UC San Diego

UC San Diego Previously Published Works

Title

Feasibility of quantitative ultrashort echo time (UTE)-based methods for MRI of peripheral nerve.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/11f640hx>

Journal

NMR in biomedicine, 31(9)

ISSN

0952-3480

Authors

Fan, Shu-Juan
Wong, Jonathan
Cheng, Xin
et al.

Publication Date

2018-09-01

DOI

10.1002/nbm.3948

Peer reviewed

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Feasibility of quantitative ultrashort echo time (UTE)-based methods for MRI of peripheral nerve

Shu-Juan Fan¹ | Jonathan Wong² | Xin Cheng^{1,2} | Ya-Jun Ma¹ | Eric Y. Chang^{1,2} | Jiang Du¹ | Sameer B. Shah^{2,3}

¹Department of Radiology, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA

²Research Service, Veterans Affairs San Diego Healthcare System, San Diego, CA, USA

³Departments of Orthopaedic Surgery and Bioengineering, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA

Correspondence

Sameer B. Shah, Departments of Orthopaedic Surgery and Bioengineering, University of California, 9500 Gilman Drive, MC 0863, La Jolla, CA 92093, USA.
Email: sbshah@ucsd.edu

Funding information

American Foundation for Surgery of the Hand, Grant/Award Number: 1242; National Institutes of Health, Grant/Award Number: 1R01 NS092650; U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, Grant/Award Numbers: 1I21 RX002367, I01CX001388 and I01RX002604; GE Healthcare

Peripheral nerves are a composite tissue consisting of neurovascular elements packaged within a well-organized extracellular matrix. Their composition, size, and anatomy render nerves a challenging medical imaging target. In contrast to morphological MRI, which represents the predominant approach to nerve imaging, quantitative MRI sequences can provide information regarding tissue composition. Here, we applied standard clinical Carr-Purcell-Meiboom-Gill (CPMG) and experimental three-dimensional (3D) ultrashort echo time (UTE) Cones sequences for quantitative nerve imaging including T_2 measurement with single-component analysis, T_2^* measurement with single-component and bi-component analyses, and magnetization transfer ratio (MTR) analysis. We demonstrated the feasibility and the high quality of single-component T_2^* , bi-component T_2^* , and MTR approaches to analyze nerves imaged with clinically deployed 3D UTE Cones pulse sequences. For 24 single fascicles from eight nerves, we measured a mean single-component T_2^* of 22.6 ± 8.9 ms, and a short T_2^* component (STC) with a mean T_2^* of 1.7 ± 1.0 ms and a mean fraction of $(6.74 \pm 4.31)\%$ in bi-component analysis. For eight whole nerves, we measured a mean single-component T_2^* of 16.7 ± 2.2 ms, and an STC with a mean T_2^* of 3.0 ± 1.0 ms and a mean fraction of $(15.56 \pm 7.07)\%$ in bi-component analysis. For nine fascicles from three healthy nerves, we measured a mean MTR of $(25.2 \pm 1.9)\%$ for single fascicles and a mean MTR of $(23.6 \pm 0.9)\%$ for whole nerves. No statistically significant correlation was observed between any MRI parameter and routine histological outcomes, perhaps due to the small sample size and lack of apparent sample pathology. Overall, we have successfully demonstrated the feasibility of measuring quantitative MR outcomes ex vivo, which might reflect features of nerve structure and macromolecular content. These methods should be validated comprehensively on a larger and more diverse set of nerve samples, towards the interpretation of in vivo outcomes. These approaches have new and broad implications for the management of nerve disease, injury, and repair.

KEYWORDS

MRI, peripheral nerve, quantitative imaging, UTE

Abbreviations: 3D, three dimensional; CPMG, Carr-Purcell-Meiboom-Gill; H&E, hematoxylin and eosin; LTC, long T_2^* component; MT, magnetization transfer; MTR, magnetization transfer ratio; ROI, region of interest; STC, short T_2^* component; T_E , echo time; T_R , repetition time; UTE, ultrashort echo time

1 | INTRODUCTION

Peripheral nerves are a composite tissue consisting of neurovascular elements packaged within a well-organized extracellular matrix. Endoneurial sheaths surround individual nerve fibers, which form parallel arrays with accompanying blood vessels and are fasciculated within the perineurium. The fascicles are bundled within the epineurium. Their composition, size, and anatomy render nerves a challenging medical imaging target.

