entered in the k-Plan interface in the 'Focal Distance' field. Free-field I_{SPPA} values were then set to 15, 30, 40, and 60 W/cm². To maintain comparability across platforms, the I_{SPPA} in water reported in BabelBrain's exported summaries was matched in k-Plan by adjusting the input I_{SPPA} in water values accordingly. For each freefield water ISPPA condition, k-Plan reported maximum and target in situ pressure, I_{SPPA} and I_{SPTA}, maximum mechanical index, and change in temperature. However, the k-Plan simulation reports consistently identified the maximum peak pressure outside the brain, often within the transducer itself. Therefore, to enable direct comparison of maximum and target values with BabelBrain outputs, pressure maps exported from k-Plan were used to extract the maximum, optimized-target, and nonoptimized-target in situ I_{SPPA} and I_{SPTA} values. These extracted outputs were then directly compared with the corresponding BabelBrain simulation results to assess differences in predicted focal intensity and thermal effects between the two software platforms.

Results

Simulation outputs from k-Plan and BabelBrain were compared across four trajectories for five subjects using a free-field I_{SPPA} of 60 W/cm², as this value most approximates intensities used in modern experimental sonication protocols. Substantial discrepancies were observed between k-Plan and BabelBrain simulations for in-situ I_{SPPA} and maximum rise in temperature at the skull for each trajectory (Figure 3). Target I_{SPTA} values also differed across the simulation platforms (Supplemental Figure 3). To quantify these discrepancies, we calculated the percent difference as:

$$\frac{BabelBrain\ Output - k{-}Plan\ Output}{k{-}Plan\ Output} x\ 100.$$

We first compared the I_{SPPA} values at the nonoptimized target, as k-Plan does not have an option for automated mechanical adjustments. At this "nonoptimized-target", we found that the mean percent difference across subjects was 227.43% +/- 148.24% (SD) ranging from 12.26% to 528.25% (see first row of Figure 3). However, the nonoptimized-target is not at the center of the beam, and the simulation platforms may have better alignment near the center of the acoustic energy as compared to beam edge. Therefore, we next compared the optimal-target I_{SPPA} values between the two platforms, where we still found substantial differences between the platforms (mean: 195.5% +/- 133.76%; range: 51.55%-595.78%) (second row of Figure 3). Next, we hypothesized that the differences may stem from differences in beam alignment. If the simulated beam fields differed between the platforms, the maximum in situ I_{SPPA} values may equalize, while the target values differ. However, the maximum I_{SPPA} values still showed substantial differences between the simulation platforms (mean: 168.91% +/- 90.12%; range: 38.96%-340.85%) (see third row of Figure 3). Finally, for the max rise in temperature at the skull we found mean percent difference of -18.82% +/- 43.22% (SD) ranging from -68.78% to 84.21% (fourth row of Figure 3). Importantly, for each comparison above, we ensured the exact same trajectory and target location were used between the two platforms as described in the Methods.

230 Across both subjects and trajectories, k-Plan consistently reported lower absolute intensities, with a
231 mean target I_{SPPA} of 3.46 W/cm^2 +/- 1.95W/cm^2 and a mean max I_{SPPA} of 4.26W/cm^2 +/- 1.87W/cm^2; the
232 highest max I_{SPPA} across trajectories was 7.45W/cm^2. In contrast, BabelBrain produced higher absolute
233 intensities overall, with a mean target I_{SPPA} of 8.65 +/- 4.29 W/cm^2 and mean max I_{SPPA} of 10.5+/- 3.83
234 W/cm^2 with the highest max I_{SPPA} across trajectories being 18 W/cm^2. Simulated changes in maximum
235 temperature rise showed less systematic differences between platforms. Indeed, while the I_{SPPA} between
236 k-Plan and BabelBrain were at least significantly correlated when using a linear mixed effects regression
237 model to predict k-Plan I_{SPPA} values using BabelBrain I_{SPPA} values and a random effect of subject (Std.
238 Beta = 0.89; 95% CI[0.66-1.11]; n = 20), changes in temperature were not (Std. Beta = -0.19; 95% CI[-
239 0.67-0.29]; n = 20). The lack of correlation between the simulated changes in temperature may be driven
240 by the results from Trajectories A and B, which were the least orthogonal trajectories (see Supplemental
241 Figure 2). Taken together, these findings indicate that despite identical input parameters and targeting,
242 simulation outputs differed markedly between k-Plan and BabelBrain.

243 To further test whether the differences between platforms were due to differences in alignment of the
244 simulation sonication beam, we compared the sonication maps for Subject 1 using Trajectory D (see
245 Figure 4). The intensity maps normalized to each simulation peak intensity showed a high degree of
246 overlap (Figure 4b,d, f). However, the absolute intensities differed systematically across the entire
247 sonication focus (Figure 4a,c,e), indicating that differences in sonication results were not simply due to
248 misalignment.

