MR Imaging of the Amide-Proton Transfer Effect and the pH-Insensitive Nuclear Overhauser Effect at 9.4 T
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The amide proton transfer (APT) effect has emerged as a unique endogenous molecular imaging contrast mechanism with great clinical potentials. However, in vivo quantitative mapping of APT using the conventional asymmetry analysis is difficult due to the confounding nuclear Overhauser effect (NOE) and the asymmetry of the magnetization transfer effect. Here, we showed that the asymmetry of magnetization transfer contrast from immobile macromolecules is highly significant, and the wide spectral separation associated with a high magnetic field of 9.4 T delineates APT and NOE peaks in a Z-spectrum. Therefore, high-resolution apparent APT and NOE maps can be obtained from measurements at three offsets. The apparent APT value was greater in gray matter compared to white matter in normal rat brain and was sensitive to tissue acidosis and correlated well with apparent diffusion coefficient in the rat focal ischemic brain. In contrast, no ischemia-induced contrast was observed in the apparent NOE map. The concentration dependence and the pH insensitivity of NOE were confirmed in phantom experiments. Our results demonstrate that in vivo apparent APT and NOE maps can be easily obtained at high magnetic fields and the pH-insensitive NOE may be a useful indicator of mobile macromolecular contents. Magn Reson Med 000:000–000, 2012. © 2012 Wiley Periodicals, Inc.
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INTRODUCTION

The exchange of nuclear magnetization between protons of bulk free water and its neighboring molecules in a saturation transfer experiment provides valuable imaging contrasts for MRI. The molecules of interest include metabolites, mobile macromolecules, semisolid macromolecules, and the hydration layer around them. With selective off-resonance irradiation, protons from certain metabolites or macromolecules are saturated and the saturated magnetization can be transferred to the free water via different pathways including intramolecular or intermolecular dipolar cross-relaxation, proton exchange, or molecular exchange, resulting in a reduction of the longitudinal water magnetization. The magnetization transfer (MT) effect can be visualized from the variation of water signal as a function of offset frequency of the irradiation pulse, i.e., the Z-spectrum (1). Conventional MT contrast (MTC) resulting from the semisolid or immobile macromolecules (IMs), denoted as MTCIM, has been developed for many years and applied in MR angiography and pathological studies such as multiple sclerosis (2,3). While MTCIM occurs over a broad range of offset frequencies (on the order of 100 ppm) in the Z-spectrum, the MTC due to mobile macromolecules, denoted as MTCMM, can be detected either by chemical exchange or the nuclear Overhauser effect (NOE) at more specific frequency offsets relatively close (<10 ppm) to the water resonance frequency (see Fig. 1a) and has attracted increasing research interests.

Amide proton transfer (APT) is one variant of the chemical exchange saturation transfer (CEST) contrast (4), referring to the proton exchange between water and backbone amide groups in proteins and peptides (5). The APT contrast has emerged as a sensitive indicator of tissue pH and concentrations of endogenous mobile proteins and peptides and has shown of great potential in stroke and cancer studies (5–11). In an image acquired under irradiation at the amide proton frequency (e.g., 3.6 ppm from water resonance frequency), the signal is decreased not only by the APT effect but also by the direct water saturation (DS) effect and the MTCIM. APT signal is usually assessed from an MTR asym map, i.e., the normalized difference between two images acquired at the amide proton frequency (e.g., 3.6 ppm) and at the reference frequency (e.g., –3.6 ppm), in an attempt to minimize both DS and MTCIM effects:

\[ \text{MTR asym}(\Omega) = \frac{S(-\Omega) - S(\Omega)}{S_0}, \]

where \( \Omega \) is the radiofrequency (RF) offset from the water, and \( S_0 \) is the signal intensity without irradiation. Unfortunately, the MTCIM in tissue is asymmetric around the water proton resonance frequency (5,12), leading to negative background signals in the MTR asym maps. Indeed, it has been shown that the magnitude of MTR asym is much larger than the APT effect at an ultrahigh field of 9.4 T (13). As MTR asym signal is confounded, the characterization of APT effect in previous APT studies, such as the determination of the exchange rate and optimization of the irradiation pulse power, is often derived from a disease model, e.g., the magnitude of APT is determined from the difference of MTR asym at the lesion site versus the contralateral normal region, or from normal versus postmortem animals, assuming other signal...
If it is significant, NOE at upfield frequencies (e.g., signal should be proportional to the mobile macromolecules (APT) in a saturation transfer experiment (27). The NOE model, thus its signal characteristics would be similar to those of NOE can be described by the same mathematical formalism as for APT. The NOE effect increases the magnitude of NOE (as well as APT) due to facilitated because the higher magnetic field slightly increases the magnitude of NOE (as well as APT) due to its proportionality to water $T_1$, and also increases the spectral separation, leading to the reduction of the DS effect and a better defined NOE feature (as well as APT peak) (13,23). The aliphatic proton frequency of mobile macromolecules observed by NMR spectroscopy spans a range of a few ppm upfield, e.g., about $-0.7$ to $-5$ ppm in myosin from rabbit skeletal muscle (24) and cat brain (25), and $-0.3$ to $-3.9$ ppm in perfused cancer cells (26). If it is significant, NOE at upfield frequencies (e.g., $-3.6$ ppm) is clearly a nuisance for the quantification of APT using the asymmetry analysis approach.