Morphological imaging is the mainstay of current nerve imaging approaches. Clinical ultrasound may be used to identify epineurial borders and nerve shape,¹ but suffers from limited contrast and resolution (0.2–0.5 mm).² Morphological MRI, including newer three-dimensional (3D) and MR neurography sequences,³ capably identifies epineurial, and sometimes perineurial, borders. However, these methods are usually qualitative, and observations of nerve signal intensity, size/shape, and structure each have their own set of limitations. Though nerves can be imaged with conventional clinical sequences, several important components of nerves are under-represented in the total signal and therefore underappreciated. This includes nerve collagen, which has a substantial contribution to structure and function. Collagen backbone protons are “invisible” with current MRI sequences.⁴ Water protons are “visible” but the transverse relaxation time (T_2) is shortened due to the structure of collagen and its interactions with water.⁵ In addition, the linear orientation and anisotropy of collagen within a nerve can affect signal intensity. Nerve signal can increase up to 175% as the overall orientation changes from parallel to 55° relative to the main magnetic field, termed the “magic angle effect.”⁶ In fact, some nerves have been reported to display increased signal intensity in up to 60% of asymptomatic patients,⁷ highlighting the caution that must be used in interpreting such images. Overreliance on nerve size/shape can also be problematic since nerve size/shape are sensitive to joint configuration, and nerve deformation and flattening can be a normal part of joint movement.⁸ Furthermore, evaluation of structure using conventional morphological MRI sequences is fundamentally limited by image resolution and acquisition time. With highly optimized conventional sequences focused on a very small field of view, resolution can approach 0.1 mm with 10–12 min acquisition time, which is sufficient to resolve the perineurium of larger, more superficial nerves.⁹

In contrast to morphological imaging approaches, quantitative MRI sequences can provide structural information on a submicron to micron scale—i.e., smaller than the highest achievable spatial resolution. For example, diffusion imaging is a very common technique in nerve imaging, and can provide quantitative information on the microenvironment of the nerve and enable tractography. Diffusion techniques are sensitive to nerve degeneration and regeneration.^{10,11} However, most diffusion imaging techniques utilize echo times (T_E) in the range of 30–100 ms,^{10,11} and similarly to other conventional sequences with longer T_E times cannot provide information on the short T_2 components of nerve. Transverse relaxation measurements, such as T_2 and T_2^* ,^{12,13} have also been used in peripheral nerve imaging, but again, the short T_2 components are not imaged when longer T_E times are used. Furthermore, these measurements are exquisitely sensitive to magic angle effects, as noted above, confounding interpretation of quantitative values.

Recently, ultrashort echo time (UTE) imaging with T_2^* bi-component analysis has been used to quantify the signal contributions from the short and long relaxation components in multiple tissues.⁵ In addition, UTE-magnetization transfer (MT) imaging has been used to provide quantitative information on the shortest T_2 components, including protons on the backbone of macromolecules such as collagen; such structures are not directly visible even with morphological UTE sequences.¹⁴ Furthermore, MT measurements and bi-component fractions have been speculated to be less sensitive or insensitive to the magic angle effect.^{15–17} In this study, we describe the application of a standard clinical Carr-Purcell-Meiboom-Gill (CPMG) sequence for T_2 measurement and experimental 3D UTE Cones sequences for T_2^* measurement with single- and bi-component analyses as well as MT ratio (MTR) analysis, which have previously been deployed in multiple tissues,^{5,14} to the imaging of peripheral nerves. Our primary goal was to demonstrate the feasibility and reliability of these methods for nerve imaging. We also performed preliminary correlations of UTE and UTE-MT outcomes with histological outcomes, as an initial effort to map imaging parameters to nerve structure.

2 | MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 | Sample preparation

Fresh human tibial nerves at the tarsal tunnel were dissected from eight donor lower limbs (donor age range 20–92 years) that were obtained from tissue banks, as approved by our institutional review board. Fresh-frozen tissue (i.e. no fixative) was acquired from the donor limbs and stored at -80°C for 6–12 months prior to being thawed for the first time at room temperature overnight. Nerves were dissected and stored within 1 h at -20°C or imaged directly after equilibration to room temperature for 2–3 h. The nerves were placed in perfluoropolyether (Fomblin® LC08; Ausimont, Thorofare, NJ) in a 30 mL plastic syringe, and imaged with their long axis parallel to the main magnetic field. After MRI, nerves were fixed with 10% formalin, treated with 30% sucrose for cryoprotection, and cut to 10 μm thick cross-sections prior to staining with routine hematoxylin and eosin (H&E). In addition, Masson's trichrome staining was performed per product literature to identify connective tissue (Aniline blue component). The location of each histological section along the nerve was tracked, and matched to the corresponding MRI slice to allow correlation of imaging and histological outcomes in the same region.

