Tissue Segmentation and Partial Volume Estimation with Magnetic Resonance Fingerprinting
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Introduction

Recent demand for precision medicine and personalized diagnostics has led to increased interest in radiomics and robust quantitative imaging with MRI. To this end, recent technical developments have included anatomical volumetry, quantitative relaxometry, and quantification of tissue microstructural and functional properties such as diffusion and perfusion. Specifically, tissue segmentation has become the basis of quantitative volumetric estimation and volume-based post-processing, which have been used to diagnose and characterize several neurological diseases. For example, multiple sclerosis [1], brain plasticity [2, 3], dementia [4], and epilepsy [5, 6] are associated with global and local brain volume and cortical thickness changes. Anatomical segmentation has also been used to target subcortical structures, such as the subthalamic nucleus (STN) [7], for surgical treatments.

The partial volume (PV) effect is a well-known challenge for any imaging modality with limited image resolution, including MRI, and poses a particular challenge for both quantitative mapping and quantitative image analysis. When the image resolution is lower than the dimension of the anatomical structure, e.g. when image voxels span tissue boundaries, some voxels may contain multiple tissue types. The PV effect causes blurring at these interfaces on the MR images because the contrast or signal of the mixed voxel is a weighted average of that from each single tissue component. For quantitative imaging and image post-processing, the assumption that each voxel contains a single and pure tissue type may lead to mis-classification and thus mask some subtle features or tissue changes, especially at tissue boundaries. Assuming that the signal evolution (for example, a relaxation curve) in each image voxel is characterized by a single tissue property (i.e. T1 or/and T2) may cause errors in tissue property quantification in mixed voxels.

Comparison of signal curves from conventional T2 mapping (1A) and from MRF (1B). The signal from a PV effect is more distinct from a pure tissue using MRF.
Depending on the desired anatomical scale for analysis of tissue properties within one voxel, certain assumptions about possible voxel compositions can be made. This article concerns multiple tissue components in the slow exchange regime, where no chemical exchange between components is assumed, such that each tissue within a voxel is modeled as a distinct component. Primarily, multi-component models for PV have been used for tissue segmentation, by assuming that each voxel contains mixed signals from pure tissues, such as gray matter (GM), white matter (WM), and CSF for brain tissue segmentation [8–10], or water and fat for fat fraction estimation in the liver [11]. The result of these methods are either hard-threshold tissue classification or soft-threshold tissue fraction maps, which can be further used for tissue volume calculation [6], image feature extraction [12, 13], and disease diagnosis. In addition, multi-component PV models have been used to analyze microstructural features. For example, multiple T2 components have long been considered when analyzing human brain [14], where three components are commonly assumed, including water protons compartmentalized between myelin bilayers, intra- and extracellular water, and free fluid (usually contained in the CSF). The results of the PV analysis consist of a volume fraction of each of the three components in each voxel. The results can be further used to calculate myelin water fraction (MWF), which is estimated as the percentage of the signal with T2 from the fast relaxation components (myelin water) to the total water content. The MWF is an important marker for white matter microstructure, especially myelin generation/regeneration, and thus a change in MWF has been associated with age-related neural tissue changes [15, 16], as well as neurodegenerative diseases such as Multiple Sclerosis [17] and Schizophrenia [18, 19].

In order to resolve multiple tissue components within one voxel, PV estimation methods employ multi-component signal models which are based on either contrast-weighted images or quantitative MRI scans. For the former scenario, weighted images with one or more contrasts are acquired and the PV is estimated based on regularized statistical models of image contrast variations [8, 20, 21]. Using quantitative MR to estimate PV has the benefit of having an additional time domain of the signal change that is characterized by one or more underlying tissue properties, such as T1 and/or T2. The PV effects can then be modeled by assuming that the acquired signal evolution is a mixture of multiple tissue components. For example, MWF estimation is based on multi-exponential T2 relaxation from a multiple spin-echo acquisition [19], and brain tissue segmentation is based on multi-exponential T1 relaxation from an inversion recovery Look-Locker acquisition [22] or based on multi-parametric mapping scans [10, 23]. The tissue fraction of each component is then estimated by interpolating between quantitative results [10], or by solving an inverse problem [22, 23].