Although not a chemical exchange, the spin exchange of NOE can be described by the same mathematical model, thus its signal characteristics would be similar to APT in a saturation transfer experiment (27). The NOE signal should be proportional to the mobile macromolecular concentration as well as the MT rate, which could potentially be exploited as a novel imaging index complementary to APT. However, little has been reported regarding some important properties of the in vivo NOE signal, especially whether it is sensitive to pH. One possible mechanism for in vivo NOE is an exchange-relayed pathway where the saturated magnetization of aliphatic protons is first transferred to neighboring labile amide, hydroxyl, or amine protons, and then transferred to free water via chemical exchange, and it has been suggested that such an exchange-relayed mechanism of NOE may be dominant (28). A dominant exchange-relay pathway would imply a possibility that NOE signal can be sensitive to pH (29). Thus, it is critical to evaluate whether the NOE signal would be affected by a change in tissue pH in the physiological range.

In this work, we reported a simple three offset measurement approach for high-resolution (HR) in vivo mapping of APT and NOE at 9.4 T. Three offset frequencies were selected; one at the center frequency of the APT or NOE peak, while the other two are at the upper and lower bounds of the peak. The signal difference between the peak of interest and the mean of the two bounds approximates true APT or NOE and are dubbed as apparent APT (APT*) or apparent NOE (NOE*). The APT* and NOE* maps measured by the three offset approach were compared with MTR$\text{asym}$ and apparent diffusion coefficient (ADC) maps in normal and ischemic rat brains. The dependence of the APT* and NOE* on the irradiation pulse power was also investigated. Finally, the concentration dependence and the pH independence of the NOE signal were validated in protein phantoms.

**METHODS**

**Three Offset Measurement of MTC$\text{MM}$**

The signal contributions from DS, MTC$\text{IM}$, and MTC$\text{MM}$ to a Z-spectrum are schematically plotted in Fig. 1a. The DS (gray line) mainly affects the RF offsets close to the...
water resonance. The addition of MTCIM effect (black line) induces significant signal drop for a wide offset range, which is also asymmetric around the water resonance frequency. At very high magnetic fields, the MTCIM, including the downfield APT and upfield NOE (red peaks), can be delineated by the increased spectral resolution. From Fig. 1, it is apparent that quantitative imaging of either APT or NOE by MTRasym is problematic. Instead, it can be determined from the difference of black and red curves (green, Fig. 1a). In principle, quantification of in vivo APT and NOE can be achieved similarly by fitting a wide Z-spectrum (at least −10 to 10 ppm) to a theoretical model where the DS and the MTCIM effect are taken into account, then subtracting the fitted Z-spectrum from the experimental Z-spectrum. However, the pixel-wise implementation of such a modeling approach is very difficult because of (i) the small magnitude of MTCIM effect versus the large number of fitting parameters involved and (ii) the requirement of large sampling offset frequency points and resultant low signal to noise ratio.

For a well-delineated peak observed at a high magnetic field, we propose that imaging of APT and NOE can be acquired with simple three offset measurements (Fig. 1b). Specifically, the Z-spectrum within two boundary frequencies with minimal MTCIM (cyan arrows, Fig. 1b) can be approximated by linear line segments (cyan lines). This is essentially a simplification of the Z-spectra fitting approach to an extreme where all other effects except the MTCIM of interest are approximated by a linear function. As such, the apparent MTCIM (MTCIM*) calculated from the difference between Z-spectrum and line segments will be an approximation of MTCIM (green vs. blue curves, Fig. 1b). Practically, MTCIM* map can be obtained from a label image at an RF offset of Ω = δ with maximum MTCIM and two boundary images with minimum MTCIM and an offset separation of ±Δ (Fig. 1b). The MTCIM* at the label frequency can be expressed as:

$$\text{MTCIM}^*(\Omega = \delta) = \frac{S(\delta - \Delta) + S(\delta + \Delta)}{2} - S(\delta) / S_0. \quad [2]$$

Because the frequency offset of the label image with maximum MTCIM is relatively easy to determine, the difference between MTCIM and MTCIM* is mainly dependent on (1) how accurate the two boundary frequencies are chosen, i.e., whether there is residual MTCIM (as shown for one boundary frequency, indicated by the green arrow in Fig. 1b) and (2) how well the Z-spectrum within the two boundary frequencies can be approximated by a linear function. Generally, MTCIM can be a good approximation if the MTCIM peak is narrow or far away from the water resonance (Fig. 1b). Specifically, for APT* mapping, as will be shown later, can be obtained from a label image acquired at 3.6 ppm and two boundary images acquired at 3.0 and 4.2 ppm:

$$\text{APT}^* = \left\{ \frac{S(3.0 \text{ ppm}) + S(4.2 \text{ ppm})}{2} - S(3.6 \text{ ppm}) \right\} / S_0, \quad [3]$$

and the NOE* map can be obtained similarly from three images acquire at −5.0, −2.0, and −3.5 ppm:

$$\text{NOE}^* = \left\{ \frac{S(-5.0 \text{ ppm}) + S(-2.0 \text{ ppm}) - S(-3.5 \text{ ppm})}{2} \right\} / S_0. \quad [4]$$

Equations [2–4] assume that the two boundary images have an equal offset shift from the label image, which can be easily extended to a more general case if the two shifts are unequal.

