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Multiscale model for VIIP research

- CNS model includes intra/extracranial cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) and cranial blood compartments
- For details on other modules, see companion works for IWS2015 by Ethier et al., Feola et al., Nelson et al., and Price et al.
CNS Blood flow and pressure model

- Several lumped CNS models exist. Our starting point was a model that had been applied to microgravity (µg) (Stevens et al., 2005; Lakin et al., 2007):
  - Time-dependent model composed of 6 fluid compartments (nodes)
    • 3 vascular:
      - Intracranial Arteries (1)
      - Capillaries (2)
      - Venous Sinous (3)
    • 2 cerebrospinal fluid
      - Ventricular CSF (4)
      - Extraventricular CSF (6)
    • 1 Brain node (5)
  - Boundary conditions at cranium and whole-body interaction provided by extracranial nodes
    • Central Arteries [A]
    • Central Veins [V]
    • Thoracic Space [Y]

Q = Flowrates between compartments (ml/min)
C = Compartment compliance

- Stevens et al. (2005)
Governing Equations

- Defining the pressures in the 6 compartments as dependent variables, the system is modeled in matrix form as a system of ordinary differential equations:

\[
C \begin{bmatrix} \frac{dP}{dt} \\ \end{bmatrix} + ZP = S
\]

Note that G is explicitly included in the forcing terms in S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>compliance</td>
<td>gravity</td>
<td>filtration coefficient</td>
<td>pressure</td>
<td>flow rate</td>
<td>source/forcing terms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- \( C \): compliance
- \( G \): gravity
- \( K \): filtration coefficient
- \( P \): pressure
- \( Q \): flow rate
- \( S \): source/forcing terms

- \( Z \): fluidity ~ 1/resistance
- \( \theta \): tilt angle
- \( \pi \): osmotic pressure
- \( \sigma \): reflection coefficient

Tabular representation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( C_{25} )</th>
<th>( -C_{25} )</th>
<th>( C_{35} )</th>
<th>( -C_{35} )</th>
<th>( dP_1/dt )</th>
<th>( Z_{A1} )</th>
<th>( Z_{A1} )</th>
<th>( P_1 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( C_{25} )</td>
<td>( -C_{25} )</td>
<td>( C_{35} )</td>
<td>( -C_{35} )</td>
<td>( dP_2/dt )</td>
<td>( Z_{23} + K_{25} )</td>
<td>( -Z_{23} )</td>
<td>( -K_{25} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_{35} )</td>
<td>( -C_{35} )</td>
<td>( C_{45} )</td>
<td>( -C_{45} )</td>
<td>( dP_3/dt )</td>
<td>( -Z_{23} )</td>
<td>( Z_{45} + Z_{46} )</td>
<td>( Z_4 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_{45} )</td>
<td>( -C_{45} )</td>
<td>( C_{56} )</td>
<td>( -C_{56} )</td>
<td>( dP_4/dt )</td>
<td>( Z_{45} )</td>
<td>( Z_{45} )</td>
<td>( Z_4 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( -C_{56} )</td>
<td>( -C_{56} )</td>
<td>( C_{66} )</td>
<td>( C_{66} )</td>
<td>( dP_5/dt )</td>
<td>( -Z_{53} )</td>
<td>( -Z_{46} )</td>
<td>( -Z_{56} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( dP_6/dt )</td>
<td>( -Z_{53} )</td>
<td>( -Z_{46} )</td>
<td>( Z_{56} + Z_{56} )</td>
<td>( Z_{64} )</td>
<td>( Z_{64} )</td>
<td>( Z_{64} )</td>
<td>( Z_{64} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( C \): compliance
\( G \): gravity
\( K \): filtration coefficient
\( P \): pressure
\( Q \): flow rate
\( S \): source/forcing terms

**Note:** The image contains a table and a system of differential equations with variables and terms explained. The table categorizes terms based on their roles in the governing equations.
MATLAB Implementation

The boundary pressure in the Central Arteries [A] node is prescribed using an oscillating pressure function $P_A(t)$ simulating the carotid pulsatile pressure wave.