MR Fingerprinting (MRF) [24] is a quantitative MR method that provides new opportunities to analyze PV effects and identify multiple tissue components. First, MRF applies pseudorandomized acquisition patterns to generate signal evolutions that never stay at constant steady state and exhibit unique signal variations depending on multiple tissue properties. These two features help to provide more incoherent signals between different tissues, which could improve the ability of tissue separation. As an example, Figure 1 compares signals from a conventional T2 mapping method (left) and from MRF (right). Because signals from the conventional method all follow an exponential pattern, they are typically inseparable in the presence of noise. The mixed signal (green) with equal contributions from gray and white matter 'looks' the same as the signal from another, uniform tissue with a different T2 (red). In MRF, since signals do not follow such a simple evolution due to variable acquisition and multi-parametric sensitivity, the mixed signal is more likely to be distinct from other pure-tissue signals. Second, since the signal model is constructed based on Bloch equations, the effects from multiple tissue properties and confounding factors (B0, slice profile and B1 etc. [25-28]) can be accounted for. The PV results could thus be more robust and less dependent on system imperfections. Finally, we will show a few examples that pattern recognition based on a pre-defined dictionary could also make MRF-based PV analysis (PV-MRF) less sensitive to noise than conventional approaches based on inverse methods [23]. In the following sections, the theories and implementations of multiple PV-MRF methods will be introduced, followed by discussions of several emerging neuroimaging applications.

Partial volume signal model and conventional PV analysis

In both conventional quantitative MR and MRF, the acquired signal evolution such as shown in Figure 1B is modeled as a weighted sum of signals from a few known tissue components. Suppose the anatomy of interest contains m component tissues. Let \( \mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{C}^{m} \) represent the MRF signal evolution for component tissue \( 1 \leq l \leq m \), where \( t \) is the number of time points acquired from an MRF scan or other T1 or T2 mapping experiment. We collect these m component signal evolutions in a sub-dictionary \( \mathbf{D}_{\text{sub}} \in \mathbb{C}^{m} \). The voxel signal evolution can be modeled as a weighted sum of the component species’ signal evolutions:

\[
s_i = \sum_{i=1}^{m} w_i d_i = D_{\text{sub}} w_i,
\]

where \( w_i \) is the weight of tissue \( l \) in voxel \( i \). For example, in normal brain tissues, we can model \( m = 3 \) to represent
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Solving the above inverse problem requires high SNR, which is typically not acquired in MRF due to highly accelerated k-space sampling and thus severe aliasing artifacts. The results are further prone to errors when more tissue components are assumed. Since dictionary matching has been shown to have relatively high error tolerance, a new dictionary-based PV-MRF has been proposed and has been shown to reduce the effect of over-fitting errors [23]. PV-MRF therefore adopts the concept of MRF, by converting a least-squares fitting problem into a pattern matching problem, where the weights are identified by exhaustive search of a new dictionary that contains all possible combinations of component tissues. To this end, a weight table $\tilde{w} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times h}$ that lists all possible weight combinations is first constructed, where $h$ is the number of weight combinations. Next, a separate PV dictionary is constructed, where each column of $D_{pv}$ contains a mixed tissue signal evolution calculated from the weighted sum of the modeled component tissues with a certain weight combination. Finally, tissue fractions are estimated by matching the acquired signal to all signals from the PV dictionary. The weight combination corresponding to the highest inner product are selected and converted into multiple tissue fraction maps.