Numerical Simulations

To estimate the error of MTCIM obtained from three offset measurements (Eq. [2]), numerical simulation of DS, MTCIM, and APT effects were performed with Bloch–McConnell equations. The MT effect between water and protons of IMs (MTCIM) was modeled as a super-Lorentzian function (30,31) and incorporated into the simulations following the work of Li et al (32). The time-dependent differential equations were solved in Matlab® 7.0 in a 1 ms step to saturation pulse duration of 3 s. The simulations were performed in the RF offset range of 0–20 ppm, with three B1 values of 0.6, 1.0, and 1.5 μT. Parameters used for simulations were: B1 values of water, amide, and IM protons = 0.5 s⁻¹, water R2 = 12, 15, and 18 s⁻¹, amide R2 = 15 s⁻¹, a fractional pool size of amide proton fAPT = 0.001 and 0, a chemical shift of amide from water = 3.6 ppm, the exchange rate of amide with water = 30 s⁻¹ (5), a fractional proton pool size of IM = 0.05 for gray matter (GM) and 0.08 for white matter (WM), IM proton T2 = 10 μs, and an exchange rate between water and IM protons = 50 s⁻¹ (12). The APT signal was obtained from the difference of the simulated Z-spectrum with fAPT = 0 and 0.001. For simplicity, symmetry of MTCIM around the water resonance frequency was assumed, and NOE was not simulated due to contributions of many aliphatic, unknown peaks spanning a relatively wide range.

Overview of MR Experiments

All MRI experiments were performed on a 9.4-T/31 cm magnet with an actively shielded 12-cm gradient insert (Magnex, UK) interfaced to a Varian Unity INOVA console. For in vivo experiments, a volume coil excitation and surface coil reception setup was used (Nova Medical, MA). In phantom experiments, a volume coil was used for both transmit and receive (Rapid Biomedical, OH). Magnetic field homogeneity was optimized by localized shimming on a volume of interest using a three-dimensional gradient-echo automated shimming routine. For a typical shimming volume of ~20 mm × 20 mm × 6 mm for phantom and 14 mm × 9 mm × 9 mm for in vivo experiments, the water spectral linewidths were 5–10 Hz and 20–30 Hz, respectively. The B1 field was mapped for calibration of the transmit power (33).

In MT experiments, a continuous wave RF pulse was applied for irradiation at an off-resonance frequency. After the irradiation, crushing gradients were immediately applied to suppress residual transverse magnetization, then the images were acquired with a single-shot spin-echo planar imaging sequence. Control images (S0) were acquired at an offset of 300 ppm for signal normalization.
In Vivo Experiments

**Animal Preparation**

A total of 16 male Sprague–Dawley rats were used with approval from the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee at the University of Pittsburgh. Rats (weighing between 290 and 480 g) were anesthetized with isoflurane (5% for induction and 2% during surgery) via a gas mixture of O2 (30%) and N2 (70%). The femoral vein was cannulated to deliver pancuronium bromide (0.2 mg/kg/h) and maintenance fluid. The femoral artery was catheterized to monitor the arterial blood pressure and to obtain blood samples for arterial blood gas measurements. For focal ischemia studies, the middle cerebral artery occlusion model (MCAO) was adapted (34). During MRI experiments, the isoflurane level was reduced to 1.5–1.3% and the rectal temperature was controlled at 37.2 ± 0.5°C using a water circulating pad.

In Vivo Experiments

Experiments were performed either at HR (Expts. #1.1–1.4), with a field of view (FOV) of 2.56 cm × 2.56 cm, four slices of 1.5-mm thickness, and 0.5-mm gap, or low resolution (LR, Expts. #1.5–1.7), with an FOV of 3.2 cm × 3.2 cm, four slices of 2-mm thickness and no gap. The matrix size was 64 × 64, echo time (TE) was 32 ms for HR and 28 ms for LR, and the postacquisition recovery time, i.e., the time between the acquisition of one MT image and the saturation pulse of the next image, was 3.5 or 4 s. For LR experiments, water saturation shift referencing images were acquired to evaluate the spatial variation of $R_2$ (35).

Seven types of data were obtained, and their detailed experimental parameters were listed in Table 1. In vivo experiments #1.1–#1.7 are as follows:

1. Whole Z-spectrum was measured in the 20 to −20 ppm offset range, with uneven steps emphasizing the APT and NOE features ($n = 6$ normal animals).

2. To better characterize APT and NOE effects, Z-spectra were acquired at finer steps and an increased number of averages (NA) to improve the signal to noise ratio ($n = 6$ normal animals).

