

## Towards whole-brain quantitative $T_1$ mapping at 3.0T for imaging Hippocampal Sclerosis

R. S. Samson<sup>1</sup>, M. R. Symms<sup>2</sup>, M. Yogarajah<sup>2</sup>, N. Focke<sup>2</sup>, and J. S. Duncan<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Neuroinflammation, UCL Institute of Neurology, London, United Kingdom, <sup>2</sup>Department of Clinical & Experimental Epilepsy, UCL Institute of Neurology, London, United Kingdom

**Introduction:** The  $T_1$  relaxation time of normal tissue is related to macromolecule concentration, water binding and water content (1), resulting in tissue contrast due to the particular composition of different tissue types. Changes in  $T_1$  resulting from pathology alter this tissue contrast. In general increased water content causes an increase in the  $T_1$  relaxation time in biological tissue. For example in the brain, oedema or inflammation may cause an increase in  $T_1$ , e.g. around tumours or in acute inflammatory Multiple Sclerosis (MS) lesions, or in chronic MS lesions, probably as a result of demyelination, axonal loss and increased water content.

Hippocampal Sclerosis (HS) is the most common pathological condition underlying intractable temporal lobe epilepsy and following surgery approximately 70% of patients become seizure free. Pathological changes occurring in HS include cell loss and astrogliosis (2). HS can be identified via MR imaging; in particular increased signal intensity on  $T_2$ -weighted images is a feature of HS as is hippocampal atrophy (3, 4, 5). Quantification of  $T_2$  can also enable bilateral HS to be detected (5) and may also identify dual pathology (2), or identify abnormalities in patients with otherwise normal conventional MRI. Abnormal signal intensity has also been observed on  $T_1$ -weighted images in HS patients, and was shown to demonstrate bilateral abnormalities better than  $T_2$ -weighted imaging but abnormalities in hippocampal  $T_2$  signal tend to lateralise better (6).  $T_1$  measurement may, however, provide complementary information to  $T_2$  mapping in HS.

In order to measure  $T_1$ , the magnetisation must be perturbed and the observation of the rate of recovery of longitudinal magnetisation towards the equilibrium state is used to obtain the  $T_1$  value. The 'gold standard' of  $T_1$  measurement is inversion recovery-based, with signal data acquired at different inversion times to allow fitting of the model to experimental data to obtain a  $T_1$  value. However it is time consuming to wait for longitudinal recovery between inversion pulses, therefore faster methods have been developed.  $T_1$  measurements are sensitive to RF pulse amplitude errors (caused by errors in the pre-scan procedure or transmit non-uniformity), therefore robust calibration of the  $B_1$  field is also necessary. The  $T_1$  weighting in a spoiled gradient echo (SPGR) sequence depends on the flip angle ( $\alpha$ ) and repetition time TR, therefore by varying one of these, and modelling the  $T_1$  recovery,  $T_1$  can be estimated. Two-point methods based on this concept have previously successfully been used to measure  $T_1$  (7,8). This study aimed to establish the normal variation in a 3D, whole-brain, three-point implementation of this method at 3.0T with a view to applying the technique in HS.

**Methods:** 3 fast 3D SPGRs (TR/TE=6.2/2.8 ms, flip angles=15°, 7°, 3°, 88 2mm thick slices, acquisition matrix=256x192, FOV=24x18cm<sup>2</sup>) were acquired coronally in order to calculate a  $T_1$  map. 19 healthy controls (9 female, 10 male, age range 22-70 (mean age 44.2yrs, SD 13.0yrs)) were scanned on a 3.0T GE Signa Excite system (General Electric, Milwaukee, WI, USA). 2 3D fast recovery FSE (TR/TE=300/24.3 ms, ETL=12, FAs=60°, 120°, matrix=64x64) sequences for  $B_1$  mapping via the double angle method [9].  $B_1$  mapping data were co-registered to each of the 3  $T_1$ -weighted images (10), 3  $B_1$  maps were calculated, and the signal intensity in each of the  $T_1$ -weighted images was corrected using the 3  $B_1$  maps. The corrected images were then co-registered, and linear regression was performed on a pixel-by-pixel basis to yield  $M_0$  and  $T_1$  maps. Examples of raw and corrected  $T_1$  images and the resultant  $T_1$  and  $M_0$  maps for a single subject are given in figure 1. In each subject 20 regions of interest (ROIs) (10 right (R), 10 left (L) on 10 different image slices) were drawn in frontal and temporal white matter (WM) regions, the thalamus (6 ROIs R/L) and hippocampus on the first  $T_1$ -weighted volume.

