## Improvement of the Arterial Input Function considering B<sub>1</sub>-Inhomogeneities

## R. Merwa<sup>1</sup>, K. Kapp<sup>2</sup>, F. Ebner<sup>3</sup>, T. Feiweier<sup>4</sup>, G. Reishofer<sup>3</sup>, and R. Stollberger<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Medical Engineering, FH OÖ - Upper Austria University of Applied Sciences, Linz, Austria, <sup>2</sup>Department of Radiation Therapy, Medical University of Graz, Graz, Austria, <sup>3</sup>Department of Radiology, Medical University of Graz, Graz, Austria, <sup>4</sup>Healthcare, Siemens AG, Germany, <sup>5</sup>Institute of Medical Engineering, Graz University of Technology, Graz, Austria

**Introduction:** RF-field inhomogeneities are a main source for image inhomogeneities and systematic errors in quantification of pharmacokinetic parameters [1, 2]. The quantification of these parameters relies on the deconvolution with the arterial input function (AIF), which can be determined from the signal changes in a major artery. In particular for field strength above 1.5 T RF-field inhomogeneities provoke considerable intensity variations in the abdominal region which significantly influence the determination of the AIF. The objective of this work was to investigate the  $B_1$ -inhomogeneity dependent influence of vessel selection for the AIF determination, the impact on quantification of the pharmacokinetic parameters K<sup>trans</sup> and V<sub>e</sub> in a region of interest (ROI) and the possibility to correct these inhomogeneities by using the measured flip angle distribution.

**Methods:** The DCE imaging was performed using a 3D FLASH sequence with the following parameters:  $T_R = 3.34$  ms,  $T_E = 1.1$  ms,  $FA = 15^\circ$ ,  $N_x \times N_y = 256 \times 256$  matrix size,  $FOV_x = FOV_y = 300$ , mm, TH = 4 mm, slices = 20 (no gaps), time points = 40, acquisition time ~ 7 min. The contrast media concentration was determined by a method mentioned by Hittmair [3] using a proton density weighted reference scan (3D FLASH) with  $T_R = 100$  ms,  $T_E = 1.1$  ms and  $FA = 5^\circ$ . All other parameters were consistent with the DCE scan parameters. The actual flip angle distribution, which is proportional to the active RF-field component B<sub>1</sub> was measured with a STEAM sequence [4]. The parameters of this sequence were:  $T_R = 1200$ ,  $T_E = 14$  ms,  $FA = 90^\circ$ ,  $N_x \times N_y = 52 \times 64$  matrix size,  $FOV_x = 308$  mm,  $FOV_y = 250$  mm, TH = 5 mm, slices = 19 (10 mm gap), acquisition time ~ 1 min. Using equation (1) the temporal T<sub>1</sub> relaxation can be calculated from the reference and the DCE images [3]. SI<sub>R</sub>, SI<sub>D</sub>(t) and T<sub>R</sub> are the signal intensity of the reference scan, the signal intensity of the dynamic scan at the time point t and the repetition time of the DCE scan respectively.  $\alpha_D$  and  $\alpha_P$  are the nominal and the corrected flip angles of the dynamic and the reference scan respectively. The contrast agent concentration (c) to follows from equation (2) using a relaxivity  $r_1$  of 3.7 L mmol<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>. The Tofts-model (3) was used for the estimation of the kinetic parameters M<sup>trans</sup> and V<sub>e</sub>.  $C_T$ (t) represents the hematocrit,  $V_e$  is the volume of extravascular extracellular space per unit volume of tissue and K<sup>trans</sup> is the volume transfer constant between blood plasma and V<sub>e</sub>. This model was fitted to the dynamic concentration data in order to obtain values for K<sup>trans</sup> and V<sub>e</sub>. For the analysis of the AIFs the maximum values and the root mean square deviation of the left to the right AIF were calculated. For the analysis of the kinetic parameters were performed for a group of 9 subjects using a 3.0 T

$$T_{1}(t) = -\frac{T_{R}}{\ln\left(\frac{SI_{R} \cdot \sin(\alpha_{D}) - SI_{D}(t) \cdot \sin(\alpha_{R})}{SI_{R} \cdot \sin(\alpha_{D}) - SI_{D}(t) \cdot \sin(\alpha_{R}) \cdot \cos(\alpha_{D})}\right)}$$
(1) 
$$C(t) = \left(\frac{1}{T_{1}(t)} - \frac{1}{T_{10}}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{r_{1}}$$
(2) 
$$C_{T}(t) = K^{trans} \cdot \int_{0}^{t} \frac{C_{A}(\tau)}{(1 - Hct)} \cdot e^{-\frac{K^{trans}}{V_{c}}(t-\tau)} d\tau$$
(3)

**<u>Results</u>:** Fig.1 (a) shows a DCE image of the pelvis region including the magenta-marked regions for the right and left AIF and for the ROI used for the calculation of the kinetic parameters with and without  $B_1$  correction. Fig.1 (b) shows the flip angle distribution (0° - 120°) for a selected slice. Fig.1 (c) and (d) show the comparison of the left and right AIF (of two selected subjects) obtained with (red, magenta) and without (blue, cyan)  $B_1$  correction.





Fig.2 (a) and (b) show the comparison of the maximum values and the root mean square deviation (RMSD) of the left to the right AIF for all 9 subjects. The red and magenta bar represents the values obtained with  $B_1$  correction and the blue and cyan bar represents the values obtained without  $B_1$  correction. Fig. 2 (c) and (d) show the absolute deviation of K<sup>trans</sup> and V<sub>e</sub> in the ROI obtained with the left and right AIF. The red bar represents the values obtained with  $B_1$  correction and the blue bar represents the values obtained with  $B_1$  correction and the blue bar represents the values obtained with  $B_1$  correction.



**Discussion:** Dynamic contrast-enhanced MRI was performed at 3.0 T in combination with a dedicated sequence for the determination of  $B_1$  inhomogeneities. AIF and tissue concentrations were calculated and the kinetic parameters K<sup>trans</sup> and V<sub>e</sub> were determined by means of a generalized kinetic model. The absolute deviation of the maximum values of the left and right AIF can be improved by a factor up to 70 and the root mean square deviation concerning the left to the right AIF can be decreased by factor up to 30 if  $B_1$  inhomogeneities are corrected accordingly. Also the absolute deviations of the kinetic parameters K<sup>trans</sup> and V<sub>e</sub> in the selected ROI obtained with the left and right AIF are significantly lower with the proposed correction algorithm.

References: [1] P.S. Tofts, J. Magn. Reson. Imaging, 10, 223-232 (1999), [2] A.R. Padhani, NMR Biomed., 15, 143-153 (2002), [3] K. Hittmair, Magn. Reson. Med. 31, 567-571 (1994), [4] W.H. Perman, Magn. Reson. Med. 9, 16-24 (1989)