3. To obtain MTR asym(3.6 ppm) and APT* maps, MT images were measured at four offsets of 3.6 ppm (11 normal animals).

4. To obtain MTR asym(5.0 ppm) in the case of brain ischemia, Expts. #1.3 and #1.4 were performed at LR after 4 h from the onset of MCAO ($n = 7$ MCAO animals). To identify ischemic regions in MCAO studies, ADC maps were obtained using a multislice spin-echo echo planar imaging sequence, with a low b value of 5 s/mm² applied on one axis, and a high b value of 1200 s/mm² applied on six different directions.

5. To determine the irradiation power dependence of APT* and NOE*, MT images were obtained with eleven $B_1$ values ($n = 7$, on three normal and four MCAO rats).

6. (1.6 and 1.7) To evaluate the imaging contrast of APT*, NOE*, MTR asym(3.6 ppm), and MTR asym(5.0 ppm) in the case of brain ischemia, Expts. #1.3 and #1.4 were performed at LR after 4 h from the onset of MCAO ($n = 7$ MCAO animals). To identify ischemic regions in MCAO studies, ADC maps were obtained using a multislice spin-echo echo planar imaging sequence, with a low b value of 5 s/mm² applied on one axis, and a high b value of 1200 s/mm² applied on six different directions.

7. Same as (f) with half NA values.

Phantom Studies

Two types of phantoms were used to characterize NOE signals. Prepared solutions were transferred to cylinders (I.D. = 8.9 mm), which were bundled together for...
imaging. Images were obtained at room temperature with an FOV of 4 cm \times 4 cm, slice thickness of 5 mm, matrix size = 64 \times 64, TE = 29 ms, and postacquisition recovery time = 10 s. 

B_0 maps were measured by a multi-TE gradient-echo echo planar imaging sequence. Z-spectra were measured from 8 to \(-20 ppm range using a 6-s saturation pulse at different B_1 values. Two phantom experiments #2.1–#2.2 are as follows:

(2.1) To study the pH dependence of NOE in proteins, 15% by weight bovine serum albumin (BSA, A7906 from Sigma Aldrich, St. Louis, MO) was dissolved in phosphate buffer saline and titrated to four different pH values of 7.0, 6.4, 5.8, and 5.0. Z-spectra were acquired with B_1 of 0.5 and 1.0 \mu T.

(2.2) To confirm the dependence of NOE signal on mobile macromolecule concentration, 5, 10, 15, and 20% by weight BSA was dissolved in phosphate buffer saline and titrated to pH = 7.0. Z-spectra were acquired with B_1 of 0.17, 0.35, 0.5, 0.7, 1.0, and 2.0 \mu T. In addition, MT images were measured by a 0.65 \mu T and 6 s pulse at three offsets of \(-2, -3.5, and -5 ppm.

Data Analysis

MTRsym(3.6 ppm) and MTRasym(5.0 ppm) maps were obtained using Eq. [1], and APT* and NOE* maps were calculated with Eqs. [3] and [4], respectively. Quantitative analyses were performed from regions of interest (ROI). To minimize the contamination from B_0 inhomogeneity, the ROIs were selected so that the shift of B_0 from the water resonance frequency was <16 Hz for in vivo data and <3 Hz for Phantom data.

In normal animals (Expts. #1.1–#1.5), five ROIs were selected from the S/S_0 map at 5 ppm for the HR data (see Insets, Fig. 2) at the cortex, corpus callosum (CC), caudate-putamen (CPu), internal capsule (IC), and cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) area, whereas two ROIs were selected on the GM and WM areas for the LR data. In the analysis of Expt. #1.5, where four MCAO animals were used, GM and WM ROIs were selected on the contralateral (normal) side. Z-spectrum and MTRsym were obtained from ROIs, and APT and NOE signals were extracted.

In MCAO studies (Expts. #1.6 and #1.7), two ROI in the ipsilateral (ischemic) and contralateral (normal) sides of the CPu area, respectively, and a WM ROI on the contralateral side were selected for quantitative comparison between APT* and MTRsym maps. To compare the regional APT* and MTRsym and their ischemic contrast, a paired Student’s t-test was used. In addition, one large lesion ROI was selected from the ADC map of each animal from which APT*, NOE*, and ADC values were obtained for pixel-by-pixel correlation analysis. All statistical data in the text and figures are shown as mean \pm standard deviation.

