fMRI in Systemic Lupus Erythematosus and Antiphospholipid Syndrome

A. M. Ulug¹, A. Vo¹, E. Kozora^{2,3}, G. Ramon⁴, J. Vega⁴, R. D. Zimmerman⁵, D. Erkan⁴, and M. D. Lockshin⁴

¹The Feinstein Institute for Medical Research, Manhasset, New York, United States, ²National Jewish Heath, Denver, Colorado, United States, ³University of Colorado Medical Center, Denver, Colorado, United States, ⁴Hospital for Special Surgery, New York, New York, United States, ⁵Weill Medical College of Cornell University, New York, New York, United States

Introduction

Patients with systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) have demonstrated cognitive dysfunction suggesting subtle but clinically important central nervous system involvement [1]. Antiphospholipid syndrome is another autoimmune disorder defined as the presence of arterial or venous thromboses and/or pregnancy morbidity with persistent antiphospholipid antibodies (APL). Diffusion tensor imaging (DTI) has been used to study the disease load in the brains of SLE patients [2-4]. SLE patients have also been investigated using functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) [4-7]. The purpose of this study is to use both fMRI and DTI imaging to characterize the disease load in SLE and APL patients and compare these two groups. **Subjects and Methods**

Three groups of subjects were studied: (1) fourteen SLE patients; (2) five APL patients; and (3) four normal controls. We acquired the MR images with a 3T clinical scanner. In addition to structural images, a 3D volumetric image set, diffusion tensor images including 5 b0 and 33 diffusion weighted images and functional MR images were acquired. The b-value in the DWIs was 800 s/mm². The DTI protocol included 60 slices of 2.6 mm thickness, FOV 240 mm, image matrix of 128x128 zero filled to 256x256 and 15 sec TR. After data acquisition, Day (=Trace/3), FA maps were calculated. The fMRI protocol included FOV of 240 mm, 5mm slice thickness, imaging matrix of 64x64, pulse angle of 70 degrees and TR of 2 sec. Four fMRI paradigms, finger tapping, word generation, rhyming and N-back were used to evaluate the motor, language, working memory functions. Results

The group difference of fMRI activation maps of control, APL, and SLE groups, finger tapping, word generation (Fig. 1), rhyming, and N-back paradigms (Fig. 2) were determined. Diffusion measurements were listed in the table below.



Figure 2: Group differences in word generation task

Discussion/Conclusions

The results show that there are considerable DTI and fMRI differences among three groups of subjects. We found the significant diffusion and fMRI activation changes in the frontal areas of the patients when compared to the controls. In both patient groups, word generation task shows abnormal activation patterns in the frontal areas suggestive of recruitment of these areas during these tasks. In the hippocampal area, there is a significant difference between APL and SLE groups during N-back, word generation and rhyming tasks. We found no difference during finger tapping among the groups. The fMRI determined regions activated during the tasks in SLE patients agreed with previously published results [4-6] using similar tasks. The diffusion changes agreed with the prior work [2-4]. In addition to regional differences, there is also whole brain diffusion (BDav) changes between the patient groups and controls. Considering that the diffusion and fMRI findings in APL are unknown, this comparative study provides novel information.

Acknowledgments

This study was supported in part by Kirkland Foundation.

References

1) Sibbitt WL, et al. Arthritis&Rheumatism 42, 2026-2038 (1999).

- 2) Zhang L, et al. MRI 25, 399-405 (2007).
- 3) Bosma et al. AJNR24, 850-854 (2003).
- 4) Ulug AM, et al. ESMRMB 2009 Congress.
- 5) DiFrancesco MW, et al. HI. Arthritis &
- Rheumatism 56, 4151-4163 (2007).
- 6) Fitzgibbon BM, et al. During, F. M. McQueen. Rheumatology 47, 50-53 (2008). 7) Rocca MA, et al. Neuroimage 30, 478-484 (2006).

		BD _{av}	Thalamus		Splenium CC		Frontal lobe		Genu CC	
			Dav	FA	Dav	FA	Dav	FA	Dav	FA
Control	mean	0.78	0.81	0.31	0.87	0.63	0.84	0.39	0.91	0.73
(n=4)	std	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.11	0.05	0.01	0.06	0.03
APL	mean	0.82	0.86	0.31	0.92	0.61	0.89	0.35	0.96	0.67
(n=5)	std	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.14	0.13	0.03	0.04	0.07	0.08
SLE	mean	0.81	0.85	0.30	0.90	0.68	0.88	0.37	0.95	0.71
(n=13)	std	0.02	0.05	0.02	0.13	0.10	0.04	0.04	0.17	0.07
Control	%incrs	4.6%	5.7%	-1.3%	5.8%	-3.8%	6.8%	-10.8%	6.2%	-9.2%
vs APL	p <	0.01	0.01	0.39	0.26	0.39	0.03	0.03	0.13	0.07
Control	%incrs	2.9%	4.5%	-5.1%	4.1%	7.8%	5.0%	-5.1%	4.5%	-3.1%
vs SLE	p <	0.03	0.07	0.11	0.31	0.20	0.05	0.17	0.32	0.26
APL	%incrs	-1.6%	-1.1%	-3.8%	-1.6%	12.1%	-1.8%	6.4%	-1.6%	6.7%
vs SLE	p <	0.10	0.34	0.17	0.42	0.11	0.22	0.15	0.42	0.12