Magnetic nanomaterials as contrast agents for MRI
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Abstract:

Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) is a powerful, non-invasive and nondestructive tool, capable of providing three-dimensional (3D) images of living organisms. The use of magnetic contrast agents has allowed clinical researchers and analysts to enormously increase the sensitivity and specificity of MRI since these substances change the intrinsic properties of the tissues within a living body, increasing the information present in the images. The advances in nanotechnology and materials science as well as the research of new magnetic effects have been the driving forces that propel the use of magnetic nanostructures as promising alternatives to the commercial contrast agents used in MRI. This review discusses the principles associated with the use of contrast agents in MRI as well as the most recent reports focused on nanostructured contrast agents. The potential applications of gadolinium (Gd) and manganese Mn-based nanomaterials and iron oxide nanoparticles in this imaging technique are discussed as well, from their magnetic behavior to the mainly used materials and nanoarchitectures. Then, it is also addressed the recent efforts made to develop new types of contrast agents based on synthetic antiferromagnetic and high-aspect ratio nanostructures. Furthermore, the application of these materials in theragnosis, either as contrast agents and controlled drug release, contrast agents and thermal therapy or contrast agents and radiosensitizers, is also presented.
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1. Introduction

Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) is a non-invasive powerful diagnostic technique used in medical science. This technique has several advantages, including extreme imaging flexibility, non-
ionizing radiation, patient harmlessness, high patient acceptance, high-resolution images with an excellent soft tissue contrast, provision of physiological parameters and acquisition of unique clinical information. As compared to other imaging modalities, the main advantage associated with this approach is its high spatial resolution, whereas its major drawback is the limited sensitivity of its probes [1]. Furthermore, over the last decades, numerous attempts have been made to improve the MRI sensitivity and facilitate biological as well as the functional information-rich imaging by the use of magnetic nanoparticles (NPs) and/or magnetic ions [2].

Gadolinium(III)-based contrast agents (GBCAs) are one of the most successful examples of MRI contrast agents. About 40% of MRI scans are performed with GBCAs and in the case of neuro MRI exams GBCAs are used in about 60% of them [3]. However, GBCAs have raised various toxicity concerns namely associated with a devastating and potentially fatal condition called nephrogenic systemic fibrosis. Also some fraction of the administrated GBCAs can remain in the organism for long periods, usually in form of Gd(III) [4]. Superparamagnetic iron oxide nanoparticles (SPIONs) have been developed and approved as viable alternatives to GBCAs. Such particles have various advantages, namely, biocompatibility, ability to be metabolized, relatively high saturation magnetic moments, and easy surface functionalization [5]. However, these contrast agents were not commercially successful [3]. This can possibly be attributed to the fact that the dimensions of such nanoparticles are restricted by the superparamagnetic regime, which limits the magnetic moment of each particle, and, through simulations, it is verified that the ideal particle size for MRI contrast agents surpasses such superparamagnetic threshold [6]. Among several nanomaterials that can be found in the literature with different shapes and compositions, magnetic nanostructures (MNS), in particularly nanodiscs and nanowires, are promising alternatives to SPIONs due to their larger magnetic moments that are not restricted by the superparamagnetic limit [7]. Also, MNS are a promising system for theragnostic since they can be used as contrast agents and at the same time generate a localized heating inside the body with the use of an external alternating current (AC) magnetic field or be used for controlled drug delivery, photodynamic therapy, and neutron capture therapy [8] and [9].

This review is focused on the recent advances in magnetic nanoparticles as contrast enhancing agents in MRI. Consequently, first we will discuss the principles of MRI regarding the use of $T_1$ and $T_2$ contrast agents, addressing, simultaneously, the contrast agents most commonly used in the clinical practice. Then, we explore the most recent efforts made to develop new types of contrast agents based on MNS: SPIONs, nanodiscs, synthetic antiferromagnets and high aspect ratio nanowires. Furthermore, the use of these nanostructures in both cancer diagnosis and therapeutics will also be discussed.

2. $T_1$ and $T_2$ contrast agents

MRI contrast agents enhance image quality by reducing the relaxation times of the nearby water protons and, consequently, changing the signal intensity of the water present in body tissues that contain the agent [10]. An MRI contrast agent normally shortens the rates of all the relaxation processes, however each substance predominantly influences one of them, therefore contrast agents that mainly shorten the relaxation time of the longitudinal component of the magnetization are called $T_1$ or positive contrast agents, while the $T_2$, or negative, contrast agents mainly reduce the relaxation time of the transverse component of the magnetization [2]. In general, two parameters are primarily used to evaluate the behavior of a contrast agent: longitudinal relaxivity ($r_1$) and relaxivity ratio, i.e. transversal relaxivity ($r_2$)/longitudinal relaxivity ($r_1$). Here, the value of $r_1$ indicates the signal enhancement potential of a contrast agent, while the $r_2/r_1$ ratio is an indicator of the suitability of a
contrast agent for positive (T₁) or negative (T₂) contrast. In general, T₁ contrast agents have a lower r₂/r₁ ratio (<5) while T₂ contrast agents have a larger r₂/r₁ ratio (>10) [11].

**T₁ contrast agents**

The longitudinal relaxation reflects the energy loss from the spin system to its surroundings (lattice) and represents the realignment process of the longitudinal component of the magnetization with the external magnetic field. When a patient is submitted to a strong external magnetic field (B₀), the hydrogen nuclei, which are randomly oriented in the absence of the field, adopt one of two possible orientations: parallel or antiparallel to the external field. The energy difference between these two states is very small and originates a net magnetization vector (M₀) that does not produce any measurable signal due to its static equilibrium state. To obtain information from the spins, a radiofrequency (RF) pulse at the Larmor frequency, i.e., the frequency at which the nuclei freely precess about B₀, must be applied. Through this interaction it becomes possible to identify two relaxation processes, resulting from the application of a pulse that causes M₀ to flip 90° from the positive z-axis to the transverse. After the RF transmitter is switched off, each individual magnetic moment will begin to precess about B₀ at their own Larmor frequency and the equilibrium state will be sought. This means that the transversal magnetization will decay over time, due to the dephasing of the magnetic moments, originating a decreasing signal, called free induction decay (FID), which oscillates at the Larmor frequency, and the longitudinal component of the magnetization will return to its initial maximum value along the direction of B₀ [12]. In this context, the T₁ relaxation time provides a measure of how fast the net magnetization vector returns to its initial state parallel to B₀. This parameter is defined as the time required for M₀ to recover to approximately 63% of its equilibrium value after the application of an RF pulse, as represented in Figure 1. Consequently, the MRI image can be improved by reducing the T₁ relaxation time, which originates a bright contrast in the acquired pictures. This can be achieved by using positive contrast agents, such as paramagnetic ions or materials.