2.2 | MRI

All imaging experiments were performed on a 3 T clinical MR scanner (GE Healthcare, Milwaukee, MI, USA) at room temperature (25°C) with peak gradient amplitude of 50 mT/m and maximum gradient slew rate of 200 mT/m/s. A home-made 22 mm diameter birdcage transit/receive coil was

used for signal excitation and reception. Eight nerves were imaged in two sessions. In the first session, five nerves were imaged with CPMG and UTE sequences. In the second session, three nerves were imaged with UTE and UTE-MT sequences. The integrity of all samples was assessed with histology. The latter three samples were used to correlate UTE or UTE-MT outcomes with histological outcomes.

A clinical CPMG sequence was performed ($n = 5$ nerves) using the following parameters: $T_R = 3000$ ms, $T_E = 14.7, 29.2, 44.1, 58.8, 73.6, 88.3, 102.9$, and 117.7 ms, flip angle = 90° , field of view = 20×20 mm², matrix size = 256×256 , in-plane spatial resolution = 78×78 μ m², slice thickness = 2 mm, no slice gap, and a total scan time of about 25 min. For T_2^* measurements ($n = 8$), dual echo images were acquired using a 3D dual echo UTE Cones sequence, which employed short RF rectangular pulses (duration = 78 μ s) for signal excitation, followed by 3D spiral trajectories with conical view ordering.¹⁸ The following parameters were used for T_2^* measurements: repetition time (T) = 200 ms, eight pairs of echo times (T_E), i.e. 0.032/13, 0.2/16, 0.4/19, 0.6/22, 0.8/25, 3/28, 6/31, and 9/34 ms, flip angle = 30° , field of view = 20×20 mm², matrix size = 256×256 , in-plane spatial resolution = 78×78 μ m², slice thickness = 1 mm, 30 slices, and scan time ≈ 35 min per acquisition (each pair of T_E values).

For UTE-MT imaging ($n = 3$), a Fermi MT preparation pulse (duration, 8 ms; spectral bandwidth = 160 Hz) was added to the 3D UTE Cones sequence. The following parameters were used: $T_R = 102$ ms, $T_E = 32$ μ s, flip angle = 7° , field of view = 30×30 mm², slice thickness = 1.5 mm, and acquisition matrix = 320×320 . A total of 12 sets of images were acquired with three different nominal flip angles of the MT pulse (300° , 550° , and 800°) in combination with four different off-resonance frequencies (2, 5, and 20 kHz). The total scan time was about 60 min.

2.3 | Data analysis

Regions of interest (ROIs) were defined both on single fascicles and over a large area including several fascicles. The CPMG data were fitted offline to the following single-component T_2 decay model in MATLAB (MathWorks, Natick, MA, USA),

$$S(T_E) = S_0 e^{-T_E/T_2} + \text{noise} \quad (1)$$

where S_0 is the signal intensity at $T_E = 0$.

The multi- T_E UTE data were fitted offline to the following single-component T_2^* decay model (Equation (2)), as well as to the following previously published bi-component fitting model (Equation (3)) in MATLAB:

$$S(T_E) = S_0 e^{-T_E/T_2^*} + \text{noise} \quad (2)$$

$$S(T_E) = A_S e^{-\frac{T_E}{T_{2S}^*}} + A_L e^{-\frac{T_E}{T_{2L}^*}} + \text{noise} \quad (3)$$

where S_0 is the signal intensity at $T_E = 0$, $S(T_E)$ is the UTE MR signal, A_S and A_L are the signal amplitudes of the STCs and long T_2^* components (LTCs) respectively, T_{2S}^* is the STC T_2^* , and T_{2L}^* is the LTC T_2^* .

The MTR is a commonly used semi-quantitative parameter in clinical applications of MT imaging.¹⁹ MTR reflects the percentage attenuation of the steady-state MRI signal after the MT saturation pulse is applied.²⁰ In this study, MTR was calculated for each combination of different flip angles of the MT pulse and different off-resonance frequencies using the following equation²¹:

$$\text{MTR} = (M_0 - M_{\text{SAT}})/M_0 \quad (4)$$

where M_0 is the equilibrium magnetization of the tissue, i.e. the magnitude of the tissue signal on an image acquired without off-resonance saturation, and M_{SAT} is the magnitude of the tissue signal acquired with off-resonance saturation. The effects of off-resonance saturation pulse power and frequency offset on MTR were investigated systematically in this study.