RESULTS

In Vivo Regional Z-Spectrum of Rat Brain

(Expts. #1.1 and #1.2)

Figure 2a shows the averaged Z-spectra from CSF, cortex, and CC ROIs (n = 6, Expt. #1.1) measured with a 1.25 \mu T and 3 s saturation pulse. Although an offset range of 20 to \(-20 ppm was acquired, only part of the data was displayed for better visualization of the main features of interest. Both cortex and CC Z-spectra had a small signal dip at \(-3.6 ppm due to APT effect (cyan arrow) and a broader dip due to NOE at negative frequency offsets (green arrow). The Z-spectrum of the CSF mostly shows the DS effect where the signal drops quickly at offset within \(\pm 2 ppm, although residual APT and NOE signals are also present due to partial volume effects. The MTRsym curves from cortex and CC ROIs show the 3.6 ppm APT peaks on top of the distorted negative baseline due to the NOE and MTCIM asymmetry effects (Fig. 2b). In addition to the amide peak, another MT peak can be seen at \(-2 ppm. Note that in the Z-spectrum, the signal dip at 2 ppm (orange arrow) is much smaller compared to 3.6 ppm due to larger DS effect. At an offset of 5 ppm, the magnitude of MTRsym is much larger than that of
APT and is \(-10.5 \pm 0.5\%\) (n = 6) for CC and \(-8.1 \pm 0.4\%\) for cortex, respectively. For better visualization of APT and NOE signals, Z-spectra were measured using finer steps in the RF offset (Expt. #1.2). The zoomed Z-spectra obtained from four tissue ROIs (Insets, Fig. 2) show that the APT effect is relatively narrow and mostly falls within the 3.0–4.2 ppm range (Fig. 3a), and the NOE signal spans approximately the –2.0 to –5.0 ppm range (Fig. 3b). Quantitative APT* and NOE* can be approximated from the difference between a linear fit of data points outside the red box (dashed lines) and the data (squares), similar to Fig. 1b. Higher APT* peaks were found at 3.6 ppm for the cortex and CPu ROIs (Fig. 3c) than for the CC and IC ROIs. In contrast, similar NOE* peak magnitudes were found for all four ROIs at about –3.5 to –3.8 ppm (Fig. 3d). Thus, a label offset of 3.6 ppm and –3.5 ppm were chosen for the acquisition of APT* and NOE* maps using Eqs. [3] and [4], respectively.

Estimation of Errors in APT* and NOE*
For both GM and WM with saturation pulse power of 0.6–1.5 μT, the numerically simulated Z-spectra in the offset range of 3.0–4.2 ppm can be well approximated by a linear function (Fig. 4a). In GM, the difference at 3.6 ppm is only 0.1, 0.18, and 0.23% for \(B_1\) values of 0.6, 1.0, and 1.5 μT, respectively. In a wider range of –2.0 to –5.0 ppm used for NOE* calculation (note that symmetric Z-spectra were assumed in the simulation), the line segment between 2.0 and 5.0 ppm deviates from the Z-spectra, and more so for the GM than WM (Fig. 4b). In GM, the difference at 3.5 ppm is 0.8, 1.4, and 1.9% for \(B_1\) values of 0.6, 1.0, and 1.5 μT, respectively. Because DS is related to water \(R_2\), a change in water \(R_2\) mainly affects the Z-spectra within 2 ppm from water resonance, and, therefore, only has a very small effect on the accuracy of APT* (Fig. 4c). Another source of error in APT* or NOE* is the residual APT or NOE effects in the boundary images. In Fig. 4d, the width of the APT effect increases with applied \(B_1\). At the two offsets of 3.0 and 4.2 ppm, the APT signal is minimal for 0.6 μT, but a higher \(B_1\) of 1.5 μT leads to small residual effects, and consequently, more underestimation in APT*.

MTRasym, APT*, and NOE* Maps of Normal Brain (Expts. #1.3–#1.5)
Figure 5 shows maps of MTRasym at 3.6 ppm and 5 ppm, and APT* and NOE* maps (Expts. #1.3 and #1.4).

FIG. 3. The APT signals (a) from the four selected ROIs span a relatively narrow offset range of 4.2–3.0 ppm, whereas the NOE signals (b) appear in a wider offset range of –2.0 to –5.0 ppm. Quantitative APT and NOE can be approximately measured from the difference between a linear fitting of data points outside the red box (dashed lines) and the measured data (squares). Apparent APT (APT*) (c) has large contrast in white matter (WM) and gray matter (GM) tissues, whereas apparent NOE (NOE*) (d) is similar for all tissue types.

FIG. 4. Z-spectrum signal due to DS and MTCIM effects was simulated for GM and WM at three \(B_1\) levels (a, b). In the 3.0–4.2 ppm range (within two dashed lines), the linear approximation holds quite well (line segments vs. Z-spectra curves (a). For a wider range of 2–5 ppm, the linear approximation shows small error for \(B_1 = 0.6 \text{ μT}\), but the error is larger for two higher \(B_1\) values (b). A change of water \(R_2\) mainly affects the offsets close to the water resonance (c). In the 3.0–4.2 ppm range, the difference between Z-spectra curve and line segments increases very slightly with \(R_2\) (inset). A higher saturation power broadens the APT peak (d), leading to more residual APT effects in the boundary images.
MTR\textsubscript{asym}(3.6 ppm) exhibits excellent contrast between cortex (red arrows), CC (green), and IC (blue). Note MTR\textsubscript{asym} is negative (see Fig. 2b) and its magnitude is significantly higher in WM (CC and IC) than in GM (cortex). Although MTR\textsubscript{asym}(3.6 ppm) has contributions from APT, NOE, and MTC\textsubscript{IM} asymmetry, the major contribution of these tissue contrasts actually comes from the MTC\textsubscript{IM} asymmetry because a quite similar imaging contrast can be seen from the MTR\textsubscript{asym} map at 5 ppm, which should be mostly out of the APT and NOE range (25,26).

