How Accurate Is MOLLI T1 Mapping In Vivo? Validation by Spin Echo Methods
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Abstract

T1 mapping is a promising quantitative tool for assessing diffuse cardiomyopathies. The purpose of this study is to quantify in vivo accuracy of the Modified Look-Locker Inversion Recovery (MOLLI) cardiac T1 mapping sequence against the spin echo gold standard, which has not been done previously. T1 accuracy of MOLLI was determined by comparing with the gold standard inversion recovery spin echo sequence in the calf muscle, and with a rapid inversion recovery fast spin echo sequence in the heart. T1 values were obtained with both conventional MOLLI fitting and MOLLI fitting with inversion efficiency correction. In the calf (n = 6), conventional MOLLI fitting produced inconsistent T1 values with error ranging from 8.0% at 90° to 17.3% at 30°. Modified MOLLI fitting with inversion efficiency correction improved error to under 7.4% at all flip angles. In the heart (n = 5), modified MOLLI fitting with inversion correction reduced T1 error to 5.5% from 14.0% by conventional MOLLI fitting. This study shows that conventional MOLLI fitting can lead to significant in vivo T1 errors when not accounting for the lower adiabatic inversion efficiency often experienced in vivo.

Introduction

Myocardial T1 mapping is a non-invasive MRI based tissue characterization technique that uses measurements of the T1 relaxation time in the heart for diagnosis and treatment. T1 mapping has been applied to a broad range of cardiac applications including quantification of lipid or iron deposition in the myocardium, and detection of subtle pathological changes due to edema [1]. In addition, T1 mapping shows a great promise for assessing cardiac amyloidosis [2–4] and other non-ischemic or congenital cardiomyopathies that result in diffuse myocardial fibrosis [5–9]. The MOLLI (Modified Look Locker Inversion Recovery) sequence [10] is a fast 2D inversion recovery (IR) balanced steady-state free precession (bSSFP) based T1 mapping method for cardiac imaging that is increasingly being used to probe differences between healthy and diseased states in the myocardium. While the accuracy of MOLLI has been studied extensively using computer simulations and water phantoms [10–15], a direct comparison of MOLLI with the gold standard IR spin echo (IR-SE) method has not yet been performed in vivo, where tissues may behave differently from water phantoms. This work aims to quantify MOLLI accuracy in vivo by comparing with the accurate but time-consuming gold standard IR-SE sequence in the calf muscle and with a rapid IR fast spin echo (IR-FSE) sequence in the heart of healthy volunteers. In addition, we quantified the effect of correcting for imperfect inversion efficiency [13–15] on the T1 accuracy of MOLLI.

Materials and Methods

T1 Fitting Approaches for MOLLI Data

The MOLLI sequence consists of inversion pulses followed by mixed periods of bSSFP readout and free relaxation and therefore has a fairly complex signal evolution (Fig.1). To overcome this problem, previous T1 mapping studies using MOLLI typically approximated this signal curve using a mono-exponential fit to extract an apparent T1 relaxation time (T1*) and subsequently corrected it to yield an improved T1 estimate [10]:

\[ T_1 \approx T_1^* \left( \frac{B}{A} - 1 \right) \]  

where T1* (the apparent T1 relaxation), A and B are obtained by a three-parameter exponential fit of the MOLLI data (after restoring signal polarity and rearranging data according to their inversion times). While simple, this correction was originally derived for T1
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Imaging Experiments

All experiments were performed on a 1.5T GE HDxt MRI scanner (GE Healthcare, Waukesha, WI) using an 8-channel receiver coil (GE Healthcare Coils, Aurora, OH). The study was approved by the Weill Cornell Institutional Review Board and all healthy volunteers provided written informed consent prior to imaging. Due to the length of the MRI study in the calf, healthy volunteers were enrolled in two separate groups for the calf and cardiac imaging experiments (one volunteer participated in both experiments). A 2D IR-SSFP MOLLI sequence was implemented following the method described in [10]. An 8.12 ms hyperbolic secant adiabatic inversion pulse and a 0.5 ms apodized half-sinc SSFP excitation pulse were used for all experiments.