2.4 | Image processing

Image processing of histological sections was performed using MetaMorph software (Molecular Devices, Sunnyvale, CA, USA). Digital images of nerves were captured from histology slides, and color thresholded to include regions positive for connective tissue. These thresholds were used to binarize the image. Area fractions within ROIs were determined by manually outlining the intra-fascicular region (i.e. not including the connective tissue surrounding each fascicle, to match ROIs selected from MR data) or the intraepineurial region (including all fascicles, but excluding the outer epineurium), and calculating the percent of connective-tissue-positive pixels within the ROI.

3 | RESULTS

We first imaged freshly harvested cadaveric tibial nerves using a standard clinical CPMG sequence (1>Figure 1). Results from a representative nerve reveal T_2 values of 28–33 ms for single fascicles (mean $\pm$ standard deviation, 31.2 ± 2.2 ms), and a T_2 value of 35 ms for a larger ROI covering the whole nerve, with an estimated fitting error of ± 3 ms (Figure 1A–D). Single-component fits of data from multi- T_E images achieved $R^2 > 0.99$ for all datasets. Analysis of additional fascicular and whole nerve ROIs revealed similar T_2 values (Figure 1E).

FIGURE 1 Single-component T_2 measurements using a clinical CPMG sequence with $T_E = 14.7, 29.2, 44.1, 58.8, 73.6, 88.3, 102.9$ and 117.7 ms. A, Illustration of the definitions of single-fascicle ROIs and large ROIs (CPMG, $T_E = 14.7$ ms). B,C, Representative T_2 fitting result in a single-fascicle ROI (ROI1 in A) (B) and a large ROI (ROI5 in A) (C). D, T_2 values measured from the five ROIs defined in A. E, Average T_2 values measured from 15 single-fascicle ROIs and 5 large ROIs (i.e. three single-fascicle ROIs and one large ROI from each nerve; five nerves were measured in total)

We next investigated the feasibility and quality of T_2^* measurements on tibial nerves imaged with the 3D UTE Cones pulse sequence. Images for a representative specimen are shown in Figure 2A. At a T_E of 0.032 ms both STCs and LTCs have strong signal, thus limiting contrast inside the nerve. Individual fascicles are more clearly visible in images with $T_E > 9$ ms, presumably due to the decay of signals from short T_2 myelin sheaths and connective tissue in the perineurium and epineurium, and between fascicles. H&E staining images of the whole nerve (Figure 2B) and the single fascicle (Figure 2C, marked with * in Figure 2B) showed no visible signs of structural damage; this was similarly confirmed in all the nerves included in this study. In addition, fascicular structure and organization was consistent along a length of 1 mm (Figure 2D), suggesting that quantitative data within a voxel may be correlated with data from a histological section mapped within the voxel.

Analyses of single-component and bi-component fitting of multi- T_E 3D UTE datasets were performed for fascicular and whole nerve ROIs from individual nerves. Analyses for two representative specimens are shown in Figure 3A-D. Fits achieved $R^2 > 0.99$ for all datasets, but revealed variability in single-component (T_2^*) and bi-component (T_{2S}^* , T_{2L}^* , f_s , f_L) parameters among individual fascicles as well as between individual fascicles and whole nerve ROIs. Averaged results from 24 individual fascicles and 8 whole nerve ROIs (three individual fascicles per nerve) are shown in Figure 3E-H. In all nerves, T_2^* obtained with single-component fitting was larger in fascicular ROI than in the whole nerve ROI (22.6 ± 8.9 ms versus 16.7 ± 2.2 ms, Figure 3H). Bi-component analyses revealed f_s and T_{2S}^* of $(6.74 \pm 4.31)\%$ and 1.7 ± 1.0 ms in individual fascicles versus $(15.56 \pm 7.07)\%$ and 3.0 ± 1.0 ms in whole nerve ROIs, respectively (Figure 3E,F). T_2^* values obtained by single-component analysis of 3D UTE data were intermediate between T_{2S}^* and T_{2L}^* values, but biased towards T_{2L}^* values due to low f_s (Figure 3F-H).

We then tested the feasibility and quality of MTR on tibial nerves scanned with a 3D Cones UTE pulse sequence. 3D Cones UTE images without (M_0) and with MT contrast (M_{SAT}) and their subtraction images, with varied flip angle of the MT pulse and off-resonance frequency, are shown for a representative nerve (Figure 4A-C) from a 64-year-old male donor. For each specific flip angle used, the subtraction image showed higher signal-to-noise ratio when a lower off-resonance frequency was used. For each specific off-resonance frequency, the subtraction image showed higher signal-to-noise ratio when a larger flip angle was used. The highest MTR was obtained at the flip angle of 800° and the off-resonance frequency of 2 kHz. The MTR of three single fascicles was $(23.8 \pm 1.4)\%$, and that of the whole nerve was 22.6%. Figure 4D shows the average MTR of nine single-fascicle ROIs and three large ROIs from three nerves. As compared with the T_2^* measurements shown in Figure 3, MTR measurements appear to demonstrate smaller variances within and among different nerves, with single-fascicle ROIs generally showing slightly higher MTR than large ROIs.

