Dynamic autoregulation of cerebral blood flow measured non-invasively with fast diffuse correlation spectroscopy
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Abstract
Cerebral autoregulation (CA) maintains cerebral blood flow (CBF) in the presence of systemic blood pressure changes. Brain injury can cause loss of CA and resulting dysregulation of CBF, and the degree of CA impairment is a functional indicator of cerebral tissue health. Here, we demonstrate a new approach to noninvasively estimate cerebral autoregulation in healthy adult volunteers. The approach employs pulsatile CBF measurements obtained using high-speed diffuse correlation spectroscopy (DCS). Rapid thigh-cuff deflation initiates a chain of responses that permits estimation of rates of dynamic autoregulation in the cerebral microvasculature. The regulation rate estimated with DCS in the microvasculature (median: 0.26 s⁻¹, inter quartile range: 0.19 s⁻¹) agrees well (R = 0.81, slope = 0.9) with regulation rates measured by transcranial Doppler ultrasound (TCD) in the proximal vasculature (median: 0.28 s⁻¹, inter quartile range: 0.10 s⁻¹). We also obtained an index of systemic autoregulation in concurrently measured scalp microvasculature. Systemic autoregulation begins later than cerebral autoregulation and exhibited a different rate (0.55 s⁻¹, inter quartile range: 0.72 s⁻¹). Our work demonstrates the potential of diffuse correlation spectroscopy for bedside monitoring of cerebral autoregulation in the microvasculature of patients with brain injury.
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Introduction
Cerebral autoregulation (CA) is a homeostatic feedback mechanism that maintains cerebral blood flow despite fluctuations in arterial blood pressure,¹ and is thought to protect the brain from hypo- and hypertension. Brain injuries, such as acute ischemic stroke, traumatic brain injury, intracerebral hemorrhage, subarachnoid hemorrhage, and diffuse hypoxic-ischemic injury may disrupt autoregulation for days to weeks. Impaired autoregulation places the brain at risk for further injury,¹⁻⁵ and the degree of CA impairment may be a predictor of functional recovery.⁹⁻¹² Further, the potential benefit of hemodynamic interventions that are frequently used to augment cerebral perfusion after acute brain injury⁶,¹³,¹⁴ may vary widely across patients due to individual differences in the degree of CA impairment.¹⁵ Disturbances in cerebral perfusion can have adverse consequences, including cerebral infarction if there is hypoperfusion and...
Further, several studies have successfully used DCS as a bedside CBF monitor in ischemic stroke and other acute brain injuries, thus suggesting that DCS measurements are well tolerated across a wide spectrum of patients.

In this study, we investigated the use of DCS to directly monitor microvascular CBF, and we characterized the rate of dynamic cerebral (and extra-cerebral) autoregulation during transient blood pressure changes. The pressure changes were induced by rapid deflation of a blood pressure cuff applied to the thigh. Thigh cuff deflation is a well-established method for producing transient changes in blood pressure and CBF; it has been used in multiple studies of CA. The DCS-based autoregulation estimates were validated by comparison with concurrent TCD measurements of blood flow velocity in proximal cerebral arteries. We also measured concurrent blood flow responses in the superficial extra-cerebral tissues of the scalp in order to characterize blood flow regulation in the systemic microcirculation. Two technological advances were critical for these measurements. First, the CBF measurement rate was increased to 20 Hz by utilizing a new software approach to measure the DCS correlation functions. Second, an optical-probe pressure-modulation algorithm was employed to distinguish CBF changes from blood flow changes in superficial extra-cerebral tissues (e.g. scalp). Together, these improvements facilitated independent monitoring of blood flow and autoregulation in both cerebral and systemic circulations simultaneously.

