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Rationale and Objectives: Perturbations in cerebral blood volume (CBV), blood flow (CBF), and metabolic rate of oxygen (CMRO₂) lead to associated changes in tissue concentrations of oxy- and deoxy-hemoglobin (ΔO₂ and ΔD₂), which can be measured by near-infrared spectroscopy (NIRS). A novel hemodynamic model has been introduced to relate physiological perturbations and measured quantities. We seek to use this model to determine functional traces of cbv(t) and cbf(t) – cmro₂(t) from time-varying NIRS data, and cerebrovascular physiological parameters from oscillatory NIRS data (lowercase letters denote the relative changes in CBV, CBF, and CMRO₂ with respect to baseline). Such a practical implementation of a quantitative hemodynamic model is an important step toward the clinical translation of NIRS.

Materials and Methods: In the time domain, we have simulated O(t) and D(t) traces induced by cerebral activation. In the frequency domain, we have performed a new analysis of frequency-resolved measurements of cerebral hemodynamic oscillations during a paced breathing paradigm.

Results: We have demonstrated that cbv(t) and cbf(t) – cmro₂(t) can be reliably obtained from O(t) and D(t) using the model, and that the functional NIRS signals are delayed with respect to cbf(t) – cmro₂(t) as a result of the blood transit time in the microvasculature. In the frequency domain, we have identified physiological parameters (e.g., blood transit time, cutoff frequency of autoregulation) that can be measured by frequency-resolved measurements of hemodynamic oscillations.

Conclusions: The ability to perform noninvasive measurements of cerebrovascular parameters has far-reaching clinical implications. Functional brain studies rely on measurements of CBV, CBF, and CMRO₂, whereas the diagnosis and assessment of neurovascular disorders, traumatic brain injury, and stroke would benefit from measurements of local cerebral hemodynamics and autoregulation.
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Near-infrared spectroscopy (NIRS) can assess noninvasively cerebral hemodynamics and brain function by being sensitive to cerebral concentrations of deoxyhemoglobin (D) and oxy-hemoglobin (O). Noninvasive measurements of task-related functional activity with NIRS, or fNIRS, have been reported (1–3). These hemodynamic changes result from changes in the cerebral blood volume (CBV), cerebral blood flow (CBF), and metabolic rate of oxygen (CMRO₂) as a result of brain activation and neurovascular coupling. Understanding the interplay between these physiological/functional/metabolic processes and the measured signals with functional neuroimaging techniques such as fNIRS and functional magnetic resonance imaging is the major objective of hemodynamic models (for a review, see Buxton, 2012 (4)).

A novel hemodynamic model has been recently introduced to provide an analytical tool for the study of oscillatory (frequency domain) and time-varying (time domain) hemodynamics that are measurable with NIRS (5). The model relates...
normalized perturbations in CBV, CBF, and CMRO₂ to the
dynamics of O and D concentrations in tissue. In particular,
this model treats the cerebral microvasculature in terms of three
compartments (arterial, capillary, venous) and describes the ef-
effects of changes in blood volume in all three compartments
even though the capillary contribution to blood volume
changes may be negligible), and the effects of changes in blood
flow and metabolic rate of oxygen in the capillary compartment
direct effects) and the venous compartment (indirect effects).
This novel model can be applied to measurements in the
time domain (O(t), D(t)), where hemodynamic changes are
induced over time, and in the frequency domain (via the phas-
ors O(ω), D(ω)), where induced hemodynamic oscillations
are measured as a function of the frequency of oscillation. He-
modynamic oscillations at a specific frequency can be induced by
a number of protocols including paced breathing (6), head-
up–tilting (7), squat-stand maneuvers (8), and pneumatic thigh-
cuff inflation (9), leading to a technique that we have recently
proposed, coherent hemodynamics spectroscopy (CHS) (5,10).
In this article, we use a new formulation of this hemody-
namic model by Fantini (11) to develop its practical imple-
mentation for NIRS and fNIRS measurements. In the time
domain, we show how the model can be used to translate
time traces of O(t) and D(t) into time-varying measures

**HEMODYNAMIC MODEL**

In the time domain, all of the time-dependent quantities are represented by time varying real functions. In the fre-
quency domain, all of the oscillatory quantities are repre-
dented by phasors (5). In the following sections, we discuss
how the model equations can be implemented in practice
to measure (1) the time dependence of the CBV, and a
combination of CBF and CMRO₂ associated with brain
activation (functional neuroimaging) or (2) a set of physi-
ological parameters on the basis of frequency-resolved
measurements of the amplitude and phase of hemody-
namic oscillations (CHS).

**Time domain equations**

We denote with lowercase letters the relative changes in
CBV, CBF, and CMRO₂ with respect to baseline
\( \text{cbl}(t) = \Delta \text{CBV}(t)/\text{CBV}_b \), \( \text{cbf}(t) = \Delta \text{CBF}(t)/\text{CBF}_b \),
\( \text{cmro}_2(t) = \Delta \text{CMRO}_2(t)/\text{CMRO}_2 b \), where \( \Delta \text{CBV}(t) \)
\( = \text{CBV}(t) - \text{CBV}_b \), \( \Delta \text{CBF} = \text{CBF}(t) - \text{CBF}_b \), and \( \Delta \text{CMRO}_2 \)
\( = \text{CMRO}_2(t) - \text{CMRO}_2 b \). The time-dependent expressions
for the absolute tissue concentrations of O(t), D(t), and total
hemoglobin (T(t)) are given by (11):

\[
O(t) = c\text{Hb} \left[ \frac{S^{(c)}}{C_0} \text{CBV}_0^{(c)} (1 + c\text{bvl}(t)) + <S^{(c)}> F^{(c)}\text{CBV}_0^{(c)} + \frac{S^{(c)}}{C_0} \text{CBV}_0^{(c)} (1 + c\text{bvl}(t)) \right] + \\
+ c\text{Hb} \left[ \frac{<S^{(c)}>}{S_0} - \frac{<S^{(c)}>}{S_0} (S^{(c)} - S^{(c)}) F^{(c)}\text{CBV}_0^{(c)} h^{(c)}_{\text{RC-LP}}(t) + (S^{(c)} - S^{(c)}) \text{CBV}_0^{(c)} h^{(c)}_{\text{RC-LP}}(t) \right] \ast [\text{cbf}(t) - \text{cmro}_2(t)],
\]

\[
D(t) = c\text{Hb} \left[ (1 - S^{(c)}) \text{CBV}_0^{(c)} (1 + c\text{bvl}(t)) + (1 - <S^{(c)}) F^{(c)}\text{CBV}_0^{(c)} + (1 - S^{(c)}) \text{CBV}_0^{(c)} (1 + c\text{bvl}(t)) \right] + \\
-c\text{Hb} \left[ \frac{<S^{(c)}>}{S_0} - \frac{<S^{(c)}>}{S_0} (S^{(c)} - S^{(c)}) F^{(c)}\text{CBV}_0^{(c)} h^{(c)}_{\text{RC-LP}}(t) + (S^{(c)} - S^{(c)}) \text{CBV}_0^{(c)} h^{(c)}_{\text{RC-LP}}(t) \right] \ast [\text{cbf}(t) - \text{cmro}_2(t)],
\]

\[
T(t) = c\text{Hb} \text{CBV}_b [1 + c\text{bvl}(t)].
\]

