

## Accurate high-resolution $T_1$ mapping in vivo

D. Mintzopoulos<sup>1</sup>, S. Inati<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Center for Neural Science, New York University, New York, NY, United States, <sup>2</sup>Center for Neural Science and Dept. of Psychology, New York University, New York, NY, United States

**Introduction**—  $T_1$  is a characteristic MR property of tissue, strongly influenced by local microstructure such as myelin content.  $T_1$  maps are useful, for example, in studies of brain development and neuropathology [1] and can be used as the basis for brain tissue classification and segmentation. It is therefore important to accurately and quantitatively estimate  $T_1$  *in vivo*, at high spatial resolution [(0.5mm)<sup>3</sup> or less]. This is challenging, because of the low-SNR intrinsic to high spatial resolution and the need to constrain the total scan time. We present results for quantitative  $T_1$  mapping at 3T at high spatial resolution (0.5-1mm)<sup>3</sup>, with error bars estimated point-wise. Following the suggestions of Wang *et al.* [2] and of Deoni *et al.* [3], we obtained a set of 3D FLASH images collected at a single TR and two flip angles. From these data,  $T_1$  and  $S_0$  and their error bars were estimated. We discuss the potential and limitations of this method for *in vivo* brain imaging at 3T.

**Methods and Results**— Experiments were performed on a SIEMENS Allegra 3T scanner, using a 3D FLASH sequence. Data were collected using a single TR at two different flip angles chosen as proposed in Ref. [3]. At each voxel,  $T_1$  and  $S_0$  were estimated from  $S_i = S_0 \sin \alpha_i [1 - \exp(-TR/T_1)] / [1 - \exp(-TR/T_1) \cos \alpha_i]$ , using a nonlinear least-squares fit in MATLAB. Estimated error bars were calculated for  $S_0$  and  $T_1$ , using nonlinear regression theory [4]; our result agrees with the calculation in [5]. The estimated variance follows the general equation  $\sigma \times f(T_1, S_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ , where  $\sigma$  is the image variance, calculated from the image background. Estimated variance of  $T_1$  increases monotonically with increasing  $T_1$ .  $T_1$  in CSF cannot be easily calculated because  $TR/T_1 \approx 0$  for all TRs used with FLASH sequences; therefore,  $\sigma_{T_1}$  is also poorly estimated in CSF.

**(A) Top Figure, 0.9mm×0.9mm×1.0mm, transverse slice.** Parameters: TR=15ms, TE=3.69ms, BW/px=200Hz/px, FOV=176×256×144. Acquisition time per volume per flip angle was 6.4min ; total acquisition time was 13min using a head coil (Nova Medical). **Left Panel**, top, image at  $\alpha=4^\circ$ , bottom, image at  $\alpha=23^\circ$ . **Middle Panel**, top,  $T_1$ (ms); bottom,  $\sigma_{T_1}$ (ms).  **$T_1$  error bars:** Notice that  $\sigma_{T_1}$  increases with increasing  $T_1$ . **Middle Panel Insert, see Magnification:** Note that we can reliably detect differences in  $T_1$  across the cortex due to the underlying differences in myelination. In particular, the  $T_1$  of gray matter in primary sensory-motor cortex is noticeably smaller than other nearby areas as to be expected from known differences in the size of the heavily myelinated cortical layer IV. **Right Panel**, top,  $S_0$ ; bottom,  $\sigma_{S_0}$  (arbitrary intensity units).

**(B) Bottom Figure, 0.5mm×0.5mm×0.5mm, coronal slice.** Parameters: TR=15ms, TE=7.21ms, BW/px=90Hz/px, FOV=256×320×104. Acquisition time per volume per flip angle was 6.7min and each intensity image was averaged 6 times; total acquisition time was 80min for both flip angles and six repetitive acquisitions per flip angle. A 4-channel occipital coil array (Nova Medical) was used in the experiment. **Left Panel**, top, image at  $\alpha=4^\circ$ , bottom, image at  $\alpha=23^\circ$ . **Middle Panel**, top,  $T_1$ (ms); bottom,  $\sigma_{T_1}$ (ms). **Right Panel**, top,  $S_0$ ; bottom,  $\sigma_{S_0}$  (arbitrary intensity units).  **$T_1$  error bars:** The background variance  $\sigma \approx 8$  in both images [note, (A) is without occipital coil. (B) is with occipital coil], implying an average image SNR of about 10 (SNR of intensity images acquired with FLASH) in each experiment, with a maximum SNR value of about 15 nearer the coils.  $T_1$  error bars range from about 10% of  $T_1$  values in regions of high SNR and in white matter in general, to about 17% in gray matter, and are much larger in CSF. **(C) SNR comparison:** The decrease in SNR in going from 1mm to 0.5mm is expected to be a factor of 8; by averaging and using a surface coil this decrease can be mitigated, and these two sets of  $T_1$  measurements have approximately the same accuracy.

**Discussion**—  $T_1$  error bars of 10-17% are easily obtained at 0.9mm×0.9mm×1.0mm in 13min total scan time at 3T, using a head coil and whole-brain acquisition. The same accuracy was achieved with 80min total scan time at (0.5mm)<sup>3</sup> with a surface array. If higher  $T_1$  measurement accuracy or higher spatial resolution are needed, however, this method may become impractical. In order to routinely measure  $T_1$  at 0.5mm resolution, it is necessary to decrease the imaging time. We intend to implement a scheme in which we increase TR and restrict the FOV using outer volume suppression. For example, using TR 35ms, TE=10ms, FOV=112×384×112, [(0.5mm)<sup>3</sup>] and averaging three times has the same SNR as in (B) but is realizable in half the scan time.

**Conclusion**— We have point-wise estimated  $T_1$ ,  $S_0$ , and  $\sigma_{T_1}$ ,  $\sigma_{S_0}$  at high spatial resolution [(0.9mm)<sup>2</sup>×1mm and (0.5mm)<sup>3</sup>] at 3T. Error bars, as expected, increase with increasing  $T_1$ . Accuracy of 10-17% in  $T_1$  can be achieved with 13min total scan time using only a head coil. The same level of accuracy required 80min and a 4-channel occipital coil array at (0.5mm)<sup>3</sup>.

### References—

- [1] Lancaster JL *et al.*, (2003) *J. Magn. Reson. Im.* **17**:1-10 ; Parry A *et al.*, (2002) *J. Neurol.* **249**: 1279-1286
- [2] Wang HZ *et al.*, (1987) *Magn. Reson. Med.*, **5**:399-416
- [3] Deoni SCL *et al.*, (2003) *Magn. Reson. Med.*, **49**:515-526

[4] Gallant AR, (1975) *The Amer. Statistician*, **29**:73-81

[5] Deoni SCL *et al.*, (2004) *Magn. Reson. Med.*, **51**:94-199

**Acknowledgements**— We acknowledge the generous support of the Seaver Foundation.

