

# T<sub>2</sub>-Selective MRI Contrast-Reagents: Revisiting the Inner-Sphere Curie-Spin Relaxation Mechanism of Dysprosium (III) Chelates

D. C. Medina<sup>1</sup>, C. S. Springer, Jr.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York, United States

**Synopsis:** Whereas the hyperfine inner-sphere (IS) relaxivity of gadolinium(III)-based contrast reagents (CRs) decreases with increasing magnetic field strength ( $B_0$ ), that of dysprosium(III)-based CRs (Dy-CRs), having larger magnetic moments, increases quadratically because of the contribution of the Curie-Spin relaxation mechanism. Furthermore, Dy-CRs display very high  $T_2$ -selectivity and strong temperature dependence ( $\propto T^{-6}$ ); thus, they could be used to restrict catalysis of  $^1\text{H}_2\text{O}$  relaxation to the transverse plane and/or to measure small tissue temperature variations. The purpose of this study is to estimate the maximum attainable transverse ( $r_{2\text{IS}}$ ) and longitudinal ( $r_{1\text{IS}}$ ) IS relaxivities, as well as the  $T_2$ -selectivity, for monomeric, single water site ( $q = 1$ ) Dy-CRs, while also investigating the effects of the mean CR water lifetime,  $\tau_m$ , on  $^1\text{H}_2\text{O}$  relaxation.

**Introduction:** In the early 1950's, NMR allowed new experiments involving systems in dynamic equilibrium because NMR signals that emanate from spins in distinct electromagnetic environments usually have different properties. The local electromagnetic field that water proton spins ( $^1\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ) experience can be systematically perturbed with a paramagnetic dopant whose unpaired electron dipolar field catalyzes transverse and longitudinal relaxation. Coincident with the 1970's advent of MRI was the debut of paramagnetic species used for the enhancement of anatomic image contrast. Although CRs are typically gadolinium(III)-based, Dy-CRs could alternatively restrict CR-dependent relaxation acceleration to the transverse plane whenever a  $T_2$ -selective CR ( $T_2$ -CR) is desired. The "Curie-spin" (CS), or "molecular susceptibility," mechanism underlies this Dy-CR property, having little or no effect on longitudinal  $^1\text{H}_2\text{O}$  relaxation, depending on the  $B_0$  and  $\tau_m$  values. The Solomon-Bloembergen-Morgan (SBM) equations neglect the effect of Boltzmann electronic polarization on the coupled proton spins. In the mid 1970's, Vega, Fiat, and Gueron realized that the dipolar field arising from a thermally averaged Boltzmann electronic polarization could also enhance the relaxation of coupled proton magnetization (1,2). They named this the CS mechanism because it can be described with the Curie Law. It becomes pronounced in paramagnetic species with rapid electronic relaxation [like Dy (III)], with long rotational reorientation times ( $\tau_r$ ), and at high  $B_0$ ; it increases quadratically with  $B_0$ . Here, the effect of CR-water exchange on the CS-dominated transverse IS relaxivity of  $T_2$ -selective Dy-CRs is characterized. Furthermore, upper-limit  $r_{1\text{IS}}$  and  $r_{2\text{IS}}$  values, as well as the  $T_2$ -selectivity, are calculated; last, the limitations and conditions under which a Dy-based  $T_2$ -CR becomes viable are predicted by the  $\tau_m$  (under present conditions,  $\tau_m$  approaches the CS correlation time,  $\tau_{\text{CS}}$ ) and  $B_0$ -dependences of calculated relaxivities presented herein.