Complexes of gadolinium (Gd(III)), manganese (Mn(II)) and iron (Fe (III)) are the most used paramagnetic T₁ contrast agents in MRI. Gd(III) has 7 unpaired electrons in the 4f subshell, whereas
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**Figure 1:** T₁ relaxation process. Diagram showing the process of T₁ relaxation after the application of a 90° RF pulse to a system at equilibrium. The z component of the net magnetization, M₀z, is reduced to zero, but then recovers gradually back to its equilibrium value if no further RF pulses are applied.
Mn(II) and Fe(III) contains 5 unpaired electrons in the valence d orbitals. Nevertheless, all of them present high magnetic moments, large longitudinal electronic relaxation times ($\sim 10^{-8}$ s), and no magnetization in the absence of an external magnetic field [13, 3, 10, 14]. There are more transition metals and lanthanide metals with unpaired electrons, but for the metal to be effective as a relaxation agent the electron spin-relaxation time must match the Larmor frequency of the protons [2]. Additionally, the main problem associated with paramagnetic heavy metal ions in their native form is their toxicity [15]. Free Gd (Gd(III)), for instance, is very toxic and must be administered in its stable form to prevent the release of the metal ion in vivo. As a result, several types of GBCAs have been developed to satisfy these conditions [13, 3]. Of all the potential metal complexes that could be imagined, discrete Gd(III) chelates have been, so far, the most successful paramagnetic contrast agents so far and clearly dominate the contrast agents used in the clinic. Clinically used GBCAs can be categorised into three groups: extracellular fluid (ECF) agents, blood pool contrast agents (BPCAs) and organ-specific agents [10]. All GBCAs utilize an octadentate polyaminopolycarboxylato-based ligand and have a ninth coordination site available for water ligation. As an example, the commercially approved ECF GBCAs T1 contrast agents, for instance, are resumed in Table 1 [3, 13]

| ECF agent (trade name) | ECF agent (chemical code) | ECF agent (generic name) | Approval date |
|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| Dotarem, Clariscan     | Gd-DOTA                   | gadoterate meglumine     | 1989 Europe 1993 United States |
| ProHance               | Gd-HPDO3A                 | gadoteridol              | 1992          |
| Gadovist (Europe)      | Gd-DO3A-butrol            | gadobutrol               | 1998 Europe 2011 United States |
| Gadavist (United States)| Gd-DO3A-butrol            | gadobutrol               |               |
| Magnevist              | Gd-DTPA                   | gadopentetate dimeglumine| 1988          |
| Omniscan               | Gd-DTPA-BMA               | gadodiamide              | 1993          |
| Optimark               | Gd-DTPA-BMEA              | gadoversetamide          | 1999          |
| Multihance             | Gd-BOPTA                  | gadobenate dimeglumine   | 2004          |

Table 1: commercially approved ECF GBCAs T1 contrast agents

To further reduce the toxicity of the free metal ions and have contrast agents that cross the blood brain barrier (BBB), the paramagnetic contrast agent research has focused on the development of nanostructured materials over the last few years [14]. Paramagnetic NPs present several advantages, such as the tuneability of size and shape, when compared to the contrast agents involving free metal ions, therefore many different approaches have been used to develop paramagnetic NPs for MRI. In general, the development of these NPs can be divided in two main classes, which are either the formation of nanoparticles with the paramagnetic ion incorporated into the nanostructured framework, such as $\text{Gd}_2\text{O}_3, \text{Mn}_3\text{O}_4, \text{Dy}_2\text{O}_3, \text{MnO}$ [16, 17, 18, 19, 20], or post-functionalisation of the NPs with lanthanide coordination complexes. This last approach has been developed together with
a number of supporting nanoparticle scaffolds (silica, gold, micelles and semiconducting quantum dots), which allow a subsequent doping with pentetic acid (DTPA), dodecane tetraacetic acid (DOTA), or derivates [21, 22, 23, 24].

As the most successful inorganic metal developed in the context of nanomedicine so far, iron-based nanomedicine has been vastly approved in the medical realm, and recent efforts have been focused on the development of T\textsubscript{1} iron-based MRI [25]. Iron oxide NPs have been explored for decades due to their magnetic properties, biocompatibility and targeting potential. In contrast to the Gd-based contrast agents, iron oxide NPs are typically negative, i.e. T\textsubscript{2} contrast agents (e.g. superparamagnetic iron oxide NPs). These types of contrast agents are associated with low resolution and background interference, caused by body fluids and voids. Therefore, to overcome this problem, several studies have been carried out, leading to the development of ultrasmall iron oxide (USIO) NPs [26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 5, 25, 31, 32] and magnetic nanowires (NWs) [28, 33, 34, 35, 36]. The T\textsubscript{1} enhancement of USIO-NPs and NWs has been attributed to several possible factors, such as increased surface area, suppressed magnetization and surface effects on magnetization. Additionally, when the size of the nanoparticles is too small, their magnetization can be easily flipped by thermal energy. Under this condition, their behaviour is paramagnetic [37, 38, 39, 40].

Besides the structures mentioned above, other types of structures have been accessed, such as stealth rare earth oxide nanodiscs [41], linear arrays of magnetite nanoparticles [42] and antiferromagnetic compounds [43, 18, 44].

**T\textsubscript{2}** contrast agents

The transverse relaxation depends on the spins precession frequency around B\textsubscript{0} and is defined by the T\textsubscript{2} relaxation time. This parameter represents the time interval during which the transverse magnetization decreases to approximately 37% of its initial value, as presented in Figure 2. Initially, after the excitation by the RF pulse, the spins precess completely in phase. But, as time passes, the observed signal starts to decrease, since the spins begin to dephase, due to small differences in the

![Figure 2: Transverse (T2 and T2*) relaxation processes. A diagram showing the process of transverse relaxation after the application of a 90° RF pulse to a system at equilibrium. Initially, the transverse magnetization (red arrow) has a maximum amplitude as the population of magnetic moments rotates in phase towards the xy plane. Then, the RF pulse is turned off and, subsequently, the amplitude of the net transverse magnetization (and therefore the detected signal) decays. The resultant decaying signal is known as the Free Induction Decay (FID).](image-url)
Larmor frequency induced by the spin-spin interactions and the local magnetic environment of each proton, causing the $T_2$ relaxation, figure 2 [45]. However, in that same figure it is possible to verify that the real signal decays faster than the prediction based on the $T_2$ relaxation time. In fact, it is observed a faster exponential decrease as a function of a $T_2^*$ time constant, which takes into account not only the intrinsic effects associated with $T_2$, but also the dephasing resulting from extrinsic magnetic inhomogeneities, such as defects within the main static magnetic field, $B_0$, or susceptibility differences between adjacent tissues. [46]

In this context, superparamagnetic iron oxides nanoparticles (SPIONs) have been developed as a viable alternative to the Gd(III)-complexes, and are widely studied by several authors [47, 48, 10, 3, 39, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53]. These nanostructures have various advantages, such as biocompatibility, ability to be metabolized, relatively high saturation magnetic moments and ease of surface functionalization [54]. Recently, it was also demonstrated that several types of nanoparticles were able to cross the BBB, increasing the possibility of early diagnosis of several diseases in the brain [55].

Nevertheless, the dimension of such nanoparticles is restricted by the superparamagnetic limit, which implies a maximum diameter of per particle in order to maintain zero remanence, which is a fundamental property since it prevents the particles' aggregation in the absence of a magnetic field. For this reason, the magnetic moment of each particle is limited and, the ideal particle size for $T_2$ MRI contrasts agents (20 nm [6]) usually surpasses the superparamagnetic limit [56]. Consequentially, to overcome these limitations, several authors have studied various alternatives namely high aspect-ratio ferromagnetic NPs [36, 57] and synthetic antiferromagnetic (SAF) nanostructures [58].

3. Magnetic properties

The unique properties of NPs, , derive from the fact that these nanoscale magnets have high surface-to-volume ratios [59, 60, 61]. It has been demonstrated, in several studies, that saturation magnetization increases linearly with size until it reaches the bulk value. While the correlation between magnetization (M) and shape is not as direct, the effect of geometry on magnetic properties continues to be evaluated for biomedical applications. Based on the response of the intrinsic NP magnetic dipole and the net magnetization in the presence and absence of an applied magnetic field, NPs are typically classified as being either diamagnetic, paramagnetic, ferromagnetic, ferrimagnetic and antiferromagnetic [59, 60].