After the representative tissue properties are determined and the signals from $D_{sub}$ are simulated (by Bloch equations, for example), the partial volume, or tissue fraction, of each component within a voxel is estimated by solving this linear model. The Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse is commonly applied to compute the signal weights:

$$W_i = (D_{sub}^H D_{sub})^{-1} D_{sub}^{H*} y_i, \quad (2)$$

where the superscript $H$ represents the Hermitian adjoint or complex transpose operator. The weights are then normalized such that the sum of the weights has unit magnitude, and the result can be interpreted as a tissue fraction.

After the representative tissue properties are determined, the signals from $D_{sub}$ are simulated (by Bloch equations, for example). The partial volume, or tissue fraction, of each component within a voxel is estimated by solving a linear model. The Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse is commonly applied to compute the signal weights:
PV-MRF can segment pure tissues, as well as visualize mixtures of GM and WM in deep gray matter structures. However, the PV fraction maps computed by pseudoinverse show residual CSF contributions in the GM and WM maps. The dictionary based PV-MRF maps exhibit better discrimination of pure tissues.

Figure 3 shows an example of all six 3D quantitative maps, including T1, T2, proton density, as well as GM, WM, and CSF fraction maps computed with a partial volume dictionary, acquired from a healthy volunteer scanned on a 3T MAGNETOM Prisma system. All maps are inherently co-registered because they are obtained from the same dataset. Sequence parameters for the 3D MRF scan are: field of view = 300 x 300 x 144 mm³, voxel resolution = 1.2 x 1.2 x 1.2 mm³ isotropic, TA = 12 minutes [30]. To compute tissue fraction maps using dictionary based PV-MRF, three tissue components, GM, WM, and CSF are assumed. K-means clustering of mapped T1 and T2 values with k = 7 is used to analyze tissue compositions based on the quantitative maps. Three clusters are then manually selected to identify the characteristic relaxation times of the modeled tissue components, which are subsequently used to construct $D_{\text{sub}}$ and $D_{\text{pv}}$.

**Bayesian model based PV-MRF**

Most segmentation methods assume that the brain consists of only three tissue components (GM, WM, and CSF) and use this assumption to represent every voxel as a weighted sum of these three tissues. A limitation in this approach may be evident in cases of pathology, where a diseased or unhealthy tissue may not be composed of these three tissues, but may contain a different component not represented in the PV model. In this case, forcing a fixed model on the voxel signals will result in erroneous tissue fraction calculations and diseased tissue will not be properly characterized. To account for variations in both diseased and healthy tissues and relax the constraints of a fixed tissue model, a model was recently proposed using the Bayesian framework in which signal evolutions are fit to a larger dictionary with no prior assumption about how many or which tissue types may comprise the voxel signal [31]. In this method, the signal evolution is still modeled as a weighted sum of dictionary elements as in equation (1), however, a larger subset of tissue types is used with the assumption that many of the weights $W_i$ should be zero, or in other words, that $W_i$ should be a sparse vector,

$$s = DW_i \quad (4)$$

where $D$ is the full MRF dictionary of simulated signal evolutions, and is of size $t \times n$, where $n \gg t$. This is, however, an underdetermined problem, and solving using linear least-squares will result in a weight vector $W_i$ which is not sparse. To achieve the desired result, a sparsity-promoting prior is placed on $W_i$, guiding the algorithm to fit the signal evolution to the dictionary using only a few significant entries to represent the signal. The result of applying this model to a voxel signal evolution is a distribution of dictionary entries and corresponding weights that best describe the characteristics of the signal, and a voxel result is a matrix containing the T1, T2 pairs and corresponding weight values of the most significantly contributing dictionary entries.