249 Given that target intensity scales linearly with stimulation intensity, we tested whether the magnitude of
250 the discrepancy between the two platforms would remain constant across different stimulation
251 intensities. Free-field I_{SPPA} in water was simulated at 15, 30, 45, and 60 W/cm^2 in both platforms using

trajectory D. As expected, across all conditions, a systematic, constant-magnitude difference was observed between the two software packages (Supplemental Figure 4).

Recent calls to standardize reporting of ultrasound sonications highlight the need to report the "effective aperture" of the transducer [23]. The effective aperture of the ultrasound beam can differ from the nominal aperture of the transducer if a coupling medium adds to the space between the transducer and scalp, affecting the ultrasound beam propagation. For example, adding a coupling medium such as a gel pad of 10 mm thickness can modify the effective aperture, making it smaller than the nominal aperture, and thereby alter simulated safety metrics. Therefore, we simulated the effect of adding a 10 mm gel pad between the transducer and scalp for one of the orthogonal trajectories in each subject (Figure 5). The results reinforced the overall trends observed in Figure 3 while revealing additional effects. For acoustic intensity measures, target I_{SPPA} and max I_{SPPA} values remained consistently lower in k-Plan compared to BabelBrain, with minimal changes when accounting for the gel pad distance. In contrast, both platforms reported an increase in maximum temperature change when the 10 mm gel pad was included. Interestingly, in Subject 1, the relative relationship between platforms reversed; BabelBrain reported a higher temperature rise without the gel pad, whereas k-Plan reported the higher value when the gel pad was included. Notably, k-Plan demonstrated greater magnitude difference than BabelBrain in predicted temperature rise when incorporating the gel pad distance. Thus, the addition of a 10 mm scalp-transducer offset resulted in a significant increase in predicted maximum temperature, likely due to higher ultrasound density per crossed bone area, highlighting the sensitivity of sonication simulations to even minor adjustments in setup parameters, and the potential for such factors to influence dosing estimates relative to safety parameters.

CT- and pseudo-CT–based simulations were compared using the same predefined trajectories to evaluate whether the skull masks produced similar results. Because this comparison does not evaluate

the platform itself but rather focuses on the skull masks derived from the CT and pseudo-CT images, we chose to run the simulations in BabelBrain. The pseudo-CT masks were generated from GE ZTE imaging sequences using the built-in BabelBrain algorithm (Figure 6). Subjects 4 and 5 in Figure 5 correspond to the same individuals shown in previous figures. Percent difference was calculated using the CT simulated result as the reference. Across subjects and trajectories, simulation outputs showed substantial variability. Target I_{SPPA} differed by an average of 18.16% +/- 26.18% (SD), ranging from −22.22% to 73.68%. Maximum temperature rise showed similar inconsistency, with a mean difference of 22.48% +/- 38.52% and a range of −38.91% to 147.3%. More orthogonal trajectories (C and D) tended to show smaller discrepancies between CT and pseudo-CT-based inputs compared to trajectories A and B (Figure 6, Supplemental Figure 3). On average, the percent difference in target in-situ I_{SPPA} was 2.25% +/- 10.87% for Trajectory C and −7.58% +/- 12.36% for Trajectory D. However, individual cases within trajectories C and D still showed large deviations, with errors up to 22.22% for pressure and 40.63% for temperature. Notably, the direction of the discrepancy was inconsistent, with pseudo-CT simulations sometimes yielding higher values and other times lower ones in different metrics (e.g., I_{SPPA}). This finding indicates that pseudo-CT-based simulations do not reliably produce more conservative estimates. Together, these results highlight the need for further optimization of pseudo-CT imaging sequences and reconstruction algorithms before they can be considered a reliable substitute for CT-based skull modeling in LIFU simulations.

295 **Discussion**

296 While individually simulating LIFU sonication is an important step for ensuring safety and accuracy,
297 our results demonstrate substantial discrepancies in key parameters across both two commonly used
298 simulation platforms and CT-based and pseudo-CT-based, even when identical input parameters and
299 trajectories were used. This is especially relevant for safety and reproducibility. We found that across
300 four representative trajectories and five subjects, I_{SPPA} and estimated temperature change varied across
301 the platforms. In particular, the changes in temperature estimated between k-Plan and BabelBrain were
302 not correlated and exhibited the greatest variation in the trajectory researchers are most likely to select to
303 optimize orthogonality to the skull (Trajectories C and D). These changes were consistent across
304 different stimulation intensities but varied further when accounting for the distance between the scalp
305 and the transducer. Finally, we also found differences in key simulated outputs when comparing CT
306 versus pseudo-CT scans as inputs, though these differences were smaller in the more orthogonal
307 trajectories.

