# Sound radiation of 3M H z driven gas bubbles

Siegfried G rossmann, Sascha H ilgenfeldt, D etlef Lohse Fachbereich Physik der Universitat M arburg, Renthof 6, 35032 M arburg, G erm any

M ichael Zom ack

Schering AG, C linical D evelopm ent, M ullerstr. 178, 13342 Berlin, G erm any (February 10, 2022)

The sound radiation of 3M Hz acoustically driven air bubbles in liquid is analysed with respect to possible applications in second harmonic ultrasound diagnostics devices, which have recently come into clinical use. In the forcing pressure amplitude  $P_a = 1$  10 atm and am bient radius  $R_0 = 0.5$  5 m parameter dom ain a narrow regime around the resonance radius R<sub>0</sub> 1 1:5 m and relatively modest 2 2:5 atm is identied in which optimal sound yield in the second Ρa harm onic is achieved while maintaining spherical stability of the bubble. For smaller P<sub>a</sub> and larger R<sub>0</sub> hardly any sound is radiated; for larger P<sub>a</sub> bubbles becom e unstable tow ards non-spherical shape oscillations of their surface. The computation of these instabilities is essential for the evaluation of the optim alparam eter regim e. A region of slightly sm aller  $R_0$  and  $P_a$ 1 3 atm is best suited to achieve large ratios of the second harm onic to the fundam ental intensity. Spherical stability is guaranteed in the suggested regim es for liquids with an enhanced viscosity com pared to water, such as blood.

### I. IN TRODUCTION

M icrobubbles, i.e., gas bubbles of a few m diam eter, have long been known to be very e ective scatterers of ultrasound (cf. e.g. [1]). Their scattering cross sections for M H z sound waves can be m one than two orders of magnitude greater than their geom etrical cross sections [2]. In the last decade, the concept of exploiting this property to perform re ned ultrasound diagnostics with gas bubbles as echo contrast enhancers has enjoyed increasing attention [3]. The general idea of this technique is to inject a microbubble suspension into a vein and to study the blood ow by detecting the bubbles' sound echo reaction to an applied acoustical eld. This leads to ultrasound im ages of higher contrast and quality as com pared to conventional diagnostic techniques using only the ultrasound backscatter from the tissue itself.

The quality of an ultrasonogram mainly depends on its spatial resolution and its signal intensity, more speci cally, on the ratio of signal intensities from \desired" echoes (such as the blood ow in bubble diagnostics) to \background noise" re ections (from surrounding tissue). Spatial resolution is, of course, limited by the wavelength of the ultrasound. But as the absorption of sound in tissue increases exponentially with frequency [4,5], frequencies below 10M Hz are used in most clinical applications. As a typical value, we will choose an ultrasound driving frequency of  $!_d=2 = 3M Hz$  throughout this work.

In doing diagnostics with bubble suspensions, it is desirable to improve the signal to noise ratio. Namely, when detecting the emitted sound from the bubble at the driving frequency 3M Hz, the signal is obscured by the driving and its re ections from tissue. To improve the signal quality, it has recently been proposed [6,7] to detect higher harm onics of the driving frequency in the sound emission spectrum of the bubble. In view of the aforem entioned strong dam ping of higher frequencies, the lowest (second) harmonic at 6MHz is of particular interest. It can be selectively excited if the parameters are chosen appropriately. We expect that soft tissue, driven into the regime of nonlinear response by the strong driving, will also reject part of the sound in higher harm onics. A lso, the large amplitude driving signal itself will undergo nonlinear distortion, generating higher harm onic frequency components [8]. As in the case of the conventional method, it may therefore be necessary to focus on the di erence between the rejected signal with and without injected microbubbles. However, by choosing the proper size of the bubbles and the proper forcing pressure amplitude, it is possible to enhance the bubbles' rejection signal in higher harm onics. The main focus of this paper is to suggest a parameter regime well suited for such an endeavor.

Experimental and theoretical research on bubble dynamics has received considerable attention since the discovery of single bubble sonolum inescence by G aitan in 1990 (cf. [9]) and the detailed experiments by the Putterm an group at UCLA  $[10\{12]$ . In those experim ents single m icrobubbles are driven with a frequency of 30 kH z and with a pressure amplitude of  $P_a = 1:1$ 1:5 atm . Under very special conditions on experim ental param eters such as the gas concentration in the liquid and the pressure amplitude, the emission of short light pulses (once per driving period) from the center of the bubble is observed. These experiments stimulated us to perform a series of studies on bubble stability [13{18]. Three types of instability mechanisms seem to be in portant: Spherical instability, di usive instability, and chem ical instability. All of these studies are based on a Rayleigh-Plesset-like (RP) equation which provides an accurate description of the bubble wall dynam ics even for strongly nonlinear oscillations. Excellent agreement with the experiments was obtained, encouraging us to rely on the RP equation also for m icrobubbles driven at 3M Hz. W e will give an overview on RP dynamics in section II. Section III shows results of calculated sound intensities em itted into the whole spectrum as well as at the fundam ental and second harm onic frequencies. Of the instability mechanisms mentioned above, only shape instabilities are important here. They will be treated in section IV and reveal im portant restrictions on useful values of driving pressure am plitudes and bubble radii. Section V presents conclusions.