**Results:** Mean  $T_1$  values in right and left ROIs and all ROIs for the control group as a whole are given in the table, with standard deviations (SDs) in brackets. Intra-subject coefficients of variation (CVs) were uniformly low (~2-8%) for all subjects (data not shown). Female  $T_1$  values were longer than male  $T_1$  values in all brain regions studied but were only found to be significantly different in the thalamus and frontal white matter. This is thought to be due to differing neuronal densities between males and females. Some right-left differences were also observed; in frontal and temporal white matter (WM) left hemisphere white matter  $T_1$  values were lower, the reverse was true in the thalamus and no significant difference was observed in the hippocampus.

**Table 1: Mean ROI  $T_1$  values for all control subjects**

Brain region	Mean $T_1$ (ms) (± SD)	Mean L $T_1$ (ms) (± SD)	Mean R $T_1$ (ms) (± SD)
Temporal WM	798.0 (± 53.2)	788.4 (± 56.6)	807.6 (± 47.9)
Frontal WM	733.4 (± 59.0)	718.8 (± 55.3)	748.0 (± 60.2)
Hippocampus	1566.0 (± 99.6)	1567.8 (± 111.6)	1564.1 (± 86.2)
Thalamus	1113.6 (± 94.6)	1183.0 (± 64.9)	1044.2 (± 63.6)

Measured  $T_1$  values were compared with literature; Wansapura *et al* [11] measured an average WM  $T_1$  value of 832 (±10) ms and an average grey matter (GM)  $T_1$  value of 1331 (±13) ms in 19 controls using a single slice saturation recovery method. Ethofer *et al* [12] used <sup>1</sup>H-MRS (PRESS) used to study the  $T_1$  of different metabolites in the brain in 8 healthy controls and measured a  $T_1$  in fronto-parietal WM of 1060 (±60) ms, and a  $T_1$  in the thalamus of 1150 (± 80) ms. Deoni [13] used a method very similar to ours to measure  $T_1$  in 3 subjects but acquired an additional inversion-prepared SPGR in order to fit for the flip angle in addition to  $T_1$ . He measured a  $T_1$  in WM of ~1100ms, and in the thalamus of ~1500ms. Clare & Jezzard [14] measured  $T_1$  in 8 subjects using a multi-slice inversion-recovery method, with single shot gradient echo EPI readout. They measured  $T_1$  to be 860 (±20) ms in centrum semiovale WM and 1060 (±40) ms in the thalamus. There is variation in the  $T_1$  measurements made using all of these methods, which can be attributed to differences in the methods used, whether  $B_1$  correction was performed and the  $B_1$  correction method used, different numbers, location and sizes of regions of interest studied, and also differences between the subject groups studied.

**Discussion:** Measured  $T_1$  values are consistent with those previously observed at 3.0T for control white and grey matter. Inter- and intra-subject CVs are low in all brain locations although results are not as precise as for some previous studies at 1.5T (15) and 3.0T (11-14). The technique shows good potential for fast quantitative  $T_1$  imaging of the brain at 3.0T which could have many applications including imaging the hippocampus. Future work might include studying other brain locations, a VBM-type analysis to allow investigation of L-R asymmetry, investigation of different  $B_1$  mapping techniques to facilitate better correction of  $B_1$  errors and optimisation of the  $T_1$  mapping acquisition parameters (flip angles) e.g. using Monte Carlo methods to minimise the SDs in  $T_1$  measurements.

**References:** [1] Gowland P.  $T_1$ : The Longitudinal Relaxation Time. In: Tofts PS, editor. Quantitative MRI of the Brain: Measuring Changes Caused by Disease. 1st ed. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd; 2003. p 109-140, [2] Kodama F *et al.* Eur Radiol 13: 2180-85; 2003, [3] Bartlett, PA *et al.* AJNR 28: 1095-98; 2007, [4] Jackson GD *et al.* Neurology 40: 1869-75; 1990, [5] Jackson GD *et al.* Neurology 43: 793-99; 1993, [6] Coan AC *et al.* J NeuroImaging 13: 228-33; 2003, [7] Imran J *et al.* MRI 17: 1347-56; 1999, [8] Parker GJM *et al.* MRM 45: 838-45; 2001, [9] Stollberger & Wach MRM 1996; 35:246-251, [10] Schnabel, JA *et al.* Proc 4th Conf. MICCAI 2001; 573-581, [11] Wansapura *et al.* JMIRI 9:531-8; 1999, [12] Ethofer *et al.* MRM 50:1296-1301; 2003, [13] Deoni SCL JMIRI 26: 1106-11; 2007, [14] Clare S & Jezzard P MRM 45: 630-4; 2001, [15] Miller DH *et al.* MRM 11: 331-6; 1989

**Acknowledgements:** The authors thank the MRC, Wellcome Trust and Action Medical Research for funding and the Big Lottery fund, Wolfson Trust & the National Society for Epilepsy for supporting the NSE MRI scanner.

**Figure 1: Raw  $T_1$ -weighted data (a), corrected  $T_1$  data (b) &  $T_1$ (left) and  $M_0$  (right) maps (c) for a single subject**