Note that the right sides of Equations (1)–(3) are given by the
sum of time-independent terms (which correspond to the base-
line values \( O_b \) in Eq. (1), \( D_b \) in Eq. (2), and \( T_b \) in Eq. (3)) and
time-dependent terms associated with \( c\text{bvl}(t) \), \( c\text{bvl}(t) \),
\( \text{cbf}(t) \), and \( \text{cmro}_2(t) \). Explicitly, the time-independent,
baseline concentrations of O, D, and T are given by:

\[
O_b = c\text{Hb} \left[ \frac{S^{(c)}}{C_0} \text{CBV}_0^{(c)} + <S^{(c)}> F^{(c)}\text{CBV}_0^{(c)} + \frac{S^{(c)}}{C_0} \text{CBV}_0^{(c)} \right],
\]

\[
D_b = c\text{Hb} \left[ (1 - S^{(c)}) \text{CBV}_0^{(c)} + (1 - <S^{(c)}) F^{(c)}\text{CBV}_0^{(c)} + \\
(1 - S^{(c)}) \text{CBV}_0^{(c)} \right].
\]

* Lowercase letters denote the relative changes in CBV, CBF, and CMRO₂ with
respect to baseline.
\[ T_0 = \text{ctHb} \text{ CBV}_0. \] (6)

In these equations, ctHb is the hemoglobin concentration in blood; \( \Phi^{(i)} \) is the Fåhræus factor (ratio of capillary-to-large vessel hematocrit); and the superscripts (a), (c), (i), and (o) for CBV and cbf indicate partial contributions from the arterial, capillary, and venous compartments, respectively, with \( \text{CBV}_0 = \text{CBV}_0^{(a)} + \text{CBV}_0^{(c)} + \text{CBV}_0^{(i)} \). The dynamic model takes into account that the arterial, capillary, and venous compartments provide individual contributions to the overall concentrations of \( O \) and \( D \). The weights of such contributions are expressed in terms of \( S^{(a)}, <S^{(c)}>, S^{(i)}, \text{CBV}_0^{(a)}, \text{CBV}_0^{(c)}, \text{CBV}_0^{(i)} \) as specified by Equations (1) and (2). Also, in Equations (1) and (2), we have set the capillary volume perturbation \( \text{cbf}^{(c)}(t) = 0 \) because a direct measurement of \( \text{cbf}(t) \) in terms of the relative change in \( T \) with respect to the baseline value \( T_0 = \text{ctHbCBV}_0 \):

\[ \text{cbf}(t) = \frac{\Delta T}{T_0}. \] (9)

The convolution operator in Equations (1) and (2) introduces a computational complication that can be addressed by Fourier transformation, which converts convolution products into regular products. By denoting the Fourier transforms with tildes and introducing the angular frequency \( \omega \), the difference of the Fourier transformed Equations (1) and (2), after normalization by dividing both equations by \( T_0 = \text{ctHbCBV}_b \), leads to the following expression for \( \text{cbf}^{(o)} - \text{cmro}_2^{(o)} \):

\[ \tilde{\text{cbf}}^{(o)}(\omega) - \tilde{\text{cmro}}_2^{(o)}(\omega) = \frac{\tilde{\Delta O^{(o)}}(\omega)}{\tilde{\text{CBV}_0}} - \left( 2 \tilde{S^{(o)}}(\omega) - 1 \right) \tilde{\text{cmr}}_2^{(o)}_0 \tilde{\text{cbf}}(\omega) - \left( 2 \tilde{S^{(o)}}(\omega) - 1 \right) \tilde{\text{cmr}}_2^{(o)}_0 \tilde{\text{cbf}}^{(o)}(\omega) \]

\[ 2 \left[ \frac{\tilde{<S^{(c)>}}(\omega)}{\tilde{S^{(o)}}(\omega)} (\tilde{<S^{(c)}>}(\omega) - \tilde{S^{(o)}}(\omega)) \text{H}_{RC-CP}^{(o)}(\omega) + \left( \tilde{S^{(o)}}(\omega) - \tilde{S^{(o)}}(\omega) \right) \text{CBV}_0^{(o)} \text{H}_{G-CP}^{(o)}(\omega) \right]. \] (10)

Measuring the Time Course of \( \text{cbf} \) and the Difference \( \text{cbf-cmro}_2 \)

In a practical implementation of this hemodynamic model in the time domain, one would like to derive the temporal dynamics of CBV, CBF, and CMRO2 from the measured time traces of the concentrations of \( O \) and \( D \). Equation (3) provides in which the complex transfer functions \( H_{RC-CP}^{(o)}(\omega) \) and \( H_{G-CP}^{(o)}(\omega) \) (which are the Fourier transforms of the corresponding impulse response functions in Eqs. (1) and (2)) are given by (5):

\[ H_{RC-CP}^{(o)}(\omega) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + (\omega \alpha)^2}} e^{-\alpha^{-1}(\omega \alpha)} \] (11)

\[ H_{G-CP}^{(o)}(\omega) = e^{-\frac{\alpha \omega}{20.28} (\omega \alpha^{3/2})^3 - e^{-0.5 (\omega \alpha^{1/2})^3}} \] (12)

To apply Equation (10) to translate NIRS measurements of \( \Delta O(t) \) and \( \Delta D(t) \) (ie, the changes with respect to the corresponding baseline values \( O_0 \) and \( D_0 \) [once they are Fourier-transformed as \( \Delta O(\omega) \) and \( \Delta D(\omega) \)]) into the difference \( \text{cbf}(t) - \text{cmro}_2(t) \) [by inverse Fourier transforming \( \text{cbf}(\omega) - \text{cmro}_2(\omega) \)], one needs to:

1. Normalize the measured changes \( \Delta O(t) \) and \( \Delta D(t) \) by the baseline total hemoglobin concentration \( T_0 \), which is also required to obtain a measure of \( \text{cbf}(t) \) via Equation (9)

2. Assume the values of the following baseline parameters: \( S^{(a)}, \alpha, t^{(c)} \) (these three parameters also determine \( <S^{(c)}> \) and \( S^{(i)} \), \( t^{(o)} \), and the blood volume ratios \( \text{CBV}_0^{(a)}/\text{CBV}_0, \Phi^{(i)} \text{CBV}_0^{(i)}/\text{CBV}_0, \), and \( \text{CBV}_0^{(o)}/\text{CBV}_0 \)