**Methods**

**Participants**

The study protocol was approved by the University of Pennsylvania’s Institutional Review Board, which adheres to the guidelines of the Common Rule and the United States Food and Drug Administration’s Institutional Review Board and human subject regulations; 21 healthy adult volunteers, 18 years or older, with no history of prior brain ischemia were recruited for the study. All participants provided written consent to participate in the study. We excluded subjects who were pregnant, who had a prior history of vascular risk factors (hypertension, diabetes, hyperlipidemia, coronary artery disease, atrial fibrillation, prior myocardial infarct or stroke, transient ischemic attack, or history of smoking), or who had a prior surgical procedure or traumatic brain injury or lower extremity amputation.

**Hemodynamic monitoring**

Optical CBF measurements were carried out using a custom DCS instrument. Briefly, coherent laser light
(785 nm, 80 mW, CrystaLaser Inc., Reno NV) of constant intensity was coupled out of the source using custom fiber-optic probes (Fiberoptic systems, CA), and was then directed to illuminate the subject’s forehead, bilaterally, at the temporal margin. Light transmitted through tissue was detected using the probe at 1.0 cm and 2.5 cm ‘source-detector’ separations. The detected light was directed to single photon counting detectors (SPCM-4AQC, Excelitas). Note, light detected at the 1.0 cm source-detector separation is primarily sensitive to superficial, extra-cerebral tissues (i.e. scalp), while light detected at the 2.5 cm source-detector separation probes both cerebral and extra-cerebral tissues. The detected intensity autocorrelation functions were computed using custom software at 20 Hz measurement rates. CBF was estimated by fitting the recorded autocorrelation functions to a two-layer solution of the correlation diffusion equation.

CBF velocity was monitored bilaterally using TCD. The TCD probes (Compumedics Ltd, Singen, Germany) were placed at the temporal bone windows to insonate the MCA and/or the anterior cerebral artery (ACA) in each hemisphere. Analog outputs of the TCD waveforms were digitized at 20 Hz, and simultaneously recorded with optically measured CBF. Both TCD and fiber-optic probes were held in place using a commercial headband (Diamon adjustable headframe). Blood pressure was monitored non-invasively using a finger plethysmograph device (Finometer Pro, Finapres Medical Systems, Netherlands). The ABP waveforms permitted computation of estimates for mean ABP, and heart rate; these data were digitized at 20 Hz and were recorded simultaneously with optically measured CBF and TCD blood flow velocity.

**Measurement protocols**

After obtaining informed consent, all subjects were placed supine with the head-of-bed flat, with DCS, TCD and Finapres probes attached. Large blood pressure cuffs (Zimmer Inc., Warsaw, IN) were then placed around each thigh, 10 cm above the knee (Figure 1(a)). After 5 min of baseline monitoring, both thigh cuffs were inflated to approximately 25–30 mmHg, and the thigh cuffs included a pressure modulation protocol (reduces blood flow in only the extra-cerebral tissues (i.e. scalp)). This constraint was then combined with a two-layer analysis of the intensity autocorrelation functions from both source-detector separations to derive calibration constants (which depend parametrically on tissue optical absorption and reduced scattering coefficients for the top and bottom layers which were assumed to be 0.1 and 8 cm⁻¹). These calibration constants, which include estimates for extra-cerebral layer thickness and weighting/correction factors for differential light pathlengths through the two layers, were subsequently utilized in a two-layer modified Beer–Lambert model for blood flow to derive estimates of cerebral (F_DCS) and extra-cerebral (F_{ecDCS}) blood flow.

**Estimation of rate of dynamic autoregulation**

The CBF (F_DCS) and extra-cerebral blood flow (F_{ecDCS}) measured with DCS, the mean flow velocities measured with TCD (MFVTCD), and the finger ABP waveforms (ABP) were first low pass filtered to remove/smooth beat-to-beat fluctuations. Subject-specific cut off frequencies (75% of the measured heart rate) were used in the design of these low-pass filters. The bilateral hemodynamic measurements were then averaged to produce a single set of CBF, extra-cerebral blood flow and blood flow velocity time courses for each subject. The deflation points of the individual blood pressure manipulation trials were identified from recorded cuff pressures. Approximately 20 s of data corresponding to each cuff-deflation trial were isolated (5 s pre-deflation, 15 s post-deflation). The rate of regulation (ROR) was calculated based on methods previously described by Aaslid et al. Figure 1(b) depicts the methods/calculations for converting filtered hemodynamic data into a rate of dynamic autoregulation.

