Three-dimensional quantitative magnetisation transfer imaging of the human brain
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Quantitative magnetisation transfer (MT) analysis is based on a two-pool model of magnetisation transfer and allows important physical properties of the two proton pools to be assessed. A good signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) for the measured signal is essential in order to estimate reliably the parameters from a small number of samples, thus prompting the use of a sequence with high SNR, such as a three-dimensional spoiled gradient acquisition. Here, we show how full brain coverage can be accomplished efficiently, using a three-dimensional acquisition, in a clinically acceptable time, and without the use of large numbers of slice-selective radio-frequency pulses which could otherwise confound analysis. This acquisition was first compared in post mortem human brain tissue to established two-dimensional acquisition protocols with differing SNR levels and then used to collect data from six healthy subjects. Image data were fitted using the two pool model and showed negligible residual deviations. Quantitative results were assessed in several brain locations. Results were consistent with previous single-slice data, and parametric maps were of good quality. Further investigations are needed to interpret the regional variation of quantitative MT quantities.
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Introduction

The magnetisation transfer (MT) effect is based on the exchange of magnetisation occurring between protons in free water (the liquid pool) and those attached to larger molecules (the semisolid pool). By exploiting this exchange of magnetisation (Wolff and Balaban, 1989), it is possible to sensitise an MR experiment to the magnetic resonance characteristics of macro-molecular protons by selective saturation. MT pulses can be applied to clinical imaging to improve the suppression of static tissue in MR angiography, to increase lesion conspicuity on conventional MRI, or to increase the visibility of enhancing lesions when gadolinium-based contrast agents are used (Silver et al., 1997). An MT weighted image can also be combined with an unweighted image to obtain the MT ratio (MTR).

Despite being a (semi-)quantitative measure, the MTR value is the result of the combination of several more fundamental quantities, and it is highly dependent on the acquisition parameters. Henkelman et al. (1993) developed a simple two-pool model for the quantitative interpretation of the MT phenomenon in gels, which allows these physical quantities – inaccessible by conventional means – to be estimated from a set of MT measurements. The application of quantitative MT in vivo has been pursued by other authors (Ramani et al., 2002; Sled and Pike, 2000, 2001; Sled et al., 2004; Tozer et al., 2003; Yarnykh, 2002), producing interesting results in healthy subjects (Sled et al., 2004), in patients with multiple sclerosis (Davies et al., 2004), and in those with tumours (Yarnykh, 2002).

Clinical applications of the technique are unfortunately still limited, mainly due to the long acquisition times and the limited brain coverage achievable. Since quantitative MT imaging requires the collection of a series of MT-weighted images and the estimation of a number of parameters by fitting a non-linear model to the measured signal, the acquisition time is predominantly affected by the number of data points required to achieve a sufficient signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) in the calculated maps. The number of data points can be decreased by reducing the number of model parameters to a subset, i.e. by imposing physically meaningful constraints on the others (Yarnykh and Yuan, 2004). This strategy has been shown to produce high-quality and high-resolution quantitative maps in healthy controls when used in combination with a 3D acquisition. While using an a priori information to fix some of the model parameters can present several advantages in healthy tissues, the approach can be more...
problematic in the presence of pathology, when the same quantities can vary independently in an unpredictable fashion. When no a priori hypotheses can be made, as many model parameters as possible should be fitted to the data, making the use of a pulse sequence with inherently high SNR even more important. This observation prompted us to evaluate the performance of different acquisition protocols.

In principle, data acquisition can use any pulse sequence, but due to their short scan times and low T1 and T2 contrast on unsaturated images, mainly single slice (Sled et al., 2004) or multislice (Davies et al., 2004; Tozer et al., 2003) 2D gradient echo (GE) sequences have been investigated to date. On the other hand, three-dimensional acquisitions overcome some of the limitations of multislice 2D GE acquisitions, such as interference between adjacent slices (Kucharczyk et al., 1988) and incidental MT effect from the slice-selective pulses used (Dixon et al., 1990). These advantages, the ability to provide whole brain coverage and the better SNR for a given time (Edelstein et al., 1986), have already led to 3D imaging being applied to (non quantitative) MT imaging better SNR for a given time (Edelstein et al., 1986), have already led to 3D imaging being applied to (non quantitative) MT imaging and MTR measurement (Dousset et al., 1992; Finelli et al., 1996; Henkelman et al., 1993). In order to extract MT parameters with those obtained using a 2D acquisition. The 3D acquisition was validated (SPGR) sequence, which provides whole brain coverage and requires a relatively short acquisition time. This sequence allows the Henkelman et al. (1993) model was modified by introducing a 3D pulse sequence also performed by Ramani et al. (2002). In brief, the