308 Beyond dosing discrepancies, our findings raise safety concerns regarding the parameters reported by k-
309 Plan and BabelBrain. For example, in Subject 1, BabelBrain simulations of trajectories B, C, and D
310 yielded I_{SPTA} values that exceeded the FDA diagnostic ultrasound safety guideline of 0.72 W/cm² [24],
311 whereas k-Plan reported values well below this threshold (Supplemental Figure 3). In Subject 2, k-Plan
312 outputs were more conservative across most trajectories; however, BabelBrain predicted a temperature
313 rise exceeding the 2 °C guideline recommended by the ITRUSST consensus guidelines [25] for
314 trajectory A. Interestingly, despite this instance, k-Plan generally reported higher temperature changes
315 than BabelBrain overall. These disagreeing safety-related outputs, even within our small sample size,
316 highlight the risk of relying solely on a single simulation platform without using reasonable safety
317 margins.

318 To further approximate real-world sonication conditions, we simulated the effect of a 10 mm gel pad
319 placed between the transducer and scalp. While BabelBrain and k-Plan generally showed minimal
320 changes in target I_{SPPA} and max I_{SPPA} values, both platforms predicted significant increases in
321 temperature rise with the added distance (Figure 5). Notably, in Subjects 1, 2, and 4, k-Plan simulations
322 reached the 2 °C safety threshold with the gel pad included. These results underscore that even modest
323 increases in transducer-scalp distance can substantially alter predicted temperature outcomes. Moreover,
324 the effect is not consistent across platforms, complicating safety interpretation.

325 Critically, it remains unclear which platform provides estimates that are closer to the ground truth.
326 Determining this would require validation against hydrophone-based measurements of sonication
327 pressures and measurements of temperature rise. A recent study compared individually optimized *k-*
328 *Wave*-based simulations to empirically measured ultrasound propagation and sonication pressures, and
329 reported some discrepancies up to ~40% compared to hydrophone measurements [26]. However, a
330 similar study using k-Plan and BabelBrain has not been performed.

331 In the absence of empirical tests, the underlying assumptions for each software platform can shed some
332 light on the observed discrepancies. Prior benchmarking work has demonstrated that the propagation
333 models used in BabelBrain and k-Plan (BabelViscoFDTD and k-Wave, respectively) produce closely
334 matched focal pressures and positions when supplied with standardized inputs, generally agreeing within
335 ~10% and <1 mm [27]. This suggests that the larger discrepancies in our study stem primarily from
336 differences in how each platform derives skull acoustic properties and models attenuation, rather than
337 from the compressional-wave models. Our pattern of results generally supports this hypothesis, where
338 we found that the simulated beam paths largely overlap but that the peak in situ intensities were
339 consistently lower in k-Plan compared to BabelBrain. Deriving individualized bone acoustic properties
340 (e.g., attenuation coefficient) from imaging masks using CTs (or pseudo-CTs) is not standardized, and is

likely the major contributor to the substantial discrepancies we observed [26, 28]. As summarized in Table 1, BabelBrain derives a voxel-wise attenuation coefficient for each simulation by converting the Hounsfield values within the skull mask into speed of sound and density values, a process that is challenging and not standardized. BabelBrain further assumes that 16% of the acoustic energy is converted to heat [18, 29]. In contrast, k-Plan does not report its attenuation coefficient but applies a fixed absorption coefficient of 13.3 dB/(cm·MHz^{y}) with an absorption power law (y) set to 1 for acoustic attenuation [29, 30] . It is unclear what proportion of total attenuation this absorption coefficient represents or whether k-Plan assumes that all attenuated energy is converted to heat. However, the use of a single, relatively high absorption coefficient appears to produce more conservative acoustic outputs, generally resulting in lower predicted *in situ* intensities compared with BabelBrain. For thermal predictions, we hypothesize that differences between platforms are similarly driven by their handling of skull properties. BabelBrain again relies on individualized, Hounsfield unit-derived parameters, whereas k-Plan uses a fixed skull Hounsfield unit value of 1850 for all subjects [30]. This uniform assumption likely accounts for the consistently higher temperature rises reported by k-Plan and reflects a more conservative thermal model compared with BabelBrain's anatomy-specific approach.

It is critical to note that more conservative simulations do not directly translate to safer simulations. Underestimation of simulated acoustic pressures can be particularly problematic when studies aim to achieve a specific in situ pressure at the target across participants, as it may prompt investigators to increase delivered sonication amplitudes to reach the desired (apparently sub-threshold) pressure, potentially resulting in true acoustic pressures that exceed safety guidelines. Alternatively, overestimation of temperature rise may lead researchers to select overly cautious parameters that underdose the target, increasing the risk of null effects and delaying scientific progress. Together, these

methodological differences highlight the need for standardized, validated pipelines for deriving skull acoustic and thermal properties to ensure consistent, effective, and safe dosing.