As a direct comparison between single-component, bi-component, and MTR analysis, we compared data from a pilot set of nerves analyzed with each method, and also processed histologically using H&E staining. The whole nerve appeared structurally normal on high-resolution

FIGURE 2 A, 3D Cones UTE images of one representative nerve with T_E values marked on each image. B,C, H&E staining images of the whole nerve (B) and a single fascicle (C, as marked with * in B). D, Osmium (black, fat) and trichrome staining of two slices about 0.9 mm apart show similar fascicular organization and intrafascicular structure, indicating the validity of mapping histological outcomes from histological ROIs to MR ROIs

histological images, and no microstructural difference was observed among the three single fascicles (Figure 5A,B). Examination of both H&E and trichrome labeling confirmed the structural similarity of each fascicle (Figure 5B-E). Connective-tissue-positive area fractions calculated following binarization of intrafascicular regions 1, 2, and 3 from the trichrome-labeled image were 38.3%, 25.2%, and 35.5% (mean $\pm$ SEM, 33% $\pm$ 4%), respectively. For the large ROI (intraepineurial), the connective-tissue-positive area fraction was 39.6%. Despite this apparent similarity, large variations of the single-component T_2^* values and bi-component T_{2L}^* values were observed among the different single-fascicle ROIs and between single-fascicle ROIs and large ROIs (Figure 5F,G). However, very small variations were observed in bi-component T_{2S}^* values for the three single-fascicle ROIs and in MTR values for the four ROIs analyzed (Figure 5G,H). Linear regression analysis yielded no significant correlation between any imaging parameter and connective tissue fraction (all $P > 0.05$, $R^2 < 0.2$). A summary of all quantitative analyses is presented in Table 1.

4 | DISCUSSION

We have described the implementation of standard clinical CPMG and new experimental 3D UTE Cones-based quantitative imaging techniques to assess the structure of peripheral nerves. We demonstrated the feasibility and the high quality of single-component T_2^* , bi-component T_2^* , and MTR approaches to analyze nerves imaged with 3D UTE Cones pulse sequences. We observed no statistically significant correlation between histological outcomes and any MRI parameters. Despite the apparent fascicular similarity within a given nerve (Figure 5), the single-component T_2^* (Figure 5F) and bi-component T_{2L}^* measurements (Figure 5G) fluctuated, while the MTR (Figure 5H) was relatively stable. The bi-component T_{2S}^* measurement was also relatively stable (Figure 5G), though its coefficient of variation was higher than that of MTR (standard deviation/mean in Table 1). These observations suggest that UTE-MTR measurements, and possibly bi-component UTE measurements, are more reliable than single-component T_2^* measurements. We also speculate that MTR may be less sensitive to variability created by variations in nerve orientations relative to the main magnetic field (magic angle effect);¹⁵⁻¹⁷ this possibility will be evaluated in future studies. Overall, we have successfully demonstrated the feasibility of imaging peripheral nerves with quantitative UTE MR methods.

FIGURE 3 A-D, Bi-component and single-component T_2^* fitting results of two single fascicles (A, C) and two whole nerves that include these fascicles (B, D). E-H, UTE bi-component T_2^* fitting and single-component T_2^* fitting results from eight nerves. In total 24 fascicles from eight nerves were analyzed. f_S , fraction of STCs; f_L , fraction of LTCs

4.1 | Quantitative MRI of nerves

The focus of this work was on the feasibility of imaging short T_2 components (such as collagen and myelin) that are typically “invisible” when using conventional imaging techniques,²² using UTE sequences that enable the detection of signal in short T_2^* tissues/tissue components, and quantification of structural elements within these tissues.⁵ Morphological and quantitative UTE-MRI sequences have been applied to many short T_2 tissues and components, including cartilage, menisci, bone, tendons, and myelin in the central nervous system.^{5,23-25} This study represents the application of such methods to a new target—peripheral nerves.

