Imaging Near Metal with a MAVRIC-SEMAC Hybrid

K. M. Koch,1* A. C. Brau,2 W. Chen,2 G. E. Gold,3 B. A. Hargreaves,3 M. Koff,4 G. C. McKinnon,1 H. G. Potter,4 K. F. King1

The recently developed multi-acquisition with variable resonance image combination (MAVRIC) and slice-encoding metal artifact correction (SEMAC) techniques can significantly reduce image artifacts commonly encountered near embedded metal hardware. These artifact reductions are enabled by applying alternative spectral and spatial-encoding schemes to conventional spin-echo imaging techniques. Here, the MAVRIC and SEMAC concepts are connected and discussed. The development of a hybrid technique that utilizes strengths of both methods is then introduced. The presented technique is shown capable of producing minimal artifact, high-resolution images near total joint replacements in a clinical setting. Magn Reson Med 65:71–82, 2011. © 2010 Wiley-Liss, Inc.
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INTRODUCTION

The soft-tissue contrast attainable with magnetic resonance (MR) imaging techniques is advantageous in diagnosing complications from arthroplasty procedures (1–3). Unfortunately, conventional MR images are significantly compromised by implant-induced susceptibility artifacts. Metal-induced B₀ perturbations are orders of magnitude larger than those induced by anatomic susceptibility boundaries. These increased perturbations dramatically disrupt the spatial-encoding mechanisms applied in conventional MR imaging.

A number of hardware and software solutions have been proposed to mitigate MR image distortions near metal implants. Such approaches include single-point imaging (4), prepolarized MRI (5), view-angle tilting (VAT) (6, 7), and dual-reversed-gradient acquisitions (8). Existing challenges and limitations have prevented widespread adoption of these techniques in the clinical arena.

The recently described multi-acquisition with variable resonance image combination (MAVRIC) and slice-encoding metal artifact correction (SEMAC) methods have been shown to significantly reduce susceptibility artifacts near metal implants (9, 10). By relying on conventional imaging techniques that can be applied on standard clinical MR hardware, the MAVRIC and SEMAC methods offer a pathway to low-artifact clinical MR imaging near a wide variety of metal implants. Measurements of artifact reduction near a total knee replacement at 1.5 T have found that MAVRIC and SEMAC both reduce image distortions by roughly a factor of 10 when compared with 2D-FSE images (11). Both techniques have also been demonstrated to be capable of revealing pathology not accessible via standard MR imaging methods (12, 13).

Although MAVRIC and SEMAC approach the susceptibility artifact problem from different perspectives (SEMAC from a 2D slice-selective approach and MAVRIC from a 3D approach), they mitigate susceptibility artifacts using similar physical principles. Here, we describe the connection between the two methods and elaborate on the nuanced differences between them. After highlighting the theoretical principles behind the MAVRIC and SEMAC techniques, the spectral properties by the two methods are analyzed in detail. A hybrid sequence possessing advantageous elements of both techniques is then presented. Finally, this hybrid method is demonstrated on arthroplasty patients in a clinical setting and is compared with existing standard-of-care clinical images.

THEORY

Susceptibility Artifacts: Spectral and RF Considerations

In the presence of an off-resonance frequency distribution \( \Delta \nu_0(x, y, z) \), the frequency-encoded dimension (x) in a conventional spin-warp image is distorted according to

\[
\rho(x, y, z) \xrightarrow{\Delta \nu_0(x, y, z)} \rho \left( x - \frac{2\pi \Delta \nu_0(x, y, z)}{\gamma G_x}, y, z \right), \quad [1]
\]

where \( G_x \) is the amplitude of the applied frequency-encoding gradient. Stepped phase-encoding dimensions in a spin-warp image are not susceptible to distortions from off-resonance effects. For notational simplicity, logical \((x, y, z)\) coordinates will be used throughout this work to represent the (read, phase, slice/phase)-encoded directions.

Frequency-encoding gradient amplitudes are not only constrained by hardware limitations but are also determined by the desired readout field of view (FOVₜ) and the chosen reception bandwidth (BWₓ, given in Hz).

\[
G_x = 2\pi \frac{BW_x}{\gamma FOV_x}. \quad [2]
\]

For a readout of 256 samples collected at a relatively high sampling (readout) bandwidth of \( BW_x = \pm 125 \text{ kHz} \) (1 kHz/pixel), each 1 kHz of \( \Delta \nu_0 \) offset corresponds to roughly 1 pixel of spatial displacement. It is not uncommon to encounter off-resonance values of 10–15 kHz near...
implanted metal hardware, which thus correlates to distortions at the 10–15 pixel level in high readout bandwidth acquisitions.

The spectral bandwidth ($\Delta v_{RF}$) of applied RF pulses determines the maximum off-resonance frequency encountered in a spatial-encoding process. It is common to use Carr-Purcell-Meiboom-Gill (CPMG) spin-echo-based imaging sequences near metal implants. In this work, the term Fast-Spin-Echo (FSE) will be used to refer to this class of imaging sequences. Such sequences allow for rapid acquisition of $T_2^*$-refocused signal, which is of particular importance in the presence of strong $\Delta v_0$ gradients. The bandwidths of refocusing RF pulses used in such sequences are limited by peak amplitude of (excitation) radio frequency field and energy absorption considerations. Typically, the maximum applied bandwidths are in the 2-kHz range. Thus, the maximum effective off-resonance value for a spin encountered in the experiment is only $\approx \pm 1$ kHz; the other spins are simply not excited.