The APT* map, although much smaller in magnitude, also shows slight imaging contrasts between GM and WM areas, whereas the NOE* map appears quite homogeneous.

It is known that MTC\textsubscript{IM} effects, including APT and NOE, are highly dependent on the irradiation pulse parameters (23,36). To find an optimal $B_1$ and also to examine whether different regional contrasts in APT* and NOE* maps may be due to the specific irradiation pulse we used, $B_1$-dependency experiments were performed (Expt. #1.5). Figure 6 shows the irradiation power dependence of the APT* and NOE* signals. The optimal $B_1$ is about 1 $\mu$T for APT* and 0.6 $\mu$T for NOE*. While the APT* of GM is about 30–40% larger than that of WM for all irradiation powers, the NOE* of GM, interestingly, is slightly smaller (10–20%) than that of WM for $B_1 \leq 1 \mu$T and the difference diminishes at larger $B_1$ values.

The contrast of APT* and MTR\textsubscript{asym}(3.6 ppm) between ischemic and normal brain regions was quantified. Figure 8b shows averaged APT* and MTR\textsubscript{asym}(3.6 ppm) between WM ROI (purple in 8a) and the contralateral normal (red contour in 8a) and ipsilateral ischemic (green contour in 8a) CPu ROIs. Although the magnitude of APT* is generally much smaller than MTR\textsubscript{asym}, the magnitude of lesion contrast in APT* (between contralateral and ipsilateral CPu) is 1.86 ± 0.27%, similar to that of MTR\textsubscript{asym} 2.00 ± 0.32% (paired t-test, $P > 0.1$). The lesion contrast in APT* is much larger than the contrast of APT* in contralateral CPu versus WM ($P < 5 \times 10^{-6}$), whereas the lesion contrast in MTR\textsubscript{asym} is similar to the contrast between contralateral CPu and WM ($P > 0.1$). In the APT* maps (Fig. 7), heterogeneous intensities were observed within the ischemic region. To determine the relationship between APT* and ADC, a scatter plot was obtained for all pixels in a large lesion ROI (yellow contour, Fig. 8a) from all MCAO rats (Fig. 8c). Clearly, highly positive correlation was observed ($R = 0.70 \pm 0.10$, $n = 7$ animals). However, NOE* is nearly

![FIG. 5. In vivo maps of MTR\textsubscript{asym}(3.6 ppm), MTR\textsubscript{asym}(5 ppm), APT*, and NOE* were obtained from the rat brain for two slices. Note the two MTR\textsubscript{asym} maps are negative and have similar tissue contrast, where cortex, CC, and IC areas are indicated by red, green, and blue arrows, respectively. The units here are % of $S_0$.](image1)

![FIG. 6. Averaged APT* (a) and NOE* (b) values as a function of $B_1$. APT* of GM is about 30–40% higher than WM. NOE* is about 10–20% higher for WM than GM at lower irradiation pulse power, but the contrast between WM and GM diminishes at larger $B_1$.](image2)

MTR\textsubscript{asym}, APT*, and NOE* Maps of Ischemic Brain (Expts. #1.6 and #1.7)

During MCAO, it is known that the APT effect will decrease due to a drop in tissue pH (5,8). Indeed, excellent lesion contrast can be found from the APT* map, which shows very similar lesion size as the ADC map (Fig. 7). Note that within the lesion area, regional heterogeneity (red vs. yellow arrow) can be seen from the quantitative APT* map, which may indicate different pH values. Although the lesion area can also be observed from the MTR\textsubscript{asym}(3.6 ppm) map, the contrast of the ipsilateral side versus the contralateral side is similar to (red vs. blue) or smaller than (green vs. blue) the contrast between normal GM and WM tissues. The weaker sensitivity of MTR\textsubscript{asym}(3.6 ppm) compared to the APT* map is partly due to there being almost no lesion contrast in the maps of NOE* and MTC\textsubscript{IM} (represented by MTR\textsubscript{asym} (5 ppm)), the major contributors to the MTR\textsubscript{asym} map.

The contrast of APT* and MTR\textsubscript{asym}(3.6 ppm) between ischemic and normal brain regions was quantified. Figure 8b shows averaged APT* and MTR\textsubscript{asym}(3.6 ppm) between WM ROI (purple in 8a), and the contralateral normal (red contour in 8a) and ipsilateral ischemic (green contour in 8a) CPu ROIs. Although the magnitude of APT* is generally much smaller than MTR\textsubscript{asym}, the magnitude of lesion contrast in APT* (between contralateral and ipsilateral CPu) is 1.86 ± 0.27%, similar to that of MTR\textsubscript{asym} 2.00 ± 0.32% (paired t-test, $P > 0.1$). The lesion contrast in APT* is much larger than the contrast of APT* in contralateral CPu versus WM ($P < 5 \times 10^{-6}$), whereas the lesion contrast in MTR\textsubscript{asym} is similar to the contrast between contralateral CPu and WM ($P > 0.1$). In the APT* maps (Fig. 7), heterogeneous intensities were observed within the ischemic region. To determine the relationship between APT* and ADC, a scatter plot was obtained for all pixels in a large lesion ROI (yellow contour, Fig. 8a) from all MCAO rats (Fig. 8c). Clearly, highly positive correlation was observed ($R = 0.70 \pm 0.10$, $n = 7$ animals). However, NOE* is nearly
independent of ADC \((R = 0.16 \pm 0.25)\), indicating that NOE* is not sensitive to pH, unlike APT.