First, relative changes in blood pressure and CBF were calculated for each trial, by normalizing to the pre-deflation baseline (see Figure 1(b), top). The relative changes of these variables are: \( r_{ABP} = \frac{ABP}{ABP_0} \), \( r_{CBF_{TCD}} = \frac{MFV_{TCD}}{MFV_{TCD_0}} \), and \( r_{CBF_{DSC}} = \frac{F_{DSC}}{F_{DSC_0}} \).
Here, the prefix \( r \) denotes relative measures, subscript \( C/EC \) denotes cerebral/extra-cerebral measurements, the superscripts \( DCS/TCD \) denote measurement instrument, and the subscript \( 0 \) denotes baseline values. Note, the CBF measured by TCD assumes that vessel diameters are constant. Hemodynamic measurements from each trial were averaged.

Second, the relative change in cerebrovascular resistance (\( rCVR \)) was calculated by dividing blood pressure by CBF

\[
rCVR^{TCD} = \frac{rABP}{rCBFTCD}, \quad rCVR^{DCS} = \frac{rABP}{rCBF^{DCS}}.
\]

The change of \( rCVR \) over time, after the point of deflation, provides a measure of dynamic CA. More specifically, the temporal rate of change of \( rCVR \) (i.e. \( drCVR/dt \)) was estimated from the slope of a best linear fit over the autoregulation time (see Figure 1(b), bottom). The start of the ‘Autoregulation time’ is thus defined to be the time at which \( rCVR \) is highest immediately post cuff deflation, i.e. the typical time when CBF starts to recover towards baseline. The autoregulation time period spans either \( \sim 4s \), or until \( rCVR \) reaches its minimum value, whichever time is smaller (e.g. green shaded region in Figure 1(b)).

Finally, a rate of regulation (\( ROR \)) is calculated:

\[
ROR = \frac{(drCVR/dt)}{ABP}, \quad \text{where } ABP \text{ is the maximum fractional decrease in blood pressure due to thigh cuff deflation. Note, the ROR is expressed in units of } s^{-1}; \text{ a regulation rate of } 0.2s^{-1}, \text{ for example, indicates that the resistance of cerebral microvasculature must change at a rate of } 20\% \text{ per second, in order to compensate for a } 1\% \text{ decrease in ABP.}
\]

Results

Of the 21 subjects who participated in the study, multimodal hemodynamic monitoring was only possible in 18. One subject did not tolerate thigh cuff inflation, and
Data acquisition was unsuccessful in two subjects due to a faulty optics and/or TCD probe. Further, in three subjects, the application of the pressure algorithm to isolate the CBF was unsuccessful; the applied pressure in these cases was insufficient to reduce extra-cerebral blood flow and resulted in a two-layer fitting that did not converge. Finally, in four subjects, the blood pressure did not decrease immediately following cuff deflation due to technical issues with the blood pressure cuff deflation apparatus. Therefore, data from these cases were excluded, leaving 11 subjects for the final analysis.

In three of the 11 subjects, the cuff-deflation induced blood pressure and/or blood flow change was insufficient (<5%) to reliably estimate and compare rates of dynamic autoregulation. These three cases were included for cumulative analysis (Figure 2, Table 1), but they were considered outliers in statistical analyses (Figures 3 and 4, see also Supplemental Figure 1).

The median reduction in mean ABP was 13.7% after thigh-cuff deflation. The corresponding median reduction in CBF was measured to be 9.1% with DCS and 11.2% with TCD. Median reduction in scalp blood flow was 27.7%, as measured with DCS. These results along with the inter-quartile ranges are summarized in Table 1.