W e will treat the dynam ics and sound em ission of a single bubble here; we assume that it is driven by a spatially hom ogeneous, standing wave eld

$$P(t) = P_a \cos!_d t \tag{1}$$

with a frequency  $!_d=2 = 3M Hz$ , corresponding to a period of T = 0.33 s, and a sound am plitude  $P_a$  between 1 and 10 atm (roughly  $10^5$  to  $10^6 Pa$ ), re ecting typical peak pressures of devices in ultrasound diagnostics. M uch higher pressure am plitudes, as applied in lithotripters (cf. e.g. [19]), could dam age the tissue.

Let us brie y discuss the approximations we made here. In water, the chosen frequency corresponds to a sound wave length of  $= 2 \text{ g}=!_{d}$ 500 m, where  $c_1 = 1481$  m =s is the sound velocity in water. The typical ambient radius  $R_0$  of the m icrobubbles is in the range of 1 5 m. Therefore, the approximation of spatial hom ogeneity is justilled. In diagnostic ultrasound devices, the driving sound is not a standing wave, but a short traveling wave pulse (which is not strictly m onochrom atic). The corresponding spatial uctuations of the driving pressure gradient at the location of the bubble will exert translational forces on the bubble. The resulting translational m ovem ents of the bubble are neglected (we will come back to this assumption later in this section) as well as bubble bubble interactions, the so-called secondary B erknes forces [20]. Finally, pressure uctuations due to the blood pressure (order of magnitude 0.05 atm ) can also safely be neglected. In many cases, ultrasound contrast enhancers do not contain pure air bubbles, but stabilized bubbles with an album in or saccharide coating [3]. This may lead to a shift in the resonance frequency of the bubbles as elaborated by de Jong, Church, and others [21{24].

Under these assumptions the dynamics of the bubble radius R (t) may be described by the following ordinary dimension [25,20]:

$$RR + \frac{3}{2}R^{2} = \frac{1}{1} (p(R;t) P(t) R) + \frac{R}{1} \frac{d}{dt} (p(R;t) P(t)) 4\frac{R}{R} \frac{2}{1} (R;t) (2)$$

Typical parameters for an air bubble in water are the surface tension  $= 0.073 \text{ kg}=\text{s}^2$ , the water viscosity  $= 10^{6} \text{ m}^2 = \text{s}$  and density  $_1 = 1000 \text{ kg}=\text{m}^3$ . We use these parameters for our calculations. Only the viscosity is chosen to be larger by a factor of three with respect to water ( $= 3 = 10^{6} \text{ m}^2 = \text{s}$ ), corresponding to the value for blood. We will later see that the increased viscosity is essential for the spherical stability of the bubble at higher values of P<sub>a</sub>. The external (am bient) pressure is P<sub>0</sub> = 1 atm. We assume that the pressure inside the bubble is given by a van der W aals type equation of state

$$p(R(t)) = P_0 + \frac{2}{R_0} - \frac{R_0^3 h^3}{R^3(t) h^3}$$
(3)

with a (collective) van der W aals hard core radius  $h = R_0 = 8.54$  (for air) [26], i.e.,  $h^3$  is a measure for the total excluded volum e of the molecules. The bubble radius under norm al conditions (am bient radius)  $R_0$  is not uniform for the bubble population in a diagnostic suspension. The size distribution can, however, be controlled experimentally and is typically centered around 1{2 m, with a width of about 1 m [3]. For the elective polytropic exponent we take 1 as for the oscillation frequencies under consideration microm eter bubbles can be treated as approximately isotherm al [27]. Equation (2) can be understood as a balance equation between the excitation due to the forcing (1) on the one hand and dissipative and acoustic loss processes on the other hand.

In this paper, we will denote (2) the (m odi ed) Rayleigh-Plesset (RP) equation, adopting a common practice in recent work on sonolum inescence [28,26,29]. Besides the pioneering work of Lord Rayleigh [25] and Plesset [30], other researchers have contributed to (2) and a number of variations of this equation, e.g. K eller and M iksis [31], F lynn [32], or G ilm ore [33]. Some of these variations are much more elaborate than (2). However, a detailed comparison of the solutions obtained from these equations [34,18] shows that signi cant deviations only occur for bubbles driven at very large pressure am plitudes (> 5 atm) and having large radii, i.e., R<sub>0</sub> would have to be substantially larger than for the bubbles of the present study to necessitate the use of a more com plicated dynam ical equation.



FIG.1. Potential according to eq. (6), non-dimensionalized through dividing by  $!_d^2$ , using  $P_a = 2$  atm and  $R_0 = 12$  m for three dimensionalized  $!_dt = 0$ ; =4; =2, respectively.