Previous nerve MR studies have largely focused on improving nerve visualization, which typically involves improving contrast between epineurial or fascicular boundaries of nerve and the surrounding structures. Recent studies have also used diffusion tensor MRI as initial efforts in quantitative imaging of nerves.^{10,11} While these approaches successfully distinguish between changes in nerve fiber continuity,²⁶⁻²⁹ the interpretation of such studies is not trivial, as assumptions are often made as to what tissue structures contribute to diffusion signal. For example, diffusion in nerves is often interpreted to reflect movement of water within axons.^{29,30} However, changes in diffusion parameters do not appear to strongly correlate with axon number or size, a fact that may reflect the relatively small percentage of nerve volume occupied by axons, in comparison to myelin, the basal lamina, and extracellular matrix.²⁹ Such findings reflect a need to more rigorously correlate imaging outcomes with histological measures as well as to develop imaging approaches yielding signatures of specific biological components.

In our study, we correlated UTE outcomes, whose signatures have been attributed to macromolecules such as collagen,⁴ with histological measures of connective tissue content. Bi-component analysis provided significant insight into the structural characteristics of the nerve. Particularly compelling was the fact that short fractions were reasonably conserved across multiple fascicles within a nerve. However, compared with area fractions of connective tissue quantified histologically (Figure 5), these fractions were quite low by percentage, suggesting that collagen, myelin, and other macromolecules exist within a highly aqueous environment. Further examination of ROIs in peri-fascicular regions (i.e. perineurium and epineurium), which were not included in this study, are posited to be more enriched in short fraction, perhaps reflecting an increase in collagen relative to water. This may reflect tighter packing of collagen in the perineurium versus endoneurium, and thus restricted water content as well.

4.2 | Scan times and clinical translation

Most recently we have focused our efforts on efficiency in order to decrease scan times. The 3D UTE Cones sequence, which can allow clinical imaging of the nerves within the forearm within a few minutes, is the result of these efforts.³¹ In this study, pulse sequences for MT imaging took 5 min per data point with a certain MT power and frequency offset; T_2^* bi-component analysis took 280 min for 16 data points. These are not practical for clinical translation; however, ultimately a sensitivity analysis on each modeling approach will provide a better understanding of the minimum number and range of data points that provide more accurate parameters. Furthermore, the total scan time can be greatly reduced by using lower in-plane resolution, thicker (and thus fewer) slices, and less spatial coverage. Our recent study on the same clinical system suggests that bi-component analysis may be completed in less than 8 min, while each MT measurement (for a certain MT power and frequency offset) may be completed in less than 1 min with a typical SNR of 10–40 depending on the size of the coil, and MT modeling may be completed in less than 10 min.¹⁸ These time frames are reasonable for clinical translation.

4.3 | Limitations

Our data must be interpreted in the context of several limitations to our work. First, we performed analysis on freeze-thawed cadaveric nerves. While there were no visual indicators of freeze damage to any of the imaged specimens, based on histological assessment of the integrity of epineurial, perineurial, and intrafascicular compartments, there may be more subtle impacts of freeze-thaw damage (e.g. to cell membranes) or

FIGURE 5 Histological images and MR parameters of tibial nerve from a 38-year-old female donor. A-C, Definitions of ROIs on the MR image (A), the corresponding H&E-labeled image (B), and the trichrome-labeled image (C). D, Thresholded (binarized) image with connective-tissue-positive pixels in black. E, High resolution histological images of three single fascicles labeled with H&E (top row, gross structure) or trichrome (bottom row, specific for connective tissue) staining. F, Single-component T_2^* fitting results in four ROIs. G, Bi-component T_2^* fitting results in four ROIs. H, MTR values measured from four ROIs with an off-resonance frequency of 2000 Hz and an MT pulse flip angle of 800°

TABLE 1 Summary of the quantitative analyses. 15 fascicles from five nerves were analyzed for CPMG. 24 fascicles from eight nerves were analyzed for Cones UTE data, of which 9 fascicles from three nerves were also analyzed for MTR and histological connective tissue quantification. Data are presented as mean $\pm$ standard deviation

	CPMG Single-component T_2 (ms) (n = 5)	Cones UTE Single-component T_2^* (ms) (n = 8)	Cones UTE Bi-component fitting (n = 8)			MTR (%) (2000 Hz/800°) (n = 3)	Connective tissue % (n = 3)
			f_s (%)	T_{2s}^* (ms)	T_{2L}^* (ms)		
Single-fascicle ROI	35.4 $\pm$ 4.7	22.6 $\pm$ 8.9	6.74 $\pm$ 4.31	1.7 $\pm$ 1.0	26.7 $\pm$ 9.0	25.2 $\pm$ 1.9	30.0 $\pm$ 12.1
Large ROI	36.6 $\pm$ 4.6	16.7 $\pm$ 2.2	15.56 $\pm$ 7.07	3.0 $\pm$ 1.0	25.5 $\pm$ 3.6	23.6 $\pm$ 0.9	N/A