MOLLI data was acquired in the calf muscle of 6 volunteers (5 men, 1 woman, mean age 30±6 years). Calf muscle was chosen for in vivo validation since its MR relaxation properties (T1/T2 ~1000/30 ms) are similar to that of myocardium (T1/T2 ~1100/50 ms). Imaging the calf muscle also eliminates the confounding effects of motion and heart rate variability on the T1 accuracy of MOLLI [18,19], as well as enables the acquisition of the time-consuming gold standard IR-SE data, which is impractical in the heart. Typical MOLLI imaging parameters were as follows: TR = 4.1 ms, TE = 1.2 ms (asymmetric echo), matrix = 256x128 (interpolated to 256x256), FOV = 26–30 cm, partial FOV factor = 0.5, 11 inversion times (TI) = 100, 200, 350, 100+RR, 200+RR, 350+RR, 100+2RR, 200+2RR, 350+2RR, 350+3RR, 350+4RR (RR = cardiac interval). A 3 sec free relaxation period was introduced between subsequent modified Look-Locker experiments similar to that used in the original MOLLI sequence [10]. A 6 Kaiser-Bessel RF ramp [29] was used to prepare magnetization prior to SSFP data acquisition. MOLLI data were acquired with 30°, 60° and 90° readout flip angles. 2D IR-SE reference data was acquired with the following imaging parameters: TR = 6 sec, TE = 10 ms, matrix = 256x128 (interpolated to 256x256), partial FOV factor = 0.5, TI = 20, 300, 1000 ms and ∞; scan time = 26 min. Synthetic ECG gating signal (80 bpm) provided by the scanner software was used to avoid variations in the cardiac R-R interval.

Cardiac MOLLI data were acquired in 5 healthy volunteers (5 men, mean age 36±11 years) with peripheral gating and imaging parameters similar to that reported in [11,21]: TR = 3.3 ms, TE = 0.9 ms (asymmetric echo), flip angle = 30°, FOV = 35–36 cm, partial FOV factor = 0.75, parallel imaging (ASSET) factor R = 2, 11 TIs, 3 heartbeat pause between subsequent modified Look-Locker experiments, scan time = 17 heartbeats. Since the gold standard IR-SE sequence is too time-consuming for cardiac applications, a rapid cardiac gated single-shot IR-FSE sequence with variable refocusing flip angles was implemented to obtain reference myocardial T1 within one breath-hold [22]. The typical IR-FSE imaging parameters were as follows: TR = 5 RR, minimum TE = 4 ms, echo train length = 48, matrix = 256x128, partial FOV factor = 0.75, TI = 20, 300, 1000 ms and ∞, ASSET factor R = 2, scan time = 16 heartbeats. Before use as a reference

Figure 1. MOLLI acquisition and data fitting: a) Simulated longitudinal magnetization during MOLLI acquisition (T1 = 1000 ms, T2 = 30 ms, readout flip angle = 30°, echo train length = 64, heart rate = 60 bpm). Note the complex pattern of the underlying magnetization evolution due to mixed periods of bSSFP readout and free relaxation. MOLLI data are sampled at 11 inversion times marked; b) Conventional MOLLI fitting approximately the rearranged MOLLI data with a mono-exponential function to derive an apparent T1, which is then corrected according to Eq.1.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0107327.g001
in the heart, the accuracy of the IR-FSE sequence was verified against the gold standard IR-SE in the calf muscle.

Data Analysis
All data were processed using Matlab R2009a (The Mathworks, Natick, MA) on a Dell XPS 8100 desktop computer. The polarity of the sampled data was restored using the method proposed in [23]. IR-SE data were fit using a three-parameter exponential signal equation \( A - B \times \exp(-T1/T2) \) to obtain the reference \( T1 \) and inversion efficiency \( \delta = B/A - 1 \). MOLLI data were fit using both conventional MOLLI fitting (Eq.1) and MOLLI fitting corrected with known inversion efficiency (Eq.2). Equation 2 used the inversion efficiency \( \delta \) obtained from IR-SE acquisition.

In the calf, signals were averaged within a 3×3 region of interest (ROI) placed in the right soleus muscle of each volunteer prior to data fitting. There were no repeated measurements in the left and right calf muscles of the volunteers. For cardiac imaging, pixel-wise fitting was performed for an ROI placed in the left ventricular septum wall. IR-FSE data were processed using a three-parameter exponential fit to obtain the reference \( T1 \).