Let us not consider the resonance structure of the RP oscillator in the small forcing limit. To calculate the main resonance frequency we instinct that for small forcing  $P_a < P_0$  the contribution of the sound coupling to the bubble dynamics (the term / 1=c<sub>1</sub> on the rhs of equation (2)) is not important. In addition, if R stays large enough to ensure  $R^3 h^3$  (which is the case for weak driving), we can replace the van der W aals formula by an ideal gas expression. Writing R (t) =  $R_0 (1 + x(t))$  we obtain

$$\mathbf{x} = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{1^{R_{0}^{2}}}} \mathbf{P}_{0} + \frac{2}{R_{0}} (1 + \mathbf{x})^{3} \frac{1}{1 + \mathbf{x}} \frac{\mathbf{P}_{0} + \mathbf{P}_{a} \cos !_{d} t}{1 + \mathbf{x}} \frac{2}{R_{0} (1 + \mathbf{x})^{2}} \frac{4 \mathbf{x}}{R_{0} (1 + \mathbf{x})} \frac{3}{2^{2} \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{x}} \mathbf{x}^{2}$$
(4)

We interpret the bracketed term on the rhs of eq. (4) as an elective, time dependent force  $Q_V(x;t)$ . Integration gives the time dependent potential

$$V(x;t) = \frac{1}{R_0^2} \frac{1}{3} P_0 + \frac{2}{R_0} (1+x)^3 + (P_0 + P_a \cos !_d t) \ln (1+x) \frac{2}{R_0} \frac{1}{1+x} ;$$
(5)

which displays a strong asymmetry in x, see Fig. 1. If  $P_a = 0$ , the equilibrium point is x = 0. For general  $P_a$  the minimum of the potential oscillates around this value. If  $P_a > P_0$  the potential is repulsive for a certain fraction of the period. For small  $P_a$  and thus small x we can linearize around x = 0 and obtain a driven harmonic oscillator

$$\mathbf{x} + 2 \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{1}_{0}^{2} \mathbf{x} = \frac{\mathbf{P}_{a}}{\mathbf{1}\mathbf{R}_{0}^{2}} \cos \mathbf{1}_{d} \mathbf{t}$$
(6)

with the eigenfrequency

$$P_{0} = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{R_{0}^{2}}} 3 P_{0} + (3 - 1)\frac{2}{R_{0}}$$
(7)

and the dam ping constant =  $2 = R_0^2$ . For xed driving frequency  $!_d = 2$  3M Hz and = 1 the bubble oscillator is in (m ain) resonance if  $!_d = !_0$ . A coording to eq. (7), this corresponds to a resonance radius of  $R_0 = 1.23$  m. Taking viscous dam ping into account, the oscillation amplitude has its maximum value at a frequency [35]

$$!_{\rm res}^{(1)} = \frac{q}{!_0^2} \frac{1}{2^2} = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{_1R_0^2}} \frac{1}{_3P_0 + (3 - 1)\frac{2}{R_0}} \frac{8^2}{_R_0^4};$$
(8)

which (with = 3  $10^{\text{m}^2}$ =s) shifts the main resonance radius to  $R_0^{(1)} = 1.18$  m. The corresponding radii for the subharm onics  $!_{\text{res}}^{(1=2)} = !_d=2$ ,  $!_{\text{res}}^{(1=3)} = !_d=3$ , and  $!_{\text{res}}^{(1=4)} = !_d=4$  are  $R_0^{(1=2)} = 2.18$  m,  $R_0^{(1=3)} = 3.14$  m, and  $R_0^{(1=4)} = 4.09$  m, respectively. The harm onic  $!_{\text{res}}^{(2)} = 2!_d$  is at  $R_0^{(2)} = 0.64$  m. As we will see below, the harm onic and subharm onic resonances will also strongly a ect the intensity of the em itted sound.



FIG.2. The bubble radius R vs. time for four di erent param eter pairs ( $R_0$ ; $P_a$ ); from upper to lower: a) (5 m, 9:0 atm), b) (0:8 m, 1:2 atm), c) (1:2 m, 2:5 atm), d) (2:5 m, 4:5 atm)

Figure 2 shows the time series R (t) for four typical sets of parameters, as computed from (2) and (3) using a double precision, fourth-order, variable stepsize R unge-K utta algorithm [36]. For sm all P<sub>a</sub> it is trivial that the radius oscillates sinusoidally, but this can also happen for driving pressure am plitudes as large as  $P_a = 9$  atm, if the radius is much larger than the resonance radius, as seen in qure 2 a). For other parameter combinations, the bubble changes its behavior and exhibits collapses, characterized by short duration m in in a of the radius, accompanied by large accelerations (large curvature of R (t)). In qure 2b) we observe one (weak) bubble collapse per cycle which becomes stronger for larger  $P_a$ , see qure 2 c). For strong collapses the typical return tim e of the collapsing bubble is in the nanosecond range. Like the tim e series of m ost nonlinear oscillators, the bubble dynam ics can period double so that a collapse only repeats every two cycles, as shown in gure 2d) for a strong collapse. In other parameter regions, aperiodic behavior (\chaos") can be observed (cf. [37]). It can also be seen from Fig.2 that our notion of strong collapse coincides well with Flynn's [32,38] de nition of \transient cavities", for which the ratio of maximum expansion radius and am bient radius (expansion ratio) m ust ful  $\ln R_{max} = R_0 > 2$ : the examples of Figs. 2 c and d show rapid collapses and an expansion ratio of 2.0 n the other hand, Figs. 2 a and b exem plify weakly oscillating bubbles with expansion ratios near one.