Non-parametric Wilcoxon signed rank test confirmed that the decrease in CBF measured with both TCD and DCS was greater than zero (statistically significant; \( p < 0.01 \), with large effect size; \( r > 0.8 \)). Furthermore, the reduction in CBF measured with

![Figure 2. Dynamic cerebral autoregulation estimated from 11 healthy subjects with the thigh cuff method, using relative blood flows measured with transcranial Doppler ultrasound (left), cerebral blood flow with optics (middle), and extra-cerebral/scalp blood flow with optics (right). Panel in the first row shows the corresponding changes in mean arterial blood pressure. In all panels, black dashed lines at time \( t = 0 \), represents the instant of cuff deflation, while solid gray lines depict the individual measurements. Solid blue, red, and green lines are the averaged relative changes in blood pressure, blood flow and cerebrovascular resistance, respectively; 95% confidence intervals of these averages are marked by the shaded region in the corresponding color. ‘Autoregulation times’ are denoted by the red dashed vertical lines; measurements during these times were used to estimate the rate of regulation.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Median% decrease</th>
<th>Inter-quartile range (25%, 75% quartiles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean arterial pressure</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>11.1%(7.4, 18.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBF measured with TCD</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>5.7%(9.2, 14.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBF measured with DCS</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>4.4%(6.8, 11.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scalp flow measured with DCS</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>8.7%(23.0, 31.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TCD: transcranial Doppler ultrasound; DCS: diffuse correlation spectroscopy; CBF: cerebral blood flow

Table 1. Median % decreases in measured hemodynamic parameters immediately after thigh cuff deflation (\( n = 11 \)).
TCD and DCS was not statistically different from one another (Wilcoxon signed rank test, \( p = 0.16 \), small to medium effect size \( r = 0.35 \)). On average, the percent reduction in cerebral flows (for both TCD and DCS) was found to be lower than the percent reduction in scalp flow (\( p < 0.001 \), Wilcoxon rank sum test). In addition, on a paired/subject-to-subject basis, a Wilcoxon signed rank test revealed that the percent reduction in scalp flow was greater than that measured in the brain (\( p < 0.005 \); percentage reduction in scalp flow was 15% and 18% greater than the cerebral flow change measured with TCD and DCS, respectively.

Figure 2 displays a summary of dynamic CA measurements from 11 healthy subjects (including outliers). Black vertical dashed lines at time \( t = 0 \) denote the instant of thigh cuff deflation, and red vertical dashed lines denote the ‘autoregulation zone’. In each panel, the solid gray lines represent trial-averaged data from each individual subject, while the solid-color lines and the shaded-color region represent the average response from all subjects and the 95% confidence intervals, respectively, of changes in blood pressure (blue, top row), blood flow (red, middle row), and cerebrovascular resistance (green, bottom row). The left column displays changes in CBF, and corresponding changes in cerebrovascular resistance, as measured using TCD. The middle/right columns display changes in cerebral-extra-cerebral blood flow, respectively, and corresponding changes in cerebrovascular resistance, as measured by optics (DCS). The relative changes in resistance during the autoregulation period were fit to a linear equation (black solid lines in the bottom row); the slope of this fitted line was used to estimate the ROR.

