Perfusion MRI: The Five Most Frequently Asked Technical Questions

OBJECTIVE. This and its companion article address the 10 most frequently asked questions that radiologists face when planning, performing, processing, and interpreting different MR perfusion studies in CNS imaging.

CONCLUSION. Perfusion MRI is a promising tool in assessing stroke, brain tumors, and patients with neurodegenerative diseases. Most of the impediments that have limited the use of perfusion MRI can be overcome to allow integration of these methods into modern neuroimaging protocols.

Since its introduction, MRI has been used in the assessment of a variety of CNS abnormalities, including tumors, metastases, infections, and vascular and degenerative diseases. Initially, most attention was focused on the improvement of visualization and resolution of morphologic characteristics. In recent years, however, there have been substantial improvements in MR protocols with a special focus on the assessment of functional tissue characteristics, such as perfusion or metabolism. The use of these functional imaging techniques has improved the differential diagnosis of CNS disease and the therapeutic management of patients and has enabled better assessment of treatment-related changes on follow-up. Multiple studies have shown that the optimized use of high-quality contrast media in perfusion MRI can substantially improve detection, characterization, and monitoring of CNS diseases [1–4].

In this context, perfusion is one of the most important physiologic and pathophysiologic parameters and can be assessed noninvasively with MRI. Today, we have several techniques to derive perfusion-related parameters using endogenous contrast methods or, more robustly and more widely used, exogenous gadolinium-based contrast agent dynamic methods [5].

In this article, we will address five questions that radiologists and radiographers frequently ask when planning, performing, processing, and interpreting different perfusion MRI studies in diseases of the CNS. In this article, we will also briefly address the technical requirements, including the use of contrast-enhanced techniques as well as the clinical applications in brain tumor imaging and acute stroke management.

Question 1: What Are the Impediments to the Routine Clinical Use of Perfusion MRI and How Can We Overcome Them?

In academic centers, the application of perfusion MRI in the assessment of acute stroke or intracranial tumors has been well established and thousands of publications have discussed the ability to perform noninvasive perfusion
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measurements using dynamic MRI techniques. Although these techniques have been available for more than 20 years, wide use in routine clinical practice has never been achieved despite the relative ease with which these techniques can be implemented on modern MRI scanner platforms [6, 7]. What are the impediments to the routine clinical use of perfusion MRI and how can we overcome them?

**Lack of Awareness of Perfusion MRI by Referring Physicians**

A general underappreciation or lack of awareness of the potential of modern MRI protocols, including perfusion imaging, by referring clinicians likely contributes to underutilization of these techniques. Because these methods might have a great impact on the management of patients, it is of great importance to discuss the perfusion results with referring physicians to gain a better insight of their needs and to make them aware of the technical possibilities. The perfusion information should be integrated into the reporting of studies and the differential diagnostic process. Processed perfusion maps should be transferred to the PACS, where they can be readily viewed by referring physicians. Improved understanding of perfusion MRI and its current capabilities through dissemination of the relevant literature may also help to bridge this gap and increase requests for the addition of perfusion MRI to conventional MRI.

**Appreciation and Experience of Perfusion MRI by the Performing Radiologist: Apparent Complexity of Perfusion MRI for Nonexpert Radiologists**

Outside of academic centers, there are likely to be few neuroradiologists in community practice who will be familiar with perfusion MRI. Coupled with this are the perceptions, some rightly so, of the apparent complexities of image acquisition, postprocessing, and interpretation of perfusion MRI. These perceptions can contribute to a lack of enthusiasm for routine implementation into clinical practice, and, consequently, few radiologists will maintain a sufficient volume of experience to be comfortable with performing and interpreting perfusion MRI.

**Lack of Standardized and Optimized Perfusion MRI Protocols**

In general, most modern MRI scanners allow us to run some perfusion sequences. The existence of a wide range of technical factors, including scanner types, pulse sequences, and hardware requirements, that need to be considered may also result in decreased enthusiasm among community radiologists. Another challenge rests in the optimization of the use of gadolinium-based contrast agents in neuroimaging protocols.

**Lack of Simple and Standardized Perfusion Postprocessing Software and Lack of Straightforward Guidelines on How to Interpret Results**

Traditionally, most postprocessing software solutions have been custom-designed institutionally based packages, and only a few commercial software packages have been available. Recently, most of the major MR scanner vendors have started to provide easy-to-use software solutions. Standardization of acquisition parameters and postprocessing software remains a major challenge and will require significant collaboration between the scanner and software manufacturers and the scientific and medical community.