Paramagnetic contrast agents

Paramagnetic contrast agents involve metal ions that have unpaired electrons, since materials whose atomic magnetic moments are uncoupled display paramagnetism [14, 37, 10, 59, 60]. The unpaired free electrons produce magnetic dipoles randomly aligned at equilibrium state, presenting an average magnetic moment equal to zero. Thus, paramagnetic materials have moments with no long-range order, as dipoles are aligned only upon the application of an external magnetic field, and they possess a small positive magnetic susceptibility [59]. Regarding their MRI application, paramagnetic nanomaterilas present several advantages over traditional coordination complexes, for instance their composition, size and shape are readily tuneable. The magnetic characteristics are improved by geometric local density effects rendering markedly higher $T_1$ and/or $T_2$ relaxometric values than the corresponding coordination complexes. In addition, pharmacokinetics enables a longer blood circulation time [14].

In addition, it has been stated that paramagnetic properties can also arise from dimensional confinement. In the regime of a single magnetic domain (i.e. superparamagnetism), when the size of the particle is below a critical value, typically 5 nm [26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 5, 25, 31, 32], the magnetization
can be easily flipped by the thermal energy. This leads to a Ti improvement that can be attributed to various aspects, such as the suppression of the magnetization, , the increased surface iron center exposure, surface effects and water diffusion [37].

**Superparamagnetic nanoparticles**

Superparamagnetism in SPIONs originates from the paramagnetic iron centers and is characterized by the presence of a large magnetic moment when applying an external magnetic field. [47]. In this case, all the magnetic moment in a particle compose a single domain, free to fluctuate in response to the thermal energy, while the individual atomic moments maintain their ordered state relative to each other. [62] This happens when the sample volume is reduced below a critical value, in which it costs more energy to create a domain wall than to support the external magnetostatic energy (stray field) of the single domain state. The magnetic anisotropy energy per particle, which is responsible for holding the magnetic moments along a certain direction, can be expressed as follows:

\[
E(\theta) = K_{\text{eff}} V \sin^2(\theta)
\]

where \( V \) is the particle volume, \( K_{\text{eff}} \) the anisotropy constant and \( \theta \) is the angle between the magnetization and the easy axis. The energy barrier \( K_{\text{eff}} V \) separates the two energetically equivalent easy directions of magnetization. With decreasing particle size, it is reached a point where the thermal energy, \( k_B T \), exceeds the energy barrier \( K_{\text{eff}} V \) and the magnetization is easily flipped. As a result, for \( K_{\text{eff}} V < k_B T \), the system behaves like a paramagnet, where instead of atomic magnetic moments, there is now a giant (super) moment inside each particle. This system is named a superparamagnet [56, 48, 37]. Such system has no hysteresis and the data of different temperatures superimpose onto a universal curve of \( M \) versus \( H/T \) [63].

The relaxation time of the moment \( \tau \), is given by the Néel-Brown expression reported below; where \( k_B \) is the Boltzmann constant, and \( \tau_0 = 10^{-9} \) s.

\[
\tau = \tau_0 \exp \left( \frac{K_{\text{eff}} V}{k_B T} \right)
\]

If the particle magnetic moment reverses at times shorter than the experimental time scales, the system is in a superparamagnetic state, if not, it is in the so-called blocked state [56, 48, 37, 62, 64], as presented in Figure 3.

**Figure 3:** (a) Schematic of the energy barrier (EB) required for the magnetization of a nanoparticle to flip between the parallel and antiparallel orientations along the easy axis. (b) Illustration of particles in a (i) quasi-stable blocked and (ii) an unblocked freely rotating state
SAFs are a novel type of magnetic nanoparticles; their structure consists mainly in two ferromagnetic layers separated by a nonmagnetic one. The nomenclature of ‘synthetic antiferromagnetic’ refers to the anti-parallel alignment of the ferromagnetic layers, which then results in the near zero remanence at low fields [65]. The coupling between two ferromagnetic layers can be of two forms: magnetostatic or by interlayer exchange coupling. The first one strongly depends on the aspect ratio of the structure, while the second one depends on the material and the number of atomic layers [66]; Moreover, an oscillatory dependence on the thickness of the spacer has been found [67, 68]. Furthermore, SAFs are nanostructures optimized to have negligible remanence, low susceptibility around zero field and a distinct, tunable, switch to full magnetization, which allows high saturation magnetization values at low applied fields [65, 58, 69].

High aspect ratio nanowires

The unusual properties of nanowires (NWs) arises from their high-density of electronic states, enhanced surface scattering of electrons and photons, high surface to volume ratio and high aspect ratio. In comparison with others low-dimensional systems, NWs have two quantum-confined and one unconfined direction that allows to tune their magnetic properties, such as the orientation of the magnetic easy axis, Curie temperature, coercivity, saturation field, saturation magnetization and remanence magnetization [7]. Moreover, in NWs with multiple segments along their length, an antiferromagnetic coupling can be induced by controlling the separation between the magnetic layers [70] Their magnetic properties can be modified by changing the diameter, chemical composition and thickness of the segmented layers. NWs often appear as alternatives to the spherical NPs, as this geometry translates into intrinsic anisotropy properties that cause them to interact differently. [71, 72, 73, 74]. Moreover, they are characterized by increased surface to volume ratio and higher magnetic moments, originated from a prevalent shape anisotropy, which make them attractive for several biomedical applications such as contrast agents in MRI [36].

4. Iron Oxide Nanoparticles

NPs are spherical nanostructures with a size between 1 and 100 nanometers, being comparable to biomolecules [75, 76]. Furthermore, they present unique physical, as well as chemical, properties, which arise from the fact that a great proportion of their atoms is present on the nanoarchitecture surface [75, 77]. Those distinct attributes, alongside the reduced size, have made these nanoformations a widely studied material in biomedicine, particularly as diagnostic, theranostic, or therapeutic tools [77, 78]. Nevertheless, only a few elements can be used for such applications due to toxicity problems [76, 79]. Within this context, iron oxide NPs have demonstrated a great potential, especially as MRI contrast agents, since they possess low toxicity, biodegradability, chemical stability under physiological conditions, and a fast response when an external magnetic field is applied [76, 49]. Consequently, various authors have been studying the use of these nanostructures in the context of that medical imaging technique.

An example is the work from Hobson et al. [80], where SPIONs have been investigated as T2 contrast agents. Particularly, here the goal was to improve the contrast produced by those NPs in T2-weighted MRI. Therefore, 5 nm spherical nanoarchitectures have been fabricated via high temperature thermal decomposition, coated with oleic acid, and then agglomerated inside a self-assembling polymer (chitosan amphiphile) through physical means without cross-linking, forming raspberry SPIONs (Figure 4). After the synthesis process, it has been verified that these nanostructures were colloidally stable within various biomedical liquids. Afterwards, the MR relaxivities of single, as well as clustered, NPs have been measured, having been noticed an increase on their spin-spin (r2) to spin-lattice (r1) relaxation ratio (r2/r1) from 3.0 to 79.1 when grouping occurred, originating, therefore, a better negative contrast. Furthermore, the aggregated nanoarchitectures have been intravenously
administered to mice, to analyze their biodistribution and perform in vivo MRI studies. As a result, it has been observed that only the liver and the spleen accumulated the nanostructures, moreover these exhibited a blood half-life of 28.3 min. Additionally, the MRI tests have demonstrated an effective contrast, associated with these raspberry SPIONs, in the two organs where they were accumulated, providing clear images of the liver vasculature, including the portal vein, since they were localized in the extravascular space of that organ (Figure 5).