Finally, comparisons between ZTE- and CT-based simulations also revealed notable variability. For example, in Subject 6, trajectory A exceeded the 2 °C safety guideline in the CT-based simulation, whereas the ZTE-based result did not. Conversely, in Subject 7, trajectory D surpassed the 0.72 W/cm² I_{SPTA} threshold in the CT-based simulation but not in the ZTE-based simulation. These examples illustrate that ZTE-derived pseudo-CTs cannot be assumed to provide more conservative safety estimates. Although pseudo-CT simulations showed smaller discrepancies to CT-based simulations for orthogonal trajectories, the individual-level differences, up to 20% for pressure and 40% for temperature, are large enough to be problematic when estimates are near safety thresholds, as such deviations can determine whether a trajectory is deemed safe or unsafe.

This study should be interpreted in light of some important limitations. First, in the absence of ground-truth measurements, we cannot determine which simulation platform is more accurate. Establishing such validation benchmarks represents an important next step for the field but was beyond the scope of the present study. Second, the small sample size resulted in wide confidence intervals around the precise magnitude and direction of the observed differences. Nevertheless, the large differences detected even within this limited cohort suggest that discrepancies between the simulation platforms are systemic and unlikely to be rare observations.

Individualized simulations of LIFU protocols, as compared to assuming a one-size-fits-all across participants with varying head sizes and skull thicknesses, remains a critical step towards realizing the power of LIFU neuromodulation as a new treatment for neurological and psychiatric conditions. While the field has already come a long way, our findings highlight the critical importance of transparent reporting of simulation parameters and inputs [23], as well as conducting simulations that accurately

reflect the specific details of the experimental setup. Such practices are essential for ensuring both the safety and reproducibility of LIFU studies. Without standardized definitions, reference measurements, and systematic validation against hydrophone and thermometry data, it remains uncertain which simulation platform more faithfully represents the true *in situ* sonication dose. Establishing consensus standards and validating simulation tools against ground-truth measurements will be necessary steps for advancing LIFU toward reliable and clinically safe applications.

Acknowledgments
KM is funded by the Weill Neurohub and DA060431.

Disclosures
SDB, BRS, AM, and KM have no relevant disclosures to declare.

399 **References**

400 1. Murphy, K.R., et al., *A practical guide to transcranial ultrasonic stimulation from the IFCN-*
401 *endorsed ITRUSST consortium.* Clin Neurophysiol, 2025. **171**: p. 192–226.

402 2. Keihani, A., et al., *Transcranial Focused Ultrasound Neuromodulation in Psychiatry: Main*
403 *Characteristics, Current Evidence, and Future Directions.* Brain Sci, 2024. **14**(11).

404 3. Bowary, P. and B.D. Greenberg, *Noninvasive Focused Ultrasound for Neuromodulation: A*
405 *Review.* Psychiatr Clin North Am, 2018. **41**(3): p. 505–514.

406 4. Legon, W., et al., *Noninvasive neuromodulation of subregions of the human insula differentially*
407 *affect pain processing and heart-rate variability: a within-subjects pseudo-randomized trial.*
408 Pain, 2024.

409 5. Strohman, A., et al., *Low-Intensity Focused Ultrasound to the Human Dorsal Anterior Cingulate*
410 *Attenuates Acute Pain Perception and Autonomic Responses.* J Neurosci, 2024. **44**(8).

411 6. Yaakub, S.N., et al., *Non-invasive ultrasonic neuromodulation of the human nucleus accumbens*
412 *impacts reward sensitivity.* Nat Commun, 2025. **16**(1): p. 10192.

413 7. Cain, J.A., et al., *Real time and delayed effects of subcortical low intensity focused ultrasound.*
414 Sci Rep, 2021. **11**(1): p. 6100.

415 8. Riis, T.S., et al., *Noninvasive Modulation of the Subcallosal Cingulate and Depression With*
416 *Focused Ultrasonic Waves.* Biol Psychiatry, 2024.

417 9. Riis, T.S., et al., *Noninvasive targeted modulation of pain circuits with focused ultrasonic waves.*
418 Pain, 2024. **165**(12): p. 2829–2839.

419 10. Riis, T.S., et al., *Noninvasive modulation of essential tremor with focused ultrasonic waves.* J
420 Neural Eng, 2024. **21**(1).

421 11. Rezai, A., et al., *Focused Ultrasound Neuromodulation: Exploring a Novel Treatment for Severe*
422 *Opioid Use Disorder.* Biol Psychiatry, 2025. **98**(1): p. 56–64.

423 12. Rezai, A., et al., *Brain injury during focused ultrasound neuromodulation for substance use*
424 *disorder.* Brain Stimul, 2025. **18**(6): p. 2050–2053.

425 13. Aubry, J.F., et al., *ITRUSST consensus on biophysical safety for transcranial ultrasound*
426 *stimulation.* Brain Stimul, 2025. **18**(6): p. 1896–1905.

14. Leung, S.A., et al., *A rapid beam simulation framework for transcranial focused ultrasound.* Sci Rep, 2019. **9**(1): p. 7965.