**Lack of Reimbursement for Perfusion MRI and Lack of High-Quality Data Showing Impact on Clinical Care**

These are perhaps the major factors that have discouraged the widespread clinical acceptance of perfusion MRI. There is a lack of high-quality evidence to show that perfusion MRI makes a substantial impact on clinical decision making. This then influences payers’ decisions as to whether perfusion MRI should be reimbursed, so that currently it is not. A substantial body of well-designed studies that show a significant clinical benefit from perfusion MRI is needed to overcome this critical barrier. Besides that, none of the gadolinium-based contrast agents has a specifically approved indication for perfusion MRI. However, as for MR angiography, the methodology and gadolinium-based contrast agents are frequently used off-label.

**Question 2: Which Methods Are Currently Available to Assess Perfusion With MRI?—Overview of Technical Considerations**

Perfusion is physiologically defined as the steady-state delivery of blood to an element of tissue. The term “perfusion” is also used to emphasize contact with the tissue, or in other words, capillary blood flow. Perfusion is variably used for different physiologic parameters that also affect the MR signal, e.g., blood volume, blood velocity, and blood oxygenation.

During the past decades, several methods have been described that noninvasively measure perfusion with MRI. Most effort in this context has been directed toward MR perfusion imaging of the brain [7].

There are two major approaches to measure cerebral perfusion with MRI. The first is application of an exogenous, intravascular, nondiffusible contrast agent, usually a gadolinium-based contrast agent, that emphasizes either the susceptibility effects of gadolinium-based contrast agents on the signal echo, namely first-pass dynamic susceptibility contrast-enhanced (DSC) MR perfusion or the relaxivity effects of gadolinium-based contrast agents on the signal echo, namely dynamic contrast-enhanced (DCE) MR perfusion. The second is application of an endogenous contrast agent using magnetically labeled arterial blood water as a diffusible flow tracer in arterial spin labeling (ASL) MR perfusion.

**Dynamic Susceptibility Contrast-Enhanced MR Perfusion**

DSC MR perfusion, also known as bolus-tracking MRI or perfusion-weighted imaging, is a technique in which the first pass of a bolus of gadolinium-based contrast agent through brain tissue is monitored by a series of T2- or T2*-weighted MR images. The susceptibility effect of the paramagnetic contrast agent leads to a signal loss in the signal intensity–time curve. Using the principles of the indicator dilution theory, the signal information can then be converted into a contrast medium concentration–time curve on a pixel-by-pixel basis (Fig. 1). From these data, parametric maps of cerebral blood volume (CBV) and flow (CBF) can be derived. Regional CBF and CBV values can be obtained by region-of-interest analysis. The study by Östergaard [8] provides an in-depth review of the physical basics of DSC MR perfusion. In neurooncology, CBV is the most robust and widely used parameter [9]. For in-depth review articles about the basic principles of perfusion imaging in neurooncology, we refer to Cha et al. [9, 10] and Provenzale et al. [11].

**Dynamic Contrast-Enhanced MR Perfusion**

DCE MR perfusion, widely referred to as “permeability” MRI, is based on the acquisition of serial T1-weighted images before, during, and after administration of extracellular low-molecular-weight MR contrast media, such as a gadolinium-based contrast agent. The resulting signal intensity–time curve reflects a composite of tissue perfusion, vessel permeability, and extravascular-extracellular space [12, 13].
MR perfusion is k_trans, the rate constant where k_trans reflects permeability [16]. Despite this complexity, k_trans appears to reproducibly measure permeability in glioma patients [17]. Review articles by Paldino and Barbortak [14] and Tofts et al. [15] provide further details regarding the general principles of DCE MRI.

**Arterial Spin Labeling MR Perfusion**

ASL is a perfusion method that uses magnetically labeled blood as an endogenous tracer. Despite the existence of multiple acronyms in the literature, there are two main types of ASL technique: continuous ASL and pulsed ASL [18–20]. In continuous ASL, there is a prolonged radiofrequency pulse that continuously labels arterial blood water below the imaging slab until a steady state of tissue magnetization is reached [21]. One consequence of this prolonged radiofrequency pulse is that it leads to magnetization transfer effects [22]. If the magnetization transfer effects are present only during the labeling scheme, perfusion may be overestimated because the saturation effect of the macromolecular pool will result in reduced signal of the free water pool from the tissue of interest [23].