From a frequency-encoding perspective, slice-selection processes widen effective spectral windows and thus introduce additional encoding distortions. Consider a spin that is $\Delta v_0 = 10$ kHz off-resonance. Without slice selection, this spin would be outside of the RF bandwidth used in a CPMG imaging process. However, if a slice-selection gradient, $G_z$, is applied to excite slices of thickness $\delta z = 2\pi \Delta v_{RF} / (yG_z)$, this spin could be brought back into the RF bandwidth for a slice that is centered a distance of $\Delta z = \delta z \cdot 10$ kHz$/\delta v_{RF}$ away from its true $z$-position. As the slice-selective gradient is turned off during signal acquisition, the spin is (a) misregistered to the wrong slice in the $z$-dimension and (b) frequency-encoded to an incorrect position given by Eq. 1. If $\delta v_{RF} = 2$ kHz RF pulses were used, the slice-selection process enables this spin to be distorted in the frequency-encoded dimension 10 times farther than any spin could be distorted in the absence of slice selection.

VAT is a process that was introduced to eliminate this effect (14). The basic principle of VAT is to apply the slice-selection gradient that was used during RF application again during the acquisition window. Such an approach allows for 2D slice-selective imaging while removing the aforementioned amplification of frequency-encoded distortions. The tradeoffs to VAT are (1) a slight shear of the slice in the logical $x$–$z$ plane by the view-angle $\theta_{VAT} = \text{atan} \left( \frac{\delta z}{\delta v_{RF}} \right)$ and (2) the introduction of an acquisition window filter

$$F(t) = \text{sinc}(yG_z t \delta z / 2),$$

which can blur acquisitions with long readout windows (14).

As a stand-alone method, the VAT technique is of limited value near most metal implants because of its vulnerability to slice-selective distortions. As discussed in detail by Lu et al. (10), the $\Delta v_0(x, y, z)$ distributions induced by metal implants can significantly alter intended slice planes from their intended geometry. Briefly, a spin will be misregistered in the slice-selective dimension by one slice-width for every $\delta v_{RF}$ kHz for which it is offset from the resonance frequency. For example, when using 2-kHz RF pulses, a spin at 10 kHz will be misregistered in the slice dimension by five slice widths. For a slice-selective image, Eq. 1 can be modified to account for these additional distortions:

$$\rho(x, y, z) \xrightarrow{\Delta v_0(x, y, z)} \rho \left( x - \frac{2\pi \Delta v_0(x, y, z)}{\gamma G_x}, y, z - \delta z \frac{\Delta v_0(x, y, z)}{\delta v_{RF}} \right),$$

Although postprocessing correction of slice-selective distortions has been proposed by Pauly et al. (15) and Skare et al. (8), such corrective measures are limited in scope. In particular, any postprocessing shifting of pixels in regions with strong $|\frac{\Delta v_0(x, y, z)}{\delta v_{RF}}|$ trends will be of limited accuracy.

The most robust manner of mitigating slice-selective distortions is to instead phase encode the $z$-dimension. However, such an approach is not without its own problems. The spectral coverage of a conventional $z$-phase-encoded approach is given by $\delta v_{RF}$, whereas that of a slice-selective experiment is $N\Delta v_{RF}$, where $N$ is the number of slices. Although many of the spins in the slice-selective imaging volume are misregistered in both the frequency-encoded and slice-selective dimension, they are at least included in the image. A single $z$-phase-encoded image will have a large signal void where spins outside of the limited RF bandwidth are resonating, whereas the slice-selective image will not have these signal voids at the expense of a severely distorted image.

MAVRIC and SEMAC

The MAVRIC method is based on 3D-FSE imaging techniques. As previously discussed, conventional 3D-FSE images have limited spatial coverage near metal implants because of off-resonance spins being excluded from the imaging process. Therefore, MAVRIC acquires multiple 3D-FSE images at incremented offsets of transmission and reception frequencies. Similar to a 2D multislice acquisition, multiple spectrally unique echo trains can be interleaved within each repetition time of a MAVRIC acquisition. MAVRIC spectral images, or “bins,” are independently reconstructed to produce volumetric images (9). Around commonly encountered metal implants, spectral bins spanning of $\pm 12$ kHz are sufficient to capture the available MR signal. Any remaining signal beyond this spectral band would not be imaged by the MAVRIC acquisition. As MAVRIC does not apply any selection gradients, the technique does not restrict signal in the $z$-dimension—which conventional 3D-FSE acquisitions accomplish via slab-selection techniques. Thus, to prevent through-plane aliasing, MAVRIC requires the use of surface coils to restrict active signal in the $z$-dimension.