Another approach has been considered by Basly et al. [81]. Here, the authors have covalently bonded hydrophilic pegylated dendrons to SPIONs, using a phosphonate anchor (Figure 6). The dendritic molecules have been selected because they were discrete and monodisperse entities, not only exhibiting adjustable characteristics, but also permitting distinct as well as reproducible polyfunctionalizations at their periphery. On the other hand, the phosphonate coupling agent has been chosen since it provided a strong binding, stabilized suspensions within water possessing a physiological pH, and conserved the magnetic properties of the nanostructures. Then, the relaxivities associated with these nanoarchitectures have been analyzed considering a 1.5 T magnetic field. As a result, the authors obtained a $r_2/r_1$ ratio equal to 44.8, having measured relaxivity values 1.5 times higher than those exhibited by commercially available polymer-decorated NPs. Additionally, in vitro relaxivity measurements, under 7 T, confirmed a significant negative contrast.
Xie et al. [82] have performed a different study, where a MRI contrast agent for identifying brain gliomas in vivo, i.e. lactoferrin-conjugated SPIONs (LfSPIONs), has been developed. After synthesizing such NPs, the authors have examined their physical, chemical, and magnetic properties, as well as their interaction with glioma cells. As a result, it has been verified a hydrodynamic diameter equal to ~ 75 nm, a 51 emu/g Fe saturation magnetization, plus a T₂ relaxivity of 75.6 mM⁻¹s⁻¹, for these spherical nanostructures. Additionally, an in vitro study, considering a rat glioma cell line (C6), revealed that the Lf-SPIONs originated MR images possessing a better T₂ contrast than the one produced by SPIONs. Furthermore, an in vivo investigation has been performed using rat models together with the developed NPs. It has been noticed a considerably improved contrast, between the tumor and the neighboring normal tissues, on T₂-weighted brain glioma MR images, until 48 h after the Lf-SPIONs administration (Figure 7). Following such time period, a histochemical analysis has allowed the observation of those nanostructures around the vascular region of the lesion tissue slices. Moreover, real-time polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) plus Western Blot have been employed in the brain tumor tissues. These techniques have allowed the authors to confirm a larger expression level associated with Lf receptors, when compared against normal tissues from the same organ. Consequently, these results have indicated that Lf-SPIONs are suitable T₂ MRI contrast agents for brain glioma, presenting high selectivity and sensitivity.

In a different work, Gonzalez-Rodriguez et al. [83] have fabricated biomcompatible SPIONs conjugated with graphene oxide (GO-SPIONs). These spherical nanostructures have presented a mean size of 250 nm and have demonstrated the ability to be used towards magnetic targeted therapy, fluorescence imaging, cancer detection via optical pH-sensing, anticancer drug delivery, as well as MRI contrast agents. Cytotoxicity assays have revealed a reduced cell death resulting from the
nanoparticles internalization, at a 15 g/mL concentration. Furthermore, relaxivity measurements have indicated a \( r_2/r_1 \) ratio of \( \approx 10.7 \) for the GO-SPIIONs, being considerably higher than the one exhibited by free SPIIONs (\( \approx 2.3 \)). Consequently, this suggested that the graphene oxide conjugated SPIIONs had the potential to be employed as T\(_2\) MRI contrast agents. Additionally, the authors have successfully distinguished cancer cells from healthy ones \textit{in vitro} through the ratios of emission intensity associated with NPs, since they presented fluorescence in the visible range that depended on the medium pH (Figure 8). Concerning drug delivery, it has been achieved a successful fluorescence-tracked intracellular delivery of hydrophobic doxorubicin non-covalently conjugated with GO, by applying an external magnetic field. This has resulted in a 2.5-fold efficacy enhancement, when compared against the free drug at reduced concentrations, becoming possible to reduce the drug dose required for reaching an identical therapeutic effect.

Figure 8 - Pictures representing the GO-SPIIONs emission in green (550 nm) and red (635 nm) in healthy HEK-293 versus cancer HeLa and MCF-7 cells [83].

Also considering SPIIONs, Sulek \textit{et al.} [84] have fabricated a contrast agent by a non-covalent functionalization of those nanoparticles with peptide amphiphile molecules, which provided water solubility and improved their biocompatibility (Figure 9). Then, after production, the nanocomplexes relaxivity has been assessed under a 3.0 T magnetic field, having been observed a \( r_2/r_1 \) ratio as high as 111.55, being a much larger value than that of commercially available SPIIONs. Furthermore, \textit{in vitro} incubation experiments using fibroblasts (NIH 3T3) have revealed that these functionalized NPs were, in fact, highly biocompatible. Moreover, it has been observed that such spherical nanostructures were located on the cell membrane or matrix. Additionally, the hydrophilic peptide sequence located at the SPIIONs surface, which has supplied stability as well as bioactivity within aqueous conditions, could be changed so as to target them towards specific tissues.

A different T\(_2\) contrast agent, i.e. multifunctional polymeric-coated multicore NPs (bioferrofluids), has been investigated by Ali \textit{et al.} [85]. These spherical nanostructures have consisted in various maghemite NPs involved with a hydrophilic polymer (polyethylene glycol, PEG, acrylate). Furthermore, their uptake and toxicity in the liver of mice has been assessed through MRI together with histological techniques. Then, the obtained outcomes have been compared against those acquired when employing commercially available Endorem magnetic fluids, under identical
experimental circumstances. As a result, it has been verified that the $r_2/r_1$ ratio for the bioferrofluids synthesized by the authors was equal to 184, while for Endorem such parameter exhibited a value of 54.02. Additionally, these NPs not only exhibited a smaller blood circulation period, but also have demonstrated to be efficient reticuloendothelial system agents, since they remained in the liver tissue. Moreover, it has been observed that those bioferrofluids stayed in such organ for a longer time interval than Endorem. Nevertheless, no perceptible histological lesions in the examined liver were caused by the two contrast agents analyzed, over a time interval of 60 days after-administration.

Another type of contrast agent has been analyzed by Zhang et al. [86]. This nanomaterial has consisted in SPIONs coated with polyethylenimine (PEI), which were obtained through photochemistry, and whose surface was modified by poly(ethylene glycol) methyl ether (MPEG), MPEG-PEI-SPIONs (Figure 9). Then, the physical properties, stability, as well as MRI feasibility of these NPs have been assessed. It has been verified that they possessed a hydrodynamic size equal to 34 nm. Furthermore, their coating has been checked through a Fourier transform infrared spectrometer, having been determined a 31% and 12% proportion of PEI and MPEG, respectively, in the MPEG-PEI-SPIONs. Additionally, magnetic measurements showed a superparamagnetic behavior, as well as 46 emu/g saturation magnetization, for these nanoarchitectures. Furthermore, a stability test has indicated that MPEG-PEI considerably enhanced the spherical nanostructures stability. Moreover, relaxation measurements have demonstrated similar $r_2$ values for PEI-SPIONs and MPEG-PEI-SPIONs. Additionally, T$_2$-weighted MR images using MPEG-PEI-SPIONs have revealed a considerable improvement of the MR signal, as the concentration of those NPs in water got higher. Consequently, this indicated that these spherical nanostructures have been able to produce large magnetic field gradients near their surface.