15. Miscouridou, M., et al., *Classical and Learned MR to Pseudo-CT Mappings for Accurate Transcranial Ultrasound Simulation.* IEEE Trans Ultrason Ferroelectr Freq Control, 2022. **69**(10): p. 2896–2905.

16. BrainBox. *k-Plan Ultrasound Planning (Version 1.1.4)*. 2025; Available from: https://brainbox-neuro.com/products/k-plan.

17. Treeby, B.E. and B.T. Cox, *k-Wave: MATLAB toolbox for the simulation and reconstruction of photoacoustic wave fields.* J Biomed Opt, 2010. **15**(2): p. 021314.

18. Pichardo, S., *BabelBrain: An Open-Source Application for Prospective Modeling of Transcranial Focused Ultrasound for Neuromodulation Applications.* IEEE Trans Ultrason Ferroelectr Freq Control, 2023. **70**(7): p. 587–599.

19. Shen, J. *Tools for NIfTI and ANALYZE image*. 2025; Available from: https://www.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/8797-tools-for-nifti-and-analyze-image.

20. Puonti, O., et al., *Accurate and robust whole-head segmentation from magnetic resonance images for individualized head modeling.* Neuroimage, 2020. **219**: p. 117044.

21. Fairbanks, T., et al., *Pipeline for Planning and Execution of Transcranial Ultrasound Neuromodulation Experiments in Humans.* J Vis Exp, 2024(208).

22. Kim, C., M. Eames, and D.G. Paeng, *Improving Sonication Efficiency in Transcranial MR-Guided Focused Ultrasound Treatment: A Patient-Data Simulation Study.* Bioengineering (Basel), 2023. **11**(1).

23. Martin, E., et al., *ITRUSST consensus on standardised reporting for transcranial ultrasound stimulation.* Brain Stimul, 2024. **17**(3): p. 607–615.

24. FDA, *Marketing Clearance of Diagnostic Ultrasound Systems and Transducers. Draft Guidance for Industry and Food and Drug Administration Staff*. 2017.

25. Aubry, J.-F.A., D; Schafer, M; Fouragnan, M; Charles Caskey, Robert Chen, Ghazaleh Darmani, Ellen J. Bubrick, Jérôme Sallet, Christopher Butler, Charlotte Stagg, Miriam Klein-Flügge, Seung-Schik Yoo, Brad Treeby, Lennart Verhagen; Butts Pauly, Kim *ITRUSST Consensus on Biophysical Safety for Transcranial Ultrasonic Stimulation.* arXiv, 2023. **arXiv:2311.05359**.

26. Krokhmal, A., et al., *A comparative study of experimental and simulated ultrasound beam propagation through cranial bones.* Phys Med Biol, 2025. **70**(2).

27. Aubry, J.F., et al., *Benchmark problems for transcranial ultrasound simulation: Intercomparison of compressional wave models.* J Acoust Soc Am, 2022. **152**(2): p. 1003.

28. Angla, C., et al., *Transcranial ultrasound simulations: A review.* Med Phys, 2023. **50**(2): p. 1051–1072.

29. Pinton, G., et al., *Attenuation, scattering, and absorption of ultrasound in the skull bone.* Med Phys, 2012. **39**(1): p. 299–307.

30. k-Plan, *k-Plan Simulation Pipeline.* 2024.

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Overview of imaging, preprocessing, target-planning, and simulation workflow. Structural MRI (T1w, T2w, ZTE) and CT scans were acquired and converted to NIfTI format. Only T1w and T2w images were preprocessed (voxel standardization, reslicing, SimNIBS segmentation) to ensure consistent visualization across Brainsight and k-Plan, whereas CT and ZTE volumes were kept at native resolution to avoid smoothing prior to acoustic simulations. Registered CT / Pseudo-CTs generated in BabelBrain were imported directly into k-Plan. Target planning for both platforms was performed in Brainsight. Although the beam trajectories were identical across the two platforms, k-Plan expects the trajectory to be anchored to the transducer position (t'), while BabelBrain expects the trajectory to be anchored to the brain target (t). To account for this difference, two trajectory files were created in Brainsight. First, $\vec{\boldsymbol{T}}$ was created for BabelBrain, which anchors the trajectory to t. Within BabelBrain, the distance between t and the scalp (d_a) was automatically computed using the CT or the pseudoCT and the distance between the transducer exit plane and the transducer apex (d_c) was accounted for by specifying the transducer model. The coupling gel creates an additional distance (d_b) between the scalp and the transducer exit plane, and this distance was manually added in BabelBrain using the 'TPO distance' and 'Distance to Tx outplane to skin' fields. To create an equivalent trajectory $\vec{\boldsymbol{T'}}$ for k-Plan in Brainsight, we add the three offsets (d_a, d_b, d_c) to the Crosshair Origin field in Brainsight to find t' for the k-Plan simulation. In k-Plan, d_a, as calculated by BabelBrain, and d_b were added to the 'Focal Distance' field. d_c is similarly accounted for in k-Plan by selecting the transducer model. Simulation outputs analyzed included max and target I_{SPPA} and I_{SPTA} and maximum change in skull temperature.