Background

This work is based on the simplified model of quantitative MT developed by Ramani et al. (2002). In brief, the Henkelman et al. (1993) model was modified by introducing \( f \), the macromolecular proton fraction, as:

\[
f = \frac{M^B}{M^0 + M^A},
\]

where \( M^B \) and \( M^0 \) are the fully relaxed values of magnetisation associated with the free pool, A, and the semisolid pool, B respectively. Using \( f \), the MT-weighted signal intensity (\( S \)) can be written as:

\[
S = gM^A \left( \frac{gM^A}{gM^0 + RM^A} \right) \left( \frac{RM^A}{RM^0 + RM^A} \right) \left( R_B + R_{MR} \right) + \left( \frac{RM^A}{RM^0 + RM^A} \right) \left( R_{MR} + R_B + RM^0 \right)
\]

In this equation, \( g \) is a scanner-dependent scaling factor, \( R \) is the MT exchange rate between the two pools; \( R_A = 1/T^A_\text{obs} \) and \( R_B \) are the longitudinal relaxation rates of the free and semi-solid pools respectively, and \( T^A_\text{obs} \) is the transverse relaxation time of pool A. \( R_{MR} \) represents the rate of loss of longitudinal magnetisation due to the irradiation by the MT pulse of amplitude \( \omega \), expressed in rad s\(^{-1}\), and offset frequency \( Af \). \( R_{MR} \) depends on the transverse relaxation time of the semisolid pool, \( T^B_\text{obs} \) and, in brain tissue, it can be modelled assuming a super-Lorentzian lineshape (Li et al., 1997; Sled and Pike, 2000).

For in vivo applications, \( \omega \) can be estimated as the continuous wave power equivalent (CWPE), where the pulse is simply replaced by a continuous wave irradiation with the same mean square amplitude (Ramani et al., 2002). Only 6 independent parameters can be determined from Ramani’s model: \( RM^A_B, gM^A_B, R_B, f/R_A (1 - f), 1/R_A T^A_\text{obs}, \) and \( T^B_\text{obs} \) (Ramani et al., 2002). In order to extract \( f \) from the fitted \( f/R_A (1 - f) \), knowledge of \( R_A \) is also required. This can be achieved by measuring independently the observed longitudinal relaxation rate of the sample, \( R_{A\text{obs}} = 1/T^A_\text{obs} \) (Henkelman et al., 1993). \( R_A \) can then be estimated according to the following relationship (Ramani et al., 2002):

\[
R_A = \frac{R_{A\text{obs}}}{RM^A_B f/R_B (1 - f) (R_B - R_{A\text{obs}})}.
\]