Ideally one needs to perform mapping of inversion efficiency in the heart in order to accurately correct for myocardial \( T1 \) obtained by MOLLI. Because this by itself is a difficult problem (e.g., due to respiratory and cardiac motion), a partial solution was pursued by mapping the inversion efficiency in the calf muscle and then adjusting this value for the heart muscle based on the theoretical difference predicted by Bloch simulation while accounting for expected values of \( T1 \) and \( T2 \) in the myocardium (see Results section). This allowed us to demonstrate the improved \( T1 \) accuracy that can be obtained in the heart with inversion efficiency correction.

Relative \( T1 \) error defined as \( |T1_{MOLLI} - T1_{IRSE}| / T1_{IRSE} \times 100 \) and relative fitting residual defined as \( \left| \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( S_{measured} - S_{fit} \right)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( S_{measured} \right)^2} \right| \times 100 \) were calculated, and statistical significance of the difference between the mean measured \( T1 \) and the mean \( T1 \) from IR-SE/FSE (gold standard) was determined using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) followed by Tukey’s post-hoc test for multiple comparison. A P-value of less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results
In the calf muscle (n = 6), conventional MOLLI fitting (Eq.1) produced fairly inaccurate and inconsistent \( T1 \) values as the readout flip angle was varied, with average \( T1 \) error reaching as high as 17.3% at 30° (Fig. 2a/Table 1). Interestingly, \( T1 \) error by conventional MOLLI fitting was lower at higher flip angles (reducing to 8.0% at 90°) although the relative fitting residual increased markedly (Fig. 2b), from 3.7% at 30° (indicating a reasonable fit of the 3-parameter exponential model) to 11.8% at 90° (indicating a rather poor fit as shown in Fig. 2b/c). Using MOLLI fitting accounting for the inversion efficiency (Eq.2), error was improved to be less than 7.4% at all flip angles.

Figure 3 shows an example of \( T1 \) maps obtained in the calf muscle at 30°. The average inversion efficiency \( \delta \) obtained from IR-SE and used in MOLLI data fitting was 85.7%±1.6%. The average fitting time per pixel was 0.03 s for three-parameter MOLLI fitting, assuming that the polarity of the signal curve had already been restored.

In the calf muscle, the gold standard IR-SE and rapid IR-FSE acquisitions were found to provide similar \( T1 \) values (1.3±0.7% relative error). However, the inversion efficiency measured by IR-FSE (81.9±2.0%) underestimated that obtained by IR-SE (85.7±1.6%) p = 0.002. To determine the in vivo inversion efficiency in the myocardium required for MOLLI data fitting, the theoretical inversion efficiency was simulated using \( T1/T2 \) of healthy soleus muscle (965/31 ms) [24] and myocardium (1088/52 ms) [22,23] and the shape of the adiabatic pulse used in the imaging experiment. Since simulation may not perfectly predict the in vivo inversion efficiency [15], the ratio of the simulated inversion efficiencies was then used to scale the average inversion efficiency obtained from the calf muscle (85.7%), yielding an inversion efficiency estimate of 88% for fitting of the cardiac data. \( B1 \) and \( B0 \) effects were not considered when estimating the inversion efficiency since the hyperbolic secant adiabatic inversion pulse is expected to be robust against \( B1 \) and \( B0 \) inhomogeneity encountered in vivo at 1.5 T. For \( T1 \) and \( T2 \) similar to that of the calf and the myocardium, the inversion efficiency is expected to vary by only a few percent with ±25% variation in RF amplitude and ±150 Hz off-resonance range as shown in Fig. 4 of [15].

In the heart (n = 5), MOLLI with inversion correction \( (T1 = 1065 ± 68 ms; p = 0.78) \) reduced \( T1 \) error compared to conventional MOLLI fitting \( (T1 = 937 ± 60 ms; p = 0.006) \) when compared to the reference \( T1 \) values provided by IR-FSE \( (T1 = 1092 ± 64 ms) \). Overall, the relative \( T1 \) error was 14.0±6.6% for conventional MOLLI fitting, and 5.3±5.1% for MOLLI with inversion efficiency correction, closely following the trend observed in the calf experiments. A comparison of short-axis myocardial \( T1 \) maps obtained with the two MOLLI data fitting methods is shown in Fig. 4. The average heart rate was 52.8±9.6 bpm (range 40–63 bpm).

