3D B1+ Mapping with Multi-Slab Catalyzed Steady-State Double-Angle Method

D. Wang^{1,2}, S. Zuehlsdorff³, and A. Larson^{1,2}

¹Biomedical Engineering, Northwestern University, Chicago, IL, United States, ²Radiology, Northwestern University, Chicago, IL, United States, ³Siemens Medical Solutions, Chicago, IL, United States

Introduction: The double-angle method (DAM) can be used for B_1^+ mapping but requires long TR (\geq 5T₁) to achieve complete relaxation of magnetization. Although modified DAM can allow shorter TR via reset saturation and combine with fast acquisition sequences [1], further improvements of 3D DAM are necessary. 3D multi-slab acquisition is a time efficient technique for large volume scanning [2]. In this study we present a 3D multi-slab DAM combined with multi-echo CPMG acquisition [3] and compensated catalyzation pulses at the end of each TR which drive the longitudinal magnetization into steady-state enabling short TR for fast imaging without T₁ bias.

Method: All experiments were performed using a 1.5T clinical MRI scanner (Siemens Magnetom Sonata) with body coil transmitter, Sequence design: The 3D multi-slab catalyzed steady-state (MSCSS) sequence (Fig. 1) includes slab-selective compensated catalyzation RF pulses with crusher gradient spoilers alternating in parity and varying in gradient moment along all three axes at the end of each TR. RF spoiling scheme was also applied consecutively to each catalyzation pulse. The longitudinal magnetization will be catalyzed into

uniform profile along slice direction. Two groups of multiple interleaved 2-partition slabs with 100% spacing were acquired separately. 100% 3D slice over-sampling was applied to preclude RF transition region and side lobes. Phantom studies: We initially validated the accuracy of 3D MSCSS DAM in an MgCl₂ phantom ($T_1 = 1200$ ms). Both conventional and MSCSS TSE DAM were performed with TR = 8000, 2000, 1000, 500, and 200 ms. Other parameters included FA = 60%120% excitation, 120% refocusing, 120%60% compensation, 85° catalyzation, 3 catalyzation pulses, TE/Tb/Tc = 9.5/9.5/5 ms, 560 Hz/pixel BW; 280×110×40 mm³ FOV, 128×50×8 matrix. The FAs from conventional and MSCSS DAM at different TR were compared to those from DAM with TR=8000 ms by calculating percentage

root-mean-squared-error (RMSE) over the central line of the phantom. Volunteer studies: We acquired 3D B1+ maps in brain and abdomen of healthy volunteers with MSCSS TSE DAM. In vivo parameters:

Brain: TR= 6000, 3000, 500 ms, 280×170×80 mm³ FOV, 128×78×16 matrix, ETL = 3. acquisition time: 2 min 24 sec (TR = 500 ms): Abdomen: TR= 600 ms. 380×200×80 mm³ FOV, 128×68×16 matrix, ETL = 5, GRAPPA acceleration factor 2, acquisition time:1 min 8 sec.

Results: FA profiles from conventional and catalyzed TSE DAM through the center of the phantom were compared in Fig. 2. While RMSE of conventional DAM increases as TR decreases, RMSE of catalyzed DAM is < 1.4% (Fig. 2b). Fig. 3 shows in vivo B₁⁺ map and FA profile along central line in human brain. Fig. 4 shows representative abdominal 60%120% TSE images and corresponding B1* map. Conclusion: Compensated catalyzed steady-state method removes the DAM reliance on long TR. The 3D multi-slab multi-echo acquisition accelerates imaging speed. Careful pulse design, 3D acquisition and 100% slice over-sampling improve





the same steady-state regardless of initial excitation flip angle (FA). Gradients and RF spoiling strategies were applied between TRs, and after the second refocusing pulse to eliminate stimulated echoes [4]. All RF pulses were designed using SLR algorithm to provide a







Fig. 3. a) The *in vivo* B_1^+ map of brain acquired using MSCSS DAM with TR = 500 ms. b) FA profile along central line of brain B1¹ maps with different TRs.

excitation FA profile and assure better quantification accuracy. In conclusion, 3D multi-slab catalyzed steady-state multi-echo DAM provides a rapid and accurate method for large volume RF field mapping.

References: [1] Cunningham et al., MRM 2006 55:1326-1333 [2] Liu et al. MRM 2000 44:269-276

Proc. Intl. Soc. Mag. Reson. Med. 16 (2008)





[3] Sled et al. MRM 2000;43:589-593 [4] Grawley et al. Mag Reson Med 1987 4:34-47