3. Estimate the dynamic relative changes in the arterial and venous blood volumes (\( \text{cbf}^{(o)} - \text{cmro}_2^{(o)} \)) in relation to the overall blood volume changes obtained from Equation (9). Because we have set \( \text{cbf}^{(c)}(t) = 0 \), the overall blood volume change can be written as follows:
cbv(t) = \frac{CBV_0^{cbv}(t)}{CBV_0} + \frac{CBV_0^{cbv}(t)}{CBV_0} \tag{13}

\begin{align*}
O(\omega) &= c t H b \left[ S^{(6)} CBV_0^{cbv}(\omega) + S^{(6)} CBV_0^{cbv}(\omega) \right] + \\
&+ c t H b \left[ \frac{<S^{(6)}>}{S^{(6)}} - \frac{<S^{(6)}> - S^{(6)}}{S^{(6)}} F^{(6)} CBV_0^{cbv}(\omega) + \left( S^{(6)} - S^{(6)} \right) CBV_0^{cbv}(\omega) \right] \left[ cbf(\omega) - cmro_2(\omega) \right], \\
D(\omega) &= c t H b \left[ \left( 1 - S^{(6)} \right) CBV_0^{cbv}(\omega) + \left( 1 - S^{(6)} \right) CBV_0^{cbv}(\omega) \right] + \\
&- c t H b \left[ \frac{<S^{(6)}>}{S^{(6)}} - \frac{<S^{(6)}> - S^{(6)}}{S^{(6)}} F^{(6)} CBV_0^{cbv}(\omega) + \left( S^{(6)} - S^{(6)} \right) CBV_0^{cbv}(\omega) \right] \left[ cbf(\omega) - cmro_2(\omega) \right], \\
T(\omega) &= c t H b \left[ \frac{CBV_0^{cbv}(\omega)}{CBV_0^{cbv}(\omega) + CBV_0^{cbv}(\omega)} \right],
\end{align*}

where \( \sigma \) is a constant such that 0\( \leq \sigma \leq 1 \). If one assumes that \( cbv^{(a)}(t) = cbv^{(d)}(t) \), then \( \sigma = CBV_0^{cbv} \left( \frac{CBV_0^{cbv}}{CBV_0^{cbv} + CBV_0^{cbv}} \right) \).

This analysis shows that it is not possible to disentangle the contributions of the arterial and venous compartments to the dynamics of the overall \( cbv(t) \) because, according to Equations (9) and (13), the change in total hemoglobin concentration (which is measured) is related to a weighted average of the blood volume perturbations in the individual compartments. Furthermore, the model shows that only the difference, \( cbf(t) - cmro_2(t) \), can be measured by NIRS. We observe that these restrictions are not specific to the model used, but are intrinsic to any technique that measures the cerebral concentrations of \( O \) and \( D \).

**Frequency Domain Equations**

In the frequency domain, the model describes sinusoidal oscillations at a given angular frequency \( \omega \). Following the convention of Fantini’s work (5), oscillatory quantities are represented by phasors that are indicated in bold type. The model expressions for \( O(\omega) \), \( D(\omega) \), \( T(\omega) \) (i.e., the phasors that describe the oscillations of \( O \), \( D \), and \( T \) concentrations) as a function of \( cbv(\omega) \), \( cbf(\omega) \), and \( cmro_2(\omega) \) (i.e., the phasors that describe the oscillations of CBV, CBF, and CMRO_2) are as follows (11):

\begin{align*}
\text{cbv}(\omega), \text{cbf}(\omega), \text{and cmro}_2(\omega) \text{ (i.e., the phasors that describe the oscillations of CBV, CBF, and CMRO}_2 \text{) are as follows (11):}
\end{align*}

because it can be directly derived by the definition given at the beginning of the Time Domain Equations section: \( \text{cbv}(t) = \Delta \text{CBV}(t)/\text{CBV}_0 \). If we proceed on the assumption that the time dependence of \( \text{cbv}^{(a)}(t) \) and \( \text{cbv}^{(d)}(t) \) is the same, then the time dependence of \( \text{cbv}(t) \) is also the same, they are all proportional to each other and one can write:

\begin{align*}
\text{cbv}^{(a)}(t) &= \sigma \frac{CBV_0}{CBV_0} \text{cbv}(t), \\
\text{cbv}^{(d)}(t) &= (1 - \sigma) \frac{CBV_0}{CBV_0} \text{cbv}(t),
\end{align*}

where \( \sigma \) is a constant such that 0\( \leq \sigma \leq 1 \). If one assumes that \( \text{cbv}^{(a)}(t) = \text{cbv}^{(d)}(t) \), then \( \sigma = CBV_0 \left( \frac{CBV_0}{CBV_0 + CBV_0} \right) \).

This analysis shows that it is not possible to disentangle the contributions of the arterial and venous compartments to the dynamics of the overall \( \text{cbv}(t) \) because, according to Equations (9) and (13), the change in total hemoglobin concentration (which is measured) is related to a weighted average of the blood volume perturbations in the individual compartments. Furthermore, the model shows that only the difference, \( \text{cbf}(t) - \text{cmro}_2(t) \), can be measured by NIRS. We observe that these restrictions are not specific to the model used, but are intrinsic to any technique that measures the cerebral concentrations of \( O \) and \( D \).

**Frequency Domain Equations**

In the frequency domain, the model describes sinusoidal oscillations at a given angular frequency \( \omega \). Following the convention of Fantini’s work (5), oscillatory quantities are represented by phasors that are indicated in bold type. The model expressions for \( O(\omega) \), \( D(\omega) \), \( T(\omega) \) (i.e., the phasors that describe the oscillations of \( O \), \( D \), and \( T \) concentrations) as a function of \( \text{cbv}(\omega) \), \( \text{cbf}(\omega) \), and \( \text{cmro}_2(\omega) \) (i.e., the phasors that describe the oscillations of CBV, CBF, and CMRO_2) are as follows (11):

\begin{align*}
\text{cbv}(\omega), \text{cbf}(\omega), \text{and cmro}_2(\omega) \text{ (i.e., the phasors that describe the oscillations of CBV, CBF, and CMRO}_2 \text{) are as follows (11):}
\end{align*}

because it can be directly derived by the definition given at the beginning of the Time Domain Equations section: \( \text{cbv}(t) = \Delta \text{CBV}(t)/\text{CBV}_0 \). If we proceed on the assumption that the time dependence of \( \text{cbv}^{(a)}(t) \) and \( \text{cbv}^{(d)}(t) \) is the same, then the time dependence of \( \text{cbv}(t) \) is also the same, they are all proportional to each other and one can write:

\begin{align*}
\text{cbv}^{(a)}(t) &= \sigma \frac{CBV_0}{CBV_0} \text{cbv}(t), \\
\text{cbv}^{(d)}(t) &= (1 - \sigma) \frac{CBV_0}{CBV_0} \text{cbv}(t),
\end{align*}

where \( \sigma \) is a constant such that 0\( \leq \sigma \leq 1 \). If one assumes that \( \text{cbv}^{(a)}(t) = \text{cbv}^{(d)}(t) \), then \( \sigma = CBV_0 \left( \frac{CBV_0}{CBV_0 + CBV_0} \right) \).