The imaged volume in a given MAVRIC spectral bin is determined by the $\Delta v_0$ distribution induced by the metal device. Instead of the Cartesian slabs excited in a slice-selective experiment, MAVRIC spectral images are 3D isosurfaces of the implant-induced $v_0$ distribution. Each of these volumetric images is free of slice distortions and possesses minimal frequency encoded distortions (dictated by the applied RF bandwidth). The independent spectral bin images are combined via quadrature summation to form a composite image.
SEMAC begins with a slice-selective VAT image, but adds phase encoding along the z-dimension to spatially resolve distorted slice planes (10). Thus, a given slice volume is excited M times to resolve M z-encoded positions within the excited volume. Frequency-encoded distortions are limited in SEMAC images because of the use of VAT. SEMAC does not z-phase encode the entire imaged volume, but instead encodes a smaller subvolume centered on excited slice volumes. This minimizes the number of z-encodes needed to adequately register slice distortions. The number of encodes needed per slice volume depends on anticipated off-resonance contributions. SEMAC typically uses 16 encodes with 2-kHz RF pulses, which can register off-resonance contributions of up to ±16 kHz. Spectral contributions resonating beyond this band will be aliased (misregistered) in the z-dimension of a SEMAC acquisition.

The readout filter introduced by the VAT process (Eq. 3) is mitigated in SEMAC through the use of a high readout bandwidth (±125 kHz). For the slice-selection processes used in SEMAC (γGz δz/2π = δRF = 2 kHz), readout windows of 1–1.5 ms (256–384 samples) do not result in significant blurring of resulting images.

Although a complex summation process was introduced in Ref. 10, high-resolution SEMAC images require quadratic summation to preserve SNR. Under this reconstruction formalism, 3D-resolved images for each excited slice volume acquired using the SEMAC technique are independently reconstructed and then registered with one another in the z-dimension before undergoing quadrature combination.

Despite their differing approaches, the underlying connection between the MAVRIC and SEMAC techniques is straightforward. Both techniques excite multiple spectral bands separated by incremented offsets. Both techniques frequency encode one dimension and phase encode the other two dimensions of each excited volume. By using the same z-selection gradient amplitude during both excitation and readout (MAVRIC uses no selection gradients, whereas SEMAC uses VAT), both techniques limit frequency-encoded off-resonance contributions to those contained within the RF bandwidth (7). Given these similarities, if identical z-encodings and spectral properties were used in both techniques, SEMAC could simply be considered MAVRIC with the added application of a static “Z-shim”.

MAVRIC and SEMAC acquisitions can both be accelerated using auto calibrated partial Fourier imaging methods such as Autocalibrated Reconstruction of Cartesian data (ARC) (16,17), which has been demonstrated compatible with imaging near metal implants (18,19). Both techniques can also be accelerated using partial-Fourier techniques in the kx-encoded dimension. Partial-Fourier techniques are applicable near metal implants when using spin-echo-based imaging methods because of the refocused signal acquired at each kx position. Elliptical sampling of the kx – kz phase-encoded plane (i.e., corner cutting) can also be used to reduce image acquisitions by 25% (20).

**Artifacts and Spectral Properties**

Both MAVRIC and SEMAC combat susceptibility artifacts near metal implants by breaking large spectral dispersions into smaller spectral bins that can be frequency encoded with reduced spatial distortions. There are two regimes of encoding errors in such spectrally segmented strategies. The first regime is composed of bulk shifts of spins on a very small length scale (typically on the sub or single pixel level). In an individually reconstructed SEMAC or MAVRIC spectral bin image, such shifts are nearly invisible to the naked eye.

The second regime of encoding errors is encountered when the implant-induced Δνg distribution has rapid spatial variation in the frequency-encoded dimension. These artifacts become prominent when the magnitude of the induced gradient approaches or surpasses that of the applied frequency-encoding gradient. A further degree of complication is introduced when the nonuniform response of spins to off-resonance radiation (i.e., the spectral magnitude profile) is taken into account.

Consider a single frequency-encoded line (x) of an individual spectral bin, b. Beginning with the distortion model presented in Eq. 1, we include the effect of spectral bin offsets:

\[ \Delta \nu_{b}(x) = \Delta \nu_{0}(x) - \nu_{0}^{b}, \]  

where \( \nu_{0}^{b} \) is the spectral offset of the given bin. We also introduce the spectral profile function \( F(\nu) \). Using these parameters, the intensity of the bth spectral bin image can be expressed as follows:

\[ I(x, b) = \rho \left( x - \frac{2\pi \Delta \nu_{b}(x)}{\gamma G_{x}} \right) \cdot F(\Delta \nu_{b}(x)). \]  

The differing effects of Δν0 gradients on reconstructed images can be isolated by taking a spatial derivative of Eq. 6:

\[ \frac{\partial I(x, b)}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial \rho(x')}{\partial x'} \cdot \left( 1 - 2\pi \frac{\partial \Delta \nu_{b}(x)/\partial x}{\gamma G_{x}} \right) \cdot F(\Delta \nu_{b}(x)) \]

\[ + \rho(x') \cdot \frac{\partial \Delta \nu_{b}(x)}{\partial x} \frac{\partial F}{\partial \nu} \bigg|_{\nu = \Delta \nu_{b}(x)}, \]  

where \( x' = x - \frac{2\pi \Delta \nu_{b}(x)}{\gamma} \).