Contribution of Chemical Exchange to the NOE Signal (Expts. #2.1 and 2.2)

Theoretically, MTC_MM is proportional to the concentration of mobile macromolecule as well as the MT rate \((5,23)\). Although no ischemic contrast was found for NOE*, suggesting its pH-independence, one cannot exclude the possibility that there were concomitant significant changes in MT rate and the mobile macromolecule content \((37)\), and that the two effects cancel each other. To examine the pH effect and concentration dependence of NOE separately, BSA phantoms were measured and the results are shown in Fig. 9. For both \(B_1 = 0.5\) and \(1.0\) \(\mu\)T, the CEST signals exhibited clear pH-dependence: sharp dips occurred at about 2.8 ppm for pH \(\leq 6.4\), and the dip was smaller and broader for pH \(= 7.0\) (Fig. 9a). The upfield NOE signals, in contrast, were almost identical for all samples indicating that the NOE of BSA is insensitive to the chemical exchange in the pH \(= 5.0–7.0\) range. As expected, both NOE and CEST signals in the Z-spectra were proportional to the BSA concentration (Fig. 9b). The dependence on the concentration could also be appreciated from the NOE* map obtained using three offset measurements of \(-2.0, -3.5,\) and \(-5.0\) ppm (inset). Figure 9c shows the Z-spectra of the 20% BSA (pH \(= 7.0\)) sample with six \(B_1\) values, where the optimal \(B_1\) maximizes the NOE signal at around 0.5 \(\mu\)T (Fig. 9c), similar to the optimal \(B_1\) of 0.6 \(\mu\)T in rat studies observed in Fig. 6. The NOE signal nearly diminishes with a 2 \(\mu\)T saturation pulse, which is similar to the \(B_1\) dependence of NOE in BSA phantoms reported by Hubbard et al. \((38)\).

DISCUSSIONS

Our results can be summarized as (i) that Z-spectra obtained at a high field of 9.4 T have two narrow CEST peaks at \(\sim 3.6\) and \(\sim 2.0\) ppm and a broader NOE peak in the \(-2.0\) to \(-5.0\) ppm range, (ii) the MTC_MM asymmetry and NOE are significant contributors to the MTR asym analysis of APT, (iii) HR APT* and NOE* maps can be obtained at a high field by simple three-offset measurements, (iv) APT* is sensitive to ischemia, whereas NOE*
and MTCim are not, and (v) NOE of BSA phantoms is proportional to the macromolecule concentration but is insensitive to chemical exchange.

Z-Spectrum and MTRasym Analysis

To investigate the MT process between water and mobile macromolecules, van Zijl et al. had performed water-exchange-filter experiments (WEX) where water magnetization was selectively labeled and transferred to other molecules (26), in a reversed way to the saturation transfer experiments. In their in vivo and postmortem water-exchange-filter experiment spectra from rat brain, a small peak at ~2 ppm downfield from water and several upfield aliphatic peaks were observed besides the APT peak, similar to the peaks observed in our Z-spectra. The width of the APT peak is about 1 ppm, which is similar to our results of 1.2 ppm. The origin of the ~2 ppm peak is still uncertain and has been attributed to mobile lipids (26) or amide of glutamine and glutamine residues in protein (25). Whereas water-exchange-filter experiment measures the mobile macromolecules directly and has better spectral resolutions, a saturation transfer experiment measures the water signal and has much enhanced sensitivity, which is crucial for imaging the small APT and NOE signals.

The MTRasym maps have usually been acquired for APT-weighted imaging. However, the APT contribution to MTRasym is small compared to the MTCim asymmetry and upfield NOE signal. Unlike our APT* map, in the MTRasym map, the contrast between ischemic versus normal tissue is often similar to or smaller than the regional variance of normal tissues (see blue vs. red and green arrows in Fig. 7), reducing the sensitivity of detecting pathological changes. The problem of quantifying APT by MTRasym has been realized by many researchers, and several approaches have been proposed to address this issue. Scheidegger et al. applied two selected saturation pulse powers at both the amide frequency of 3.5 ppm and the reference frequency of ~3.5 ppm to extract the APT effect, assuming that APT would be equal for both powers whereas the DS and MTCim effects linearly increase with the saturation power (39). An advantage of this approach is that it is insensitive to the B1 inhomogeneity (39), but it may not be able to separate the APT from NOE because the MT rate of NOE is slower than APT (26) and, thus, NOE can be saturated at a smaller power level than APT. Recently, Jones et al. proposed to use pulsed saturation in a three-dimensional imaging sequence and the CEST data is obtained at the steady state (20). To extract the APT, a very low power irradiation pulse (equivalent to a 0.4 μT continuous wave pulse) was chosen to minimize the MTCim, and the DS effect is fitted from the Z-spectra with a Lorentzian function. However, sampling a wide Z-spectrum reduces the scanning efficiency because the APT signal is only contained in the narrow range around 3.6 ppm (26).