An example of this method applied to a 3D MRF acquisition in an epilepsy patient is shown in Figure 4. The scatter plot shows Bayesian MRF results from four pixels indicated from a T1 map, one containing pure white matter (red), one containing pure gray matter (blue), one containing a mixture of white matter and gray matter (green) and one containing an epileptic lesion (black). The key advantage of using this Bayesian method is that the lesion cluster is not forced to fit to a fixed tissue model,

![Figure 4: Bayesian MRF results from four pixels indicated from a T1 map](siemens.com/magnetom-world)
which may not include the relaxation properties of the lesion. The lesion is shown as a single cluster, which is different from those of two pure tissues (red and blue), while the PV pixel is identified by two separate green clusters, which are overlapped with the clusters from two pure tissues. This approach gives us a completely new tool to detect and characterize lesions.

The key feature of the Bayesian MRF method is that signal evolutions are not forced to fit a fixed model with predefined relaxation properties. However, this freedom results in distributions across voxels that may vary slightly, even within similar tissue structures. Summarizing the results is done most effectively by segmentation, using tissue fraction maps calculated from the Bayesian MRF results. To this end, voxel-wise results from the Bayesian method are combined across the full image or 3D volume and grouped using a Gaussian mixture model applied to the conglomerate T1, T2, and weight matrices. As there is no fixed tissue model in the Bayesian analysis, choosing a large enough number $K$ of Gaussian distributions to represent the full range of possible tissue distributions is desirable. In a normal volunteer, one can assume fewer Gaussian distributions than in the case of disease. The mixture model allows for a probability to be associated to each point in T1, T2 space for each of the $K$ Gaussian distributions. By using the Gaussian probability densities as a mask, tissue fraction maps can be calculated by multiplying the calculated weighted by the corresponding probabilities. These maps are normalized so that for each voxel, the fraction across each of the $k$ classes is equal to one.

### Potential clinical applications for neuroimaging

**Epilepsy**

Conventional MRI can be limited in its ability to recognize the existence and extent of subtle lesions, particularly focal cortical dysplasia (FCD). Up to 50% of potential epilepsy surgery candidates had a diagnosis...
of ‘negative MRI’, as there is no identifiable lesion to guide surgery. Our group recently demonstrated that 3D whole brain MRF and PV-MRF techniques can aid detection and characterization of lesions in epilepsy patients [30]. First, a fast and whole brain 3D MRF scan was applied to simultaneously quantify T1, T2, and proton density maps with 1.2 mm isotropic image resolution. The isotropic 3D maps allowed identification of lesions from multiple orientations and multiple tissue properties. Second, dictionary based PV-MRF [23] was applied to the same data to generate gray matter, white matter, and CSF maps. These maps could resolve multiple tissue components from a single voxel and additionally provide new contrasts along tissue boundaries. All available maps from a single scan are shown in Figure 3.

Figure 5 shows the MRF findings from a patient with right temporal lobe epilepsy. The clinical MRI showed that the right amygdala was enlarged with hyperintense FLAIR signal, with the right temporal lobe otherwise unremarkable by visual inspection (Figs. 5A, B). As shown in Figure 5C–E, MRF maps revealed a previously unseen signal abnormality ‘tail’ in addition to the amygdala hyperintensity. A subtle increase in the T1 value was seen on the T1 map (Fig. 5C) and increased gray matter fraction on the GM fraction map of the right superior temporal region (Fig. 5E), indicating potential abnormality. Figure 5E and 5F compare the GM fraction maps from MRF and from SPM segmentation of T1-weighted images. The GM map estimated from MRF not only identified the subtle tissue abnormality, but also showed wider variations of the gray matter fractions across the brain, which is believed to correspond to underlying cytostructure differences among different cortical regions. While this abnormality had no significant conspicuity on conventional MRI, the location of the abnormality was highly concordant with interictal and ictal EEG localization. Histopathology of the surgical specimen showed mild malformation of cortical development.