Although continuous ASL provides greater perfusion contrast, pulsed ASL is less technically demanding [24, 25]. In pulsed ASL, a short radiofrequency pulse is used to label a thick slab of arterial blood at a single point in time and imaging is performed after a period of time to allow distribution in the tissue of interest [26]. There are two categories of pulsed ASL technique depending on whether the labeling is applied in a symmetric or asymmetric fashion relative to the imaging volume [24]. A relatively new technique, called “pseudocontinuous ASL,” represents a compromise between pulsed ASL and continuous ASL. This technique may provide improved balance between labeling efficiency and signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) compared with conventional ASL methods [27].

CBV derived from DSC MR perfusion has been the primary metric used in brain tumor perfusion imaging, although CBF, particularly from ASL, has been an emerging focus. With technical modifications, CBV and mean transit time (MTT) can theoretically be obtained using ASL; however, these methods are not yet widely used [28–32].

Because corrections for age- and patient-dependent mean perfusion must be made to derive absolute CBF, relative CBF appears to be sufficient in brain tumor evaluation [33]. However, the use of absolute values can allow comparisons for a given individual patient throughout the course of treatment.

**Advantages and Disadvantages of the Available Perfusion Methods**

DSC techniques are the most widely used method to measure brain perfusion with MRI. The software to postprocess these data is widely available and relatively straightforward to use. DSC-derived relative CBV is the most widely used and robust method to evaluate brain tumors. Some disadvantages of this technique include the difficulty in determining absolute quantification, susceptibility artifacts (i.e., blood product, calcification, metal, air, and bone), and user dependence.

DCE techniques offer the user the ability to examine the brain microvasculature from a different perspective from DSC MRI by allowing quantitative assessment of the blood-brain barrier and microvascular permeability. This can give a more complete assessment of brain tumor angiogenesis. Some drawbacks of DCE MRI include complexity in image acquisition and pharmacokinetic model postprocessing, user-dependence, and lack of widely available and easy-to-use postprocessing software.

Methods that use exogenous contrast agents have some advantages over ASL. In general, DSC and, even more, DCE MR perfusion achieve a substantially higher SNR that allows imaging at a higher temporal and spatial resolution, e.g., DSC MR perfusion allows the...
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Permeability, a major confounder in DSC MR perfusion relative CBV measurement accuracy, is less of a concern in ASL because it relies on a diffusible tracer (labeled “arterial water”) and thus appears to be relatively insensitive to permeability [38]. Interestingly, a recent study using a continuous ASL method with a twice-refocused spin-echo diffusion sequence appeared to be able to quantify permeability; this type of analysis may become more popular in the future [39]. In addition, there is also the potential for ASL to be completely operator independent [21].


To perform a perfusion study there are technical requirements on the acquisition and on the postprocessing side. To acquire imaging data that can be used for a perfusion analysis, the requirements that are necessary for the scanner are generally not very specific. Some technical considerations must be fulfilled to allow raw data acquisition for the different methods (Table 1), and there are some substantial advantages of high-field systems. In general, the amount of contrast media used is 0.1 mmol/kg of body weight—contrast-enhanced imaging after perfusion should be performed at least 3 minutes after contrast media injection [2].

Dynamic Susceptibility Contrast-Enhanced MR Perfusion

Because the method is based on a fast echo-planar imaging acquisition, the scanner needs to be equipped with echo-planar imaging capabilities. Susceptibility changes on the basis of the injection of an exogenous tracer (gadolinium-based contrast agent) are not strongly field dependent. Therefore, perfusion measurements can be performed both at 1.5 T and 3 T, but even a 1-T system, if equipped with echo-planar imaging, can be used. For the sequence, the maximal temporal resolution should be 1.5 seconds; both 2D and 3D gradient-recalled echo or spin-echo echo-planar imaging sequences can be used.

