## Imaging T<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>2</sub> and proton density with minimum possible acquisitions

Guan Wang<sup>1,2</sup>, Abdel-Monem M. El-Sharkawy<sup>2</sup>, and Paul A. Bottomley<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Electrical & Computer Engineering, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, United States, <sup>2</sup>Russell H. Morgan Dept. of Radiology & Radiological Sciences, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, United States

TARGET AUDIENCE. MRI clinicians and scientists interested in efficient, complete T<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>2</sub>, proton density (PD) characterization.

**PURPOSE.** The  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  relaxation times, and proton density (PD) contain almost all of the <sup>1</sup>H MRI information routinely used in clinical diagnosis and research, but are seldom imaged directly. In addition, their accuracy depends critically on B<sub>1</sub>-field homogeneity, making field mapping essential, especially at higher field strengths. Here we propose a novel 'Tri-FA' method to measure and image  $T_1$ ,  $T_2$ , PD and B<sub>1</sub> with only 4 acquisitions–the minimum possible. This 'Tri-FA' method encodes  $T_1$  with 3 varied flip-angles (FA), and  $T_2$  via long 0° BIR-4 pre-pulses instead of spin-echoes. 2D and 3D 'Tri-FA' MRI is demonstrated *in vitro* and *in vivo* at 3 Tesla.

**METHODS**. It was recently noted (1) that self-refocusing B<sub>1</sub>-independent rotation (BIR-4) adiabatic pulses are prone to intra-pulse T<sub>2</sub> decay that depends on the BIR-4 pulse duration ( $\tau$ ), B<sub>1</sub> amplitude, sweep frequency, but is independent of BIR-4 FA. Using four spoiled gradient-echo sequence (SPGR) acquisitions, the 'Tri-FA' measures signals S<sub>1-3</sub> acquired with the same TR (eg, 600ms) but varied excitation FAs ( $\theta_{1-3}$ =30°, 80°, 140°), and a 4<sup>th</sup> signal, S<sub>4</sub> acquired with a  $\tau$ =20ms 0° BIR-4 prepulse (excitation FA= $\theta_1$ , TR'=1036ms). It can be shown that: S<sub>1-3</sub>=M<sub>0</sub>(1-E<sub>1</sub>)sin(q. $\theta_{1-3}$ )/(1-E<sub>1</sub>.cos(q. $\theta_{1-3}$ )), and S<sub>4</sub>=M<sub>0</sub>(1-E<sub>1</sub>').sin(q. $\theta_1$ )E<sub>p</sub>./(1-E<sub>1</sub>'.cos(q. $\theta_1$ ).E<sub>p</sub>), where q reflects the B<sub>1</sub> field inhomogeneity. T<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>2</sub>, M<sub>0</sub>, and q are solved from S<sub>1-4</sub>.

Tri-FA was validated in 2D and 3D MRI studies on a clinical *Philips* 3T scanner. *In vitro* validation was performed on 11 CuSO<sub>4</sub> doped agarose phantoms with  $186 \le T_1 \le 1332$ ms,  $13.2 \le T_2 \le 227$ ms. *In vivo* brain studies were performed on healthy consenting adult volunteers (3D matrix = 224x224x5, FOV= 200x200x25mm<sup>3</sup>; 2D matrix=224x224, FOV=200x200x5mm<sup>3</sup>). Tri-FA measurements were compared with the central slices of standard 3D spin-echo (SE) T<sub>2</sub>, partial saturation (PS) T<sub>1</sub>, PD maps and B<sub>1</sub> maps acquired by actual flip-angle imaging (AFI)(2). 2D Tri-FA measurements were corrected for slice profile distortions.

**RESULTS.** The measured  $T_1$ ,  $T_2$ , PD and  $B_1$  of the phantoms are plotted vs. the standard values in Fig.1(a-d). The  $T_1$ ,  $T_2$ ,  $B_1$ , and PD errors(%) vs the standard values is  $2.5\%\pm14\%$ ,  $3.6\%\pm9\%$ ,  $0.9\%\pm8\%$ , and  $3.6\%\pm4\%$ , respectively. *In vivo* 3D results from a volunteer are shown in Fig.1(e-h). Mean ( $\pm$ SD) errors are  $-4.8(\pm10.4)\%$  for  $T_1$ , and  $1.1(\pm12.5)\%$  for  $T_2$ , measured in the boxes annotated in Fig.1(e). For 2D Tri-FA brain MRI, errors are  $-3.6(\pm6)\%$  for  $T_1$ , and  $-8.5(\pm3.6)\%$  for  $T_2$  after slice profile correction. Analysis shows Tri-FA provides considerably higher accuracy/unit time vs other parameter mapping methods (DESPOT1/2, etc; not shown).

**Conclusion.** The novel Tri-FA method offers a minimum-acquisition option for imaging single-component  $T_1$ ,  $T_2$ , and PD, with  $B_1$ -inhomogeneity self-correction. Tri-FA was validated in 3D applications at 3T, as well as 2D MRI where standard methods can fail.

**References. 1.** Wang G et al. J Magn Reson 214(2012): 273 – 280. 2. Yarnykh VL. Magn Reson Med 57(1):192 – 200 (2007) Grant support: NIH R01 EB007829.



Fig 1. (a-d) In vitro Tri-FA results vs. standard values in 11 phantoms. (e-h) Color coded in vivo 3D Tri-FA maps for a volunteer.