Observed changes in CBF, shown in the averaged TCD and DCS-cerebral curves, are similar. CBF decreased immediately after cuff deflation, thereby triggering a near-instantaneous but small increase in cerebrovascular resistance, followed by a gradual decrease (at \( \sim 1 \) s), as well as a corresponding increase in CBF. The rates of regulation measured from the median TCD and DCS responses (i.e. from the subject averaged responses, solid green lines in Figure 2) are similar (\( R_{\text{ROR}_{\text{TCD}}} = 0.229 \pm 0.008 \) s\(^{-1}\), \( R_{\text{ROR}_{\text{DCS}}} = 0.271 \pm 0.007 \) s\(^{-1}\)), and the character of the changes in cerebrovascular resistance is consistent with that reported in previous experiments.\(^9\) By contrast, the average change in extra-cerebral scalp blood flow was greater than that in brain. Further, the resistance in the scalp blood vessels increased significantly after thigh cuff deflation and reached a peak of approximately 1.2 at \( \sim 4 \) s after thigh cuff deflation, and then it recovered back to baseline. A corresponding ROR for scalp can be estimated from the data obtained during the period where blood flow recovered to baseline; the computed ROR for the scalp, \( R_{\text{ROR}_{\text{scalp}}} = 0.492 \pm 0.029 \) s\(^{-1}\), was higher than that measured in the brain.

Figure 3 displays the cumulative results of ROR estimation (Figure 3(a)) and autoregulation start times (Figure 3(b)) for each subject, estimated from the averaged individual autoregulation responses. A median ROR for CBF was 0.262 (0.170, 0.366) s\(^{-1}\) with TCD and 0.278 (0.199, 0.300) s\(^{-1}\) with DCS; here the numbers in the parentheses refer to the lower and upper quartiles. The median RORs estimated with TCD and DCS exhibit no statistically significant difference (Wilcoxon Rank Sum test). In contrast, the median ROR estimated for extra-cerebral
(i.e. scalp) blood flow using DCS was 0.553 (0.314,1.035) s\(^{-1}\); ROR for the extra-cerebral tissue was greater than the rates of regulation for cerebral flow, estimated by both TCD and DCS (Wilcoxon Rank Sum test, \(p < 0.05\)).

Figure 3(b) similarly depicts box plots of the “autoregulation start-times” of CBF measurements with TCD and DCS, and of scalp flow measurements with DCS. With CBF derived from TCD, the median start time for autoregulation was 1.40 (1.175, 1.9) s, while the median start time was 0.95 (0.2, 2.3) s for CBF derived from DCS; here the numbers in the parentheses refer to the lower and upper quartiles. Note, the “autoregulation start-time” refers to the time of maximum cerebrovascular resistance, after which the resistance decreases to drive CBF to return to baseline. On a subject-to-subject/paired basis, the median autoregulation start times measured with DCS and TCD were found to be equivalent to each other (Wilcoxon Signed Rank test, \(p > 0.4\)). With scalp flow, the median autoregulation start time was 4.2 (3.7, 4.7) s—significantly later than CA times measured by either TCD or DCS (Wilcoxon Rank Sum test, \(p < 0.05\)).

Figure 4 shows the concordance between paired ROR measurements using TCD and DCS across subjects. The scatter plot (Figure 4 left) reveals a linear relationship between the ROR measured with TCD and DCS (\(R = 0.812\)). A linear fit (solid red line, with shaded red region indicating 95% confidence intervals) of the individual data points (blue circles, with horizontal and vertical blue lines indicating the uncertainties in the estimate of ROR as measured by TCD and DCS, respectively) confirms this relationship. A slope of 0.9 \pm 0.18 shows that the measurements are in close agreement. Here, to improve the robustness of the regression analysis, especially given the small sample size, we have forced the regression line to have zero intercept. When the regression line is not forced through the origin (see Supplemental Figure 2), the slope and intercept were estimated to be 0.54 \pm 0.38 and 0.1 \pm 0.1 s\(^{-1}\), respectively. Note, however, the regression slopes, estimated with and without the zero intercept approximation, overlap, and the estimated intercept includes the origin.