For the purposes of this paper, it is instructive to compute the minimum radius  $R_{min} = min_t (R(t))$  which the bubble achieves during its oscillation. This quantity is

shown in Fig.3. For this gure, as for the other 3D plots, the displayed function was evaluated at 100 100 equidistant grid points in the  $P_a$   $R_0$  plane. For weak forcing them inimum radius essentially equals the ambient radius (limit of sm all oscillations). However, if the driving pressure am plitude is large enough, the bubble collapse is only halted in the immediate vicinity of the sm allest possible radius, i.e., the van der W aals hard core radius. The transition towards hitting the hard core radius  $h = R_0 = 8.54$  (upon increasing  $P_a$ ) is rather abrupt, form ing a well-de ned threshold in the  $P_a$  { $R_0$  plane. Obviously, this transition occurs for sm aller  $P_a$  if the bubble radius is near one of the above mentioned resonance radii. The resonances at  $R_0^{(1)} = 1.18$  m and  $R_0^{(1-2)} = 2.18$  m are clearly recognized in Fig. 3. As  $P_a$  becomes larger, the



FIG.3. M inimum radius  $R_{m in}=R_0$  as a function of  $R_0$  and  $P_a$ . Note that the graph is enclosed between two planes: for small  $P_a$ , the quotient  $R_{m in}=R_0$  is nearly equal to one (weak oscillations), for large  $P_a$  and small  $R_0$  it approaches  $h=R_0 = 1=8.54$ , with the van der W aals hard core radius h. A rrows in gures 3, 4, 7 { 9 indicate axis orientation.

We now come back to our above assumptions on the pressure eld. The results of this work were obtained assuming a driving by standing plane waves. Today's ultrasound diagnostics devices usually emit a bundle of traveling waves that interfere constructively to build up large pressure peaks (5 10 atm) and to achieve su cient spatial resolution. The resulting spatial pressure gradients lead to translational forces acting on the bubble, the so called prim ary B jerknes forces [20]:

$$F_{\rm B}$$
 (r;t) = V<sub>b</sub>(t)r P (r;t); (9)

where  $V_b$  (t) is the time dependent volume of the bubble, and P (r;t) is the external pressure exerted on the bubble. However, numerical computation of (9) shows that the accelerations resulting from a pressure gradient jr P j  $P_a$  = are rather weak and that the translational velocities of the bubbles are sm all compared to their radial oscillation velocities.

#### III. SOUND EM ISSION OF OSCILLATORY BUBBLES

Our focus of interest is on the sound emitted by the oscillating bubble. The far eld sound pressure at a distance r R from the center of the bubble can be calculated as [20,39]

$$P_{s}(r;t) = \frac{1}{4 r dt^{2}} \frac{d^{2}V_{b}}{dt^{2}} = \frac{R}{1 r} 2R^{2} + RR :$$
(10)

An ultrasound diagnostics device will display a picture of sound intensity, which is based on the modulus (or, equivalently, the square) of the sound pressure. O by iously, the total detected intensity will not consist exclusively of signals due to (10), but there will also be intensity components from rejections of the incoming signal (1) in the tissue. A sthese latter contributions depend on many peculiarities of the experimental or diagnostic setup, we do not try to model them here, but focus on the active sound radiation of the bubble.

Figure 4a shows the total sound intensity I as a function of the forcing pressure amplitude  $P_a$  and the ambient radius  $R_0$ . A coording to Parseval's theorem it can be calculated either from the sound pressure time series  $P_s(r;t)$  or from its Fourier transform  $P_s(r; !) = {R \atop_0} P_s(r;t) \exp(i!t) dt$ , T, namely

$$I(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{Z} \mathfrak{P}_{s}(\mathbf{r}; t) f dt = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \int_{1}^{Z+1} \mathfrak{P}_{s}(\mathbf{r}; !) f d! :$$
(11)

We divide by the length of the time series ( 8T for all computations) and measure I in units of atm<sup>2</sup>. The intensity is evaluated at a distance of  $r_N = 1$  cm from the bubble's center using standard double precision Fourier transform algorithm s [36]. As I spans several orders of magnitude in our parameter regime, we also present its logarithm in Fig. 4b.



FIG.4. a) Total sound intensity I at a distance of  $r_N = 1$ cm from the bubble center as a function of  $R_0$  and  $P_a$ . The strong correlation between this gure and gure 3 is obvious. Note that the graph is truncated (higher I-values are not displayed) for better illustration of the resonance tongue structure. Figure b) shows a logarithm ic plot of the same quantity. The sm all undulations at very large  $P_a$  on top of the resonance structure are due to num erical aliasing in the Fourier analysis and can be reduced with increasing com puter power.