Pulse sequence and fitting routine

All images were obtained on a 1.5 T clinical scanner (SIGNA Horizon Echospeed, General Electric, Milwaukee, WI, USA). The pulse sequence consists of a MT-weighted 3D fast SPGR acquisition with a TR of 30.7 ms and a TE of 5.3 ms. In order to minimise the amount of T1-weighting, an excitation flip angle of 5° was used. MT saturation was achieved using Gaussian pulses (standard deviation = 2.98 ms, duration = 14.6 ms), applied once every TR prior to RF excitation. Their flip angle and offset frequency were varied. Ten MT points were collected in total, for each of the experiments described below, using only two MT pulse powers, following the observations of Sled and Pike (2000) (the powers can be described by their equivalent on-resonance flip angles: low flip angle = 212° and high flip angle = 843°). For each power, five different frequency offsets, ranging from 400 Hz to 20000 Hz, were used. The frequencies were separated by a constant logarithmic step of about 0.4. For all the experiments reported in this paper, a matrix of 256 × 96 × 32 over a FoV of 240 × 180 × 160 mm\(^3\) was used, for a total scan time of approximately 15 min. Data were then reconstructed to an in-plane matrix of 256 × 256 over a 24 × 24 cm FoV, while the 32 through-plane phase encode steps were used to reconstruct twenty-eight 5-mm-thick slices (with 4 slices being discarded to minimise wrap around effects). The manufacturer’s birdcage head coil was used for both signal transmission and reception. The specific absorption rate (SAR) was estimated during scan setup, using the manufacturer’s standard calculation routines, assuming a ‘worst case scenario’ of MT pulses with the maximum flip angle for all measurements; in no cases were the SAR limits reached or exceeded (runtime hardware SAR monitoring is provided as standard, for all sequences, by the scanner).

All image processing was performed on a Unix workstation (Sun Microsystems, Mountain View, CA, USA). The quantitative MT parameters were obtained as follows. Five of the six independent parameters of Eq. (2) \((RM^A_B, gM^A_B, f/R_A (1 - f), 1/R_A T^A_\text{obs}, T^B_\text{obs}\rangle \) were estimated using the non-linear least squares approach in Sowego's implementation of the Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm (Szego et al., 1992). Briefly, the Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm is an iterative technique that finds the local minimum of a function. The function \( S(f) \) is defined as the difference between the observed data and the model data. The initial estimates of the parameters were obtained by a preliminary fit of selected \( f/R_A (1 - f) \) values and \( R_A \) were used.

Materials and methods
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This work is based on the simplified model of quantitative MT developed by Ramani et al. (2002). In brief, the Henkelman et al. (1993) model was modified by introducing \( f \), the macromolecular proton fraction, as:
$R_A T_2^A$, and $T_2^B$) were estimated by fitting Ramani’s model to the data, using the Levenberg–Marquardt method, as implemented in Numerical Recipes (Press et al., 1992). In order to correct the nominal flip angle of the MT pulses, the $B_1$ field was estimated using a calibration oil-filled phantom (24 cm diameter, 40 cm length), according to the method of Barker et al. (1998); the MT pulse nominal flip angle was then scaled by a factor equal to $B_{1\text{nominal}}/B_{1\text{actual}}$, where $B_{1\text{nominal}}$ is the $B_1$ field in the centre of the phantom. This correction was performed only for in vivo data. $\omega_{\text{CWPE}}$ was then calculated as described by Ramani et al. (2002). Look-up tables were used for the super-Lorentzian lineshape and its derivative in order to speed up the computation. $R_B$ was set arbitrarily to 1 s$^{-1}$ and kept fixed during the fitting, an approach adopted by other authors (Ramani et al., 2002; Sled and Pike, 2001; Tozer et al., 2003) because estimates of the other parameters are largely insensitive to the value of $R_B$, and $R_B$ tends to vary widely during the fitting procedure, leading to physically meaningless estimates.

Validation of the technique

In order to validate the 3D acquisition against an established 2D protocol and to compare performance, a coronal post mortem brain slice (thickness: 1 cm) from one hemisphere of a patient with multiple sclerosis was scanned using two different protocols. The specimen was provided by the UK Multiple Sclerosis Tissue Bank, (Charing Cross Hospital, Imperial College London, London, UK). Age at death and disease duration were 44 and 18 years respectively. The sample was fixed for 133 days in 10% formalin solution. The following scans were collected during a single session: (a) the MT-weighted 3D-SPGR sequence, as described in the previous section, and (b) an MT-weighted 2D-SPGR sequence (TE/TR = 12/1040 ms, imaging flip angle = 25°, matrix = 256 × 96, NEX = 0.75, in plane FOV = 240 × 180, 28 5-mm-thick slices). For protocol (b), the same number of points (10, for a scan time of about 14 min) was collected using Gaussian MT pulses with the same duration and standard deviation as those used for protocol a) (14.6 and 2.98 ms, respectively). The flip angles of the MT pulses were chosen to be similar in the two protocols, within the constraints of their different interval between subsequent pulses (although this match was not perfect due both to differences in the CWPE and to the different handling of pulse scaling (Tofts et al., in press)). The same values of frequency offset per flip angle were used for both 2D and 3D acquisitions. All images were collected in the coronal plane. In order to compare the two protocols at similar SNR levels, protocol (b) was repeated 3 times for averaging purposes.