Yue-Jian et al. [87] have addressed a novel contrast agent consisting in antifouling PEG-coated SPIONs. Here, monodisperse oleic acid-coated SPIONs have been synthesized via thermal decomposition of iron oleate. Then, the self-assembly occurring between those spherical
nanostructures and the PEG-lipid conjugates in water. It has been observed, through dynamic light scattering, that the PEG-coated SPIONs were stable within water for a pH from 3 unto 10 and at sodium chloride concentrations up until 0.3 M. Furthermore, their incubation with a cell culture medium possessing 10% fetal bovine serum, which simulated the *in vivo* plasma, has confirmed such stability, not having been noticed changes in the NPs dimensions after a 24 h time period. These results have pointed out an absence of protein adsorption upon their surface. Moreover, *in vitro* relaxation measurements have indicated a greater $r_2$ for these spherical nanoarchitectures than that of the commercially available contrast agent Feridex IV, suggesting, therefore, that a better contrast could be created by these PEG-coated SPIONs.

Several authors have also gained interest for the use of iron oxide NPs as T$_1$ contrast agents, since in the clinical practice the typically employed positive contrast agents are Gd complexes, which, as previously referred, pose health risks to the patients [88, 10, 89, 5]. Within this context, Wei *et al.* [90] have investigated zwitterion-coated SPIONs (ZES-SPIONs), possessing inorganic cores with a size of $\sim$ 3 nm as well as an ultrathin hydrophilic shell ($\sim$ 1 nm). As a result, it has been verified that these NPs presented a $r_2/r_1$ ratio equal to 2.0, being a value lower than the one associated with other SPION-based positive contrast agents, nevertheless it was within a factor of 2 to that exhibited by Gd-based chelates. Additionally, *in vivo* MRI has been performed on mice injected with ZES-SPIONs, to assess their preclinical potential as T$_1$ contrast agents for MRI and MR angiography. These tests have revealed a contrast power, associated with those NPs, that was sufficiently high for their use in the considered applications. Moreover, it has been observed an efficient renal clearance of the ZES-SPIONs and, by measuring once again their $r_2/r_1$ ratio after excretion, the authors have verified that the MR contrast power of those NPs was kept largely unmodified under physiological conditions.

![Figure 11: T1-weighted MR angiography, at 7 T, of a mouse (a) 4 min; (b) 12 min; and (c) 20 min, after the injection of ZES-SPIONs [90].](image)

Yin *et al.* [91] have achieved a T$_1$ contrast in MRI by employing SPIONs, with diameters between 11 and 22 nm, in a ultra-low field (ULF) MRI system, which applied a $\sim$ 0.13 mT magnetic field, at room temperature. This approach has allowed improving the positive contrast created by such NPs, because under these conditions their relaxation times were similar to the proton Larmor precession period, originating a great increase of the $r_1$ value. Additionally, their $r_2$ was lowered, since the magnetic moments, present in the SPIONs, were not saturated at this field magnitude. As a result, a $r_1$ as high as 615 mM$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$ has been obtained for Z$_{\text{Fe}_2\text{O}_4}$ NPs, coated with silicon dioxide, and possessing a size of 18 nm, being a value 100 times larger than that of typical commercial Gd-based positive contrast agents under large magnetic fields, i.e. 1.5 and 3.0 T. Furthermore, the authors have verified a linear dependence of $r_1$ on the imaginary part of the magnetic AC mass susceptibility, at 5.56 kHz, i.e. the proton resonance frequency, for all the studied cases. This result has been justified by the NPs magnetic fluctuations, associated with Brownian motion or Néel relaxation. As a
conclusion, various benefits have been observed for this approach, namely adjustable magnetic susceptibility in SPIONs, improved signal, shorter imaging times, as well as the use of biocompatible substances.

Another work by Corr et al. [42] have addressed suspensions of linear chains of magnetite NPs, produced by the cross-linking of surrounding particles with polyelectrolyte molecules and the application of an external magnetic field, for biomedical application. Through the application of an external magnetic field, it has been verified that these nanostructures have rearranged into parallel arrays. Then, their relaxivity has been measured using field-cycling NMR at 37 °C, having been observed a considerable reduction in the relaxation times for all the considered fields. The authors also acquired MR images of live rats, injected with these nanoarchitectures, so as to assess their effect on the rodents’ brain. The obtained results have proved that these nanostructures had a good biocompatibility and could be employed as contrast agents for in vivo MRI, having darkened the brain regions in a T1-weighted MR image, as shown in Figure 12.

![Figure 12: Echo planar image (EPI) of a mouse brain (a) before and (b) as PSSS-Mag1(Fe/Polysodium-4-styrene sulfonate ratio 1:2) passes through the organ; Fast Low Angle Shot (FLASH) image of mouse brain (c) before and (d) as PSSS-Mag1 passes through the organ [42].](image)

Yeast derived β-glucan particles (GPs) are a class of microcarriers, under development, with the capability to target cells of the immune system, allowing, for example, the delivery of drugs or imaging agents to those biological entities. However, encapsulation those compounds in the porous GPs is challenging. In this context, Patel et al. [43] have produced high spin Fe(III) macrocyclic complexes that function as effective in vivo T1 MRI contrast agents. As a result, it has been shown that the unique coordination chemistry of the Fe(III)-based macrocyclic T1 MRI contrast agents permitted their facile encapsulation in GPs. Remarkably, the GPs labelled with the simple Fe(III) complexes were stable under physiologic conditions. Additionally, in contrast to the free Fe(III) coordination complex, the labelled Fe(III)-GPs have lowered the T1 relaxivity and acted as a silenced form of the contrast agent.

4. Gd and Mn-based nanomaterials

A broad range of approaches have been applied to the incorporation of Gd chelates into nanoparticles [14]. Of them, gadolinium-doped silica nanoparticles have been extensively reported. In this context, Rieter et al. [92] have produced stables nanoparticles with $r_1$ values greater than those of conventional Gd chelates by the utilization of a luminescent core $[\text{Ru(ppy)}_3]\text{Cl}_3$ with a silylated Gd complex
coating. Another work has demonstrated that the location of the Gd chelate within mesoporous silica nanoparticles (MSNs) greatly influences its relaxometric properties. The highest relaxivities have been specifically reported to occur when synthesis occurs by a long delay co-condensation process, leading to a \( r_1 \) value of \( 33.6 \pm 1.3 \, \text{mM}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1} \), which is higher than any previously reported Gd-DOTA silica NPs and 20 times larger than free Gd-DOTA \[93\]. Then, these particles were biotinylated showing a large relaxivity that was kept after the external biomodification, but presenting reversibly gateable on subsequent protein recognition \[94\]. Graphene oxide (GO) has also been used as a scaffold to integrate Gd-DOTA moieties. A study by Zhang et al. \[95\] reported that GO has been first pegylated, functionalised with DOTA, and then metallated with Gd(III). These nanoparticles have presented a large \( r_1 \) value of \( 14.2 \, \text{mM}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1} \) measured at 11.7 T. Some other strategies to incorporate Gd in several types of nanoparticles have also been reported, namely by grafting Gd(III) in detonation nanodiamond (DND) \[96\] and melanin-dots (M-dots) loaded with Gd (II) \[97\].