This analysis shows that it is not possible to disentangle the contributions of the arterial and venous compartments to the dynamics of the overall \( \text{cbv}(t) \) because, according to Equations (9) and (13), the change in total hemoglobin concentration (which is measured) is related to a weighted average of the blood volume perturbations in the individual compartments. Furthermore, the model shows that only the difference, \( \text{cbf}(t) - \text{cmro}_2(t) \), can be measured by NIRS. We observe that these restrictions are not specific to the model used, but are intrinsic to any technique that measures the cerebral concentrations of \( O \) and \( D \).
and \( T(t) \) of Equations (16)–(18) represent oscillations about baseline values.

**Measuring Physiological Parameters with CHS**

Fourteen physiological parameters appear in the expressions for \( O(t) \), \( D(t) \), and \( T(t) \) (Eqs. (16)–(18)), namely: chtb, \( S^\alpha(a) \), \( \ell(t) \), \( t^\alpha \), \( \text{CBV}_0 \), \( \frac{\text{F}^\alpha}{\text{CBV}}_0 \), \( \text{CBV}_0 \), \( \text{cbv}^\alpha(a) \), \( \text{cbv}^\alpha(a) \), \( \text{cmro} \), \( \alpha \text{Reg} \), \( \alpha \text{AutoReg} \), and \( k \). A new method for the assessment of cerebral hemodynamics, CHS, is based on the frequency-resolved measurement of induced hemodynamic oscillations (5) and potentially allows for the measurements of these parameters. Because it is impractical, and in some cases impossible, to control the amplitude and the phase of induced hemodynamic oscillations at different frequencies, we consider the following phasor ratios, thereby canceling unknown common amplitude or phase factors:

\[
\frac{D(t)}{O(t)} = \left[ \frac{\angle[D(t)] - \angle[O(t)]]}{|D(t)|} \right], \quad (21)
\]

\[
\frac{O(t)}{T(t)} = \left[ \frac{\angle[O(t)] - \angle[T(t)]}{|T(t)|} \right]. \quad (22)
\]

Furthermore, if the induced hemodynamic oscillations do not involve modulation of the cerebral metabolic rate of oxygen, one can assume \( \text{cmro}_2 (a) = 0 \), so that the model Equations (16)–(18), in conjunction with Equation (19), yield the following expressions for the phasor ratios of Equations (21) and (22):

\[
\frac{D(t)}{O(t)} = \left( 1 - S^\alpha \right) \frac{\text{CBV}^\alpha_0 (\text{cbv}^\alpha (a))}{\text{CBV}^\alpha_0 (\text{cbv}^\alpha (a))} + \left( 1 - S^\alpha \right) - \frac{\frac{\text{F}^\alpha}{\text{CBV}}_0 ^\alpha \text{H}^\alpha_{\text{LC-LP}} (a) + \left( S^\alpha - S^\alpha \right) \text{H}^\alpha_{\text{LC-LP}} (a)}{\frac{\text{F}^\alpha}{\text{CBV}}_0 ^\alpha \text{H}^\alpha_{\text{LC-LP}} (a) + \left( S^\alpha - S^\alpha \right) \text{H}^\alpha_{\text{LC-LP}} (a)}, \quad (23)
\]

\[
\frac{O(t)}{T(t)} = \left( S^\alpha \frac{\text{CBV}^\alpha_0 (\text{cbv}^\alpha (a))}{\text{CBV}^\alpha_0 (\text{cbv}^\alpha (a))} + S^\alpha - \frac{\left( S^\alpha - S^\alpha \right) \text{H}^\alpha_{\text{LC-LP}} (a) + \left( S^\alpha - S^\alpha \right) \text{H}^\alpha_{\text{LC-LP}} (a)}{k \text{CBV}^\alpha_0 (\text{cbv}^\alpha (a)) + 1}, \quad (24)
\]

A first observation is that, contrary to the time domain case, by taking the phasor ratios \( D / O \) and \( O / T \), we do not have access to \( \text{cbv}(a) \). In fact, the blood volume phasor \( \text{cbv}(a) \) contains an unknown frequency-dependent term related to the variability of the amplitude of the induced hemodynamic oscillations as a function of frequency, which cancels out in the ratios \( \text{cbv}^\alpha (a) / \text{cbv}^\alpha (a) \) that appear in Equations (23) and (24). Similar to the time domain case, we assume that the blood volume of the arterial and venous compartments have the same frequency dependence, and we take the phase of blood volume oscillations as the phase reference. In other words, we set \( \text{cbv}^\alpha (a) = \text{cbv}^\alpha (a) \leq 0^\circ \) and \( \text{cbv}^\alpha (a) = \text{cbv}^\alpha (a) \leq 0^\circ \), with \( \text{cbv}^\alpha (a) \neq \text{cbv}^\alpha (a) \), so that the phasor ratio \( \text{cbv}^\alpha (a) / \text{cbv}^\alpha (a) \) is replaced by the real constant \( \text{cbv}^\alpha (a) / \text{cbv}^\alpha (a) \) in Equations (23) and (24).

A second observation is that of the 14 model parameters, one (chtb) has canceled out in Equations (23) and (24), and the remaining 13 are combined in Equations (23) and (24) in a way that reduces the number of independent parameters to eight: \( S^\alpha \), \( \alpha \), \( \ell(t) \), \( \frac{\text{F}^\alpha}{\text{CBV}}_0 ^\alpha \), \( \frac{\text{CBV}^\alpha_0 (\text{cbv}^\alpha (a))}{\text{CBV}^\alpha_0 (\text{cbv}^\alpha (a))} \), \( \frac{\text{CBV}^\alpha_0 (\text{cbv}^\alpha (a))}{\text{CBV}^\alpha_0 (\text{cbv}^\alpha (a))} \), \( \alpha \text{Reg} \), \( \alpha \text{AutoReg} \), and \( k \text{CBV}^\alpha_0 (\text{cbv}^\alpha (a)) \). We will assume a value of \( \alpha = 0.8 \) seconds\(^{-1} \) on the basis of literature results (22), and we will show how this assumption influences the results presented here. The venous blood transit time \( \ell(t) \) only appears in \( H^\alpha_{G-LP} (a) \). \( \frac{\text{F}^\alpha}{\text{CBV}}_0 ^\alpha \) provides a measure of the baseline capillary to venous blood volume ratio, whereas \( \frac{\text{CBV}^\alpha_0 (\text{cbv}^\alpha (a))}{\text{CBV}^\alpha_0 (\text{cbv}^\alpha (a))} \) is the ratio of the arterial to venous blood volume oscillations. The autoregulation cutoff frequency \( \frac{\alpha \text{Reg}}{2\pi} \), which appears in \( H^\alpha_{R-H} (a) \), provides a measure of the efficiency of cerebral autoregulation (with higher values of the autoregulation cutoff frequency indicating a broader frequency range over which autoregulation is effective). Finally, the high-frequency flow-to-volume amplitude ratio \( k \) does not appear independently, but rather is coupled with the base-
hemodynamic signals measured with fNIRS to obtain measures of cbv(t), cbf(t), cmro2(t). We point out that Equations (9) and (10) show that fNIRS can lead to measures of blood volume, cbv(t), and the difference, cbf(t) – cmro2(t), not cbf(t) and cmro2(t) separately. To this aim, we have used simulated data for O(t) = 0.6 seconds. Here we have chosen the following gamma functions (26). Here we have chosen the following approximation for simulating the temporal traces of cbv(t) and cbf(t) – cmro2(t) that cause them. Recently, Fantini (11) derived the following explicit expressions for the coefficients γt and γr, under the approximation (1 – S(t)) ≜ 0:

\[
\gamma_t = \frac{1 - <S(t)>}{S(0)} \frac{F(t) \cdot \text{cbv}(t)}{\text{CBV}(0)} + (1 - S(0)) \frac{F(t) \cdot \text{cbv}(t)}{\text{CBV}(0)} + (0 - S(0)) \frac{F(t) \cdot \text{cbv}(t)}{\text{CBV}(0)}
\]

\[
\gamma_r = \left(1 - \frac{<S(t)>}{S(0)} \frac{F(t) \cdot \text{cbv}(t)}{\text{CBV}(0)} + (1 - S(0)) \frac{F(t) \cdot \text{cbv}(t)}{\text{CBV}(0)} + (0 - S(0)) \frac{F(t) \cdot \text{cbv}(t)}{\text{CBV}(0)}\right) \frac{\Delta \text{CBV}(t)}{\Delta \text{CBV}}.
\]

Using Equations (26)–(28), one can determine the cbf(t) – cmro2(t) traces derived using the steady-state approach and compare them to those derived using the hemodynamic model of Fantini.
TABLE 1. Upper and Lower Limits for the Six Fitting Parameters of the Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Lower limit</th>
<th>Upper limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( t^{(a)} ) (s)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{t}^{(a)} ) (s)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F^{(a)}_{\text{CBV}} / \text{CBV}_0^{(a)} )</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{CBV}^{(a)} / \text{CBV}_0^{(a)} )</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{AutoReg} / \text{Hz} )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{CBV}^{(a)} / \text{CBV}_0^{(a)} )</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- \( t^{(a)} \), contributions from arterial compartments; \( \bar{t}^{(a)} \), contributions from capillary compartments; \( \text{CBV}^{(a)} / \text{CBV}_0^{(a)} \), contributions from venous compartments; \( \text{AutoReg} / \text{Hz} \), cutoff frequency of autoregulation.

**Frequency Domain**

The goal of this work for the frequency domain is to demonstrate in practical terms how the novel hemodynamic model introduced by Fantini (5) can be applied to frequency-resolved measurements of induced hemodynamic oscillations to determine the following independent combinations of model parameters: \( t^{(a)} \), \( \bar{t}^{(a)} \), \( F^{(a)}_{\text{CBV}} / \text{CBV}_0^{(a)} \), \( \text{CBV}^{(a)} / \text{CBV}_0^{(a)} \), \( \text{AutoReg} / \text{Hz} \), and \( \text{CBV}^{(a)} / \text{CBV}_0^{(a)} \), after having assumed specific values for \( S^{(a)} = 0.98 \) (the arterial saturation) and \( \alpha = 0.8 \) seconds\(^{-1} \) (the rate constant for oxygen diffusion from the capillary to tissue). The methods of obtaining such frequency resolved spectra (CHS) has been described previously (5,10). Here we perform a new analysis of previously collected paced breathing data, which we are analyzing with \( (5,10) \). Here we perform a new analysis of previously resolved spectra (CHS) has been described previously.

Subjects were asked to perform paced breathing, guided by a metronome. Five subjects performed paced breathing at 11 frequencies (0.071, 0.077, 0.083, 0.091, 0.100, 0.111, 0.125, 0.143, 0.167, 0.200, and 0.250 Hz). Six subjects performed paced breathing at four frequencies (0.071, 0.100, 0.167, and 0.250 Hz). After slow temporal drifts were removed from the data, band-pass filtering was performed around each paced breathing frequency. Based on phasor analysis and using this band-pass filtered data, we could obtain \( |D|/|O|, |O|/|T|, \arg(D) - \arg(O), \) and \( \arg(O) - \arg(T) \) for each paced breathing frequency (with \( \arg \) describing the angle). For the purpose of this work, we have calculated the average and standard error of the data collected in all 11 subjects. The experimental protocol was approved by the institutional review board, and written informed consent was obtained from all participants before the study.

After setting \( S^{(a)} = 0.98 \) and \( \alpha = 0.8 \) seconds\(^{-1} \), we are left with six unknown parameters \( t^{(a)} \), \( \bar{t}^{(a)} \), \( F^{(a)}_{\text{CBV}} / \text{CBV}_0^{(a)} \), \( \text{CBV}^{(a)} / \text{CBV}_0^{(a)} \), \( \text{AutoReg} / (2\pi) \), and \( \text{CBV}^{(a)} / \text{CBV}_0^{(a)} \). Those parameters can be determined by fitting experimental data with the model (Eqs. (23) and (24)). We have used a built-in fitting procedure in MATLAB (function “lsqcurvefit”) with the default reconstruction algorithm, which is a trust region reflective algorithm. This algorithm allows one to carry out a reconstruction of the six unknowns by searching within a bounded region of the six parameters’ space. The fitting procedure considers as known or input values the four parameters \( |D|/|O|, |O|/|T|, \arg(D) - \arg(O), \) and \( \arg(O) - \arg(T) \) (measured at multiple frequencies) and finds the optimal set of the six unknown parameters by minimizing a cost function (\( \chi^2 \)) that is the sum of the residuals squared. The phase differences were expressed in radians, so that the four different input quantities were of the same order of magnitude. For the fitting procedure, we have set upper and lower limits on the parameters as summarized in Table 1. The lower and upper limits were based on physiological ranges for these parameters. The limits for \( j^{(a)} \) (0.4–1.4 seconds) were set by requiring that the venous saturation be bound between 32 and 71%. The limits for \( k^{(a)} \) correspond to a range of venule lengths of 1 to 3 mm assuming a typical speed of blood flow in venules of 1 mm/s (43). The limits of (0.8–2.4) for the capillary to venous blood volume times the Fähraeus factor (set to 0.8) correspond to the reported range of ~0.3–0.65 for the capillary to total blood volume over cortical depths of 0–2.5 mm (44) after assuming that overall arteriole and venule blood volumes are the same.