Four circular regions of interest (ROIs) (area = 13.2 mm$^2$) were placed on the unsaturated image of the post mortem brain slice, within the normal appearing white matter (NAWM), using a high resolution scan of the same slice as visual reference and carefully avoiding contamination with MRI-visible MS lesions, CSF and grey matter. The location of the ROIs is shown in Fig. 1i. Ten data points for each ROI were obtained by superimposing the ROI outlines on the 10 different MT-weightings available for each of the following: (1) the 3D data sets (3D), (2) a single 2D data set (2D), (3) the (magnitude) average of two 2D data sets (2D2AV), and (4) the (magnitude) average of three 2D data sets (2D3AV). The calculated $\omega_{\text{CWPE}}$ was, respectively, $\omega_{\text{CWPE}} = 212$ and 845 rad s$^{-1}$ for protocol (a); and $\omega_{\text{CWPE}} = 190$ and 440 rad s$^{-1}$ for protocol (b). For each ROI, the quantitative MT parameters were estimated using the fitting routine described previously.

In vivo MRI acquisition

Six healthy subjects (F/M = 2/4, mean age = 38.5 years, SD = 8.3 years) were scanned using the following protocol: (A) the 3D-MTSPGR acquisition described above; and (B) three 3D SPGR volumes (TR = 13.1 ms, TE = 4.2 ms) with three different excitation flip angles ($\chi = 25°, 15°, 5°$) in order to independently estimate the longitudinal relaxation rate of the system, $R_{\text{Abs}}$. All images were collected along the axial plane. The same acquisition matrix and FoV as the MT-SPGR were used for sequence (B). The total imaging time was less than 20 min.

One subject (female, age 31 years) was scanned twice, the second time acquiring all the images in the coronal plane, with a protocol otherwise identical to the axial acquisition, to allow orientation and slice thickness dependant effects to be investigated.
The study was approved by the Joint Research Ethics Committee of The National Hospital for Neurology and the Institute of Neurology, UCL, and all subjects gave written informed consent before entering the study.

Image post-processing

For the in vivo data, the ten MT-weighted volumes obtained with sequence (A) and the three volumes obtained with sequence (B) were co-registered with the first MT-weighted volume using a modified (Symms et al., 2003) version of Automated Image Registration (AIR, available at http://air.bmap.ucla.edu:16080/AIR) (Woods et al., 1998). $T_{1\text{obs}}$ was estimated on a pixel-by-pixel basis by fitting the theoretical SPGR signal equation to the SPGR signal (sequence B), as a function of the flip angle (Venkatesan et al., 1998). The nominal flip angle was corrected for B1 inhomogeneities using the same method described for quantitative MT parameters measured on axial and coronal acquisitions were, respectively. 

Statistical correlations were assessed using the Spearman correlation coefficient in SPSS (SPSS Inc., Chicago, USA). All reported significances are two-tailed.