Figure 6 shows MRF and PV-MRF results from another patient with right temporo-parietal epilepsy, who had known bilateral periventricular heterotopias. As shown in Figure 6A and 6B, the nodules showed uniform signal intensity on clinical MRI scans as well as post-processing analysis using SPM segmentation of T1-weighted images. From Figure 6C and 6D, both the MRF T1 map and PV-MRF GM fraction maps showed increased values in the nodules at the right occipital horn. This distinct signal abnormality was not appreciable on the conventional MRI scans. The patient underwent invasive evaluation with stereotactic EEG (SEEG) targeting multiple brain regions. The nodules with abnormal signals shown by MRF and PV-MRF were consistent with the interictal SEEG findings and ictal onset of a typical seizure. Electrical stimulation of the electrodes at the right occipital horn produced habitual auras.

Brain development in early childhood
Chen et al. have recently applied MRF and dictionary based PV-MRF to characterize early brain developmental changes for healthy children from birth to five years old, who were enrolled in the UNC/UMN Baby Connectome Project [16]. In addition to T1 and T2 maps estimated from MRF scans, myelin water fraction (MWF) maps were estimated using dictionary based PV-MRF, by estimating tissue fractions from a three-compartment model including myelin water, intracellular/extracellular water, and free water. Representative T1, T2, and MWF maps from five subjects at different
ages are shown in Figure 7. Both T1 and T2 values decrease while MWF increases with age. Based on the results from 28 children, R1 (1/T1) and R2 (1/T2) showed a marked increase until approximately 20 months of age, followed by a slower increase for all WM regions. The MWF remained at a negligible level until about 6 months of age and gradually increased afterwards. In addition, significant differences in R1 and MWF trajectories were observed across different white matter region, and the spatial pattern for myelination during early brain development matches well to the previous findings obtained from post-mortem brain tissues [32].

**Brain tumors**

Depending on the stage, cancers originating or metastasized in the brain can be heterogeneous, containing regions of solid cellular neoplasms, edema, inflammation, cysts, and necrosis. However, conventional approaches using pseudoinverse calculations to invert partial volume models result in less accurate tissue fraction estimations as the PV model complexity increases. Moreover, these complex PV models can be difficult to establish, since unlike normal tissue segmentation or microstructure evaluation, the relaxation properties of heterogeneous tissue compartments cannot be easily determined for each subject or obtained from the literature. PV analysis in tumors therefore requires careful construction of a comprehensive partial volume model, which encompasses multiple types of diseased tissue.

In heterogeneous tissues such as the region in and around the brain tumor, pure tissues may not occupy enough voxels for k-means clustering of mapped T1 and T2 values to identify unique tissues. Bayesian MRF analysis provides particular value in these scenarios. Figure 8 shows the results from three different slices of a patient diagnosed with a glioblastoma brain tumor (GBM). The patient gave written consent and was scanned with 3D-MRF FISP acquisition with image resolution of 1.2 x 1.2 x 3 mm

A Gaussian mixture model was applied to the Bayesian results, with K = 14 Gaussian distributions found. Shown in Figure 8 are the weight maps from 8 of these distributions, corresponding to (from left to right) white matter, two gray matter classes, CSF, and two clusters related to the tumor pathology. Remaining maps from the other eight tissue distributions correspond to other tissues, such as fat and bone surrounding the brain, or may have very small weights in comparison to the six shown.

Bayesian MRF and dictionary-based PV-MRF work hand-in-hand. In place of or in addition to using k-means clustering of T1 and T2 times, Bayesian MRF can help establish the relaxation times of healthy and diseased tissues in and around the brain tumor. This information can

---

**Figure 8**

Representative T1, T2 and MWF maps from five subjects at different ages. Similar slice location that covers the genu and splenium of the corpus callosum was selected. Both T1 and T2 decrease while MWF increases with age [16].