This latter assumption also results in the limits for \( \text{CBV}_0^{(a)} / \text{CBV}_0^{(a)} \) (0.2–5) by allowing for a range of scenarios between the extreme cases of arterial-dominated (value of 5) and venous-dominated (value of 0.2) blood volume changes. The limits for the autoregulation cutoff frequency (\( \text{AutoReg} / (2\pi) \)) reflect the full range between a lack of autoregulation (0 Hz) and normal autoregulation (0.15 Hz) (19). Finally, the limits for \( \text{CBV}_0^{(a)} / \text{CBV}_0^{(a)} \) (0.4–1.6) result from a reported range for \( k \) (the inverse of the Grubb’s exponent) of 2 to 5 (45–48) and from the range of venous-to-total blood volume ratio (0.2–0.35) obtained from the capillary to total blood volume ratio (0.3–0.65) in the human brain cortex (44) under the assumption that \( \text{CBV}_0^{(a)} / \text{CBV}_0^{(a)} = \text{CBV}_0^{(a)} / \text{CBV}_0^{(a)} \). We have used 54 different sets of initial guesses for the six unknown parameters, which were evenly spread out throughout the range of upper and lower bounds of the parameters. For each initial guess, the solution of the six parameters and the corresponding \( \chi^2 \) value was stored for further analysis of the obtained solutions.
RESULTS

Time Domain Results for cbv(t) and cbf(t)–cmro2(t)

To obtain the cbv(t) traces, Equation (9) was applied and \( \Delta T(t) \) was obtained from the sum of \( \Delta O(t) \) and \( \Delta D(t) \) (Figure 1a). The corresponding time traces can be seen in Figure 1b (dashed line). To obtain the cbf(t)–cmro2(t) traces, \( \Delta O(t) \) and \( \Delta D(t) \) were first normalized to the baseline total hemoglobin \( T_0 = 55 \mu M \) (Figure 1a). Then, we set the model parameters to typical values obtained from the literature (5). Those values are \( S^{(1)} = 0.98 \), \( \alpha = 0.8 \) seconds\(^{-1} \), \( t^{(1)} = 2s \), \( F^{(1)} = 0.8 \frac{\text{CBV}^{(1)}}{\text{CBV}_0^{(1)}} = 1 \), and \( \frac{\text{CBV}^{(2)}}{\text{CBV}_0^{(2)}} = 0.65 \). Because the baseline tissue saturation was set to \( S_0 = 65\% \) and the relative arterial, capillary, and venous blood volumes were set to the values reported previously, the transit time in the capillaries could be calculated as \( t^{(2)} = 1.23s \) from the following equation that expresses the tissue saturation as a weighted average of the arterial, capillary, and venous saturation:

\[
S_b = \frac{S^{(1)}\text{CBV}_a^{(0)} + S^{(1)}\exp(-\alpha t^{(1)})\text{CBV}_c^{(0)} + S^{(2)}\exp(-\alpha t^{(2)})\text{CBV}_v^{(2)}}{\text{CBV}_0^{(2)}}.
\]  

(29)

Furthermore, we assumed the arterial and venous volume perturbations to have the same magnitude and time dependence (ie, \( \text{cbv}^{(0)}(t) = \text{cbv}^{(1)}(t) \) or \( \sigma = \text{CBV}_0^{(1)}/(\text{CBV}_0^{(2)} + \text{CBV}_0^{(2)}) \) using the notation of Equations (14) and (15)). Taking the fast Fourier transform (FFT) of \( \Delta O(t) \) and \( \Delta D(t) \), we found cbf(\( \omega \))–cmro2(\( \omega \)) from Equation (10), and by applying an inverse FFT (FFT\(^{-1} \)), we found cbf(t)–cmro2(t) as shown in Figure 1b.

The determination of cbv(t) is model-independent and only depends on \( \Delta T(t) \) and \( T_0 \) as shown by Equation (9). To determine the sensitivity of the derived trace of cbf(t)–cmro2(t) on the assumed values for the model parameters, we have considered multiple values of the input parameters. First, the sensitivity to the capillary transit time, \( t^{(1)} \), was evaluated (Figure 2a). Keeping all other parameters fixed to the values used to generate Figure 1, we assumed a range of the tissue saturation \( S_b \) from 75 to 55\%, which correspond, according to Equation (29), to a range for \( t^{(1)} \) of 0.8 to 1.8 seconds. The associated variability in the derived traces of cbf(t)–cmro2(t) can be seen in Figure 2a (solid light gray lines). The magnitude of cbf(t)–cmro2(t) ranges from 0.07 for \( t^{(1)} = 1.8s \) to 0.11 for \( t^{(1)} = 0.8s \). The steady-state solution of cbf(t)–cmro2(t) was also determined by using Equations (26)–(28) with the traces of \( \Delta O(t) \) and \( \Delta D(t) \). In comparison to the dynamic model, the steady-state solutions (dashed black lines) show the same magnitude change, with \( \gamma \), varying between 0.86 and 0.99 and \( \gamma \), varying between 0.86 and 1.04. In addition, the peak time for cbf(t)–cmro2(t) differs between the dynamic model prediction and the steady-state solutions as seen in the inset of Figure 2a. By definition, the steady-state prediction shows a peak time coincident with the peak times of \( \Delta O(t) \) and \( \Delta D(t) \). The dynamic model, however, predicts an earlier rising of cbf(t)–cmro2(t) in comparison to \( \Delta O(t) \) and \( \Delta D(t) \), with peak times preceding the hemoglobin signals by 0.9 seconds for \( t^{(1)} = 0.8s \) and 1.2 seconds for \( t^{(1)} = 1.8s \). This temporal lead of the physiological changes (cbf(t)–cmro2(t)) with respect to the measured signals \( \Delta O(t) \) and \( \Delta D(t) \) is the result of the blood transit time in the microvasculature.

We have set \( \alpha = 0.8 \) seconds\(^{-1} \). The rate constant of oxygen diffusion can be estimated by \( \alpha = D/d^2 \), where \( D \) is the diffusion coefficient of oxygen in tissue and \( d \) is the intercapillary distance. For the oxygen diffusion coefficient \( D \), literature values of \( 1.7 \times 10^{-5} \) to \( 2 \times 10^{-5} \) cm\(^2\)/s have been reported for brain tissue (22,49,50). Values of \( 40–60 \) \( \mu m \) have been reported for the intercapillary distance \( d \) in the rat brain and
TABLE 2. Results of the Fitting Procedure for the Six Parameters of the Model, Reported in Terms of Their Mean Value and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Mean ± SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( t^0 ) (s)</td>
<td>0.92 ± 0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \gamma^0 )</td>
<td>1.29 ± 0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F^{cbv0} )</td>
<td>1.08 ± 0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( CBV^{cbv0} )</td>
<td>2.95 ± 0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta O )</td>
<td>0.035 ± 0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \alpha_{tot} )</td>
<td>0.59 ± 0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( r^0 \), contributions from arterial compartments; \( s^0 \), contributions from capillary compartments; \( CBV \), cerebral blood volume; \( cbv \), relative change in \( CBV \) with respect to baseline; \( \kappa \), inverse of the modified Grubb exponent; \( \gamma^0 \), capillary blood transit time in seconds (s); \( t \), time; \( \alpha \), contributions from venous compartments; \( \alpha_{tot} \), cutoff frequency of autoregulation.

Figure 3. Experimental results of frequency-resolved measurements of cerebral hemodynamic oscillations during a paced breathing protocol in human subjects. (a) Phase difference between phasors \( O \) and \( T \), \( \arg(O) - \arg(T) \); (b) amplitude ratio \( O/|T| \); (c) phase difference between \( D \) and \( O \), \( \arg(D) - \arg(O) \); and (d) amplitude ratio \( D/|O| \). The symbols and error bars were obtained by averaging the data over the 11 subjects and taking the standard errors. A set of spectra corresponding to a range of \( \chi^2 \) values corresponding to model results that fall within the data error bars is shown (shaded areas).