**Simulations:** The calculated IS relaxivities and  $T_2$ -selectivity are confined to the limiting case where  $\tau_r \gg \tau_m$ , thus  $\tau_{\text{CS}} \approx \tau_m$ ; as  $\tau_r$  approaches infinity,  $\tau_{\text{CS}}$  approaches  $\tau_m$ . Bulk magnetic susceptibility (BMS) and outer-sphere (OS) contributions to relaxation will be treated in future investigation. For relevance to human physiology,

present simulations hold  $T = 310$  K. The  $B_0$  and  $\tau_m$  dependences of the Dy-CR  $r_{1\text{IS}}$  and  $r_{2\text{IS}}$  values are calculated using the published CS (1,2) and Swift-Connick equations for the  $5\text{ T} < B_0 < 15\text{ T}$  range. [At low  $B_0$  values, the CS relaxation channel closes;  $B_0 > 15\text{ T}$  is unlikely to soon become available for human MRI because of magnet design and RF excitation pulse issues.] A broad  $\tau_m$  range,  $10^{-12} < \tau_m < 10^{-4}\text{ s}$ , is employed because the optimum  $\tau_m$  is  $B_0$ -dependent and different for  $r_{1\text{IS}}$  and  $r_{2\text{IS}}$ . The parameters (in their usual notations) used in the simulations are:  $q = 1$ ,  $p_m = 1.8 \times 10^{-5}$ ,  $\gamma_l = 2.675197 \times 10^8\text{ rad s}^{-1}\text{ T}^{-1}$ ,  $\mu_0 = 4\pi \times 10^{-7}\text{ kg m s}^{-1}\text{ A}^{-2}$ ,  $\mu_B = 9.27410 \times 10^{-24}\text{ JT}^{-1}$ ,  $k = 1.38062 \times 10^{-23}\text{ JK}^{-1}$ ,  $r(\text{Dy-H}) = 3.111 \times 10^{-10}\text{ m}$  (3),  $(\Delta\omega_m/\omega)^{\text{iso}} = 43\text{ ppm}$  (4),  $(\Delta\omega_m/\omega)^{\text{con}} = 17\text{ ppm}$  (4), and  $\mu_{\text{eff}} = 10.646$ . The sum of the scalar and dipolar SBM contributions to  $R_{1m}$  and  $R_{2m}$  (the rate constants  $[T_{1m}^{-1}, T_{2m}^{-1}]$  for CR-bound  $^1\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ),  $\Sigma R_{1m}^{\text{SBM}} = 1665.14\text{ s}^{-1}$  and  $\Sigma R_{2m}^{\text{SBM}} = 3027.76\text{ s}^{-1}$  (5), respectively, are essentially asymptotic for the  $B_0$  range used: thus the corrections of Gillis et al (6) are not included. The  $\tau_r$  value is set to infinity in order to isolate water exchange effects on the CS relaxivity contribution and to estimate its upper-limit for the chosen  $B_0$  range. Alternatively, one could more realistically simulate the  $B_0$ - as well as  $\tau_m$ -dependences of relaxivities at fixed  $\tau_r$  values or any other combination of  $\tau_r$ ,  $\tau_m$ , and  $B_0$ . In the same way, relaxivity dependences can be simulated for  $q > 1$ , and for polymeric Dy-CRs with minor parameter adjustments.

**Results and Discussion:** The  $B_0$  and  $\tau_m$  dependences of  $r_{2\text{IS}}$  and the  $T_2$ -selectivity ( $r_{2\text{IS}}/r_{1\text{IS}}$ ) are plotted in **Figs. 1 and 2** respectively, assuming the limiting  $\tau_r \gg \tau_m$  case [therefore,  $\tau_{\text{CS}} \approx \tau_m$ ]. The optimum  $\tau_m$  shifts to smaller values as  $B_0$  increases. The optimum  $\tau_m$  for  $r_{1\text{IS}}$  (not shown) ranges from  $5 \times 10^{-10}$  to  $2 \times 10^{-7}\text{ s}$ , and varies from  $3 \times 10^{-7}$  to  $10^{-7}\text{ s}$  for  $r_{2\text{IS}}$  and  $r_{2\text{IS}}/r_{1\text{IS}}$ , depending on  $B_0$ . The topological features of **Figs. 1 and 2** are easily intuited. If  $\tau_m$  is too short, the protons will not effectively interact with the paramagnetic species; on the other extreme, however, if  $\tau_m$  is excessively long, then the CR loses its catalytic effectiveness because it interacts with too few water molecules per unit time. As depicted in **Fig. 1**,  $r_{2\text{IS}}$  reaches its zenith at a value slightly below  $85\text{ mM}^{-1}\text{ s}^{-1}$  (for  $B_0 = 15\text{ T}$  and  $\tau_m \approx 10^{-7}\text{ s}$ ) and  $r_{1\text{IS}}$  (not shown) peaks at a value slightly below  $0.35\text{ mM}^{-1}\text{ s}^{-1}$  (for  $B_0 = 15\text{ T}$  and  $\tau_m \approx 2 \times 10^{-10}\text{ s}$ ). This  $r_{1\text{IS}}$  increase corresponds to an  $\sim 7$  fold enhancement whereas the  $r_{2\text{IS}}$  increase is  $\sim 1700$  fold higher than IS relaxivities measured for Dy-CRs [ $r_{1\text{IS}} = 0.05\text{ mM}^{-1}\text{ s}^{-1}$ ,  $r_{2\text{IS}} = 0.05\text{ mM}^{-1}\text{ s}^{-1}$  at  $310\text{ K}$  for varied  $B_0$  (5)] when the overall