Figure 2. Simulated sonication trajectories The following four trajectories targeting the ventral striatum were used in all five subjects. Illustrated example trajectories targeting the left ventral striatum from Subject 1. 3D head renderings illustrate the placement of the transducer in k-Plan (panels with blue rings) and Brainsight (panels with green rings), with the green/blue ring indicating the transducer location. For each trajectory, the accompanying 2D maps from BabelBrain display the normalized acoustic intensity along the X–Z and Y–Z planes. In each 2D map, the top black line represents the

scalp, the middle black line represents the outer surface of the skull, and the bottom line represents the inferior surface of the skull. The pink shading marks the deviation of the ultrasound beam from orthogonality, approximated through a tangent to the skull's surface at the center of the ultrasound beam. A) Trajectory A was perpendicular to the midsagittal plane. B) Trajectory B was ~60 degrees from the midsagittal plane. C) Trajectory C was the most orthogonal trajectory ipsilaterally. D) Trajectory D was the most orthogonal trajectory, contralaterally – note that trajectory D provided the most orthogonal incidence angle relative to the skull for targeting the ventral striatum across all participants.

Figure 3. Simulation results from k-Plan and BabelBrain varied substantially across all trajectories. Left panels: For each subject (1-5), simulation results from the four trajectories (A-D) were compared between k-Plan and BabelBrain for the nonoptimized-target, optimized-target, and max derated brain I_{SPPA}, and the max change in skull temperature (°C). The nonoptimized-target is a target that was not optimized to be at the center of the beam. The optimized-target is optimized to be near the center of the acoustic energy of the beam. The max value is the maximum I_{SPPA} in the brain. The location of the max value could differ between simulation platforms, while location of the target values was the same. The dashed red line indicates the max change in temperature safety threshold of 2°C. All trajectories were simulated at 60 W/cm^2 I_{SPPA} in water. Right panels: Percent differences between BabelBrain and k-Plan outputs are shown for each trajectory across all five subjects, with mean ± SEM overlaid. Percent difference was calculated as: $\frac{BabelBrain\ Output - k{-}Plan\ Output}{k{-}Plan\ Output} x\ 100$.

Figure 4. Sonication beam shape and intensity comparison across platforms. (a–b) k-Plan sonication intensity maps overlaid on the subject's T1-weighted MRI. Panel **(a)** shows absolute spatial-peak pulse-average intensity (ISPPA; W/cm²), while panel **(b)** shows intensity normalized to the peak ISPPA and expressed in decibels (dB re peak). Both maps are thresholded at −6 dB (25% of peak intensity). **(c–d)** Same as panels **(a–b)**, but for the BabelBrain sonication intensity maps. **(e)** Difference between the BabelBrain and k-Plan absolute intensity maps (BabelBrain − k-Plan). Positive (negative) values indicate regions where BabelBrain predicts higher (lower) intensity than k-Plan. **(f)** Spatial overlap of the −6 dB sonication regions from BabelBrain and k-Plan. Insets show enlarged views of the focal region near the target.

Figure 5. Changing the focal distance by accounting for gel pad or water bladder affected simulation results in a non-systematic way between platforms. Left panels: simulation results at two distances from the scalp (0 mm and 10 mm) in each subject (1-5) were compared to the target and max derated I_{SPPA} in the brain, and the max change in skull temperature (°C). One of the orthogonal trajectories (C-D) was simulated in each subject with an additional 10 mm added outside of the scalp. The dashed red lines indicate a temperature rise of 2°C. Both distances were simulated at 60 W/cm^2 I_{SPPA} in water. Right panels: Absolute differences between 0 mm and 10 mm from the scalp in each platform are shown for each intensity level across all subjects, with mean ± SEM displayed.

Figure 6. Comparison of CT and pseudoCT-based simulations. Left panels: Simulation outputs for five subjects (Subjects 4–8), each with both CT and ZTE images, are shown across the four sonication trajectories (A–D). For each subject, simulations were run in BabelBrain using either CT-derived or ZTE-derived (pseudoCT) skull models. Outputs include the target derated brain I_{SPPA}, target derated brain I_{SPTA}, and the maximum change in skull temperature (°C). The dashed red lines represent the safety limits of 0.72 W/cm^2 I_{SPTA} and a 2°C temperature rise. All simulations were performed at 60 W/cm^2 I_{SPPA} in water with the transducer positioned 10 mm from the scalp. Right panels: Percent differences between CT and pseudo-CT simulations are shown for each trajectory across all subjects, with mean ± SEM. Percent difference was calculated as: $\frac{pseudoCT\ Output - CT\ Output}{pseudoCT\ \ Output} x\ 100$.