Bolus injection of the gadolinium-based contrast agent should commence after about a 20-second delay (range, 5–30 seconds) from the start of the DSC MR perfusion sequence. A minimum 3 mL/s (range, 3–5 mL/s) bolus injection rate of gadolinium-based contrast agent is recommended to allow robust and compact bolus arrival in the cerebral tissue. This should be followed by a 25-mL (range, 10–30 mL) saline flush at the same rate to push the bolus toward the heart. Although at the beginning of MR perfusion use, a dose of up to 0.3 mmol/kg of body weight was recommended, today we perform the majority of our MR perfusion examinations at a dose of 0.1 mmol/kg. Higher doses are recommended only if older MR technology is used or if the perfusion study is combined with other contrast-enhanced techniques, such as contrast-enhanced MR angiography or DCE MR perfusion.

Dynamic Contrast-Enhanced MR Perfusion

For DCE MR perfusion, a fast T1-weighted spoiled gradient-recalled echo acquisition technique should be available, e.g., 2D or 3D FLASH (Siemens Healthcare) or turbo FLASH. Spoiled gradient-recalled echo (SPGR) sequences are preferred over standard gradient-recalled echo sequences because the latter have high T2 sensitivity, which is suboptimal because the T2-mediated signal decreases from tissue with a gadolinium-based contrast agent will counteract the desired T1-mediated signal increase [40]. Although 2D sequences do not require specific scanner hardware and are therefore more widely used, 3D sequences, such as SPGR (GE Healthcare), T1-weighted spoiled gradient-recalled echo technique should be available.

TABLE 1: Typical Sequences Used and Minor Practical Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>T1-Weighted (DCE)</th>
<th>T2*-Weighted (DSC)</th>
<th>ASL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPGR/MP RAGE/FLASH/FFE (Typically 3D)</td>
<td>GRE Echo-Planar Imaging (2D Multislice)</td>
<td>GRE Echo-Planar Imaging (2D Multislice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal resolution</td>
<td>~3–6 s</td>
<td>~1–2 s</td>
<td>3–5 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total acquisition time</td>
<td>3–5 min</td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td>3–5 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial resolution</td>
<td>1-mm in-plane × 5-mm slices</td>
<td>2-mm in-plane × 5-mm slices</td>
<td>3-mm in-plane × 5-mm slices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometric artifact</td>
<td>Low impact</td>
<td>Prone to problems at the skull base</td>
<td>Prone to problems at the skull base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model parameters</td>
<td>$k_{trans}$, $v_p$, $v_e$, IAUC</td>
<td>CBV, CBF, MTT</td>
<td>CBF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note—DCE = dynamic contrast-enhanced, DSC = dynamic susceptibility contrast-enhanced, ASL = arterial spin labeling, SPGR = spoiled gradient-recalled echo, MP RAGE = magnetization prepared rapid gradient echo, FFE = fast-field echo, GRE = gradient-recalled echo, $k_{trans}$ = transfer constant, $v_p$ = fractional volume of the plasma space, $v_e$ = fractional volume of the extravascular-extracellular space, IAUC = initial area under the contrast agent concentration-time curve, CBV = cerebral blood volume, CBF = cerebral blood flow, MTI = mean transit time.
ed fast-field echo (T1FFE, Philips Healthcare), volumetric interpolated breath-hold (VIBE, Siemens Healthcare), 3D fast spoiled gradient-echo (GE Healthcare), turbo field echo (Philips Healthcare), and magnetization prepared rapid gradient echo (MP RAGE, Siemens Healthcare), are technically more challenging but show less inflow effect on the arterial input function and less flow artifact in the tissue and provide improved SNR. However, for 3D sequences, the temporal resolution may be lower for the same amount of spatial coverage and these sequences also require a better gradient system on the scanner.

The acquisition time depends on the parameters that should be extracted and sums to 3 minutes’ acquisition for only $k_{\text{trans}}$ assessments to approximately 6- to 7-minute acquisitions for plasma volume and extravascular-extracellular space assessments. The temporal resolution of the single T1-weighted acquisition should be between 3.5 and 6 seconds depending on the scanner specifics and the field strength used. The injection should start 20 seconds after the start of the DCE MR perfusion sequence, with an injection speed of approximately 2–4 mL/s when using the Tofts model and an infusion over 30 seconds when using the Brix model for postprocessing the data. The contrast medium injection should be followed by a saline injection of a minimum of 10 mL at the same injection speed.