---
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then be used to construct $D_{sub}$ and $D_{pv}$ for dictionary-based PV-MRF for segmentation and estimation of diseased tissue fractions. Figure 9 shows an example of tissue segmentation and partial volume estimation using dictionary-based PV-MRF [23] in a patient with a small-cell lung cancer metastasis in the brain, scanned with 3D MRF on a 3T MAGNETOM Prisma system. Clinically-acquired FLAIR and contrast-enhanced T1-weighted images show an enhancing tumor with cystic and necrotic components, and surrounding edema. MRF provides 3D maps of T1, T2, and M$_0$, from which distinct relaxation times for normal appearing brain tissues (fat, GM, WM, CSF) and diseased tissues could be identified by k-means clustering and confirmed by Bayesian MRF analysis in these regions. An expanded partial volume dictionary containing all possible combinations of six tissue components allows for segmentation and volume fraction estimation of normal as well as tumor tissues, including solid enhancing components, cystic components, and the surrounding edema. Note that dictionary-based PV-MRF provides quantitative maps of tissue volume

---

**Figure 9** Segmentation of a small-cell lung cancer metastasis in the brain using dictionary-based PV-MRF and 3D MRF acquisition. Dictionary matching enables the use of expanded multi-component models and segmentation of more tissue types compared to conventional partial volume analysis [23].
fractions, as shown in Figure 9 [23], whereas the Bayesian MRF visualization illustrated in Figure 8 visualizes weighted probabilities that each voxel corresponds to the particular tissue class.

Improved synthetic imaging

It is sometimes the case that certain contrast weightings are unavailable for diagnosis, due to poor patient compliance or scan time limitations. Quantitative mapping of underlying tissue MR properties with methods like MRF opens the possibility for synthetic MRI. Rather than scanning the patient again to acquire new images with the desired contrast, these images can be synthesized or calculated off-line by applying known equations to the underlying tissue properties T1, T2, and $M_0$, mapped with quantitative MRI. With this approach, image contrast can be optimized for discrimination of lesions without the associated lengthy scan time. Synthetic imaging can also be a useful aid in the transition between interpreting multiple weighted-contrast images, which is currently standard clinical practice, and quantitative maps.

While typical T1- and T2-weighted images are straightforward to calculate, synthetic MRI of widely used sophisticated contrast weightings such as fluid attenuated inversion recovery (FLAIR) still pose a challenge due to partial volume effects. This challenge is illustrated in Figure 10. In a FLAIR sequence, the image is acquired when the magnetization of the fluid is nulled and does not contribute to the voxel signal. However, in voxels containing partial volumes mapped T1 and T2 values will be influenced by the long relaxation times associated with fluids. A synthetic FLAIR image calculated from mapped MRF relaxation times therefore will have poor contrast in the sulci, where partial volumes of fluid contaminate the mapped relaxation times.

Here again the uniqueness of MRF signal evolutions provides an advantage: not only can fluid partial volumes in each voxel be quantified with PV-MRF, the corresponding contribution of fluid signals can also be subtracted from the measured voxel signal. The remaining voxel signal, reflecting the signal evolutions of the remaining non-fluid tissues, can be matched to the MRF dictionary again and the resulting T1 and T2 maps can be used to calculate the synthetic FLAIR image. This approach improves the contrast of the synthetic FLAIR by effectively "nulling" the partial volume contribution of fluid in each voxel in post-processing [34].

Conclusion

MRF allows for fast, robust, simultaneous quantification of multiple tissue properties. Moreover, the unique signal shapes generated by the pseudorandom MRF sequence allow for additional insight into the multi-component contributions to the voxel signal evolution. Using dictionary-based PV-MRF, partial volumes of healthy and diseased tissues and microstructures can be robustly segmented and estimated. Properties of component tissues, including diseased tissues in tumors, can be determined without prior knowledge by $k$-means clustering of quantitative MRF results or through sophisticated Bayesian analysis of sub-voxel compositions. In combination, MRF, Bayesian MRF, and PV-MRF can provide new, clinically-relevant information about subtle tissue changes which may not be apparent on conventional weighted MR images.

1 Work in progress: the application is currently under development and is not for sale in the U.S. and in other countries. Its future availability cannot be ensured.
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