Results

Validation of 3D acquisition and SNR-related variability post mortem

The SNR of post mortem data was calculated as $SNR = S_{SNWMI}/\sigma_{\text{NOISE}}$, where $S_{SNWMI}$ is the average signal intensity measured on the ROIs on the image with the least amount of direct saturation ($\Delta = 20$ kHz, $\omega_{\text{CWPE}} = 212$ rad s$^{-1}$ for the 3D acquisition, and $\omega_{\text{CWPE}} = 190$ rad s$^{-1}$ for the 2D acquisition), and $\sigma_{\text{NOISE}}$ is estimated on the same data by measuring the standard deviation of signal intensity in a region of background and dividing that value by 0.66, according to the method of Henkelman (1985). The resulting values were SNR2D (1 average) $\approx 43$ and SNR3D $\approx 71$, respectively. The mean values and the standard error for $RM^A_0$, $fR_A(1-f)$, $1/R_A^2$, and $T_2^A$ obtained by fitting the model to the 4 data sets (2D, 2D2AV, 2D3AV, and 3D) are shown in Fig. 1ii (gM$^2$$_A$ depends on an arbitrary multiplicative gain factor and therefore was not compared). The quantitative MT parameters obtained from the 4 data sets can be considered equivalent, within the experimental error. All estimates obtained from 2D data sets approach the values obtained from the 3D data sets when the number of averages and thus the SNR are increased. As expected, the standard error is also reduced when the number of averages is increased.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>$f$ [%]</th>
<th>$T_2^A$ [ms]</th>
<th>$T_1^A$ [ms]</th>
<th>$T_{1\text{obs}}$ [ms]</th>
<th>$T_2^B$ [ms]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corpus genu</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splenium</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal genu</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capsule</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posterior limb</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corona</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optic</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radiation</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedunculus</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cerebi</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebellum</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pons</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontal</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalamus</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caudate</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putamen</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>1092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontal GM</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>1279</td>
<td>1279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$f =$ macromolecular proton fraction; $A =$ free pool; $B =$ restricted pool; SD = standard deviation; GM = grey matter; WM = white matter. See text for further details.

With the exception of the corpus callosum and the pons, the values were measured bilaterally.

Whole-brain 3D acquisition in vivo

All in vivo images obtained with the 3D-MTSPGR were of good quality. The average SNR on the least saturated image, measured using a ROI positioned in the periventricular white matter, was 108.1. Typical parametric maps are shown in Fig. 2.

The fit of the MT-weighted signal intensity for two ROIs (40 voxels) is shown in Fig. 3. The variance of the fit (calculated as the sum of the squared difference between the data and the model, divided by the number of degrees of freedom) was 1.7 for the internal capsule (Fig. 3A) and 2.6 for the thalamus (Fig. 3B). The mean residual errors for these fits were 1.1% and 1.2%, respectively.

Average values for the estimated $T_{1\text{obs}}$, $f$, $T_2^A$, $T_1^A$, and $T_2^B$ in various brain regions are summarised in Table 1. Bivariate correlations (Spearman rank correlation coefficient) between parameters established a strong inverse correlation between $T_1^A$ and $f$ ($R = -0.9$, $P < 0.001$) and between $T_2^B$ and $f$ ($R = -0.7$, $P < 0.001$). $T_2^A$ and $T_2^B$ were also correlated, more strongly in grey matter ($R = 0.7$, $P < 0.001$) than in white matter ($R = 0.4$, $P < 0.001$). Paired samples correlations between parameters measured on axial and coronal acquisitions were,
respectively, $0.7 \ (P < 0.001)$ for $f$, $0.7 \ (P < 0.001)$ for $T_2^B$, $0.6 \ (P = 0.003)$ for $T_2^A$, and $0.6 \ (P = 0.003)$ for $T_2^A$.

Discussion

A report describing regional variations of quantitative MT parameters within the brain of healthy subjects has recently been published, where a single 7-mm-thick slice was acquired (Sled et al., 2004). In the present study, the application of a 3D-MTSPGR sequence for quantitative MT acquisition allowed us to extend these investigations to a larger number of anatomical locations by collecting data from 6 healthy subjects, covering the whole brain with a $1 \times 2 \times 5 \ mm^3$ resolution in less than 20 min.

Whole-brain coverage can also be achieved using a 2D multislice acquisition (Davies et al., 2004; Tozer et al., 2003). However, a 3D Fourier encoding provides considerable advantages over a 2D multislice method, including improved SNR for comparable resolution and a reduction of partial volume effects and slice profile artefacts. Moreover, when using a 2D multislice acquisition, the incidental MT effect produced by subsequent slice excitation (Dixon et al., 1990) should be taken into account in modelling the signal intensity, particularly since this effect can vary with slice location.

In order to validate the 3D-MTSPGR acquisition, we have compared the performance of 2D and 3D SPGR in a post mortem brain slice. As expected, the SNR estimated on experimental data was higher for the 3D acquisition (despite the reduced excitation flip angle). The comparison was therefore carried out using 2D data sets characterised by different levels of SNR, obtained by averaging.