It can be seen from Fig. 4 that for sm all  $P_a$  or large  $R_0$  the bubble hardly em its any sound. Sound losses set in at a sharp threshold which is very similar to the threshold seen in Fig. 3 for the minimum radius. Moreover, comparing Figs. 3 and 4 one realizes that strong sound emission and collapsing to the hard core radius are strongly correlated (note the opposite orientations of these two graphs). This behavior is expected from equation (10), as a stronger collapse means larger bubble wall acceleration R at the moment of collapse. The resonance structure in  $R_0$  is also clearly rejected in the emitted sound intensity.



FIG.5. Time series of the sound pressure  $P_s(r_N;t)$  from (10) for the same four pairs of parameters as in gure 2.

T in e series of  $P_s(r_N;t)$  and their power spectra for the same four parameter pairs  $(R_0, P_a)$  as in Fig. 2 are shown in Fig. 5 and Fig. 6, respectively. If the collapse is too violent, the sound intensity is distributed in a broad band spectrum with a large fraction of intensity emitted at higher harmonics, which will be absorbed by the tissue. Therefore it is appropriate to focus on the signal at the second harmonic frequency in order to get high intensities away from the driving frequency. The intensity  $I_2(r) = \frac{1}{2}(r; ! = 2!_d) f = 2$  in the second harmonic is displayed in Fig.7. For comparison, we show the same plot also for the intensity  $I_1(r) = \frac{1}{2}(r; ! = !_d) f = 2$  of the fundamental (driving frequency) in Fig.8.



FIG.6. Power spectra  $\mathcal{P}_{s}(r_{N}; !_{d})^{\frac{2}{2}}$  for the same four pairs of parameters as in gure 2.



FIG.7. Absolute intensity of the second harm onic of the sound em ission (10).

Not surprisingly, the regions of greatest intensity of the fundam ental as well as of the second harm onic coincide with those of the total intensity, i.e., they can be found at the resonance radii. The largest region and the highest maxim a of second harm onic intensity occurs around  $R_0^{(1)}$ . For sm all  $P_a$  the intensity is of course nearly exclusively in the driving frequency itself, which is the frequency of the sm all oscillations of the bubbles. Upon increasing  $P_a$ , sound is also em itted in the second harm onic mode, for some parameter combinations up to 40% of the total intensity. At even larger  $P_a$ , higher and higher modes are excited, leaving a sm aller and sm aller fraction of total intensity for the second mode (cf. Fig. 6c and d). Even for large  $P_a$ , the driving frequency  $!_d$  remains the largest component of total em itted power in spite of the strong collapse, which displays much larger peak pressures, but only lasts for extrem ely short periods of time.



FIG.8. Absolute intensity of the fundam ental of the sound em ission (10).



FIG.9. Ratio  $I_2=I_1$  of intensities of sound em ission at the second harm onic and fundamental frequencies.

The key question now is: How should one choose the parameters for optimal detection of the second harm onic? The answer cannot be given exclusively from the absolute intensity of the second harmonic, Fig. 7. Clearly, the signal has to have a certain absolute intensity to overcome the noise level, and therefore Fig. 7 gives in portant information. One in portant application of the second harm onic m ethod in ultrasound diagnostics, how ever, relies on the contrast between intensities at fundam ental and second harm onic frequencies: W hen in jecting a bubble suspension into the vascular system, a second harm onic signal is only expected from the contrast agent. Thus, detecting at 6M Hz in our example will give a bright in age of the blood vessels. In a diagnostic situation, it should be possible to switch between this in age and the scattering signal from surrounding tissue, which re ects the 3M Hz driving. But if the bubble em ission signal at 3M Hz is more intense than these re ections, the vascular system will be the dominant feature in the fundamental frequency in age, too. Therefore, meeting the dem ands of this application means to identify parameter regions where the ratio of second harm onic intensity to fundam ental intensity  $I_2=I_1$ is as high as possible. Fig. 9 displays this quantity. It shows a distinct maximum at 0:8 m close to the harm onic bubble resonance radius  $R_0^{(2)}$ . In this sm all R<sub>0</sub> 0:7 parameter region, the bubble essentially oscillates with 6M Hz instead of 3M Hz; an example for this behavior can be seen in Figs. 5b and 6b. For even sm aller radii, a

rise in  $I_2=I_1$  indicates other resonances. A llbubbles with high  $I_2=I_1$  ratios em it little absolute acoustic intensity (cf. Figs. 4 { 8).

We have presented a variety of intensity diagram s in Figs. 4 { 9 in order to meet the di erent dem ands of di erent experim ental setups or diagnostic applications. A coordingly, the optim al parameter ranges for second harm onic sonography depend on the focus of interest: If the important quantity is relative intensity  $I_2=I_1$ , one would pick the maximum of Fig. 9, i.e., bubbles with  $R_0$ 0:5 1:2 m and driving pressure 1 3 atm. If absolute intensity is the key variable, one would choose am plitudes P<sub>a</sub> the region around the main resonance radius in  $R_0$ , i.e.,  $R_0$ 1:0 1:5 m.Moreover, Fig. 7 suggests choosing the pressure amplitude P<sub>a</sub> as large as possible. However, as we will show in the next paragraph, bubble shape instabilities set an upper lim it on practically useful P<sub>a</sub>. Note that a change in the driving frequency would shift the resonance radii and, consequently, also the location of regions of maximum sound em ission. If, for example,  $!_d$  is smaller, the resonances are shifted towards larger  $R_0$ , see equation (7).