In the absence of Δν0 perturbations, the right-hand side of Eq. 7 reduces to \( \partial \rho/\partial x \), which is the result expected from inherent image contrast. However, when Δν0 perturbations are taken into account, additional spatial intensity variations are introduced in the image. The first term in Eq. 7 accounts for intensity disruptions resulting from local perturbation gradients that are large when compared with the applied frequency-encoding gradient, \( G_{x} \). These artifacts fall into the previously discussed “second regime” of encoding errors occurring when the condition

\[ \gamma |G_{x}| \gg 2\pi \left| \frac{\partial \Delta \nu_{0}}{\partial x} \right| \]  

is violated. The image signal in such regions represents either (a) integration of the effective spin density across regions where \( \gamma G_{x} \approx -2\pi \frac{\partial \Delta \nu_{0}}{\partial x} \) or (b) a reduction in signal due to the effective encoded voxel approaching zero size. These two cases represent the local negation and exacerbation of the frequency-encoding gradient, respectively, when it is superimposed with the implant-induced frequency distribution.
The second term in Eq. 7 convolves local perturbation gradients and non-uniform spectral responses. The contribution of the spectral derivative $\frac{\partial F}{\partial \nu}$ acknowledges that spins being pushed through an inhomogeneous spectral response will result in additional spatial intensity artifacts. The scaling of this term by the local perturbation gradient demonstrates that this effect also depends on the rate of field variation.

A challenge with both the MAVRIC and SEMAC methods is how to smoothly combine separately encoded spectral bins, each of which inevitably contains the spatial intensity artifacts represented by Eq. 7, to form a composite image spanning the entire spectral dispersion.

Broadly speaking, there are two spectral strategies from which to choose. Figure 1a, b presents these two strategies. In (a), highly selective box-car spectral responses are closely aligned with one another. A quadrature sum of the responses will produce a largely uniform response over the entire spectral dispersion spanned by the bins. The arrangement presented in (b) uses smoothly varying and strongly overlapping responses (gaussian responses are used in this work) that, when properly spaced relative to one another, can also provide a relatively uniform response after quadrature summation. For identical imaging parameters (repetition time, echo time, flip-angle, etc.), this strategy produces composite images that have higher SNR than images constructed with the strategy in (a) because of an averaging effect of the strongly overlapping spectral profiles.

Either strategy presented in Fig. 1 will have intensity artifacts resulting from the first term in Eq. 7. Removing such effects is beyond the scope of the work presented here. However, an iterative reconstruction technique relying on the smooth spectral overlap strategy (b) has been demonstrated in concept and shown to dramatically reduce the intensity artifacts caused by rapid field variations (21).

The dependence of the second term on $\frac{\partial F}{\partial \nu}$ results in a stronger artifact contribution from the tightly arranged spectral strategy presented in Fig. 1a. This is because the edges of such spectral profiles have more rapid $\frac{\partial F}{\partial \nu}$ variations, which is demonstrated in Fig. 1c. As illustrated in (d), the smoother Gaussian responses have a significantly lower rate of spectral variation and therefore show a reduced contribution from this effect.

Spins resonating in overlapping spectral regions will be imaged multiple times. As demonstrated in Fig. 1a, b, these spins will be distorted in opposite directions for adjacent bins. This effect can exacerbate the high-frequency intensity artifacts characterized by Eq. 7. In addition, while the smooth overlap strategy shown in Fig. 1b, d possesses fewer rapidly changing intensity artifacts, it does suffer significant composite image blurring from this opposing-displacement effect. The encoding distortions generating this blur were earlier classified as “first-regime” distortions. Although such shifts cannot be perceived in individual bins, the blur they generate in composite spectrally summed images is easily identifiable. This blurring effect...
is global (i.e., not localized to the implant) and can significantly impact the effective composite resolution of high-resolution acquisitions.

The spectral strategies presented in Fig. 1 are theoretical constructions using ideal spectral profiles. In reality, MAVRIC applies a strategy resembling that presented in Fig. 1b using a Kaiser-Bessel filter in the Shinnar-Le Roux pulse-design algorithm (22) to approximately generate a Gaussian spectral response. SEMAC uses an approach approximating that presented in Fig. 1a. However, it is difficult in practice to generate high bandwidth spin-echo refocusing pulses with the narrow and well-behaved transition band presented in Fig. 1a. Therefore, in practice, SEMAC spectral profiles will have more overlap and a smoother $\frac{dF}{d\nu}$ profile than the analyzed idealized box-car strategy.

Figure 2 demonstrates the varying practical consequences of the spectral strategies used by MAVRIC and SEMAC. Images were acquired at 1.5 T using an eight-channel transmit-receive knee coil on a knee fitted with multiple stainless steel screws. Imaging parameters for the displayed images are presented in Table 1. Figure 2a presents a high readout bandwidth ($\text{BW}_r = \pm 125$ kHz) 2D-FSE image displaying significant distortions near the stainless steel screws. The SEMAC image displayed in Fig. 2b clearly resolves most of the readout and slice-selective distortions identified in (a). A 3D-FSE image (collected as the on-resonance spectral bin in a MAVRIC acquisition) is presented in (c). The signal loss suffered near metal implants using a conventional 3D imaging strategy is plainly evident. The MAVRIC image presented in (d) is able to recover this missing signal with minimal artifact introduction.

