Abstract: The objective of impedance-cystovolumetry is the continuous, non-invasive monitoring of bladder volume. By using electrical impedance tomography, a correlation between the change of impedance in the image and bladder volume can be found. However, the typically used time-differential approach has the problem of both requiring a calibration measurement with an empty bladder and being dependent on the urine conductivity. This paper presents an improvement to the time-differential approach using multifrequency electrical impedance tomography.

1 Introduction
The continuous monitoring of the bladder volume is of great interest to patients with paraplegia as they have to empty the bladder manually using catheterization. Currently, this is done using a fixed-time scheme. To allow a demand driven catheterization, a continuous monitoring is necessary.

2 Methods
One possibility for the estimation of the bladder volume from electrical impedance tomography is the global impedance method. After reconstructing an image using the GREIT-algorithm [1], all pixel values are summed up. To retain phase information, both data acquisition and image reconstruction are performed in the complex domain. Previously it was shown, that this sum over all pixel values and the bladder volume correlate with each other [2]. However, the time-differential approach that has been used has the two problems of requiring a reference measurement with an empty bladder as well as being dependent on the urine conductivity. Thus, a frequency-differential approach is examined, where the measurements are performed nearly simultaneously using frequencies of 51.8 kHz and 100 kHz. Since the urine conductivity is not frequency dependent in our frequency range, the reconstructed impedance change in this area is zero. In contrast, the impedance of muscle or fat is frequency dependent. As a full bladder displaces more tissue than an empty one, the global change of impedance in the tomogram correlates with the bladder volume while being independent of urine conductivity.

2.1 Simulation
The simulation was performed in Matlab using the EIDORS-framework [3]. The finite element model consists of a cylinder inside of a tank with 8 electrodes. The conductivity of the environment was simulated as complex, frequency dependent muscle tissue according to the tissue database from Gabriel & Gabriel [4]. In contrast, the urine conductivity was simulated using frequency independent values in the physiological range of 12–28 mS/cm.

2.2 Measurement
The real measurement was performed using an agar-agar model inside a tank similar to the simulation. To simulate the bladder, holes were cut into the model and filled with distilled water (0 mS/cm), 0.9 % saline (approx. 16 mS/cm), and 1.8 % saline (approx. 30 mS/cm).

3 Results
To analyze the influence of urine conductivity, a calibration curve was calculated based on the data at a reference conductivity of 20 mS/cm in the simulation and 0.9 % saline in the measurement. Then, the mean of the relative error $\bar{\epsilon}$ and the standard deviation $\sigma_{e_r}$ between the data at other conductivities and the calibration curve were calculated. A comparison between the time-differential and the multifrequency approach is shown in Table 1. The simulation results show an improvement regarding the impact of urine conductivity on volume estimation as the average error decreases significantly compared to the time-differential approach. Furthermore, the standard deviation improves as well. This simulation results were verified in the agar-agar measurement.

4 Conclusion
Multifrequency impedance tomography for impedance-cystovolumetry is a very promising approach as it provides urine conductivity independent results. In addition, no empty bladder reference measurement is required taking the concept one step further towards clinical use.
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Table 1: Mean relative error $\bar{\epsilon}$ and its standard deviation $\sigma_{e_r}$ in simulation and measurement with different urine conductivities. Both in simulation and measurement the time-differential (TD) and multifrequency (MF) results are compared.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\sigma$ (mS/cm)</th>
<th>simulation</th>
<th>measurement saline conc.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TD $\bar{\epsilon}$ (%)</td>
<td>$\sigma_{e_r}$ (%)</td>
<td>MF $\bar{\epsilon}$ (%)</td>
<td>$\sigma_{e_r}$ (%)</td>
<td>TD $\bar{\epsilon}$ (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-27.46</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>-6.26</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.8 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>