A lso, the total am ount of bubbles should be large enough to guarantee a strong signal, but low enough to prevent considerable bubble-bubble interaction. Therefore, it is of prim ary importance to assure that a high percentage of the generated bubbles is in the correct  $R_0$  regime. All other bubbles are essentially useless regarding the yield in the second harm onic and may even obscure the measurem ents.

### IV . SPHERICAL STABILITY

To take advantage of the above suggested parameter regimes derived from RP dynamics, the bubbles in these domains should be spherically stable, i.e., stable against the growth of non-spherical bubble deformations, which could eventually lead to bubble fragmentation and a breakdown of sound emission. The corresponding stability analysis has been performed in detail in [15]. We give a brief summary here. Consider a small distortion of the spherical interface R (t),

$$R(t) + a_n(t)Y_n(;);$$

where  $Y_n$  is a spherical (surface) harmonic of degree n. An approximate linearized dynamical equation of the distortion  $a_n$  (t) for each mode has been derived in [15], following the pioneering work of Prosperetti [40]. It reads (cf. [13])

$$a_n + B_n(t)\underline{a}_n \qquad A_n(t)a_n = 0$$
(12)

#

with

$$A_n(t) = (n \quad 1) \frac{R}{R} \quad \frac{n}{wR^3} \quad \frac{2R}{R^3} \quad (n \quad 1)(n+2) + 2n(n+2)(n \quad 1)\frac{n}{R};$$
 (13)

11

$$B_{n}(t) = \frac{3R}{R} + \frac{2}{R^{2}}(n+2)(2n+1) \qquad 2n(n+2)^{2}\frac{\#}{R}$$
(14)

Here, n = (n - 1)(n + 1)(n + 2) and is a viscous boundary layer cuto [15],

$$= \min \frac{s}{\frac{R}{!_{d}}}, \frac{R}{2n}$$
 (15)

If the coe cients A  $_n$  (t) and B  $_n$  (t) are periodic with period T, (12) is an equation of H ill's type and instability occurs whenever the magnitude of the maximal eigenvalue of the F loquet transition matrix  $F_n$  (T) of eq. (12) is larger than one. The F loquet transition matrix  $F_n$  (T) is de ned by

$$\begin{array}{c} a_n (T) \\ \underline{a}_n (T) \end{array}^{!} = F_n (T) \quad \begin{array}{c} a_n (0) \\ \underline{a}_n (0) \end{array}^{!} : \quad (16) \end{array}$$

Now for some parameter regimes the radius is not periodic with period T and thus the coe cients A<sub>n</sub> (t) and B<sub>n</sub> (t) are not either. Therefore, rather than calculating the F loquet matrix  $F_n$  (T) we calculate a transition matrix  $F_n$  (NT) with a large integer N (here N = 20) to average the dynamics. We numerically compute the eigenvalues of  $F_n$  (NT). The logarithm of the maximum eigenvalue can be understood as an approximate Lyapunov exponent. If it is positive, the mode  $a_n$  (t) grows exponentially and the bubble is unstable towards the corresponding mode of shape oscillation. In F ig. 10b and 10c we show the resulting stability diagrams for the second and the third mode (n = 2 and n = 3, respectively). Bubbles are shape unstable in the dark regions of the P<sub>a</sub> R<sub>0</sub> plane, and shape stable in the white areas. Generally, the n = 2 m ode is the most unstable one, but there are regimes where this does not hold.

The most pronounced features of these stability diagram s are \tongues" of instability. In the low  $P_a$  regime equation (12) reduces to a M athieu equation; in this case the tongues of instability are the well known M athieu tongues, as demonstrated in [13]. Large viscosity strongly damps out this tongue structure, as seen from comparing the stability diagram s for water and blood (di erent viscosities) in Fig. 10a and 10b. In some regions of parameter space, stable and unstable points seem to be mixed erratically. This is due to long-periodic or chaotic bubble dynamics for these  $P_a$   $R_0$  combinations, for which the results of our stability analysis over 20T depend sensitively on the initial conditions, so that for slightly deviating parameters the stability behavior may be completely di erent.



FIG.10. Stability diagram for the n = 2 m ode for bubbles in water (a) and in blood (b) and for the n = 3 m ode for bubbles in blood (c) according to the F loquet multipliers computed from equation (16). In the white regions the bubbles are parametrically stable towards perturbations of the corresponding mode, in the dark regions they are parametrically unstable. Bubbles in water are much less stable than those in blood and higher modes  $a_n \text{ with } n$  3 tend to be more stable than the second mode  $a_2$ . We stress that details of these stability diagram s depend on our approximation (12) { (15) as well as on the choice of the parameters of the liquid and the averaging time which is 20T here. Thus they should only be considered as a rejection of the general trend.