This analysis confirmed that quantitative MT could benefit from the use of a pulse sequence with high inherent SNR. Particularly, while the mean estimated value of $1/R_2T_2^A$ is very consistent across the 4 data sets, the other parameters appear more sensitive to raw data uncertainty.

Above all, $RM_0^A$ tends to vary widely, even at high SNR. This is not surprising, as the measured signal is quite insensitive to variation in $M_0^A$ (Graham and Henkelman, 1997), and in previous studies based on Ramani’s model (Ramani et al., 2002), $RM_0^A$ could not be estimated, as the fitting algorithm converged to large indiscriminate values. It has been argued that this parameter is highly sensitive to the timing of the pulse sequences; hence, its sensitivity to noise can be reduced by more accurate mathematical models (Yarnykh and Yuan, 2004). It is possible that the CWPE approximation is an oversimplification and that more sophisticated models may be required in order to accurately estimate the exchange rate between the two pools. Fortunately, the uncertainty in $RM_0^A$ does not appear to affect the fit of the remaining parameters.

In terms of validating the 3D acquisition, the analysis of post mortem data showed that 2D and 3D acquisitions for quantitative MT produce consistent estimated quantitative MT parameters, in agreement within the confidence limits, particularly when several 2D data sets are averaged to reach an SNR comparable to the 3D data.

In vivo, the quantitative MT parametric maps obtained using the 3D-MTSPGR were characterised by acceptable quality; they appear visually slightly noisier than those published by Sled and Pike (2001), as would be expected given the smaller number of points (10 vs. 60) and the higher resolution used for the present study.

Quantitatively, all estimated parameters are within the range of expected values. Our average, $T_2^B$ values show very good agreement with previously published data (Sled et al., 2004; Davies et al., 2004). Interestingly, this parameter is characterised by a significant variability within white matter, which may result from different fibre geometries in different areas of the brain. The highest values were measured in the internal capsule, corona radiata, and pedunculus cerebri, and the lowest in the corpus callosum and in the
pons. The explanation for this finding is unclear. Since the resolution of the parametric maps is higher in-plane than in the slice-selective direction, the partial volume with either grey matter or CSF could affect $T^2_B$ estimates in white matter fibres running within the axial plane, while preserving those running in the superior–inferior direction. However, the distribution of $T^2_B$ estimated from a coronal data set showed a similar trend to those obtained from an axial data set, suggesting that the observed $T^2_B$ variation does not originate from a partial volume artefact.

Yarnykh and Yuan (2004) imposed a fixed value to $T^2_B$ and therefore found no spatial variation of this parameter; however, they did note a variation in $f$ maps with position when using an acquisition with thinner slices than ours. This was explained as a result of the variable density of myelinated fibres in white matter tracts. The reason why the underlying structure is reflected by two different parameters in the two different studies is unclear, but it might be related to the use of different MT models in the two studies. Particularly, since Yarnykh and Yuan fitted a reduced model (with fixed $T^2_B$) to their experimental data, it is conceivable that the variation in $T^2_B$ was reflected by a different parameter. Despite these differences, this result confirms that quantitative MT is sensitive to white matter architecture.

Provided that differences in the model are taken into account, the $f$ values in our study are consistent with those obtained in an earlier study (Sled et al., 2004). Here, we used the relation $f = F / (1 + F)$ when comparing previously published values of the relative size of the restricted pool to $f$, where $F = M_0^T / M_0^T$.

For the present proof of concept study, we used a simplistic approach for correcting the nominal flip angles of the MT pulses. Clearly, the use of calibration scans on a phantom to estimate the $B_1$ field is not ideal since field homogeneity may vary due to loading or standing wave effects. Nevertheless, such effects should be subtle, and we have evidence from the phantom measurements that the birdcage head coil we used gives very high homogeneity over its normal imaging volume. For future clinical applications of the quantitative MT protocol here described, particularly at higher field strength, a direct measure of $B_1$ uniformity in the head should be obtained at the acquisition time.
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