Calibration of confounder-corrected R2* for liver iron quantification at 1.5T and 3T: preliminary results

Diego Hernando¹, Naila Qazi¹, and Scott B Reeder^{1,2}

¹Radiology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, United States, ²Medical Physics, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, United States

Target audience: Basic and clinical researchers working on MR relaxometry or iron quantification.

Purpose: Accurate measurement of liver iron concentration (LIC) is needed for detection, staging and treatment monitoring of iron overload. MRI is very sensitive to the presence of iron, and several techniques based on either R2- or R2*-relaxometry have been proposed. R2-based techniques (eg: Ferriscan) (1) have been shown to be accurate at 1.5T, however they suffer from long acquisition times. R2*-based techniques (2-4) can be performed very rapidly (single breath-hold multi-echo 3D-SPGR for whole-liver coverage). However, R2* can be affected by several confounding factors: presence of fat, background B₀ variations and noise floor effects. It is not understood whether variations in acquisition parameters affect R2*-LIC calibration. In this work, we calibrated confounder-corrected R2*-based LIC quantification at 1.5T and 3T using multiple different protocols, with Ferriscan-LIC (1.5T) as the reference standard.

Methods: In accordance with the local IRB, 24 subjects (9 controls/15 subjects with liver iron overload, 13 men/11 women, age 12-70) were scanned at 1.5T (HDxt, GE Healthcare, Waukesha, WI), and 3T (GE MR750) at part of an ongoing study in 60 subjects. Spin-echo data at 1.5T were used as R2-based LIC (Ferriscan) reference to determine R2* vs LIC calibration curves (1). Single breath-hold, multi-echo 3D SPGR sequences (5) were acquired using four different protocols at both 1.5T and 3T: *Protocol 1* (axial 8mm slices, 6 TEs) 1.5T: TE_{init}=1.2ms, Δ TE=2.0ms; 3T: TE_{init}=1.2ms, Δ TE=2.0ms; 3T: TE_{init}=1.2ms, Δ TE=2.0ms; 3T: TE_{init}=1.2ms, Δ TE=1.0ms. *Protocol 2*: (axial 6mm slices, 6 TEs) 1.5T: TE_{init}=1.2ms, Δ TE=2.0ms; 3T: TE_{init}=1.2ms, Δ TE=0.7ms; 3T: 8 TEs, TE_{init}=0.6ms.

 $R2^*$ maps corrected for the presence of fat (by performing joint estimation of fat, water, and $R2^*$), background B_0 variations (6), and avoiding noise floor effects (by using complex fitting) were generated for each acquisition. For each $R2^*$ map, a region-of-interest measurement (avoiding large blood vessels and bile ducts) was obtained from liver segment 7, which is generally homogeneous and free of artifacts. Linear regression was performed to construct calibration curves for $R2^*$ obtained with each of the 8 acquisition protocols, using Ferriscan-LIC as the reference.

Results and Discussion: Figure 1 shows calibration results between R2* and Ferriscan-LIC at 1.5T and 3T. Good correlation was observed, with similar calibration slope and intercept for all protocols at each field strength. Further, slopes at 3T were nearly half those at 1.5T, as expected (7).

Calibrations provided by this study have different slope than previous $R2^*$ -LIC calibrations (2-4). This discrepancy could be due to differences in R2* mapping algorithms, or differences in the reference standard, including variability of Ferriscan at high LIC (1). Excluding the highest Ferriscan-LIC value (19.2 mg Fe/g dry tissue), the slopes become nearly 0.032 and 0.016 at 1.5T and 3T, respectively (closer to previous 1.5T studies) (2,3). However, the fact that essentially identical calibrations were obtained with different protocols at each field strength (and consistent between 1.5T and 3T) suggests that R2* can provide accurate and robust liver iron quantification, as long as relevant confounding factors are addressed.



Conclusion: Confounder-corrected R2*-MRI is a promising technique for rapid, accurate, and robust liver iron quantification at both 1.5T and 3T.

References: (1) St Pierre TG, et al. Blood 2005;105(2):855-861. (2) Wood et al, Blood 2005;106(4):1460-1465. (3) Hankins et al, Blood 2009;113(20):4853-4855. (4) Chan et al, ISMRM 2010, p. 4635. (5) Meisamy et al, Radiology 2011;258(3):767-775. (6) Hernando et al, Magn Reson Med, 2012;68(3):830-840. (7) Storey et al, Magn Reson Imaging 2007;25(3):540-547.

Acknowledgements: We acknowledge support from the NIH (RC1 EB010384, R01 DK083380, R01 DK088925, and R01 DK096169) and the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation (WARF) Accelerator Program. We also wish to thank GE Healthcare for their support.