

## Histogram analysis of the macromolecular proton fraction and bound pool $T_2$ in multiple sclerosis

G. R. Davies<sup>1</sup>, D. Tozer<sup>1</sup>, A. Ramani<sup>1</sup>, G. Barker<sup>1,2</sup>, P. Tofts<sup>1</sup>, D. Miller<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>NMR Unit, Institute of Neurology, London, United Kingdom, <sup>2</sup>Neuroimaging Research Group, Institute of Psychiatry, London, United Kingdom

**Introduction** The magnetization transfer ratio (MTR) correlates with axonal and myelin density (1) and therefore is useful in the study of multiple sclerosis (MS). This study used a model for magnetization transfer (MT) to estimate two underlying parameters (the macromolecular proton fraction ( $f$ ) and the macromolecular  $T_2$  ( $T_{2b}$ )). The model is based on that of Henkelman et al(2) and has been adapted (3,4) to allow estimation of MT parameters in human subjects. Similar techniques have also been developed by Sled and Pike and Yanykh(5,6). Although results from small regions of interest (ROI) have been reported(7), we now present data from  $f$  and  $T_{2b}$  normal appearing gray and white matter maps, which provide a global but tissue specific measure.

**Methods** Fifty eight clinically definite MS patients (36 female, 22 male, mean age 47, median expanded disability status scale (EDSS) score 3.0, range 1.0-7.5) and 27 healthy controls (13 female, 14 male, mean age 35) were studied (using a 1.5 Tesla Signa). Three sequences were acquired in all subjects. 1) A dual echo fast spin echo sequence (TR 2000ms, TEs 19/95ms, 28 contiguous 5mm axial slices covering the whole brain. 2) A MT sequence consisting of a MT pulse (duration 14.6ms, interval between the centers of successive MT pulses 41ms) applied before each slice of a 2D spoiled gradient echo sequence (TR 1180ms, TE 12ms, excitation flip angle 25°, 0.75 NEX (ie partial k-space acquisition), field of view (FOV) 24x18cm<sup>2</sup> and acquisition matrix 256x128, reconstructed as 256x256 over a 24x24cm<sup>2</sup> FOV, slice thickness 5mm). Ten separate measurements each consisting of 28 contiguous oblique axial slices covering the whole brain were made at differing MT pulse offsets and amplitudes (4). 3) PD and  $T_1$  weighted gradient echo data sets permitting the calculation of  $T_1$  relaxation time(8). Total scan time was 1 hour. The FSE images were registered to the first MT data set (using the AIR package(9)) while the  $T_1$  map and other 9 MT data sets were also registered to this MT dataset using mutual information registration (4). Lesions were then contoured on the FSE data set with DispImage (Plummer, UCL). As previously described (4), the model was fitted on a pixel by pixel basis to the signal intensities from the 10 MT images using a least squares technique based on a Numerical Algorithms Group routine. This allowed for the generation of  $f$  and  $T_{2b}$  maps. A Gaussian line shape was assumed for the absorption line shape of the bound pool. The first MT dataset was used in SPM99 to create white matter (WM), gray matter (GM) and CSF probability maps and whole brain masks were then generated in SPM using the WM and GM probability outputs. These masks were used to remove non-brain parenchyma from the  $f$  and  $T_{2b}$  maps. A maximum likelihood algorithm utilising the three probability maps was then used to separate GM and WM segments in the  $f$  and  $T_{2b}$  maps. Lesions were set to zero to leave only normal-appearing white and gray matter (NAWM and NAGM). These tissue segments were subjected to a single pixel erosion of inner and outer voxels to minimize partial volume voxels. Data from lesion ROIs were also placed on to the  $T_1$  map and 10 MT data sets permitting lesion  $f$  and  $T_{2b}$  to be estimated. Mean values for  $f$  and  $T_{2b}$  from NAWM, NAGM and lesions were compared between subject groups allowing for age and gender effects (using linear modeling - SPSS11.0). The relationships between parameters were assessed with Spearman's rank correlation co-efficient ( $r_s$ )

**Results** Mean  $f$  values from NAWM, NAGM and lesions were significantly lower in MS patients than controls. For the various tissues, the mean  $f$  and standard deviations (in brackets) were: NAWM  $f$ : 12.9% (1.1%) vs 14.2% (0.7%) ( $p < 0.001$ ); NAGM  $f$ : 8.4% (0.6%) vs 8.9% (0.5%) ( $p = 0.008$ ); Lesion  $f$  (compared to control WM): 9.9% (1.0%) vs 14.2% (0.7%) ( $p < 0.001$ ).  $T_{2b}$  was significantly lower in lesions in comparison to control WM: 17.1  $\mu$ s (0.5  $\mu$ s) vs 18.4  $\mu$ s (0.2  $\mu$ s) ( $p < 0.001$ ). No difference was seen between NAWM  $T_{2b}$  and control WM  $T_{2b}$  or between NAGM  $T_{2b}$  and control GM  $T_{2b}$ . In MS,  $T_{2b}$  and  $f$  were *inversely* correlated in NAWM ( $r_s = -0.44$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ) and NAGM ( $r_s = -0.39$ ,  $p = 0.003$ ). In controls  $T_{2b}$  and  $f$  were *inversely* correlated in NAGM only ( $r_s = -0.47$ ,  $p = 0.01$ ). NAGM  $T_{2b}$  in MS was inversely correlated with the EDSS ( $r_s = -0.31$ ,  $p = 0.02$ ).

**Conclusions**  $f$  shows widespread abnormality and is reduced in NAWM, NAGM and lesions whereas  $T_{2b}$  is only reduced in lesions. The inverse relationship between  $f$  and  $T_{2b}$  in normal appearing brain tissue confirms the earlier ROI analysis(7) and appears to be present in controls and MS patients alike. This might occur as result of a slight variation in brain tissue free water content, with low  $f$  and high  $T_{2b}$  corresponding to high free water content. If true, any *decrease* in  $T_{2b}$  (eg in lesions) may be independent of free water effects (such as edema) and therefore could be specific for changes in tissue structure (presumably demyelination, axonal loss and gliosis). This could be why NAGM  $T_{2b}$  (as opposed to NAGM  $f$ ) correlates with the EDSS. However further work, including histopathologic studies, are now needed to confirm these findings

- 1) Van Waesberghe, JH et al., Ann. Neurol., 46, 747, 1999.
- 2) Henkelman, RM et al., Magn. Reson. Med., 29, 759, 1993.
- 3) Ramani, A et al., Magn. Reson. Imaging, 20, 721, 2002.
- 4) Tozer, D et al., Magn. Reson. Med., 50, 83, 2003.
- 5) Sled, JG et al., Magn. Reson. Med., 46, 923, 2001.

- 6) Yarnykh, VL et al., Magn. Reson. Med., 47, 929, 2002.
- 7) Davies, GR et al., Proc. Intl. Soc. Mag. Reson. Med., 11, 2286, 2003.
- 8) Parker, G, et al., Magn. Reson. Med., 45, 838, 2001.
- 9) Woods, RP, et al., J. Comput. Assit. Tomogr., 17, 536, 1993.