Notice that the 3D-FSE image in Fig. 2c does have some intensity artifacts (particularly on the dipolar magic angles of the signal dropout regions). These are intensity variations caused by the first term in Eq. 7, which do carry through into the composite MAVRIC image in (d). Such artifacts are to be expected in both the MAVRIC and SEMAC images. However, comparison of Fig. 2b, d shows stronger intensity lines in the SEMAC images, which result from the added bin combination artifacts stemming from the second term in Eq. 7. Although MAVRIC images do not suffer as prominently from these second-term artifacts, they do show a global blurring effect that is demonstrated in (e) and (f). Close inspection of the indicated zoomed images from the on-resonance 3D-FSE (e) and MAVRIC (f) acquisitions shows that the MAVRIC image has a broader point spread.

When compared with the conventional images in (a) and (c), both MAVRIC and SEMAC are clearly able to dramatically reduce susceptibility artifacts. The residual intensity artifacts seen in MAVRIC and SEMAC images primarily result from spins being slightly misencoded in the frequency-encoded dimension. Although the magnitude of these distortions are typically on the single-pixel or sub-pixel level, the above analysis shows that they can have a noticeable effect on composite image quality.

Removal of Blurring from Bin Overlap

In this work, the overlapping spectral bin strategy of the MAVRIC technique is used. A method to mitigate the resulting image blur using spectral information inherent to such acquisitions is now presented.
The overlapping Gaussian spectral windows $G_b(v)$ used in MAVRIC are constructed such that

$$\sum_{b=1}^{B} G_b(v) \approx 1 \quad \forall v,$$  \[9\]

which produces a relatively uniform spectral response across the imaged spectral dispersion.

This property of the MAVRIC acquisition allows field map estimations through a simple weighted average of the magnitude images, $I_b(x, y, z)$. First, the spectral bin image magnitudes are normalized at each pixel location,

$$\sum_{b=1}^{N_b} I_b(x, y, z) = 1 \quad \forall x, y, z.$$  \[10\]

Using these normalized image intensities, a weighted average field map solution can be estimated as follows:

$$\Delta \nu_b(x, y, z) = \sum_{b=1}^{N_b} I_b(x, y, z) \cdot \nu_b^b.$$  \[11\]

Field maps are estimated using this procedure with much greater precision than the separation between the spectral bins (typically 1 kHz). This additional spectral information is extracted from the known homogeneous spectral response of the composite MAVRIC image. Thus, the motivation for using the overlapping Gaussian profiles (a smooth composite image construction) is precisely the reason that such field maps can be constructed with sufficient precision.

Using these field maps, subimages can be spatially corrected relative to one another in the frequency-encoded dimension. Each pixel in each subimage experiences a net frequency offset, $\Delta \nu_b(x, y, z)$, previously represented in one dimension by Eq. 5, but reproduced here to include all spatial dimensions:

$$\Delta \nu_b(x, y, z) = \Delta \nu_b(x, y, z) - v_0^b.$$  \[12\]

A given subimage $I_b(x, y, z)$ can then be repaired according to

$$I_b(x, y, z) \rightarrow I_b \left( x - \frac{\Delta \nu_b(x, y, z)}{BWr}, y, z \right).$$  \[13\]

Relative to the severe $\Delta \nu_b$ distributions found near metal hardware, the majority of pixels in an image experience relatively homogeneous distribution. Therefore, much of the shifting needed to remove the blurring effect is large-scale bulk shifting of one image relative to another. The images presented here use nearest-neighbor pixel interpolation when applying this bin-specific correction procedure. More sophisticated interpolation schemes could be applied to gain incremental improvements in performance.

After correcting each subimage using Eq. 13, quadrature summation can be used to produce an image with a significant reduction in spectral overlap–induced blurring.

### Hybrid Approach

The spectral overlap strategy used by MAVRIC provides a smooth bin combination procedure and much needed SNR when considering the undersampling schemes needed to accelerate MAVRIC and SEMAC. With the application of the previously described deblurring correction, MAVRIC’s spectral strategy can produce high SNR, high-resolution images near metal implants with minimal residual artifacts. However, MAVRIC is challenged in cases where coil sensitivities cannot provide adequate volume selectivity. Particularly in hip and shoulder arthroplasty cases, MAVRIC’s lack of slice (or slab) selectivity has resulted in significant aliasing in the z-encoded dimension. Such aliasing can easily compromise the diagnostic quality of MAVRIC images, despite their high SNR and low residual artifacts. Therefore, a more advantageous method would have the z-selectivity of SEMAC and the spectral properties of MAVRIC. A procedure is now described to construct such a hybrid acquisition sequence.
The presented method hinges on an earlier statement that SEMAC can simply be considered MAVRIC with a properly scaled Z-shim. Here, we describe how to determine the amplitude and effectively implement such a Z-shim to add z-selectivity to the MAVRIC technique.