Gadolinium oxides are the most utilised alternatives to Gd chelates, where it has been found that decreasing particle diameter resulted in a progressive trend towards higher relaxivities. For instance, Park et al. \[17\] have shown that the highest relaxivities were obtained for NPs synthesised with an average diameter, \( d \), of \( 1\text{–}2.5 \, \text{nm} \), as presented in Figure 13. As a result, high contrast in \textit{in vivo} \( T_1 \) images of the brain tumour of a rat have been observed. The large \( r_1 \) has been discussed in terms of the big surface to volume ratio of the ultrasmall gadolinium oxide nanoparticles, coupled with the cooperative induction of surface Gd(III) ions for the longitudinal relaxation of a water proton. It should be noted, however, that ultrasmall \( \text{Gd}_2\text{O}_3 \) NPs have been found to form deposits in the brain and, consequently, there is a compromise between limiting the toxicity of the particles and maximising imaging potency. Yin et al. \[98\] have produced silica nanoparticles with a \( \text{Gd}_2\text{O}_3 \) nanoshell of varying thicknesses. By systematically changing the thickness of the silica shell, the variations in relaxivity values could be investigated and it was demonstrated that a thinner shell resulted in larger \( r_1 \) values. Furthermore, the core-shelled nanoparticles showed negligible nanotoxicity. The enhanced signals in \textit{in vivo} tumour-targeted MRI indicated that ultrathin gadolinium oxide nanoshells may function as a potential candidate for advanced positive contrast agents in further clinical applications.

![Graph](image-url)

**Figure 13:** Reproductions of \( r_1 \). The functions are labeled as G (Gaussian), L (Lorentzian), and LN (log-normal) \[17\].
Dual T₁- and T₂-weighted MRI agents were also reported by Zeng et al.. Such authors fabricated biocompatible gadolinium hybrid iron oxide (GdIO) nanocomposites with hydrodynamic size between 120 and 150 nm. These nanocomposites exhibited both superparamagnetic and paramagnetic properties, with unsaturated magnetic moments of 33.5 emu g⁻¹ at 5 T. The GdIO samples exhibited high contrast ability for both T₁ and T₂-weighted MR imaging, with r₁ value of 70.10 ± 3.65 mM⁻¹ s⁻¹ (based on Gd) and an r₂ value equal to 173.55 ± 6.48 mM⁻¹ s⁻¹ (based on Fe). In vivo studies showed that the GdIO nanocomposites were able to achieve the brain tissues and translocate into neurons [99].

Bailey et al. [41] have reported the fabrication of RE₂O₃-based nanodiscs, with diameters ranging from 10 to 14 nm; RE stands for Gd, dysprosium (Dy) or ytterbium (Yb) passivated with a biocompatible polymer (Poly(acrylic acid) grafted with short methoxy-terminated polyethylene oxides). Here, their suitability as MRI contrast agents has been analysed. The relaxation times of such nanostructures, measured at 37 °C (body temperature) in a magnetic field of 1.41 T, have been compared to the reported values for their spherical counterparts or small molecule chelates, based on the DTPA ligand. The authors have also performed an MR scan of a phantom for all the considered contrast agents, using T₁ weighted sequences, having been found that Gd₂O₃ nanodiscs were more suitable as contrast agents compared than the commercially available Gd-DTPA, due to their higher relaxivities [100]. This factor should increase the efficiency of in vivo targeted imaging schemes, since it becomes possible to get a high amount of proton relaxation without requiring multiple small molecules in contact with the imaging target. Besides this benefit, it has been verified that these Gd₂O₃ nanodiscs were suitable as T₁ contrast agents. Also, no significant cytotoxic effects have been observed for the polymer coated Gd₂O₃ and Dy₂O₃ nanoarchitectures, on a cell line derived from a human cervical cancer (HeLa).

Singh et al. [20] also reported the suitability of polyethylene glycol (PEG) coated Gd₂O₃ paramagnetic nanodiscs and PEG coated Gd doped iron oxide (GdIO) superparamagnetic cubic/spherical-shaped nanoparticles, with different dimensions, as MRI contrast agents. In this case, the relaxivities of the different nanoarchitectures have been measured with a 7 T MR scanner and it has been showed that smaller sized nanostructures (<5 nm) were the more effective T₁ contrast agents, as presented in figure 14.

Figure 14: T₁ relaxation rate as a function of concentration measured for (a) Gd₂O₃ nanodiscs of different diameters and (b) GdIO NPs of spherical (9 nm and 6 nm) and cubic (4 nm) shapes [20].
Besides Gd-based nanoparticles, Mn has also been extensively researched as a possible T₁ contrast agent with reduced toxicity (compared to that of Gadolinium), but it possesses low native r₁ relaxivities. Nevertheless, it has shown promising results as dual modal imaging agent, as presented in Figure 5 [14]. Much effort has been invested in increasing and biocompatibility and r₁ by using derived nanoparticulate systems. For instance, PEG-functionalised Mn₃O₄ nanoparticles have been encapsulated in a mesoporous, biocompatible carbon framework. Then, it was demonstrated that the agent displayed significant contrast enhancement in T₁-weighted images. The carbon encapsulation and surface modification rendered biocompatibility and water solubility to the nanosystem. Furthermore, the porous network ensured water accessibility for the nanoparticles, making them helpful in interpretation of MRI scans [101].

Neves et al. [44] have addressed Mn oxide (MnO) NPs (average size of ~ 20 nm) coated with carboxymethyl-dextran. Despite not having performed an in vivo study, the authors have considered such nanostructures adequate as T₁ contrast agents, due to their significant longitudinal relaxivity, measured on a clinical 3.0 T MRI scanner. Moreover, it has been observed that such NPs presented no in vitro cytotoxicity for healthy cells at concentrations lower than 25 µg/ml, however for HeLa cells a notable toxicity has been observed, even at low concentrations of NPs (5 µg/ml).

Manganese ferrite nanoparticles (Fe₃O₄@MnIO) have also exhibited remarkably higher longitudinal relaxivity than their counterpart iron oxide NPs [102]. Here, the authors found a r₁ value of 33.8 mM⁻¹s⁻¹ for Fe₃O₄@MnIO and a r₂ equal to 306.3 mM⁻¹s⁻¹. The increased T₁ relaxivity was attributed to the extended electronic relaxation time and the increased number of unpaired electrons due to the Fe substitution by Mn ions. Additionally, in vivo results indicated that these nanoparticles could achieve in vivo contrast imaging with acceptable biocompatibility, with the dosage of 1 mg/kg, however the systemic toxicity evaluation was unclear.

5. Synthetic antiferromagnetic nanostructures

More recently, antiferromagnetic nanoarchitectures have also been investigated as potential T₁ contrast agents by different authors. Namely, Na et al. [18] fabricated antiferromagnetic MnO nanoparticles of sizes between 7 and 25 nm, coated with a PEG-phospholipid shell. The relaxivity of such particles has been measured in a 3.0 T human clinical scanner and their in vivo performance as MRI contrast agents has been analyzed in a mouse. The obtained results have indicated that these NPs were suitable as T₁ contrast agents, having demonstrated no significant toxicity, for a MnO concentration lower than 0.82 mM, in eight human cell lines originating from different tissues. Furthermore, by conjugating them with a tumour-specific antibody, it has been possible to selectively improve the contrast of breast cancer cells located in a mouse’s metastatic brain tumour, which has been intravenously injected with the functionalized nanoparticles through T₁-weighted MRI.