in vivo versus ex vivo differences (e.g. intra-nerve pressure, hydration, or temperature) that could influence imaging outcomes. Also, while we inspected nerves for gross structural changes, we were blinded to any pertinent medical history that may have influenced nerve quality. Additionally, there was a reduction in data quality and an increase in challenges associated with image registration with smaller ROIs. While we were able to successfully generate T_2^* , fraction, and MTR values from individual fascicles, we were unable to compare ROIs of sub-fascicular or peri-fascicular scales. There are also several limitations related to correlation of imaging outcomes with histology. While we matched the orientation and location of each histology section with a corresponding MRI slice, there are resolution differences between the two modalities and differences in section and slice thickness. Also, there was mild distortion of the sample during MR scanning due to its embedding; this resulted in slight differences in shape between fascicles/nerve in MR images versus histological images. For these reasons, our minimum ROI was a single fascicle (i.e. no sub-fascicular ROI, for which the above differences might preclude an accurate comparison). Finally, we emphasize that any correlation between MR and histological outcomes should be viewed as preliminary; a comprehensive correlation will likely require the examination of pathological specimens, to broaden the range of structural outcomes.

5 | CONCLUSION

We have demonstrated the feasibility of applying quantitative MRI methods to peripheral nerves ex vivo. There is considerable clinical value in the development and validation of new MR methodologies to quantify changes in nerve morphology. Beyond the identification of fascicular or nerve boundaries, the ability to measure changes in collagen quantity, localization, or organization has significant value for any number of neuropathies or injuries in which nerve structure is altered. Such approaches have new and broad implications for the management of disease, including the assessment of the extent of nerve injury or regeneration (i.e. fascicular continuity, identification of fibrosis, or identification of a regenerating nerve front), surgical planning or pre-operative decision making, and development or assessment of new strategies for physical therapy, surgery, and rehabilitation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors acknowledge grant support from the National Institutes of Health (1R01 NS092650), American Foundation for Surgery of the Hand (Award 1242), GE Healthcare, and the Department of Veterans Affairs (1121 RX002367, I01CX001388, and I01RX002604).