Discussion
Our in vivo data showed that conventional MOLLI (Eq.1) provided fairly accurate and inconsistent in vivo \( T1 \) values in muscle tissues when compared with the standard spin echo based methods. As indicated by our results, a major source of \( T1 \) error comes from reduced adiabatic inversion efficiency due to shorter \( T2 \) of muscle tissues when compared with the standard spin echo based MOLLI sequence at 7T [14] and serves to confirm that a source of error with traditional MOLLI \( T1 \) mapping is the inversion efficiency, which can be improved upon when using Eq. 2 if the inversion efficiency is measured. Further in vivo studies may be warranted to quantify \( T1 \) error in MOLLI as a function of inversion efficiency in different tissues.

The conventional MOLLI fitting method (Eq.1) has been validated in water phantoms doped with various contrast agents [10–12,18] by comparing with the gold standard IR-SE method. However, water phantoms are different from in vivo tissue in biochemical composition and underlying biophysical process (e.g., exchange among water compartments), resulting in different relaxation and MRI signal behavior. In vivo validation of MOLLI has not been performed so far most likely due to the excessive IR-SE acquisition time. In this work, we used the calf muscle as a
**Figure 2.** MOLLI results in the calf muscle (n = 6): A) $T_1$ errors obtained at 30°, 60° and 90° readout flip angle for conventional MOLLI fitting (Eq.1) and MOLLI fitting with inversion correction (Eq.2); B) Relative fitting residuals for the three parameter fit used in Eqs.1 and 2. Note the increasing residuals with the three parameter fitting (used by Eqs.1 and 2) at higher flip angles; C) Measured signal and curves fit with the 3-parameter MOLLI fit in the calf muscle of one volunteer at 30°, 60° and 90°. Notice the increasing discrepancy between the fit and measured data at higher flip angle, confirmed by the increase in fitting residual in (B).

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0107327.g002

**Table 1.** Comparison of $T_1$ values obtained in the calf muscle (n = 6) and myocardium (n = 5) of healthy volunteers using conventional MOLLI fitting (Eq.1) and MOLLI fitting with inversion correction (Eq.2) at various flip angles (FA).

| Calf Muscle (n = 6) | FA = 30° | FA = 60° | FA = 90° |
|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| IR-SE | IR-FSE | MOLLI | MOLLI w. Inv | MOLLI | MOLLI w. Inv | MOLLI | MOLLI w. INV |
| $T_1$ (ms) | 986±32 | 987±42 | 815±40 | 952±38 | 871±36 | 1016±27 | 907±35 | 1058±27 |
| Inv. Eff. | 85.7±1.6% | 81.9±2.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| P | N/A | 1 | <0.001 | 0.69 | <0.001 | 0.79 | 0.007 | 0.02 |
| Fitting residual | 3.7±0.6% | 8.5±0.3% | 11.8±0.36% |

| Myocardium (n = 5) | FA = 30° |
|---------------------|----------|
| IR-FSE | MOLLI | MOLLI w. Inv |
| $T_1$ (ms) | 1092±64 | 937±60 | 1065±68 |
| Inv. Eff. | 88% (sim. from calf and Bloch) | N/A | N/A |
| P | N/A | 0.006 | 0.78 |
| Fitting residual | 5.3%±1.8% |

P values are given for comparison with the gold standard IR-SE method (calf) or IR-FSE method (myocardium).

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0107327.t001
tissue model for the myocardium, thus enabling for the first time a direct in vivo comparison of MOLLI with IR-SE. For cardiac T1 mapping, a more rapid IR-FSE sequence was developed to enable cardiac T1 mapping in a single breath-hold [22]. While conventional MOLLI fitting of phantom data traditionally shows good to excellent T1 accuracy [10–12,18], we found larger in vivo T1 errors (above 10%) in both the calf muscle and the myocardium which could be reduced to less than 7.4% when accounting for inversion efficiency as in Eq.2. This observation suggests that in vivo validation should be considered following the initial phantom validation when assessing the performance of T1 mapping for in vivo imaging.