Three Offset Measurement Approach for APT and NOE

At a high magnetic field of 9.4 T, we showed that APT* and NOE* maps can be acquired simply with measurements at three offsets, which can be considered as an extreme simplification of the Z-spectrum fitting for the APT and NOE. Our in vivo APT* data should have only a small quantification error because (i) the magnitude of APT matches well with literature values reported by other groups (5,14), (ii) a linear function is a good approximation of Z-spectra within 3.0–4.2 ppm, based on simulation results of APT, and (iii) the magnitude of ischemic APT* contrast is nearly equal to that of MTRasym (Fig. 8b). Similar to our APT* approach of three offsets (3.0, 3.6, and 4.2 ppm), Sun et al. recently proposed to use three offsets of 2.0, 3.5, and 5.0 ppm for obtaining APT-weighted maps (11). The width of APT resonance is only 1–1.2 ppm from our results as well as the water-exchange-filter experiment spectrum (26), thus two reference scans of 2.0 and 5.0 ppm would increase the quantification error. Moreover, the 2.0 ppm scan has significant MT contribution from nonamide protons [Fig. 2 and also Ref. 26], which may contaminate the results. Compared to APT*, which should be a good surrogate of APT, the NOE* results have a larger quantification error due to its wider offset range. At an irradiation power of 0.6 μT, the linear assumption underlying the three offset method underestimates the NOE signal by 0.8%, or about
15% of the NOE* signal. In addition, the aliphatic region observed by NMR spectroscopy is wider and also closer to the water (24–26). Therefore, the ~2.0 ppm chosen as a boundary offset here likely contains residual NOE effects, leading to a greater underestimation in our NOE* results. Further systematic evaluations are needed to determine the accuracy of using NOE* as a surrogate of NOE.

The three offset measurement relies on clear delineation of the APT and NOE peaks, therefore, a high magnetic field is beneficial, and the bandwidth of the saturation pulse should be kept as narrow as possible. In our study a 3–4 s continuous wave pulse was used. For clinical scanners, however, a long irradiation pulse is often unavailable and short saturation pulse trains have been used instead. For very short saturation pulses, the peaks and boundaries of APT and NOE may not be well defined, leading to quantification errors. In addition, a good shimming and B0 field homogeneity is critical for accurate determination of the APT and NOE peaks. Although the three offset measurement may be difficult to achieve at field strengths of 3 T or lower, our results should still be applicable to 7 T, where the offsets and the optimal saturation pulse may need slight adjustments, and would result in only a slightly increased quantification error. Further studies using simulations or phantom experiments will be helpful to evaluate the validity of the three offset measurement at lower fields and the minimum pulse length necessary for pulse trains to obtain three offset APT* and NOE* mapping with acceptable accuracy.

Sources of APT and NOE Signals

Although APT and NOE both reflect MT effect from mobile macromolecules, GM has larger APT* and smaller NOE* than WM, indicating somewhat different signal origins (Fig. 6). Taking into account that the MTCMM is proportional to water T2, which is ~20% longer in GM than WM at 9.4 T (40), and assuming that the MT exchange rate of APT and NOE are similar in gray and white matters, the population of mobile macromolecule protons will be about 10–20% higher in GM for APT* and 30–40% higher in WM for NOE*, respectively. Therefore, one may postulate that APT mainly arises from mobile proteins and peptides that have a slightly higher concentration in GM, whereas NOE, in addition to mobile proteins and peptides, has contributions from mobile lipid, which may have a much higher concentration in WM.

Our MCAO and phantom experiments indicate that pH has minimal effect on NOE, unlike APT. Similar conclusions can be made from previous Z-spectra showing a minimal difference in the upfield NOE frequencies between ischemic brain and normal control (5,11,13). Little ischemic contrast in NOE is also in agreement with the notion that there is little change in the concentration of mobile proteins during initial hours of ischemia, whereas the large drop in APT magnitude is mostly due to the decrease of exchange rate (5). Thus, NOE can provide a valuable imaging index of mobile macromolecular concentration and is complementary to APT.

CONCLUSIONS

To circumvent the problem of APT quantification using the asymmetry analysis, the wide spectral separation associated with a high magnetic field can be exploited for direct mapping of the APT as well as the NOE signal. HR maps obtained from the three offset measurement show that the apparent APT is larger in GM than WM and is highly sensitive to tissue acidity. The magnitude of NOE* is much higher than APT*, but it has less regional heterogeneity across brain and is insensitive to pH. With direct imaging of APT* and NOE*, these contrasts can potentially provide complementary quantitative information regarding pH and mobile macromolecule concentrations and gives more insight and opens new opportunities in pathological applications.
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