Slice thickness is dependent on spatial coverage, varying between 2 and 10 mm. A good trade-off between temporal and spatial resolution can be obtained with a matrix size of $128 \times 128$. The relationship between signal intensity and gadolinium-based contrast agent concentration is not always linear and will be affected by the native T1 values of the tissues. As a result, baseline T1 mapping before administration of the gadolinium-

Fig. 2—49-year-old patient with high-grade glioma who underwent combined 3-T MR perfusion protocol. A, Contrast-enhanced gradient-recalled echo T1-weighted image shows cystic rim-enhancing lesion with solid frontal parts. B and C, In accordance with the Standardization of Acquisition and Post-Processing study, combined protocol of dynamic contrast-enhanced (DCE) MR perfusion (transfer constant map, B) was obtained first with 0.05 mmol/kg gadobutrol at 2 mL/s and 20 mL saline flush followed by dynamic susceptibility contrast-enhanced (DSC) MR perfusion imaging (relative cerebral blood volume map, C) with 0.05 mmol/kg gadobutrol at 5 mL/s and 20 mL saline flush. D, Although small amount of contrast medium was used, signal intensity–time curve for DCE MR perfusion shows excellent contrast enhancement, resulting in high-quality perfusion maps. E, Concentration-time curve for DSC MR perfusion shows short and sufficient bolus geometry and was not influenced by preload of contrast medium.
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The use of contrast-agent-enhanced perfusion MRI has been recommended in DCE MR perfusion, most often using the variable flip angle approach [14, 41]. For the more sophisticated user who would like to quantify the data, T1 mapping with a variable flip angle has been proposed. Furthermore, obtaining T1 measurements both before and after dynamic imaging has also been proposed as a means of increasing the accuracy of the conversion of signal intensity versus time to gadolinium-based contrast agent concentration versus time [42–44].

Combined Dynamic Contrast-Enhanced and Dynamic Susceptibility Contrast-Enhanced MR Perfusion Protocols

When using advanced or multimodal MRI protocols, how can we integrate DCE and DSC MR perfusion into our protocols? What should we measure first, and how should we combine these with other functional methods?

Both sequences can be performed in a single MRI protocol, with the DCE sequence performed before the DSC sequence (Fig. 2). The first injection serves two functions: first as a preload of gadolinium-based contrast agent to help compensate for leakage correction for DSC imaging and, second, to provide dynamic data for calculation of permeability metrics. Because there is an approximate 5- to 8-minute interval recommended between the two injections, an intervening sequence, such as diffusion-weighted imaging, can be performed between DCE and DSC MR perfusion sequences. If combined permeability and perfusion MRI is being performed, it is recommended that the dose be split into two equivalent injections followed by a minimum 10-mL saline flush for each.

A single dose (0.1 mmol/kg of body weight) can only be split if a new-generation gadolinium-based contrast agent (e.g., gadobutrol, a high-relaxivity and high-concentration gadolinium-based contrast agent) and a modern or high-field scanner are used. With standard equipment or a standard gadolinium-based contrast agent, a higher total dose should be considered when two injections are used.

The recommended injection scheme for the single or combined use of DSC and DCE MRI is as follows: For DCE MRI, the recommended injection protocol is 2 mL/s for 0.05 mmol/kg of gadobutrol. Hand injection or lower rate of injection is acceptable, but automated injection is preferred for reliability and consistency. For DSC MRI, the recommended injection protocol is 5 mL/s for 0.05 mmol/kg of gadobutrol at a minimum rate of injection of 3 mL/s. Automated injection is required. The IV catheter that is used must be able to sustain these injection rates. This information can be found on the catheter label.

Injection Device

Because both contrast-enhanced methods (DSC and DCE MR perfusion) are based on dynamic acquisition of imaging data while a contrast bolus is passing through the tissue of interest, the use of a power injector for bolus injection is mandatory. The automated injection is used to allow a fast injection as needed for DSC MR perfusion and to deliver a standardized and reproducible administration of gadolinium contrast agent as recommended for DCE MR perfusion [12, 13]. IV injection into the right arm can decrease the risk of significant contrast agent reflux into the jugular vein [45].
The use of a power injector should allow the injection of a second bolus of saline at the same speed immediately after the contrast media injection. Ideally, this saline flush should be 25 mL (range, 10–30 mL) injected at the same rate to push the gadolinium-based contrast agent bolus toward the heart.