At the current timestep, a unique solution for the timestep-forward pressure at every node is calculated using the Matrix inverse.

Pressures are integrated through time using an adaptive-timestep 4th and 5th order Runga-Kutta solver.

After solutions are found, pressure equations are used to calculate flow rates.

Data for pressures and flow rate at current time is stored.

Timestep is advanced.
Verification Tests

- 20 independent verification tests that included variation in hydrostatic pressure
- 3 independent users of the code

**TEST**

- Short-term head down tilt (HDT)
- Long-term HDT
- Microgravity
- Blood-brain barrier influence

Verification tests also had a validation component

- Used Lakin and Stevens equation structure and parameters, but
- Developed independent implementation, arterial pressure that drives unsteady response and solution methodology
Short-term head down tilt

• Tests called for monitoring of changes in pressure differences pre- to post-tilt:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tilt angle (°)</th>
<th>Δ(P_s-P_v) (mmHg)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Δ ICP (mmHg)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.10 to 3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-10</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.18 to 7.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion:** The current model agrees with prior experimental and numerical work.

Long-term HDT and Microgravity

Conclusion: Using their parameters, our predicted ΔICP is consistent with the prior model in μg and long-duration HDT, but are their parameters correct?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Δ ICP (mmHg)</th>
<th>Model [1]</th>
<th>Our Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term HDT</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μg</td>
<td>&lt;0</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[1] Stevens et al. (2005)
Blood-brain barrier influence

- Later work by the Stevens/Lakin team hypothesized that the blood/brain barrier might weaken in μg.
- In Lakin et al. (2007), they performed a sensitivity study for a hypothetical change in the reflection and filtration coefficients.
- This *changed their findings* on ICP in μg.

**Conclusion:** Our model agrees with literature results to within 2% or better.

Revising prior findings, authors concluded that ICP could increase in μg. But how do we assess the credibility of this claim?
Preparing for μg simulations

• Before weighing in on the potential change in ICP in μg, we need to:
  • Re-assess parameters used by Lakin/Stevens based on the most current VIIP research
  • Quantify uncertainty in model parameters
  • Define a physiological envelope for parameters that will be relevant for the astronaut corps on orbit
  • Perform sensitivity studies over a much larger parameter space
  • Examine model predictions against independent studies in HDT, μg, and postural change, particularly for chronic conditions. We need our model to do a good job in predicting:
    • Volumes of intra/extracranial CSF compartments
    • Volumes of intracranial blood compartments

• Only after these steps are taken can we make intelligent predictions about μg response
Sensitivity analysis

- We are analyzing this system by testing model sensitivity
  - Parameters include: compliances, resistances and filtration coefficients
  - Each described by statistical parameters
    - Mean and range of variation (variance)
    - Distribution of variation (density function)

- Methodology
  - Partial Rank Correlation Coefficient (PRCC) Analysis
    - Provides the linear relationships between two variables
      - one input parameter and one output parameter
    - All linear effects of other variables are removed after rank transformation
    - Rank Transformation: transforms nonlinear monotonic relations to linear
  - Latin Hypercube sampling
    - Efficient method to randomly characterize the sets of combined parameters
    - Many independent runs with randomly chosen parameter sets provide statistics on the system response
Conclusions

• A CNS lumped parameter model has been produced based on the model developed by Lakin and Stevens
  – Our solution methodology and computational platform is unique

• Our model has been tested and verified
  – ICP predictions agree with Lakin/Stevens in 20 cases of acute and chronic μg and HDT

• CNS model infrastructure is complete, but additional work is needed
  – Re-assess parameters used by Lakin/Stevens
  – Define flight and flight analog derived parameter ranges
  – Perform parameter sensitivity studies
  – Validate against the latest VIIP research

• In the future this model will be
  – integrated with lumped CVS and eye models
  – Used to establish spaceflight responses with fidelity sufficient to supply boundary conditions for more complex VIIP eye simulations.