The data points in the scatter plot include measurements of error in the estimates of ROR obtained from each subject; horizontal error bars depict the uncertainty in estimates of ROR measured with TCD (\(\text{ROR}_{\text{TCD}} \pm \Delta \text{ROR}_{\text{TCD}}\)), while vertical error bars depict the uncertainty in estimates of ROR measured with DCS (\(\text{ROR}_{\text{DCS}} \pm \Delta \text{ROR}_{\text{DCS}}\)). The errors in estimates of ROR were used to calculate the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) of the respective methodologies (\(\text{SNR}_{\text{DCS}} = \frac{\text{ROR}_{\text{DCS}}}{\Delta \text{ROR}_{\text{DCS}}}\) and \(\text{SNR}_{\text{TCD}} = \frac{\text{ROR}_{\text{TCD}}}{\Delta \text{ROR}_{\text{TCD}}}\)). The average SNR for ROR measured from all subjects with TCD (\(\text{SNR}_{\text{TCD}} = 14.6\)) was observed to be twice that of the ROR measured with DCS (\(\text{SNR}_{\text{DCS}} = 7.8\)). Note that
in this context, SNR is a measure of the repeatability of the ROR estimates.

A Bland–Altman analysis (Figure 4, right) shows that the mean difference between ROR estimates from TCD and DCS-cerebral is small (absolute mean difference \(= 0.013 \, \text{s}^{-1}\)), and that all measurements fall within the 95% confidence intervals. We note that the width of the confidence interval in the Bland–Altman analysis is large compared to the mean, but less than the differences that might be expected to arise between intact and impaired autoregulation.\(^9,46\) These results confirm that cerebral rates of regulation estimated with DCS and TCD are in agreement.

**Discussion**

Several prior studies have utilized non-invasive optics and DCS to measure CBF in a variety of clinical applications.\(^{15,24,26,27,31,33,35,36,47}\) These experiments, however, for the most part measure relative changes in CBF. The present work is the first study to employ DCS to estimate changes in cerebrovascular resistance after thigh cuff deflation, and thereby measure rates of dynamic cerebral (and extra-cerebral) autoregulation at the microvascular level. The technical approach utilizes a ‘fast DCS’ blood flow monitor that permits blood flow measurements at sufficiently high measurement rates to fully resolve the blood flow pulse wave. With speeds of the DCS measurements comparable to that of TCD, it was possible to capture rapid decreases in CBF speeds of the DCS measurements comparable to that of rates to fully resolve the blood flow pulse wave. With flow measurements at sufficiently high measurement a ‘fast DCS’ blood flow monitor that permits blood flow returned to baseline faster in the brain.

Further, autoregulatory vessel dilation occurred much later in the superficial circulation and was of greater amplitude. Finally, the extra-cerebral vessels appeared to vasocostrict, as evidenced by a marked increase in vascular resistance, in response to reductions in systemic blood pressure. The mechanism(s) associated with this response are uncertain, but they could include either passive collapse, or active mechanisms to divert blood flow into the brain and other vital organs in the setting of systemic hypotension.

The characterization of systemic peripheral autoregulation and its divergence from CA is the second significant result from this study. The ability to simultaneously measure both cerebral and systemic autoregulation could have significant clinical implications, given that patients with severe neurologic injury are at high risk for confounding non-cerebral complications which may impact both systemic and cerebral perfusion (e.g. sepsis, arrhythmia, hypotension, severe hypertension). While additional studies will be required to investigate/validate the link between systemic and CA, including for example, independent measurements of systemic blood flow in the limbs, our approach has the potential to be a valuable bedside tool for managing critically ill patients with neurological injuries.

A few recent studies have utilized near infrared spectroscopy (NIRS), an alternative optical technique, to measure CA.\(^{19,48–54}\) These devices provide a measure of cerebral oxygenation in the form of a tissue oxygenation index; changes in tissue oxygenation index are then used as a surrogate for CBF changes. However, NIRS-based measurements do not directly measure CBF, and instead require several assumptions to convert changes in tissue oxygenation index to blood flow changes. First, these methods assume that oxygen extraction fractions are constant, an assumption that may breakdown in cases of cerebral pathology or task/event-related changes. Second, NIRS techniques
often use blood volume changes to measure blood flow. Unfortunately, this approach can be inaccurate because oxygenation/blood volume measurements place higher weights on venous circulation. Finally, NIRS measurements of cerebral oxygenation are sometimes susceptible to contamination from superficial tissues. Two recent studies\(^{42,55}\) have addressed some of the limitations of previous NIRS measurements, and have quantified CA with estimates of CBF derived from measurements of tissue oxygenation and a coherent hemodynamics model.\(^{56}\)

The present study is qualitatively different from this previous work in that it utilized a custom optical instrument to directly measure microvascular CBF.