Consider a MAVRIC acquisition with $N_b$ spectral bins and a bin separation of $\Omega_b$ kHz. We desire to restrict the excited $z$ FOV to $\Delta Z$ cm. This can be accomplished by applying the MAVRIC excitations under a $z$-gradient of amplitude $G_z = \frac{2\pi N_b \Omega_b \gamma}{\Delta Z}$. As in SEMAC, the $z$-gradient must also be turned on during the readout process to keep off-resonance effects limited to the RF bandwidth. Thus, this approach also adds VAT to the MAVRIC acquisition. Like SEMAC, readout filtration dictated by Eq. 3 is minimized using a high readout bandwidth ($\pm 125$ kHz). Also like SEMAC, the resolution in the $z$-dimension of such an acquisition is not determined by the selective $z$-gradient amplitude, but rather by the extent of the $k_z$ phase encodes. As multiple $z$-encodes are performed on each excited volume, the view angle is also much lower than that used in an equivalent 2D VAT experiment. Here, this hybrid method will be referred to as volume-selective 3D multi-spectral imaging (VS-3D-MSI).

METHODS

Images were acquired on 1.5-T and 3.0-T General Electric HDx (GE Healthcare, Milwaukee, WI) systems running 15.0 Signa software. All volunteers were scanned in accordance with site-specific Institutional Review Board policies.

All presented MAVRIC and VS-3D-MSI images were collected using $N_b = 24$ spectral bins with $\Omega_b = 1$ kHz bin separation, readout bandwidth of $BW_r = \pm 125$ kHz, Gaussian RF spectral profiles with full width at half maximum ratio = 2.25 kHz, $2 \times$ ARC parallel imaging (20 calibration lines) in $k_y$, homodyne-reconstructed partial-Fourier acceleration (eight overscans) in $k_y$, and elliptical view ordering in the $k_y - k_z$ plane. Images were reconstructed using compiled Matlab (Natick, MA) software.

Images are presented from a number of implant scenarios. Phantom images demonstrating the method are presented from a cobalt-chromium/titanium total hip replacement phantom at 1.5 T using an eight channel cardiac reception array. A direct in vivo comparison of the VS-3D-MSI and MAVRIC methods is performed on images acquired at 3.0 T near stainless steel ankle hardware using an eight-channel head reception array. Finally, three clinical cases are presented. First, images of a cobalt-chromium/titanium total hip replacement patient are used to demonstrate the clinical limitations of the MAVRIC technique in the absence of $z$-selectivity. In the other two cases, the SNR and $z$-selectivity advantages of the VS-3D-MSI technique are shown to produce high-diagnostic quality images near cobalt-chromium/titanium total hip and shoulder replacements. For these cases, conventional 2D-FSE images using established standard-of-care arthroplasty protocols (2) are shown in addition to the VS-3D-MSI images. All hip and shoulder images were acquired with a three-channel shoulder reception array.
FIG. 4. Total hip replacement phantom at 1.5 T: (a–d) 4 kHz, 0 kHz, 4 kHz bins, and composite reformatted (coordinate axes indicate logical encoding directions) MAVRIC images. Arrows indicate aliasing in the k_z-encoded dimension. (e–h) 4 kHz, 0 kHz, 4 kHz bins, and composite-reformatted VS-3D-MSI images; (i–k) 2D-FSE, MAVRIC, and VS-3D-MSI in-plane images.

The acquisition parameters for all presented images are reported in Table 1.

RESULTS

Figure 3 demonstrates the correction of bin-overlap blurring. Here, MAVRIC images are displayed, though the applied deblurring algorithm remains identical for VS-3D-MSI images (the calculated field map will simply show the applied Z-shim in addition to the background field). Images are presented from the same implant scenario analyzed in Fig. 2 (Case 1 in Table 1). Uncorrected sum-of-squares images, 3D-FSE images, deblurred sum-of-squares images, and utilized field maps are displayed in (a,e), (b,f), (c,g), and (d,h), respectively. To illustrate the source of the field distortions, field maps are displayed as semitransparent color maps superimposed on the composite MAVRIC image. Close inspection of the zoomed images in (e–g) show that the blurring identified in the uncorrected image (e) is clearly repaired in the corrected image (g). After correction, the spatial resolution of the repaired image closely represents the native Fourier-encoded resolution represented by the on-resonance image (f). This blurring correction is implemented on all MAVRIC and VS-3D-MSI images presented throughout the rest of this work.

Figure 4a–f presents the variation of excitation volumes and composite images when applying a z-gradient in the presence of an implant-induced \( \Delta v_0 \) distribution. Here, a total hip replacement phantom fitted with an acrylic grid is imaged at 1.5 T (Case 2 in Table 1). The volumes (viewed in the \( k_y - k_z \) encoded plane) excited without the use of a z-gradient are displayed (a–c) for the \(-4 \text{ kHz}, 0 \text{ kHz}, +4 \text{ kHz}\) spectral bins. A composite MAVRIC image is shown in (d). It is clear that the 0 kHz bin (b) in this case is susceptible to phase-encode aliasing in the z-dimension (arrows). When the appropriately scaled z-gradient is applied in the VS-3D-MSI images (e–h), the excited volumes are all selective in z, eliminating the threat of phase-encode aliasing.
in this dimension. The reduction of aliasing is clearly visible in the composite images (d and h). Figure 4i–k displays the in-plane images using (i) 2D-FSE (\(BW_z = \pm 125\) kHz), (j) MAVRIC, and (k) VS-3D-MSI. It is clear that both (j) and (k) correct the susceptibility artifacts found in (i). In particular, the curvature of the grid lines in the 2D-FSE image is removed in both the MAVRIC and VS-3D-MSI images. There is no significant change of the artifact reduction found in (j) when the \(k_z\)-selective process (k) is used. Examination of the plastic phantom gridlines in (k) shows a slight shear relative to those in (i) and (j). This is an anticipated effect of the VAT process and is easily identifiable in the displayed phantom images because its grid lines are aligned with the \(k_x\)- and \(k_y\)-encoded dimensions.