**Contrast Media**

For DSC MR perfusion and DCE MR perfusion, we need to inject gadolinium-based contrast agent. The first MR contrast agent, gadopentetate dimeglumine (Magnevist, Bayer HealthCare), entered clinical trials for MRI of the brain in 1985 [46] and was marketed initially in parts of Europe and Asia in 1988 and later in the United States. Since then, other gadolinium-based contrast agents have been developed and are now available in many countries. All gadolinium-based contrast agents are paramagnetic, i.e., they gain magnetic properties in a strong magnet field and reduce the T1 and T2 relaxation times of nearby water protons. The gadolinium-based contrast agents currently approved for the diagnosis of CNS diseases are gadopentetate dimeglumine (Magnevist), gadoteridol (ProHance, Bracco), gadomethate dimeglumine (MultiHance, Bracco), and gadoterate meglumine (Dotarem, Guerbet), which is only available in Europe, Latin America, and Asia. The next-generation gadolinium-based contrast agent is gadobutrol (Gadovist, Bayer HealthCare), the first agent with a double-gadolinium concentration (1 molar). The size of this compound is comparable with that of conventional gadolinium chelates and, in addition to its double concentration, its in vitro relaxivity has been shown to be higher (approximately 20–25% in plasma at 1.5 T) compared with other non–protein-binding gadolinium chelates [47]. The higher relaxivity has been shown to be beneficial in many applications [2, 48], leading to better contrast enhancement and therefore better diagnostic performance. The double concentration of this agent reduces the bolus volume, which has been shown to be preferable for MR angiography and specific neuroimaging applications such as DSC MR perfusion and DCE MR perfusion [1, 49].

When using fast acquisitions with a short or ultrashort temporal resolution, we can expect an advantage for agents with higher concentrations, such as gadobutrol. The short bolus geometry enables better determination of the peak for arterial input function, which is of importance for quantification of perfusion measurements, e.g., in stroke and other indications that require accurate measurements of the perfusion results.

The advantage of a higher gadolinium concentration was first presented in a direct comparison of gadobutrol at two concentrations (with the same total dose) in volunteers [49]. In this study, the authors showed the benefits of the 1-M over a 0.5-M concentration of gadobutrol for CNS perfusion imaging, which is attributable to the sharper bolus peak and the increased first-pass gadolinium concentration related to the lower injection volume [49] (Figs. 3 and 4).

In a recent study by Giesel et al. [5], 1-M concentrated gadobutrol was compared with a half-molar agent for DSC MR perfusion at 3 T using an intraindividual comparative study design. A significant difference in the maximal signal change after contrast media administration was found, with a stronger signal drop for the 1-M concentrated agent both in gray and white matter, also leading to better delineation of the tumor boundaries in five of six tumor cases (Fig. 5).

**Question 4: Is Perfusion MRI Safe?**

In general, both DSC and DCE perfusion MRI are very safe imaging methods. Besides the general MRI risks and contraindications, both methods require IV infusion of a gadolinium-based contrast agent at a fairly rapid injection rate, especially for the DSC MR perfusion acquisition.

**Scanner-Related Safety Aspects in Perfusion MRI**

There are no additional safety concerns regarding MRI scanners with respect to the different perfusion MRI techniques. Neither the echo-planar imaging techniques used for DSC MR perfusion and ASL MR perfusion nor the gradient-echo technique used for DCE MR perfusion have a specific safety concern. They are available on most modern MRI scanners and do not impact the specific absorption rates for radiofrequency deposition [50, 51].

**Injection-Related Safety Aspects in Perfusion MRI**

A second important safety aspect of perfusion MRI is the IV injection of the gadolinium-based contrast agents, including the injection rate. Because there is no general recommendation for the injection rate in standard MRI examinations, higher injection speeds are especially recommended as is the use of an automated injection device for perfusion sequences (see Question 3: What Is Needed...
to Perform Perfusion MRI?). Explicit evaluations of the injection rate are often combined with questions regarding the image quality for special indications such as MR perfusion. Consequently, safety information on the injection rate may be drawn from the clinical studies. Even in early reports on the safety of gadolinium-based contrast agents, no effects from the injection speed were recorded [52]. However, investigators reported some minor injection-site reactions and pain.

Gadolinium-Based Contrast Agent–Related Safety Aspects in Perfusion MRI

Gadolinium-based contrast agents are considered generally safe, with a less than 1% rate of acute adverse reactions in retrospective analyses, and they lack the nephrotoxicity associated with iodinated contrast media [53–55].