Some limitations of this study and potential technical improvements must be acknowledged. Autoregulation measurements were only completed in about half of the subjects; this problem, however, was mostly due to experimental difficulties unrelated to the optical technique. In a small fraction of cases, the cuff deflation was not instantaneous, suggesting that further optimization, either in the form of automated cuff deflation, or standardization of procedures may be needed. For example, we have anecdotaly noticed that the standard practice of inflating the thigh cuff to 20–25 mmHg above systolic pressure\(^{9,22,42,46}\) may be insufficient to ensure transient cessation of blood flow to the lower extremities. Future optimizations may need to include approaches that confirm absence of arterial pulses in the legs. In a few subjects, the pressure modulation algorithm was unable to separate cerebral from scalp blood flow. This effect could be due to insufficient optical signal at the long source-detector separation, but is more likely a result of insufficient application of pressure during calibration. The two-layer DCS modified Beer–Lambert law analysis is more sensitive to measurement noise than conventional semi-infinite homogeneous methods\(^{41}\); therefore, poor signal-to-noise of measured DCS autocorrelation functions, especially in fast blood flow measurements, could affect the fidelity of the pressure calibration method.\(^{39,41}\)

Both DCS and TCD provided estimates of the rates of regulation with good SNR. Nevertheless, several strategies can be employed to reduce the uncertainty in ROR and thereby improve the overall SNR of the DCS measurements. These strategies include better fiber optic probe interfaces, optimization to reduce motion artifacts, careful application and processing of the pressure calibration method, and use of hybrid diffuse optics instruments which directly measure tissue optical properties to better constrain CBF indices measured with DCS. Technical improvements that facilitate improved detection of the optical signal (i.e. increase measured optical power/signal) could arguably have the biggest impact on the SNR of DCS ROR estimates. Higher detected intensities permit DCS CBF to be recorded at higher measurement speeds,\(^{39}\) thereby improving the frequency resolution of pulsatile CBF. In this case, smaller and faster changes in cerebral blood flow (and cerebrovascular resistance) induced by the thigh cuff can be recorded, permitting better characterization of the dynamic autoregulation response curves, and reducing errors in estimates of \(\text{dCVR/}dt\) and ROR. Of course averaging autoregulation response curves over more thigh cuff deflations will also improve the SNR of ROR estimates, although this approach may not always be practical.

In summary, our results demonstrate proof-of-concept that DCS offers a feasible approach to directly measure and monitor dynamic CBF changes noninvasively, and that CBF measured with DCS can directly characterize autoregulation in the cerebral and scalp microvasculature. A natural extension of this study would be to explore alternative methods of characterizing CA such as using spontaneous blood pressure fluctuations. Although spontaneous blood pressure changes are generally much smaller than the response to thigh cuff deflation, they can be monitored over extended periods to signal-average the data. Such an approach will be particularly useful for critically ill patients, since they may not tolerate repeated thigh cuff inflations. Future studies will also apply these methods to study CA in patients with brain injury, including stroke, where they may ultimately be used to devise more individualized care plans for blood pressure management.

**Conclusions**

Dynamic autoregulation, as induced by acute blood pressure changes, can be measured non-invasively using optical measurements of CBF with DCS. Optically measured autoregulation indices are in good agreement with TCD, while providing a method with the potential for greater spatial specificity.
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