Liuet et al. [103] have also fabricated spherical nanostructures exhibiting antiferromagnetic properties towards the same application. These nanoarchitectures were glutathione-functionalized iron-oxide nanoparticles, having been produced at room temperature and in aqueous-phase, by a facile, highly efficient, as well as eco-friendly, one-step reduction process, using tetrakis(hydroxymethyl)phosphonium chloride as the reducing agent. After the synthesization
procedure, the nanostructures characterization has revealed a diameter of 3.72 ± 0.12 nm, an $r_1$ equal to 8.28 mM⁻¹s⁻¹, a 2.28 $r_2/r_1$ ratio, a reduced magnetization, plus an adequate water dispersion. Additionally, through their incubation with HeLa cells, it has been observed that they were biocompatible and improved the acquired MR signal intensity, in T₁-weighted sequences, as the iron content inside the considered biological entities increased. Moreover, the fabricated nanoparticles have also been injected into mice as well as rat models, so as to not only study their in vivo circulation and metabolic path, but also to analyze the contrast created by them in MR images, under those conditions. As a result, it has been observed that the nanostructures escaped the hepatic reticuloendothelial system and, subsequently, were expelled from the body via the urinary system, enabling, therefore, the realization of a renal function assessment. This course led to a long circulation period in the vasculature, allowing a strong improvement, in T₁-weighted MRI, of the vascular resolution at the internal carotid artery and superior sagittal sinus, which are locations where the thrombus identification is essential for diagnosing a stroke (figure 15). Additionally, various T₂-as well as T₂-weighted MR images of a rat’s kidney injected with the produced nanostructures, allowed a detailed visualization of the cortical-medullary anatomy and renal physiological functions.

![Figure 15: T₁-weighted MR images of a mouse’s brain, before (T₁-pre) and after (T₁-post) the injection of the glutathione-functionalized iron-oxide nanoparticles [103].](image)

In a different work, Peng et al. [43] have investigated another T₁ contrast agent type, known as antiferromagnetic-iron oxide-hydroxide nanocolloids, which possessed a diameter of 2-3 nm. Such nanostructures have been prepared in the mesopores of worm-like mesoporous silica. Then, the relaxation times have been measured at 40 °C using a 0.47 T Minispec spectrometer. As a result, it has been verified that these nanoparticles not only had the lowest $r_1/r_2$ ratio reported, until 2013, for iron-based colloidal T₁ contrast agents, but also possessed a considerably large longitudinal relaxivity. Additionally, the acquired MR images have shown that such nanocolloids were a superior T₁ contrast agent, in both in vitro (HeLa cells) and in vivo (rat and mouse) MRI, when compared to ultrasmall iron oxide nanoparticles. Furthermore, these nanocolloids also demonstrated a high level of biocompatibility and biodegradability.

In addition to the previously mentioned nanoarchitectures, (SAF nanostructures have also been studied as potential contrast agents for MRI. For example, Roosbroeck et al. [58] have fabricated phospholipid-coated, disc-shaped, and multilayered [Au(10 nm)/Ni80Fe(5 nm)20/Au(2.5 nm)/Ni80Fe(5 nm)20/Au(10 nm)] SAF nanoarchitectures, with diameters ranging from 89.8 nm to 523.2 nm, using a colloidal lithography technique. The magnetic characterization of these nanodiscs has indicated a very low remanence value, which is necessary to prevent particle agglomeration, as well as a high magnetization, making them adequate for biomedical applications. Then, these nanostructures have been evaluated as T₂ contrast agents, as indicated in Figure 16, having shown improved relaxivities, at 24.85 °C in a 9.4 T magnetic field, when compared to SPIONs, especially the smallest particles with a diameter of 90 nm. The authors have also carried out an in vitro MRI study, using an ovarian cancer cell line (SKOV3), confirming the increased T₂: relaxation for cells marked with such nanostructures.
Figure 16: Theoretical (black lines) and measured (points) $r_2$ values of [Au(10 nm)/NiFe(10 nm)/Au(2.5 nm)/NiFe(10 nm)/Au(10 nm)] SAF-NPs as function of SAF-NP diameter. The reference theoretical values for spherical NiFe particles are represented in gray [58].

6. High-aspect ratio nanowires

Nanowires (NWs) have also been addressed by some reports in the context of this biomedical application. For example, Bañobre-López et al. [57] evaluated the relaxivity properties of poly-acrylic acid (PAA)-coated Ni ferromagnetic NWs characterized by longitudinal magnetic anisotropy, in a colloidally stable water dispersion. This dispersion has been produced through a process of pulsed electrodeposition of Ni/Gold (Au) multilayer nanowires inside a porous alumina at room-temperature, followed by the template removal and chemical etching of the Au layer in a two-step acidic etching. The relaxation times of these nanostructures, which have presented a monodisperse average diameter and length of ~36 nm and ~600 nm, respectively, have been measured using a relaxometer operated at 60 MHz and under 37 °C for two magnetic fields, namely 1.41 T and 3.0 T. In both situations, the obtained results have indicated that these nanostructures were efficient as $T_2$ contrast agents, as clearly visible in Figure 17. The contrast effect of the PAA-coated Ni nanowires has been verified by performing an MR scan of a phantom at a magnetic field of 3 T. Shore et al. [36] also studied nanowires for MRI application. Specifically, Fe and segmented Fe/Au nanowires, with various lengths and diameters, have been fabricated by template-assisted electrodeposition. These nanostructures have been coated with compounds, namely Dop-PEG and/or SH-PEG-COOH, which allowed the binding of biological molecules to the nanowires in order to target specific cells. The magnetic characterization of both nanostructures has shown that the Fe/Au nanowires exhibited a larger saturation magnetization. Since Fe layers are thinner than the diameter, these nanostructures were easily magnetized in the direction perpendicular to the long axis of the nanostructure, than in the Fe nanowires. The relaxivity properties of the fabricated nanowires have been measured at 25 °C in a 1.5 T magnetic field and the obtained results have been compared against those of Fe and Fe-Au nanoparticles. As a result, it has been verified that the Fe nanowires with a length of 0.7 µm and a diameter of 110 nm, coated with Dop-PEG, were the best suited as $T_1$ contrast agents. On the other hand, Fe-Au nanowires with a length of 1 µm and a diameter of 32.8 nm, coated with SH-PEG-COOH and Dop-PEG, were the most appropriate as $T_2$ contrast agents, being comparable to commercial Fe oxide nanoparticles. The authors also performed an MR scan of some samples containing Fe and Fe-Au nanowires, at a magnetic field of 9.4 T, in order to confirm the contrast caused by the nanostructures in the image.
A different type of nanowires for this biomedical application has been investigated by Leung et al. [104]. These nanostructures, made from Mn-Fe, have been synthesized through ligand-induced self-organization of Mn–Fe oxide nanoparticles. Then, via TEM, it has been observed that they possessed a mean diameter equal to 35 nm and, on average were 1 μm long. Furthermore, the nanowires elemental content has been verified by inductively coupled plasma-optical emission spectroscopy (ICP-OES), as well as through energy-dispersive X-ray (EDX) spectroscopy, having been determined a Fe percentage of ∼40.65. Moreover, their influence in the T2 relaxation time has been assessed using a 1.5 T MRI system. As a result, it has been noticed that these nanoarchitectures have considerably decreased the MRI signal, when concentrations of 100 μg/mL or 10 μg/mL have been considered, which demonstrated their potential as T2 contrast agents. Moreover, the cell labelling efficiency of these nanostructures was assessed by incubating them with a macrophage cell line (RAW264.7). After this process, it has been observed an effective Mn-Fe nanowires incorporation into the considered biological entities.