Figure 5 displays in vivo results near a stainless steel ankle hardware at 3 T (Case 3 in Table 1). Reformats \((x, z)\) plane of 2D-FSE (a), MAVRIC (b), and VS-3D-MSI (c) images are presented. Notice the dramatic slice-selective distortions in the 2D-FSE image. Although the MAVRIC image (b) repairs these distortions, the lack of selectivity in the \(z\)-dimension is clearly evident by the aliasing of the toe region (arrow). The VS-3D-MSI image (c) repairs the susceptibility artifacts while also removing the aliasing in the \(k_x\)-encoded dimension. In-plane images for the 2D-FSE (\(BW_x = \pm 125\) kHz), MAVRIC, and VS-3D-MSI acquisitions are also displayed in (d), (e), and (f), respectively. The dotted lines in (a–c) indicate the location of the corresponding in-plane images. Images (g–i) present zoomed views of (d–f) localized to the region indicated by the box in (f). Again, the significant 2D-FSE distortions of the bone structure near the metal hardware are repaired in both the MAVRIC and VS-3D-MSI images.

A few important characteristics of the MAVRIC versus VS-3D-MSI images are illustrated here. First, the shearing effect seen in the gridlines of Fig. 4k is not easily identifiable in the in vivo VS-3D-MSI images Fig. 5c,f. Second, there is no dramatic change in the resolution between the MAVRIC and VS-3D-MSI images, which indicates that the high readout bandwidth (\(\pm 125\) kHz) is satisfactorily mitigating the blurring filter expressed in Eq. 3. Third, close inspection of the air regions of (e) and (f) shows that the MAVRIC image has more residual in-plane signal aliasing after parallel image reconstruction [an arrow in (e) indicates such aliasing]. Both images were processed through the same reconstruction pipeline. The improved performance in the VS-3D-MSI image can be explained by the amount of in-plane signal available for each spectral bin’s independent reconstruction process. As demonstrated in Fig. 4, the amount of in-plane signal is consistently larger across VS-3D-MSI spectral bins. This provides more information to the data-driven autocalibration process used in ARC and results in more successful unaliasing of the \(k_y\) undersampled data in VS-3D-MSI images.

Although Fig. 5 demonstrates VS-3D-MSI’s removal of through-plane aliasing found in MAVRIC images, the displayed aliasing is not likely to be diagnostically significant. In a clinical environment, it is not difficult to find cases where such aliasing is of severe diagnostic impact. Figure 6a presents an in-plane MAVRIC image of a total right hip arthroplasty patient at 1.5 T (Case 4 in Table 1). Despite the marked susceptibility artifact reduction, aliased through-plane signal destroys the image integrity near the acetabular head of the implant. A reformat of this MAVRIC acquisition is presented in (b) and clearly illustrates the problematic aliasing through plane signal. Increasing the number of \(k_y\)-encodes to eliminate this aliasing would result in clinically unacceptable acquisition times. Images near a similar total left hip replacement (Case 5 in Table 1) are presented for (c) and (e) VS-3D-MSI and standard-of-care (d) 2D-FSE (\(BW_x = \pm 100\) kHz) acquisitions. Figure 6c presents a reformat of the VS-3D-MSI image that clearly eliminates the through-plane aliasing seen in (b). The significant geometric distortions in the 2D-FSE image (d) are greatly reduced in the VS-3D-MSI (e) image while simultaneously eliminating the detrimental
FIG. 6. Clinical utility of the VS-3D-MSI method on total hip replacements. a: MAVRIC image of a total hip replacement where through-plane aliasing overwhelms the signal near the implant. b: Reformat (coordinate axes indicate logical encoding directions) of the MAVRIC image displayed in (a), indicated through dotted line. c: Reformat of a VS-3D-MSI image on another total hip replacement patient where the aliased signal seen in (b) has now been removed. d: In-plane 2D-FSE image of the implant displayed in (c). e: In-plane VS-3D-MSI image of the case displayed in (d), with dotted line indicating the position of the reformatted image in (c). In-plane ($k_y$) aliasing remains in the VS-3D-MSI image (e), but is suppressed in the clinical 2D-FSE images (d) via the application of extra phase encodes embedded in the signal-averaging process (i.e., $k_y$ oversampling).

through-plane aliasing that would be introduced with a similar MAVRIC acquisition.