Figure S1. Comparison of trajectories C and D. Simulations of the most orthogonal ventral striatum trajectories are shown for Subjects 4–8 using CT-based models in BabelBrain. Left panels show the ipsilateral orthogonal trajectory (Trajectory C); right panels show the contralateral orthogonal trajectory (Trajectory D). Each row includes a 3D head rendering from Brainsight illustrating the transducer placement (green ring), followed by 2D BabelBrain maps of the normalized acoustic intensity in the X–Z and Y–Z planes. In the 2D maps, the green line marks the ideal perpendicular (normal) angle relative to the skull surface, while the pink line indicates the actual angle at which the ultrasound beam enters the skull. A smaller deviation between the pink and green lines indicates a more orthogonal incidence. Across all subjects, Trajectory D consistently shows a beam angle closer to the surface normal than Trajectory C. The top dotted line denotes the skin surface, and the two lower dotted lines mark the skull layers. The equivalent panels are shown for Subject 1 in Figure 2.

Figure S2. Correlations between BabelBrain and k-Plan simulations. For each subject (1-5), simulation results from the four trajectories (A-D) were correlated between k-Plan and BabelBrain for the target derated brain I_{SPPA} and the max change in skull temperature (°C). All trajectories were simulated at 60 W/cm^2 I_{SPPA} in water. Each point is a simulation from a single subject. Each panel shows the correlation for one of the four trajectories. Lines reflect linear fits between the BabelBrain and k-Plan simulations. The dashed black line indicates the identity line.

Figure S3. I_{SPTA} values from k-Plan and BabelBrain varied substantially across all trajectories. Left panel: For each subject (1-5), simulation results from the four trajectories (A-D) were compared between k-Plan and BabelBrain. The dashed red line indicates the I_{SPTA} safety threshold of 0.72 W/cm^2. All trajectories were simulated at 60 W/cm^2 I_{SPPA} in water. Right panel: Percent differences between BabelBrain and k-Plan outputs are shown for each trajectory across all five subjects, with mean ± SEM overlaid. Percent difference was calculated as: $\frac{BabelBrain\ Output - k{-}Plan\ Output}{k{-}Plan\ Output} x\ 100$.

Title: Empirical limitations of current low-intensity focused ultrasound simulation platforms

Authors: Sierra D. Brandts[1#], Brooke R. Staveland[1#], Ananya Madhusudhan[1], Ryan T. Ash[2], Tommaso DiIanni[2], Leo P. Sugrue[3], Andrew D. Krystal[2], Khaled Moussawi[1]*

Main Figures and Tables:

- Figures 1-6
- Table 1

Figure 1.



Figure 1. Overview of imaging, preprocessing, target-planning, and simulation workflow. Structural MRI (T1w, T2w, ZTE) and CT scans were acquired and converted to NIfTI format. Only T1w and T2w images were preprocessed (voxel standardization, reslicing, SimNIBS segmentation) to ensure consistent visualization across Brainsight and k-Plan, whereas CT and ZTE volumes were kept at native resolution to avoid smoothing prior to acoustic simulations. Registered CT / Pseudo-CTs generated in BabelBrain were imported directly into k-Plan. Target planning for both platforms was performed in Brainsight. Although the beam trajectories were identical across the two platforms, k-Plan expects the trajectory to be anchored to the transducer position (t'), while BabelBrain expects the trajectory to be anchored to the brain target (t). To account for this difference, two trajectory files were created in Brainsight. First, $\vec{T}$ was created for BabelBrain, which anchors the trajectory to t. Within BabelBrain, the distance between t and the scalp (d_a) was automatically computed using the CT or the pseudoCT and the distance between the transducer exit plane and the transducer apex (d_c) was accounted for by specifying the transducer model. The coupling gel creates an additional distance (d_b) between the scalp and the transducer exit plane, and this distance was manually added in BabelBrain using the 'TPO distance' and 'Distance to Tx outplane to skin' fields. To create an equivalent trajectory $\vec{T'}$ for k-Plan in Brainsight, we add the three offsets (d_a, d_b, d_c) to the Crosshair Origin field in Brainsight to find t' for the k-Plan simulation. In k-Plan, d_a, as calculated by BabelBrain, and d_b were added to the 'Focal Distance' field. d_c is similarly accounted for in k-Plan by selecting the transducer model. Simulation outputs analyzed included max and target I_{SPPA} and I_{SPTA} and maximum change in skull temperature.

Figure 2.