A swe learn from this qure, bubbles in the  $R_0$  require of maximum (absolute) yield in the second harm onic become spherically unstable for drivings with  $P_a > 2.5$  atm. Below, the bubbles are stable in blood (due to its enhanced viscosity), whereas for water these bubbles are unstable with respect to the  $a_2$ -mode even at  $P_a$ 0:5 atm . Note that it is risky even to be close to an unstable reqime, as the bubble may diffusionally shrink or grow into these regimes. This suggests that experiments with bubble suspensions in water will probably give misleading results (with respect to clinical applications) and should rather be carried out in blood or a uid of correspondingly enhanced viscosity. In our calculations, we have assumed a viscosity = 3  $10^{\circ} \text{m}^2$ =s, which is at the low end of typical measured blood viscosities of 10m<sup>2</sup>=s, [41]). Thus, we have determ ined lower bounds of the instability ( 3 5 thresholds in Fig. 10 and the actual regions of stability may be somewhat larger. Note also that stability will be enhanced when lower driving frequencies are used as this leads to a larger e ective dam ping of surface oscillations (cf. [13]).

Stability analysis shows that very large driving am plitudes (say 10 atm ) will not help provide large response signals from the suspended bubbles. Instead, it may be useful to lim it the am plitudes in the bubble regions to < 2.5 atm.

The predictions for the region of optim al  $I_2=I_1$  intensity ratio remain virtually unaltered, as there is very little overlap of this region with the instability tongues. Indeed, according to the regime of large  $I_2=I_1$  identi ed above, shape instability in this regime is to be expected only in a tiny area of parameter space at  $R_0$  12 m and  $P_a$  3 atm (see Fig. 10b).

Besides spherical instability, di usive instability and chem ical instability also are matters of concern, as pointed out in detail for 26 kH z forced bubbles in refs. [15,16]. Both types of instabilities will only be important on long timescales (milliseconds or longer) where our approximation of a stable standing wave is not appropriate anyhow. This is why we postpone the discussion of these instabilities to future work.

## V.SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Bubble suspensions as contrast enhancers in ultrasound diagnostics are now state of the art. Improving the image quality by detecting the second harmonic of the driving frequency in the emitted sound spectrum is likely to lead to their further acceptance, as the advantages compared to conventional methods become even more pronounced. We have identified regions in parameter space, i.e., values for the driving pressure amplitude  $P_a$  and the ambient bubble radius  $R_0$ , where relatively high sound intensities at the second harmonic frequency are to be expected. These regions are intim ately connected to the resonance structure of the bubble oscillator and to the collapse dynamics of the bubble. The best suited parameter regime to achieve a high absolute second harmonic intensity  $I_2$  is located around the main bubble resonance radius, i.e.,  $R_0 = 1.0$  1.5 m if a xed driving frequency of 3M Hz is used. Requiring bubble stability towards non-spherical perturbations limits useful driving pressures to a maximum of about 2:5 atm, if the bubbles oscillate in blood (cf. Fig. 10b). Here, we employed the previously specified values for  $_1;c_1;$ ; to model the average properties of blood. Bubbles in this parameter range are stable in uids with (at least) three times higher viscosity than water.

The intensity ratio  $I_2=I_1$  is in portant for diagnostic purposes (switching between \background" and contrast agent in ages). It is optimized for bubbles around  $R_0$ 0.8 m and  $P_a$  1 3 atm. Note that, again, there is an upper limit to the strength of optim aldriving.

We therefore suggest not to use very high (2.5 atm) pressure amplitudes; a gentler driving m ay lead to a better in age quality. A lso, the bubble radii should be somewhat sm aller than those dom inant in bubble suspensions used today (e.g. SH U 508 A with a radius distribution peak at 1.4 m [3]), if maximum e ciency at 3M H z driving frequency is to be achieved. A narrower distribution around the peak (i.e., m ore uniform radii) would, of course, further amplify the sound signal.

A cknow ledgm ents: The authors thank T.M atula for valuable comments on the manuscript. This work has been supported by the DFG through its SFB185.