ORCID

Shu-Juan Fan <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6975-2735>

Jiang Du <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9203-2450>

Sameer B. Shah <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6613-3904>

REFERENCES

1. Lawande AD, Warriar SS, Joshi MS. Role of ultrasound in evaluation of peripheral nerves. *Indian J Radiol Imaging*. 2014;24(3):254-258.
2. Moran CM, Pye SD, Ellis W, et al. A comparison of the imaging performance of high resolution ultrasound scanners for preclinical imaging. *Ultrasound Med Biol*. 2011;37(3):493-501.
3. Amrami KK, Felmlee JP, Spinner RJ. MRI of peripheral nerves. *Neurosurg Clin N Am*. 2008;19(4):559-572. vi
4. Ma YJ, Chang EY, Bydder GM, Du J. Can ultrashort-TE (UTE) MRI sequences on a 3-T clinical scanner detect signal directly from collagen protons: freeze-dry and D₂O exchange studies of cortical bone and Achilles tendon specimens. *NMR Biomed*. 2016;29(7):912-917.
5. Chang EY, Du J, Chung CB. UTE imaging in the musculoskeletal system. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 2015;41(4):870-883.
6. Chappell KE, Robson MD, Stonebridge-Foster A, et al. Magic angle effects in MR neurography. *Am J Neuroradiol*. 2004;25(3):431-440.
7. Husarik DB, Saupe N, Pfirrmann CW, Jost B, Hodler J, Zanetti M. Elbow nerves: MR findings in 60 asymptomatic subjects—normal anatomy, variants, and pitfalls. *Radiology*. 2009;252(1):148-156.
8. Goetz JE, Kunze NM, Main EK, et al. MRI-apparent localized deformation of the median nerve within the carpal tunnel during functional hand loading. *Ann Biomed Eng*. 2013;41(10):2099-2108.
9. Felisaz PF, Chang EY, Carne I, et al. In vivo MR microneurography of the tibial and common peroneal nerves. *Radiol Res Pract*. 2014;2014:780964.
10. Lehmann HC, Zhang J, Mori S, Sheikh KA. Diffusion tensor imaging to assess axonal regeneration in peripheral nerves. *Exp Neurol*. 2010;223(1):238-244.
11. Sun C, Hou Z, Hong G, Wan Q, Li X. In vivo evaluation of sciatic nerve crush injury using diffusion tensor imaging: correlation with nerve function and histology. *J Comput Assist Tomogr*. 2014;38(5):790-796.
12. Shen J, Zhou CP, Zhong XM, et al. MR neurography: T1 and T2 measurements in acute peripheral nerve traction injury in rabbits. *Radiology*. 2010;254(3):729-738.
13. Tagliafico A, Bignotti B, Tagliafico G, Martinoli C. Peripheral nerve MRI: precision and reproducibility of T2*-derived measurements at 3.0-T: a feasibility study. *Skeletal Radiol*. 2015;44(5):679-686.
14. Chang EY, Bae WC, Shao H, et al. Ultrashort echo time magnetization transfer (UTE-MT) imaging of cortical bone. *NMR Biomed*. 2015;28(7):873-880.
15. Shao H, Chang EY, Pauli C, et al. UTE bi-component analysis of T2* relaxation in articular cartilage. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2016;24(2):364-373.
16. Pauli C, Bae WC, Lee M, et al. Ultrashort-echo time MR imaging of the patella with bicomponent analysis: correlation with histopathologic and polarized light microscopic findings. *Radiology*. 2012;264(2):484-493.
17. Henkelman RM, Stanisz GJ, Kim JK, Bronskill MJ. Anisotropy of NMR properties of tissues. *Magn Reson Med*. 1994;32(5):592-601.
18. Ma YJ, Chang EY, Carl M, Du J. Quantitative magnetization transfer ultrashort echo time imaging using a time-efficient 3D multispoke Cones sequence. *Magn Reson Med*. 2018;79(2):692-700.
19. Helms G, Dathe H, Dechent P. Modeling the influence of TR and excitation flip angle on the magnetization transfer ratio (MTR) in human brain obtained from 3D spoiled gradient echo MRI. *Magn Reson Med*. 2010;64(1):177-185.
20. Dousset V, Grossman RI, Ramer KN, et al. Experimental allergic encephalomyelitis and multiple sclerosis: lesion characterization with magnetization transfer imaging. *Radiology*. 1992;182(2):483-491.
21. Henkelman RM, Stanisz GJ, Graham SJ. Magnetization transfer in MRI: a review. *NMR Biomed*. 2001;14(2):57-64.
22. Horch RA, Gore JC, Does MD. Origins of the ultrashort-T2 1H NMR signals in myelinated nerve: a direct measure of myelin content? *Magn Reson Med*. 2011;66(1):24-31.
23. Du J, Carl M, Bydder M, Takahashi A, Chung CB, Bydder GM. Qualitative and quantitative ultrashort echo time (UTE) imaging of cortical bone. *J Magn Reson*. 2010;207(2):304-311.

24. Du J, Carl M, Diaz E, et al. Ultrashort TE $T_1\rho$ (UTE $T_1\rho$) imaging of the Achilles tendon and meniscus. *Magn Reson Med*. 2010;64(3):834-842.
25. Sheth V, Shao H, Chen J, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging of myelin using ultrashort echo time (UTE) pulse sequences: phantom, specimen, volunteer and multiple sclerosis patient studies. *Neuroimage*. 2016;136:37-44.
26. Haakma W, Jongbloed BA, Froeling M, et al. MRI shows thickening and altered diffusion in the median and ulnar nerves in multifocal motor neuropathy. *Eur Radiol*. 2017;27(5):2216-2224.
27. Heckel A, Weiler M, Xia A, et al. Peripheral nerve diffusion tensor imaging: assessment of axon and myelin sheath integrity. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(6):e0130833.
28. Gallagher TA, Simon NG, Kliot M. Diffusion tensor imaging to visualize axons in the setting of nerve injury and recovery. *Neurosurg Focus*. 2015;39(3):E10.
29. Boyer RB, Kelm ND, Riley DC, et al. 4.7-T diffusion tensor imaging of acute traumatic peripheral nerve injury. *Neurosurg Focus*. 2015;39(3):E9.
30. Takagi T, Nakamura M, Yamada M, et al. Visualization of peripheral nerve degeneration and regeneration: monitoring with diffusion tensor tractography. *Neuroimage*. 2009;44(3):884-892.
31. Carl M, Bydder GM, Du J. UTE imaging with simultaneous water and fat signal suppression using a time-efficient multispoke inversion recovery pulse sequence. *Magn Reson Med*. 2016;76(2):577-582.

How to cite this article: Fan S-J, Wong J, Cheng X, et al. Feasibility of quantitative ultrashort echo time (UTE)-based methods for MRI of peripheral nerve. *NMR in Biomedicine*. 2018;31:e3948. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nbm.3948>