Also considering the improvement of the negative contrast in MRI, Martínez-Banderas et al. [105] have fabricated distinct one-dimensional nanostructures, which were composed by an iron core together with an iron oxide shell (Fe-Fe,Oₓ core–shell NWs). Then, their r1, r2, and r2/r1 ratio have been assessed under a 1.5 T magnetic field, having been observed that they possessed a great potential for this application. Furthermore, the effects of various oxidation levels as well as surface coatings have been evaluated at a 7.0 T field. As a result, it has been verified that their r2 could be adjusted by not only the oxide shell thickness, but also coating agents. Moreover, breast cancer cells (MDA-MB-231) labelled with Fe-Fe,Oₓ core–shell NWs, which were coated with two different compounds, namely bovine serum albumin (BSA) and (3-aminopropyl)triethoxysilane (APTES), were inserted in tissue-mimicking phantoms. Then, T2-weighted MR images of those two cases has been performed, having been noticed that the BSA coating improved the dispersion, as well as the cellular internalization, while allowing an identical cell identification efficiency through MRI, when compared against APTES. Consequently, this has permitted the use of a lower nanostructures concentration to efficiently label the desired cells, lowering, therefore, the probability of toxic effects. Furthermore, using such coating, the authors have been able to detect ∼25 cells/μL by employing a NW concentration equal to 0.8 μg of Fe/mL. Moreover, cells labelled with BSA coated nanostructures were implanted inside a mouse’s
brain and, subsequently, several T2-weighted MR images were acquired, at a 11.7 T field, considering various time intervals post-implantation. As a result, it has been observed that these biological entities could be identified in such organ during, at least, 40 days after insertion.

Iron oxide (Fe₃O₄) nanostructures with rod-like morphology (nanowires with low aspect ratio), presenting a diameter of 4–12 nm and length ranging from 30 to 70 nm, were also addressed in the context of this biomedical application by Mohapatra et al. [106]. As a result, it was verified that nanorods of 70 nm length showed a r₂ relaxivity of 608 mM⁻¹ s⁻¹. Additionally, the increase of the nanorods size led to a linear increase in their r₂ relaxivity values, from 312 to 608 s⁻¹ mM⁻¹. This linear trend was attributed to an enhancement of the saturation magnetization and the surface area of the nanostructures. Moreover, in vitro assays considering HeLa cells indicated that those biological entities exhibited a normal growth in the presence of Fe₃O₄ nanorods, indicating an acceptable biocompatibility without toxic effects (approximately 90 % the cells remained viable), even after incubation with 1 mg/ml of nanorods.

7. Theragnosis Applications

Nanotechnology is a powerful approach for the development of novel nanomaterials that can be used in both the diagnosis and treatment of illnesses, filling, for example, the biggest challenges in the cancer therapeutics. Several types of nanostructures have attracted much attention due to their promising applications as “theragnostic” anti-cancer agents, showing good performance in imaging combined therapy, namely by using hyperthermia, radiotherapy, or drug delivery [102, 107].

A study by Wang et al. [108] reported the construction of an intelligent near-infrared (NIR) light and a tumor microenvironment (NIR/TME) dual-responsive nanocapsule for enhanced tumor accumulation and improved therapy efficacy. The large initial size of these nanocapsules (NCs) ensured the circulatory stability in the blood while, under irradiation of an NIR laser, the shrinkage and decomposition of the nanocapsule in the acidic TME guaranteed intratumoral permeability of NPs and the controllable release of doxorubicin (DOX). Interestingly, the overproduced reactive oxygen species (ROS), by synergistic catalysis of the Fenton reaction based on Fe/FeO NCs and light activation from indocyanine green (ICG), relieved the hypoxia for solid tumors, which is necessary for mitigating the hypoxia-related resistance during chemo/photo- and chemodynamic therapy. As a result of these unique properties of the nanocapsules, it was achieved an almost complete destruction of the tumors. In addition, dual-mode MRI and fluorescence imaging provided complementary imaging information. Hence, this study presented the design of smart nanocapsules with enhanced tumor accumulation, highly effective therapy and diagnosis capability.
Until now, magnetite nanostructures with designed composition and properties are the ones that showed greater potential as theragnostic agents, due to their versatility, biocompatibility, facile production and good magnetic performance for remote in vitro and in vivo biomedical applications, as presented, for instance, in Figure 18 [109]. This core-shell strategy has given rise to different configurations like single- and multi-core@shell NPs, where magnetite is located in the core (Fe₃O₄@SiO₂; Fe₃O₄@C), in the shell (gelatin-NPs@Fe₃O₄-NPs) or embedded in a polymer matrix (polyester, gelatin magnetic beads). In all cases, the nanocomposites inherit a combination of properties that ensure their multimodal capacities for simultaneous magnetic separation/detection/targeting procedures, like contrast agents in magnetic resonance imaging/positron emission tomography (MRI/PET), magnetic hyperthermia (MH)/drug delivery therapeutic agents, among others [110].

Also, a study by Efremova et al. [111] reported the growing of 25 nm octahedral-shaped Fe₃O₄ magnetite nanocrystals on 9 nm Au seed NPs using a modified wet-chemical synthesis. These Fe₃O₄-Au Janus nanoparticles exhibited bulk-like magnetic properties. Additionally, due to their high magnetization and octahedral shape, the hybrids have shown superior in vitro and in vivo T₂ relaxivity for magnetic resonance imaging as compared to other types of Fe₃O₄-Au hybrids and commercial contrast agents. These nanoparticles provided two functional surfaces for theragnostic applications. Furthermore, for the first time, Fe₃O₄-Au hybrids were conjugated with two fluorescent dyes or a combination of drug and dye, allowing the simultaneous tracking of the nanoparticle vehicle and the drug cargo in vitro and in vivo. Here, the drug delivery to tumors and payload release has been demonstrated in real time by intravital microscopy. Moreover, replacing the dyes with cell-specific molecules and drugs made the Fe₃O₄-Au hybrids a unique all-in-one platform for theragnostics. Gold and SPION-loaded micelles were also used for both imaging and treatment of brain tumors, serving a theragnostic purpose as both an MRI-based contrast agent and a radiosensitizer [107].

Figure 18: In vivo accumulation of Fe₃O₄-MSN at tumor site. (a) In vivo T₂-weighted MR images (upper) and color mapped (lower) images of tumor site before and 3 h after intravenous injection of Fe₃O₄-MSN (arrows indicate tumor site). (b) Confocal laser scanning microscopic images of sectioned tumor tissue harvested 24 h after injection. Left: Red fluorescence showing Fe₃O₄-MSN internalized cells. Right: Merged image with 4',6'-diamino-2-phenyl-indol (DAPI) stained nuclei (blue) (scale bar ) 10 μm). From [109]
magnetic-gold nanoarchitectures also can be found in the literature as alternatives for theragnosis applications [112, 113].

10. Prospects and Conclusions

The progress in contrast agents for MRI is notorious. Beyond the several contrast agents approved for use in the humans, there are a significant number of new agents in clinical and research development. For this purpose, there is a broad variety of fabrication procedures to obtain paramagnetic and superparamagnetic nanoparticles with a control over their composition, size, and shape. Furthermore, the ability to integrate additional imaging modes or drugs for treatment and the employment of specific vectors linked to the particle surface make these contrast agents yet more promising. More recently, other exciting spin configurations appeared in the literature as potential MRI contrast agents, namely synthetic antiferromagnets (SAFs) and high aspect ratio nanowires (NWs). Biocompatible SAFs nanostructures have been reported with coupling between ferromagnetic layers and their relaxivities and saturation magnetization make them promising for this biomedical application. Also, the characteristics of magnetic NWs and segmented NWs have been explored. As a result, it was observed that the high surface area of these nanostructures and the high magnetic moment also shows an interesting potential for contrast enhancement. The development and comprehension of different magnetic effects has an uttermost importance in the pursuit of novel contrast agents in MRI. On the other hand, systematic in vivo studies are also needed so as to understand their mechanism of action and accumulation in the different organs.
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