- [1] R.Gram iak and P.M. Shah, Invest. Radiol. 3, 356 (1968).
- [2] R.Y.Nishi, Acustica 33, 65 (1975).
- [3] See the articles in Advances in echo imaging using contrast enhancement, edited by N.C.Nanda and R.Schlief (Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1993).
- [4] C.M. Sehgal and J.F.G reenleaf, J.A coust. Soc. Am. 72, 1711 (1982).
- [5] H.A.H. Jongen, J.M. Thijssen, M. van den Aarssen, and W.A. Verhoef, J.Acoust. Soc.Am. 79, 535 (1986).
- [6] B.A.Schrope and V.L.Newhouse, Ulrasound Med. & Biol. 19, 567 (1993).
- [7] P.N.Bums, Clinical Radiology Suppl. 51, 50 (1996).
- [8] B.W ard, A.C.Baker, and V.F.Humphrey, J.Acoust. Soc.Am. 101, 143 (1997).
- [9] D.F.Gaitan, L.A.Crum, R.A.Roy, and C.C.Church, J.Acoust. Soc.Am. 91, 3166 (1992).
- [10] B.P.Barber and S.J.Putterm an, Nature (London) 352, 318 (1991).
- [11] R.Hiller, K.W eninger, S.J.Putterm an, and B.P.Barber, Science 266, 248 (1994).
- [12] For review s, see L.A. Crum, Physics Today 47, 22 (1994); S.J. Putterm an, Scienti c Am erican 272, 32 (1995); D. Lohse, Phys. Blatt. 51, 1087 (1995).
- [13] M P.Brenner, D.Lohæ, and T F.Dupont, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 954 (1995).
- [14] M P. Brenner, D. Lohse, D. Oxtoby, and T F. Dupont, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 1158 (1996).
- [15] S.Hilgenfeldt, D.Lohse, and M.P.Brenner, Phys.Fluids 8, 2808 (1996).
- [16] D.Lohse, M.Brenner, T.Dupont, S.Hilgenfeldt, and B.Johnston, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 1359 (1997); M.P.Brenner, S.Hilgenfeldt, and D.Lohse, \W hy air bubbles in water

glow so easily", in Nonlinear Physics of Complex Systems { Current Status and Future Trends, edited by J.Parisi, S.C.Muller, and W.Zimmermann (Springer Lecture Notes in Physics, Berlin, 1996), p.79.

- [17] M. P. Brenner, S. Hilgenfeldt, D. Lohse and R. Rosales, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 3467 (1996).
- [18] S. Hilgenfeldt, M. P. Brenner, S. Grossmann, and D. Lohse, \Analysis of Rayleigh-Plesset dynamics for sonolum inescing bubbles", submitted to J. Fluid Mech. (1997).
- [19] C.C.Church, J.Acoust.Soc.Am. 86, 215 (1989).
- [20] C.E.Brennen, Cavitation and Bubble Dynamics (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1995).
- [21] N. deJong, F. Ten Cate, C. T. Lance, T. C. Roelandt, and N. Bom, Ultrasonics 29, 324 (1991).
- [22] N. deJong, L. Ho, T. Skotland, and N. Bom, Ultrasonics 30, 95 (1992).
- [23] C.C.Church, J.Acoust.Soc.Am. 97, 1510 (1995).
- [24] Z.Ye, J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 100, 2011 (1996).
- [25] Lord Rayleigh, Philos. Mag. 34, 94 (1917); M. Plesset, J. Appl. Mech. 16, 277 (1949);
   W. Lauterborn, J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 59, 283 (1976).
- [26] R. Lofstedt, B. P. Barber, and S. J. Putterm an, Phys. Fluids A 5, 2911 (1993).
- [27] M. Plesset and A. Prosperetti, Ann. Rev. Fluid Mech. 9, 145 (1977).
- [28] B.P.Barber and S.J.Putterm an, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 3839 (1992).
- [29] R. Lofstedt, K. W eninger, S. J. Putterm an, and B. P. Barber, Phys. Rev. E 51, 4400 (1995).
- [30] M. Plesset, J. Appl. Mech. 16, 277 (1949).
- [31] J.B.Keller and M.J.Miksis, J.Acoust. Soc. Am. 68, 628 (1980).
- [32] H.G.Flynn, J.Acoust. Soc. Am. 58, 1160 (1975).
- [33] F. R. Gilmore, Hydrodynamics Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, report 26-4 (1952).
- [34] G.J.Lastm an and R.A.W entzell, J.Acoust. Soc.Am. 69, 638 (1981).G.J.Lastm an and R.A.W entzell, J.Acoust. Soc.Am. 71, 835 (1982).
- [35] L.D.Landau and E.M.Lifshitz, Mechanics (Pergam on Press, Oxford, 1960).
- [36] W.H.Press, S.A.Teukolsky, W.T.Vetterling, and B.P.Flannery, Numerical Recipes in FORTRAN (Cambridge University Press, 1992).
- [37] W .Lauterborn and U.Parlitz, J.Acoust. Soc. Am. 84, 1975 (1988).
- [38] H.G.Flynn and C.C.Church, J.Acoust. Soc.Am. 84, 985 (1988).
- [39] L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz, Fluid Mechanics (Pergam on Press, Oxford, 1987).
- [40] A. Prosperetti, Quart. Appl. M ath. 34, 339 (1977), see also Ref. [20] and H.W. Strube, A custica 25, 289 (1971); M. Plesset, J. Appl. Phys. 25, 96 (1954); G. Birkho, Quart. Appl. M ath. 12, 306 (1954); A. Eller and L A. Crum, J. A coust. Soc. Am. Suppl. 47, 762 (1970).
- [41] H. Landolt and R. Bornstein, Zahlenwerte und Funktionen aus Physik und Chemie (Springer, Berlin, 1969).