Figure 2. Simulated sonication trajectories The following four trajectories targeting the ventral striatum were used in all five subjects. Illustrated example trajectories targeting the left ventral striatum from Subject 1. 3D head renderings illustrate the placement of the transducer in k-Plan (panels with blue rings) and Brainsight (panels with green rings), with the green/blue ring indicating the transducer location. For each trajectory, the accompanying 2D maps from BabelBrain display the normalized acoustic intensity along the X–Z and Y–Z planes. In each 2D map, the top black line represents the scalp, the middle black line represents the outer surface of the skull, and the bottom line represents the inferior surface of the skull. The pink shading marks the deviation of the ultrasound beam from orthogonality, approximated through a tangent to the skull's surface at the center of the ultrasound beam. A) Trajectory A was perpendicular to the midsagittal plane. B) Trajectory B was ~60 degrees from the midsagittal plane. C) Trajectory C was the most orthogonal trajectory ipsilaterally. D) Trajectory D was the most orthogonal trajectory, contralaterally – note that trajectory D provided the most orthogonal incidence angle relative to the skull for targeting the ventral striatum across all participants.

Figure 3.



Figure 3. Simulation results from k-Plan and BabelBrain varied substantially across all trajectories. Left panels: For each subject (1-5), simulation results from the four trajectories (A-D) were compared between k-Plan and BabelBrain for the nonoptimized-target, optimized-target, and max derated brain I_{SPPA}, and the max change in skull temperature (°C). The nonoptimized-target is a target that was not optimized to be at the center of the beam. The optimized-target is optimized to be near the center of the acoustic energy of the beam. The max value is the maximum I_{SPPA} in the brain. The location of the max value could differ between simulation platforms, while location of the target values was the same. The dashed red line indicates the max change in temperature safety threshold of 2°C. All trajectories were simulated at 60 W/cm^2 I_{SPPA} in water. Right panels: Percent differences between BabelBrain and k-Plan outputs are shown for each trajectory across all five subjects, with mean ± SEM overlaid. Percent difference was calculated as: $\frac{BabelBrain\ Output - k\text{-}Plan\ Output}{k\text{-}Plan\ Output} x\ 100$.

Figure 4



Figure 4. Sonication beam shape and intensity comparison across platforms. (a–b) k-Plan sonication intensity maps overlaid on the subject's T1-weighted MRI. Panel **(a)** shows absolute spatial-peak pulse-average intensity (ISPPA; W/cm²), while panel **(b)** shows intensity normalized to the peak ISPPA and expressed in decibels (dB re peak). Both maps are thresholded at −6 dB (25% of peak intensity). **(c–d)** Same as panels **(a–b)**, but for the BabelBrain sonication intensity maps. **(e)** Difference between the BabelBrain and k-Plan absolute intensity maps (BabelBrain − k-Plan). Positive (negative) values indicate regions where BabelBrain predicts higher (lower) intensity than k-Plan. **(f)** Spatial overlap of the −6 dB sonication regions from BabelBrain and k-Plan. Insets show enlarged views of the focal region near the target.

Figure 5.



Figure 5. Changing the focal distance by accounting for gel pad or water bladder affected simulation results in a non-systematic way between platforms. Left panels: simulation results at two distances from the scalp (0 mm and 10 mm) in each subject (1-5) were compared to the target and max derated I_{SPPA} in the brain, and the max change in skull temperature (°C). One of the orthogonal trajectories (C-D) was simulated in each subject with an additional 10 mm added outside of the scalp. The dashed red lines indicate a temperature rise of 2°C. Both distances were simulated at 60 W/cm^2 I_{SPPA} in water. Right panels: Absolute differences between 0 mm and 10 mm from the scalp in each platform are shown for each intensity level across all subjects, with mean ± SEM displayed.

Figure 6.



Figure 6. Comparison of CT and pseudoCT-based simulations. Left panels: Simulation outputs for five subjects (Subjects 4–8), each with both CT and ZTE images, are shown across the four sonication trajectories (A–D). For each subject, simulations were run in BabelBrain using either CT-derived or ZTE-derived (pseudoCT) skull models. Outputs include the target derated brain I_{SPPA}, target derated brain I_{SPTA}, and the maximum change in skull temperature (°C). The dashed red lines represent the safety limits of 0.72 W/cm^2 I_{SPTA} and a 2°C temperature rise. All simulations were performed at 60 W/cm² I_{SPPA} in water with the transducer positioned 10 mm from the scalp. Right panels: Percent differences between CT and pseudo-CT simulations are shown for each trajectory across all subjects, with mean ± SEM. Percent difference was calculated as: $\frac{pseudoCT\ Output - CT\ Output}{pseudoCT\ \ Output} x\ 100$.

Table 1. Comparison of simulation parameters between k-Plan and BabelBrain

Parameter	k-Plan	BabelBrain
Modeling of acoustic intensity loss due to skull properties	Does not disclose the attenuation coefficient. Implements a fixed absorption coefficient of 13.3 dB/(cm.MHz^{y}) for acoustic attenuation.	Uses a dynamic attenuation model derived from the voxel-wise Hounsfield Units (HU) of the skull mask. Assumes approximately 16% of the acoustic energy is converted to heat.
Thermal simulations inputs	Applies a uniform skull HU value of 1850 HU for all simulations.	Uses individualized voxel-based HU obtained directly from each subject's anatomical CT scan.