correlation time is dominated by the, somewhat  $B_0$ -independent, electronic relaxation time constant [in other words, when the CS relaxation mechanism is ineffectual]. Selectivity is defined here as the ratio  $\Delta R_{2\text{IS}}/\Delta R_{1\text{IS}}$ ; for any given [CR], this equates to  $r_{2\text{IS}}/r_{1\text{IS}}$ . This is plotted in **Fig. 2**, displaying a maximum  $r_{2\text{IS}}/r_{1\text{IS}} \sim 2600$  (for  $B_0 = 15\text{ T}$  and  $\tau_m \approx 10^{-7}\text{ s}$ ). Realistically speaking,  $\tau_r$  is a finite number; therefore, the assumption that  $\tau_{\text{CS}} \approx \tau_m$  will lead to a small error in  $\tau_{\text{CS}}$  ( $\leq 10\%$ ), as long as  $\tau_r$  is at least  $10\tau_m$ .

**Conclusion:** The irrefutable benefits of high  $B_0$  and the flourishing of targeted-CR developments in MRI research presage countless clinical promises. With the future prevalence of high field MRI scanners, close attention should be paid to the potential applications of the CS relaxation mechanism, since it increases quadratically with  $B_0$ . Dy-CRs might be effectively administered as  $T_2$ -CRs and/or as temperature indicators. Development of monomeric targeted-CRs, capable of binding large cellular assemblies such as erythrocytes and leukocytes, could henceforth yield another *avant-garde*  $T_2$ -selective blood-pool agent. The conditions for the optimum CS relaxation mechanism are somewhat confined; in order to maximize the CS effect on  $^1\text{H}_2\text{O}$  transverse relaxation,  $T_2$ -CR design must also consider the modulatory effect of  $\tau_m$ —particularly,  $\tau_m$  on the order of  $100\text{ ns}$ . Despite relatively small enhancement in the actual  $r_{2\text{IS}}$  value, the "Curie-Spin" contribution to transverse relaxation may also be maximized using polymeric and/or  $q > 1$  Dy-CRs. Currently, the relative magnitudes of the combined IS plus OS CS and the BMS contributions to  $r_2$  are under investigation. If the hyperfine  $r_2$  ( $r_{2\text{IS}} + r_{2\text{OS}}$ ) can become sufficiently large, it may be possible to minimize the non-analytical BMS relaxivity ( $r_{2\chi}$ ) term, which becomes finite in the multicompartamental tissue situation, and which increases with  $B_0$ .

**Support:** NIH (RO1 EB-00422 and RO1 NS-40801) and DOE (DE-ACO2-98CH108).

**References:** 1. Vega, A. J., et al, *Mol Phys* **31**:347-355 (1976). 2. Gueron, M., *J Magn Reson* **19**:58-66 (1975). 3. Bertini, I., et al, *J Phys Chem* **97**:6351-6354 (1993). 4. Reuben, J., et al, *J Chem Phys* **51**:4909-4918 (1969). 5. Caravan, P., et al, *Magn Reson Med* **46**:917-922 (2001). 6. Gillis, P., et al, *J Magn Reson* **137**:402-407 (1999).