Frequency Domain Results

Figure 3 shows the experimental results of the average data set from 11 paced breathing subjects, with the data points being the mean values of the data collected on the 11 subjects and the error bars showing the standard error. Launching 54 initial guesses for the six parameters of the fitting procedure, we found 54 times the same final values with the same

human gray matter (51–53). These reported measured ranges for \( D \) and \( d \) lead to a range of possible oxygen diffusion rate constants \( \alpha \) of 0.4 to 1.2 seconds\(^{-1}\). We have evaluated the influence of \( \alpha \) by keeping the baseline tissue saturation \( S_0 \) constant at 65%. Based on Equation (29), the capillary transit time for a given \( \alpha \) was calculated and the corresponding \( cbf(t) - cmro_2(t) \) traces were obtained (data not shown). We found that the magnitude of \( cbf(t) - cmro_2(t) \) was independent of the value of \( \alpha \), provided that the product \( \alpha t^0 \) is kept constant. However, the peak time of \( cbf(t) - cmro_2(t) \) varied by 400 ms because of the variability in \( t^0 \).

The effect of changing the venous transit time \( t^0 \) between 1 and 3 seconds can be seen in Figure 2b, where again we kept constant all other model parameters and the baseline tissue saturation, which was set to \( S_0 = 65\% \). A change in magnitude as well as in peak time of \( cbf(t) - cmro_2(t) \) can be seen. However, the effect of changing \( t^0 \) is negligible in comparison to the effect of \( \gamma_t \). For the steady-state solutions, we found \( \gamma_t = 0.93 \) and \( \gamma_t = 0.96 \). According to the dynamic model, changing the capillary-to-total blood volume ratio, \( \frac{cbv^{cbv0}}{CBV^{cbv0}} \), between 0.3 and 0.65, we observe a magnitude change between 0.08 and 0.09 and a change in peak time that precedes by 0.9 to 1.3 s the peak time of \( \Delta O(t) \) and \( \Delta D(t) \) as seen in Figure 2c. Again, the steady-state solutions show comparable magnitudes, with \( \gamma_t \) within the range 0.93–0.97 and \( \gamma_t \) within the range 0.96–0.99. Last, changing the arteriovenous blood volume ratio, \( \frac{CBV^{cbv0}}{CBV^{cbv0}} \), between 0.8 and 1.2 did not result in a magnitude change in the dynamic model determination of \( cbf(t) - cmro_2(t) \), as seen in Figure 2d. The peak times were only slightly affected, ranging from 0.97 to 1.05 seconds. Also in this case, the steady-state solutions show a comparable magnitude, with \( \gamma_t \) within the range 0.93–0.94 and \( \gamma_t \) within the range 0.91–1.02.
minimum $\chi^2$ value. Those parameter values were: $t^{(0)} = 1.19$ seconds, $\rho^{(0)} = 1$ s, $F^{(0)}(\text{CBV}) \over \text{CBV}_0 = 1$, $(\text{CBV})^{(0),\text{cbf}} \over \text{CBV}^{(0)} = 4.14$, $\omega^{(\text{AutoReg})} \over (2\pi) = 0.04$ Hz, and $K^{(0)} \over \text{CBV}_0^2 = 0.47$. However, although the solution with the smallest $\chi^2$ value is a robust solution in terms of independence of the initial guess, there are other solutions with marginally larger $\chi^2$ values that also result in good fits to the data. Because the fitting procedure used did not provide errors of the solutions and did not take the standard error of the experimental data into account, we included a number of solutions for each parameter corresponding to a range of $\chi^2$ values, with the criteria being that the fit for $\mathbf{D}/|\mathbf{O}|$, $|\mathbf{O}|/|\mathbf{T}|$, $\arg(\mathbf{D}) - \arg(\mathbf{O})$, and $\arg(\mathbf{O}) - \arg(\mathbf{T})$ goes through all the experimental data points and their error bars.

The shaded area in Figure 3 contains all the spectra for $\mathbf{D}/|\mathbf{O}|$, $|\mathbf{O}|/|\mathbf{T}|$, $\arg(\mathbf{D}) - \arg(\mathbf{O})$, and $\arg(\mathbf{O}) - \arg(\mathbf{T})$ for a set of solutions for the six parameters that results in $\chi^2$ values that are within a range of 0.02 (the minimum $\chi^2$) to 0.15. The solutions for the data set shown in Figure 3 are summarized in Table 2, where we report the mean value and standard deviation of the set of acceptable values for each parameter. The cutoff frequency, $\omega^{(\text{AutoReg})} \over (2\pi)$, which provides a measure of the efficiency of cerebral autoregulation, shows the smallest relative standard deviation (5.7%) of all six parameters.

As in the time domain, we kept $\alpha = 0.8$ s$^{-1}$. However, as discussed previously, $\alpha$ may vary between $\sim 0.4$ and 1.2 s$^{-1}$. We evaluated the dependence of the frequency domain results on $\alpha$ by making it an independent parameter in the fit (data not shown). It was found that the mean values of the six parameters stay within one standard deviation of the mean values reported in Table 2, further validating the assumption of keeping $\alpha$ constant.

**DISCUSSION**

In the time domain, we have used simulated data for $\Delta \mathbf{O}(t)$ and $\Delta \mathbf{D}(t)$ and shown how the novel hemodynamic model by Fantini (5,11) can be used to obtain traces of $\text{cbf}(t) - \text{cmro}_2(t)$, in addition to the cbv$(t)$ trace directly derived from $\Delta \mathbf{T}(t)$. The temporal traces of cbv$(t)$ and $\text{cbf}(t) - \text{cmro}_2(t)$ are descriptive of the underlying physiology of cerebral activation, so that they can be used to investigate the processes associated with brain activity or to detect and assess neurovascular deficits. We have shown that the obtained traces are robust in terms of magnitude and temporal shift for varying $t^{(0)}$, $\over \text{CBV}$, and $\over \text{CBV}$, with the magnitude change being between 0.08 and 0.09, which is a variability of 10%. For those three parameters of the model, we have found that the time of the peak was also shifted with a variability of $\sim 500$ ms. The one parameter of the model that resulted in a large variability of $\text{cbf}(t) - \text{cmro}_2(t)$ magnitude was the capillary transit time $t^{(0)}$, in which the magnitude showed a variability of 50%. However, the $t^{(0)}$ range considered here corresponds to a wide range in the tissue saturation $S_0$ of 55 to 75%. A measurement of $S_0$, as opposed to an assumption based on literature values, can provide a more precise estimate and a smaller uncertainty in the magnitude of $\text{cbf}(t) - \text{cmro}_2(t)$. For example, a range of 62 to 68% for $S_0$ corresponds to a magnitude variability for $\text{cbf}(t) - \text{cmro}_2(t)$ of 15%. As a result, by assuming typical values for the model parameters and by refining these assumptions by appropriate baseline measurements, the model yields reliable traces for the temporal evolutions of cbv$(t)$ and $\text{cbf}(t) - \text{cmro}_2(t)$.

