SNR IMPACTS THE ACCURACY AND PRECISION OF KNEE ARTICULAR CARTILAGE **T2 RELAXATION TIME MEASUREMENTS**

B.J. Dardzinski¹, E. Schneider²

¹Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., West Point, PA USA ²Imaging Institute, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, OH USA and SciTrials LLC, Rocky River, OH

The authors have no conflicts with the work reported in this study.

MRI Assessments of Cartilage

- Morphological MRI
 - Insensitive to early stage cartilage lesions
 - Outerbridge I softening / swelling
 - Unexposed (no risk) and Incidence (at risk, no symptoms or ROA) have equal incidence of early defects (WORMS <5)
- T2
 - collagen integrity, [GAG], orientation dependent
- T1 (dGEMRIC)
 - [GAG] charge-based, orientation independent
- T1rho
 - collagen integrity, [GAG], orientation dependent (less than T2)

T2 Assessments

- Are not absolute
- Values are:
 - Spatially dependent
 - Knee positioning (magic angle)
 - Cartilage plate
 - Cartilage zone
 - MR System Dependent
 - Magnetic Field Strength
 - Refocusing flip angle
 - Acquisition sequence
 - Analysis method
 - Image noise, particularly last echo

Introduction

- OAI opted for 3T
 - Increased SNR allowed higher spatial resolution
- In 2003:
 - Not many 3T MR systems
 - Only one knee coil (USAI)
 - However other options in development
 - Pilot study to evaluate impact two different knee coils
 - Similar transmit design (similar excitation / refocusing pulses)
 - Different detection design (different SNR)





	SN	R 1.5	5T '	vs.	3T			
			SNB	(BW =	125)	SNB	(BW =	250)
		ROI	1.5T	3T	Ratio	1.5T	3T	Ratio
	$\langle \rangle$	Bone	53	109	2.1	61	95	1.6
	V	Cartilage	22	46	2.1	29	45	1.6
	()	Fat	74	132	1.8	84	112	1.3
		Muscle	26	42	1.6	31	44	1.4
0	1		SN	(R =	= \	S/σ	n	



T2 Comparison						
ROI	1.5T	3T				
Bone	123 ± 5	122 ± 7				
Cartilage	50 ± 6	43 ± 5				
Muscle	39 ± 4	38 ± 6				
Fat	123 ± 9	128 ± 6				



QTR vs. QT8PAR



Inner height Inner width Inner Circumference Equivalent diameter

180 mm 190 mm 580 mm 184 mm



Min inner height	130 mm
Min inner width	140 mm
Inner Circumference	420 mm
Equivalent diameter	134 mm
Thigh/Calf inner height	180 mm
Thigh/Calf inner width	185 mm













































Findings	
 SNR higher in QT8PAR Global T2 longer with QT8PAR cMF (45.9ms/50.7ms) MT (41.6ms/48.2ms) muscle (37.9ms/40.7ms) T2 precision better with QT8PAR cLF, cMF, and infrapatellar fat 	

Findings

- Due to anatomy, T2 values differ spatially
 cLF has the longest value (52ms)
 - LT has the shortest (40.6ms)
- SNR can vary spatially depending upon coil
- With higher SNR, significantly longer T2 values
 Deep cartilage T2 values were most affected
- T2 changes with SNR can be larger than the impact of changing magnetic field strength

What does this mean for analyzing the OAI data?

- Same USAI QTR coils
 - Used from 2004 early 2012
- Failing quality assurance
 - No replacements have been available for past 2yrs
 - Replaced with InVivo QT8PAR
 - Spring 2012

T2 Summary

- Monitors rotational freedom of water motion
- Sensitive to both collagen integrity, [GAG] in cartilage
 - hydration
- Orientation dependent
- Equipment, acquisition and analysis dependent
 - Analysis precision varies with plate and zone
 (0.5-2% RMS CV%)
 - Measurement precision varies with plate and zone
 - (3.3-10.9% RMS CV%)
 - Include quality control ROIs
 - Accommodate for noise in analysis

T2 values are higher in disease, possibly sensitive to early OA

- Reversible (exercise)
- Small changes, 1-3ms
- Higher T2 in
 - Knee Pain
 - Cartilage or meniscal defects
 - Weaker quadriceps muscles
 - Increases with age, but no diff in rate of change with early OA

T2 in Clinical Research

- Pair the acquisition and analysis
 - $-\,$ Ensure accuracy and sensitivity to change with phantoms
- Perform within subject comparisons for longitudinal change
- Use an intrinsic reference tissue (if possible)
 - Cartilage in a different compartment
 - No gold standard
- Tailor the acquisition to the clinical question
 cartilage repair vs. OA vs. deep cartilage change due to trauma
- Difficult to perform meta-analyses

Acknowledgments

- The OAI and this pilot study are conducted and supported by NIAMS in collaboration with the OAI Investigators and Consultants
- The research reported in this abstract was supported in part by contracts N01-AR-2-2261, N01-AR-2-2262 and N01-AR-2-2258
- We are grateful to the Ohio State University and Memorial Hospital of Rhode Island OAI study teams for recruitment of the study subjects and acquisition of the MR exams