The images in Fig. 7 present (a) standard-of-care 2D-FSE (BW$_r$ = ±100 kHz) and (b) VS-3D-MSI images near a total shoulder replacement at 1.5 T (Case 6 in Table 1). The oblique scan plane imaged in these acquisitions was not achievable with MAVRIC due to through-plane aliasing. While a significant amount of signal near the implant has been distorted out of the 2D scan plane in (a), the VS-3D-MSI image (b) offers spatially accurate visualization of anatomy near the implant that is unavailable using any conventional MR methods.

The clinical standard-of-care 2D-FSE scans presented in Figs. 6–7 suppress in-plane ($k_y$) aliasing by embedding extra $k_y$ encodes within the signal-averaging process. Because of scan time constraints, MAVRIC, SEMAC, and VS-3D-MSI are not yet capable of applying such in-plane-aliasing prevention schemes.

DISCUSSION

A hybrid method that incorporates advantageous elements of both the SEMAC and MAVRIC imaging techniques has been introduced. The slab selectivity of SEMAC has been fused with the smooth bin combination and higher SNR spectral strategy implemented by MAVRIC. In addition, a technique to remove unwanted blurring introduced by such a spectral overlap strategy has been described and
FIG. 7. Clinical utility of the VS-3D-MSI method on a total shoulder replacement. a: 2D-FSE image of a total shoulder replacement. b: VS-3D-MSI image of the same replacement. The oblique imaging plane used in acquiring these images was not feasible with the MAVRIC technique, because of excessive through-plane (kz) aliasing. In-plane (ky) aliasing remains in the VS-3D-MSI image (b), but is suppressed in the clinical 2D-FSE images (a) via the application of extra phase encodes embedded in the signal-averaging process (i.e., ky oversampling).

demonstrated. The resulting VS-3D-MSI technique has been conceptually demonstrated and its utility is proven in a clinical setting. Using the VS-3D-MSI method, images of previously unattainable image quality have been acquired on total hip and total shoulder arthroplasty patients in clinically viable acquisition times. The presented methods allow for high-quality spatially accurate diagnostic imaging near a wide variety of metal implants.

VS-3D-MSI images presented in this work were acquired with acquisition times ranging from roughly 7 to 12 min, depending on the used acquisition parameters. Partial-Fourier, autocalibrated parallel imaging, and kx−kz corner-removal schemes have been implemented to minimize this scan time. Without any acceleration, each of the displayed images would have ranged from roughly 20 to 50 min in total acquisition time. The significant undersampling required to achieve such acceleration is one of the motivations to maximize SNR with the applied spectral windowing strategy. Although a variety of slight parameter alterations could be used to further reduce these scan times (such as increasing the ETL, reducing the TR period, reducing z-encodes, and/or reducing in-plane resolution), VS-3D-MSI images will typically require slightly more acquisition time than conventional imaging strategies. Regardless, the advantages of accessing previously unavailable anatomy near metal hardware may often prove worth the added scan time requirements.

In vivo imaging with both the SEMAC and VS-3D-MSI techniques has shown little adverse effects of the VAT method. The use of high-bandwidth readouts in both techniques minimizes the blurring effects of the readout filtration expressed in Eq. 3. The VAT-induced shear identified in Fig. 4 has not been identifiable in vivo. This is because imaging of anatomy does not provide the hard and consistent boundaries that allow for visualization of the shear of the readout in the kx−kz plane. Even though there does not appear to be any pressing motivation for doing so, removal of the shear could be accomplished through regridding of the acquired kx and kz lines. Initial clinical investigations suggest that the SNR of VS-3D-MSI images is often high enough to seek further undersampled acceleration. Unfortunately, available coil geometries restrict the amount of parallel imaging acceleration feasible in a given spatial dimension. Moving toward the sliding z-encoded FOV implemented with SEMAC could offer a path to spend extra SNR while slightly reducing scan times. Further kx−kz undersampling of MAVRIC has also been demonstrated by exploiting the redundant spatial information contained in overlapping spectral bins (23). In the face of such additional undersampling, more sophisticated spectral bin combination strategies, such as those explored to maximize SNR in SEMAC images (24), could be implemented in the VS-3D-MSI method. In particular, empty spectral bins containing only noise could be identified and removed from the summation process.

In this work, initial images were demonstrated with the VS-3D-MSI technique at 3 T. The image displayed in Fig. 5 shows significant artifact reduction using the VS-3D-MSI method when compared with 2D-FSE. This suggests that imaging near smaller hardware fixations (screws, etc.) may be feasible at 3 T and that the residual artifacts in VS-3D-MSI (or SEMAC and MAVRIC) images will be far more modest than those in 2D-FSE. However, further studies will be required to assess the viability of imaging larger total joint assemblies at 3 T. Initial investigations with the MAVRIC technique have identified significant B1 radiofrequency field perturbations near total hip replacements at 3 T (25). Because of specific absorption rate constraints, the use of high-bandwidth spin-echo refocussing pulses adds further complexity to the application of the presented methods at 3 T.

In conclusion, the VS-3D-MSI method provides further advancement toward routine MR imaging near embedded metal hardware. By fusing the MAVRIC and SEMAC techniques, high-quality clinical images have been demonstrated on total hip and total shoulder replacement patients.
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