We have assumed the baseline total hemoglobin concentration, $T_0$, to be known. From this, we were able to derive time-dependent traces for volume changes, cbv$(t)$, as shown in Figure 1b. If however, $T_0$ is not known while assuming the other model parameters to be known, and we allow a range of values of $T_0$ from 42 to 79 $\mu$M, the magnitude of cbv$(t)$ will vary between 0.05 and 0.09. The corresponding magnitude change in $\text{cbf}(t) - \text{cmro}_2(t)$ would show a variability from 0.06 to 0.11. As pointed out for $S_0$, this variability can be drastically reduced if absolute values of $T_0$ are known.

We have further evaluated the dependence on $\alpha$, where we found that the magnitude of $\text{cbf}(t) - \text{cmro}_2(t)$ is only dependent on the product $\alpha t^{(0)}$, which is fixed when keeping the baseline tissue saturation constant at $S_0 = 65\%$. However, as seen in Equation (29), $S_0$ depends on the relative volumes of the three vascular compartments, which are typically not known. Alternatively, instead of setting the constraint on $S_0$, one could set a constrain on the venous saturation, which does not depend on the blood volume fractions being given by $S^{(0)} = S^{(0)} e^{-at^{(0)}}$ (18).

Because of the dynamic nature of the novel hemodynamic model, we were able to report $\text{cbf}(t) - \text{cmro}_2(t)$ time traces, which showed an earlier rising and peak time than the steady-state version reported in the literature (41,42). Also, Fantini (11) reported analytical expressions for the empirical constants $\gamma_c$ and $\gamma_t$, which we have used here, allowing us to have access to those values. We found both $\gamma_c$ and $\gamma_t$ to be $\sim 1$, which falls within typical literature values, with 0.75 to 1.25 being reported to be a plausible physiological range (42).

For the frequency domain part of the model, we have used experimental data from a paced breathing paradigm designed to induce hemodynamic oscillations, described by phasors $\mathbf{O}$ and $\mathbf{D}$, at multiple frequencies. Using a fitting procedure, the new hemodynamic model yielded the values of six physiological parameters that are related to the cerebral hemodynamics in the microvasculature. The first two parameters—$t^{(0)}$ and $t^{(0)}$—provide a measure of the blood transit time in the capillary bed and in the venous compartment that lies within the optically probed volume. These are the two parameters that determine, according to this new model, the delay (in the time domain) or the phase lag (in the frequency domain) between the hemoglobin concentration changes measured with NIRS and the underlying CBF and CMRO$_2$ changes. The
model does not allow for a complete determination of the relative arterial, capillary, and venous blood volume, but it yields the ratio of the capillary to venous blood volume (where the capillary blood volume contains the Fahraeus factor: $F^{(c)} = \frac{CBV^{(c)}}{CBV^{(v)}}$). The ratio between the magnitudes of the arterial and venous blood volume oscillations—

$$\frac{CBV^{(a)}}{CBV^{(v)}}$$

—contains the ratio of arterial to venous blood volume, which is expected to be close to 1 in the microvascular context (because of the symmetrical architecture of the arteriolar and venular branches) but may deviate from 1 in the presence of larger arterial or venous vessels within the tissue volume probed by NIRS. The autoregulation cutoff frequency ($\omega_{\text{AutoReg}}/(2\pi)$) was found to be robustly determined by fitting the measured CHS spectra with the new model. However, it is important to point out that it is not defined in terms of systemic arterial blood pressure and global cerebral blood flow as typically done in the literature (19,54). By contrast, cerebral autoregulation is defined here in terms of the local cerebral blood flow and the microvascular blood volume as described by Equation (19). This accounts for a specific physiological meaning of the autoregulation cutoff frequency as defined here, and more work is needed to fully characterize its information content and its meaning in relation to the conventional definition of cerebral autoregulation. The asymptotic blood flow to volume ratio ($k$) (i.e., the ratio between changes in blood flow and changes in blood volume in the absence of autoregulation) cannot be measured by the approach presented here, unless an assumption is made on the venous to total blood volume ratio because it appears in the parameter $\kappa CBV^{(c)}/CBV_0$. These six physiological parameters have a diagnostic potential for any neurovascular disorder or brain damage that impact the cerebral hemodynamics and microvascular integrity. Recently, we have demonstrated the clinical applicability of CHS to patients in the hemodialysis unit, for whom we found a significantly slower cerebral microvascular blood flow with respect to a group of healthy controls (55).

Similar to the time domain case, we have set $\alpha = 0.8 \text{ s}^{-1}$. We have found that by considering $\alpha$ as a variable parameter and fitting for $\alpha$ does not change the results for the other six parameters, confirming that the reported solutions are insensitive to $\alpha$. This insensitivity results from the fact that only the ratios of the hemodynamic signals are considered. Because, as shown in the time domain, $\alpha$ together with $t^*$ determine a magnitude change in the data, the effect is canceled out by taking the ratios of $|D|/|O|$, $|O|/|T|$. This lack of sensitivity to absolute changes in $D$ and $O$ makes the fitting procedure robust for determining the other six parameters of the model.

**CONCLUSIONS**

We have demonstrated how the novel dynamic hemodynamic model by Fantini (11) can be applied to analyze NIRS measurements of time-varying hemodynamics (time domain) and frequency-dependent hemodynamic oscillations (frequency domain). In the time domain, the model can be used to convert measured $O(t)$ and $D(t)$ traces into $\text{cbf}(t) - \text{cmro}_2(t)$ traces. We have shown that the magnitude of $\text{cbf}(t) - \text{cmro}_2(t)$ is relatively insensitive to the model parameters if the absolute values of baseline total hemoglobin concentration ($T_0$) and tissue saturation ($S_0$) are known. It is inherent to fNIRS data that $\text{cbf}(t)$ and $\text{cmro}_2(t)$ cannot be accessed independently. If, however, an independent measurement of $\text{cbf}(t)$ is available, a decoupling of $\text{cbf}(t)$ and $\text{cmro}_2(t)$ is, of course, possible. In the frequency domain, the model has led to the novel CHS method, which is based on measurements of induced hemodynamic oscillations at multiple frequencies as described by phasors $O(\omega)$ and $D(\omega)$. Here, the model can be used to derive the blood transit time in capillaries and venules, the cutoff frequency for cerebral autoregulation, and measures of capillary-to-venous blood volume ratio and arterial-to-venous blood volume changes.

This formulation of the new hemodynamic model results in a practical analytical tool that can find broad applicability in the study of functional brain activation and cerebral hemodynamic assessment with NIRS. In particular, measurements of cerebral blood volume, blood flow, and metabolic rate of oxygen are of paramount importance in studies of brain activation and neurovascular coupling. The quantitative assessment of brain microvascular hemodynamics, cerebral autoregulation, and cerebrovascular reactivity can have far-reaching implications in the diagnosis and assessment of a variety of neurovascular disorders, traumatic brain injury, and stroke.
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