Minor adverse effects occur infrequently and include nausea, taste alteration, and hives. Whereas the different agents have all proven to be safe with respect to the different mild adverse effects, recent studies have indicated differences in the rate of both mild and severe side effects.

Abujudeh et al. [56] compared 32,659 injections and reported that rates of acute adverse reactions to gadopentetate dimeglumine and gadobenate dimeglumine were 0.14% and 0.28%, respectively. They also reported cases of anaphylaxis, which were associated only with the use of gadobenate dimeglumine, providing additional evidence that such reactions can occur, albeit rarely.

In a recent report, Prince et al. [57] evaluated the severe side effects of gadolinium-based contrast agents and raised the possibility that nonionic linear gadolinium-based contrast agents and gadopentetate dimeglumine may have fewer severe immediate adverse events compared with gadobenate dimeglumine.

Other than acute reactions, gadolinium-based contrast agents also differ with regard to chelate stability, with clinical laboratory abnormalities shown for the less-stable agents. Gadolinium-based contrast agents can be categorized by their molecular structure into linear and macrocyclic groups. Relative to agents in the linear group, gadolinium-based contrast agents with a macrocyclic structure (gadobutrol, gadotericum, and gadoteridol) showed increased stability and a reduced propensity to release gadolinium ions in preclinical experiments that included conditions mimicking renal impairment [58].

The dissociation of gadolinium ions from MR contrast material chelating agents in certain contrast media has been associated with the rare condition of nephrogenic systemic fibrosis in patients with severe renal impairment. In separate initiatives, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration and the Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use of the European Medicines Agency have issued guidance on the risk of nephrogenic systemic fibrosis associated with each gadolinium-based contrast medium, placing the macrocyclic agents into lowest-risk groups [59, 60].

Question 5: What Are the Future Perspectives for Perfusion MRI? New Technologic Developments, Standardization

Although there remain many limitations in the different contrast-enhanced perfusion methods and we are still far from a sufficient standardization of the clinically available perfusion techniques, the acquired parameters are of importance, e.g., for tumor grading and assessing patient prognosis as well as treatment guidance and assessing treatment response in both stroke and tumors.

With improvements of image acquisition techniques and the improvement and standardization of postprocessing software in the future, DSC, DCE, and ASL MR perfusion may receive greater acceptance in the everyday clinical routine.

Improvement of Acquisition Techniques

Technical improvements may come from the broader use of higher-field systems [61–63], compressed sensing [64], view sharing, and parallel imaging. Using a higher field provides a substantially higher SNR that one can invest in the different contrast-enhanced perfusion techniques, improving and assessing patient prognosis as well as treatment guidance and assessing treatment response in both stroke and tumors.
struction of subsampled data. Similarly, the applied algorithms can be used to improve both the temporal and spatial resolution of DCE MR perfusion, and several works describing retrospective simulations have shown the feasibility of such improvements.

View sharing allows a faster acquisition for MR angiography but can also be applied for DCE MR perfusion assessments. Initial results exist for lung perfusion [65], and a recently described fat-suppressed approach [66] might improve the DCE MR perfusion results in head and neck indications.

Methodologic and first clinical studies describe a significant artifact reduction, the possibility of faster acquisition, and a more robust assessment of the structural and functional parameters with the use of parallel imaging [67].

For ASL, the use of higher-field strengths (i.e., 3 T or higher), use of a phased-array coil as the receiver, and introduction of fast 3D sequences as an alternative to traditional echo-planar imaging approaches are some technical modifications that may improve SNR and image quality of ASL [25, 51, 68–72].

**Improvement of Postprocessing and Standardization**

Standardization of an optimized protocol across centers is an important objective, with benefits for the uniform performance and interpretation of MRI studies. However, variability between centers in the equipment and the data-interpretation software that are available and a lack of trial evidence to confirm the clinical benefit of novel MR techniques represent barriers to standardized protocol implementation.

Efforts such as the Acute Stroke Imaging Standardization Group [73], Stroke Imaging Repository Consortium [74], Radiological Society of North America Quantitative Imaging Biomarkers Alliance [75], the National Cancer Institute Quantitative Imaging Network [76], and Standardization of Acquisition and Post-Processing Study [77] have been created to facilitate the standardization, development, and validation of quantitative imaging biomarkers (Fig. 6). To transform radiology from a qualitative effort into a quantitative science, work must progress on making “measuring” devices rather than “imaging” devices [75].
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