Our in vivo T1 results obtained with the conventional MOLLI fitting (Eq.1) are similar to that reported in previous studies (761 ms in the skeletal muscle [10] and 962–998 ms in the myocardium [10,18,21]). Interestingly, we observed increasing T1 values at higher readout flip angles in the calf muscle, a trend opposite to that reported previously in the myocardium [11]. To better understand this phenomenon, we have performed Bloch simulation for T1/T2 of the calf muscle and the heart and observed that the trend highly depends on tissue T2 and other timing parameters such as heart rate. In addition, conventional MOLLI analysis (Eq.1) does not explicitly take into account the flip angle. Since it was originally derived for SPGR imaging, and as a result can provide a flip angle dependent bias specific to tissue T1/T2. This bias may explain the increase in T1 error after inversion efficiency correction, especially at higher flip angles of 60° and 90°. This is additional evidence that the conventional MOLLI data fitting may not work well for different tissues or when imaging conditions are changed.

The above findings are clinically relevant for two reasons. First, inversion efficiency correction can significantly reduce T1 error in MOLLI to within 7.4%, thereby improving the reliability of this technique for diagnostic purposes. Second, the improved consistency of T1 estimates at different flip angles and T1/T2 values after applying correction (Eq. 2) to MOLLI analysis may benefit multi-site multi-vendor T1 mapping studies by reducing discrepancies due to different hardware and software implementations.

This work has several limitations. The effect of inversion efficiency on T1 fitting post contrast, which is important for clinical application, was not investigated. This was because myocardial T1 can vary significantly post contrast depending on factors such as cardiac output and bolus timing, making accurate comparisons between the reference IR-FSE sequence and the MOLLI sequence in multiple subjects challenging. The long echo train of the IR-FSE sequence may also result in errors due to blurring in tissue with short T1. The trade-off between scan time reduction by prolonging the echo train (which is relevant for breath-hold cardiac imaging) and the associated image blurring in such situations is an important question and will be investigated in our future work. In addition, post-contrast myocardial T2 is difficult to measure for the same reason, making the estimation of inversion efficiency non-trivial. In this work, in vivo inversion efficiency was obtained as a by-product of IR-SE data fitting, which is not a practical method due to long IR-SE acquisition time and the lack of experimental mapping of in vivo inversion efficiency in the heart further limited the work.

A fitting method that can improve MOLLI T1 estimates in vivo using Eq.2 would require the knowledge of imaging and tissue parameters (e.g., inversion efficiency), which may not be readily available. Mapping inversion efficiency, for example, is a non-trivial problem particularly in the in vivo setting, and this is an important limitation of the MOLLI approach. Another possible avenue for inversion efficiency correction in MOLLI would be to measure the inversion efficiency in the calf in an initial study in both healthy subjects and patients, and then establish and validate a population average. We believe however that IR-FSE is a better approach in patients with lower heart rate (to reduce the motion sensitivity of the FSE readout) and when blood T1 is not needed. Another potential solution could be to fit for the inversion efficiency, however this requires the use of an SPGR readout with reduced SNR efficiency a four parameter fit that is more sensitive to noise [14]. A shorter adiabatic pulse could also be used to...
improve the inversion efficiency, although this is often limited by the maximum allowable RF transmit power [15]. Other potential factors limiting MOLLI accuracy in vivo, but not studied here, were reviewed in [15] and may include, but are not limited to deviation from the nominal flip angle profile [24,26], heart rate variability [18,27,28], magnetization transfer (MT) effect [26,29–31], motion [19], and B₀ inhomogeneity [13,32].

Recent works have proposed acquiring MT sensitive data (e.g., by varying RF pulse length) and including MT effect in the signal model [26,29,30] for accurate T₁ fitting; however, the utility of this approach for cardiac T₁ mapping using MOLLI remains to be investigated. A potential solution for these imperfections could be to develop a 1R-FSE based T₁ mapping sequence [22] which is more robust against imperfect inversion efficiency and field inhomogeneities than the bSSFP based MOLLI sequence.
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In conclusion, the conventional correction (Eq.1) of apparent T₁ in MOLLI can lead to significant in vivo T₁ errors partly due to lower adiabatic inversion efficiency in muscle tissues. T₁ errors can be reduced significantly by using a modified version of the conventional MOLLI correction accounting for inversion efficiency (Eq.2), when the inversion efficiency is known.
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