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Abstract

**Introduction:** Global oxygen extraction fraction (OEF) and cerebral metabolic rate of oxygen (CMRO\(_2\)) were quantified in a test-retest study. Cerebral blood flow (CBF) data, required for CMRO\(_2\) estimation, were obtained using dynamic susceptibility contrast MRI (DSC-MRI). OEF and CMRO\(_2\) were quantified using two separate datasets, that is, conventional high-resolution (HR) gradient echo (GRE) phase maps as well as echo planar imaging (EPI) phase maps taken from the baseline (pre-contrast) part of the DSC-MRI time series. The EPI phase data were included to elucidate whether an extra HR-GRE scan is needed to obtain information about OEF and CMRO\(_2\), or if this information can be extracted from the DSC-MRI experiment only. **Methods:** Twenty healthy volunteers were scanned using 3 T MRI on two occasions. Oxygen saturation levels were obtained from phase data measured in the great cerebral vein of Galen, based on HR-GRE as well as EPI phase maps. In combination with DSC-MRI CBF, this allowed for calculation of OEF and CMRO\(_2\). **Results:** HR-GRE- and EPI-based phase images resulted in similar OEF spread and repeatability, with coefficients of variation/intra-class correlation coefficients of 0.26/0.95 and 0.23/0.81, respectively. Absolute OEF values (HR-GRE: 0.40±0.11, EPI: 0.35±0.08) were consistent with literature data. CMRO\(_2\) showed similar repeatability, somewhat increased spread and reasonable absolute values (HR-GRE: 3.23±1.26 ml O\(_2\)/100g/min, EPI: 2.79±0.89 ml O\(_2\)/100g/min). **Discussion:** In general, the results obtained by HR-GRE and EPI showed comparable characteristics. The EPI methodology could potentially be improved by using a slightly modified DSC-MRI protocol (e.g., with regard to spatial resolution and slice gap).
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Introduction

During its passage through the microvasculature of the brain, oxygenated arterial blood is deoxygenated by release of a fraction of its oxygen molecules to the surrounding tissue. Deoxygenated blood is subsequently collected in major cerebral venous outflow vessels, for example, the internal jugular vein, the superior sagittal sinus and the great cerebral vein of Galen (below referred to as the vein of Galen) (Fernandez-Seara et al., 2006; Jain et al., 2010). Assessment of the oxygen saturation level of the blood in major cerebral veins enables estimation of the global oxygen delivery and cerebral oxygen consumption (Haacke et al., 1997; Fernandez-Seara et al., 2006; Donahue et al., 2009). Knowledge of the blood oxygen saturation, either globally (by measuring in the major outflow veins) or locally (by measuring in other, smaller, veins), is important when it comes to understanding the physiology of the brain, evaluating oxygen supply in relevant diagnostic groups and assessing the overall vitality and function of the brain (Haacke et al., 1997; Jain et al., 2010; Sharf & El-Gebali, 2013). It has, for example, been shown that the jugular venous oxygen saturation correlates with the Glasgow coma scale (Sharf & El-Gebali, 2013). Furthermore, the oxygen extraction of the brain can be used to calculate the cerebral metabolic rate of oxygen (CMRO$_2$), which is of clinical and scientific relevance, for example, in differentiation between incipient and advanced late-onset Alzheimer’s disease and in the understanding of the relationship between cerebral metabolism and the blood CO$_2$ level (connected with hypercapnia) (Siesjö, 1980; Hoyer et al., 1991; Jain et al., 2011; Xu et al., 2011). Another example of clinical relevance is that a global measure of CMRO$_2$ could be used for treatment guidance in neonates with neonatal congenital heart disease, and thus reduce the risk of permanent brain damage (Jain et al., 2014).

A common clinical approach to acquire a global measure of oxygen saturation is to acquire blood samples from the internal jugular vein bulb and then analyze them in vitro, or to continuously monitor the oxygen saturation using a fiber-optic catheter (van der Hoeven et al., 1995; Trubiani et al., 1996). Non-invasive methods are also available, for example, near infrared spectroscopy (NIRS)
for measurement of cortical and sub-cortical oxygenation in a region of the brain (Jöbsis, 1977; Colquhoun et al., 2012), and positron emission tomography (PET) which has proven successful in regionally distinguishing viable from nonviable cerebral tissue (Powers et al., 1985). Several magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) approaches have also been presented. For example, Wright et al. measured the oxygen saturation level in large blood vessels by in vitro calibration of the relationship between the oxygen saturation of the blood and the T2-value of blood, for conditions similar to the in vivo environment (Wright et al., 2005). An & Lin proposed the use of blood oxygenation level-dependent contrast in combination with a signal model by Yablonskiy & Haacke (Yablonskiy & Haacke, 1994; An & Lin, 2000) for obtaining quantitative measures of cerebral blood oxygen extraction fraction. A more recent method for determining local oxygen saturation of venous blood was presented by Bolar et al., based on velocity-selective spin labelling to isolate the MR signal originating from venous blood and subsequently determining its T2 for application of oxygen saturation calibration data (Bolar et al., 2011). Xu et al. used phase-contrast MRI for quantitative global cerebral blood flow (CBF) measurement in combination with T2-relaxation-under-spin-tagging (TRUST) MRI for estimation of global CMRO₂ (Xu et al., 2009).

In 1992, Weisskoff and Kiihne developed a technique to measure the absolute magnetic susceptibility by mapping the magnetic field perturbation using information from phase difference images (Weisskoff & Kiihne, 1992). In 2006, Fernández-Seara et al. presented a method (based on the phase approach by Weisskoff and Kiihne), which is very similar to the one used in the present work, to determine oxygen saturation in a major vein in vivo by MRI susceptometry (Fernandez-Seara et al., 2006). The method requires no in vitro calibration, and is based on the relationship between oxygen saturation level and magnetic susceptibility. The basic methodology is to measure the phase of globally draining veins and their surrounding tissue in gradient echo (GRE) phase maps. The oxygen extraction fraction (OEF), closely related to the oxygen saturation, can then be calculated based on the fact that there is a difference in magnetic susceptibility between oxygenated and deoxygenated blood, extracted from the difference between the phase value of the venous blood and the phase
value of the surrounding tissue. Fan et al. combined MRI susceptometry and arterial spin labelling (ASL) CBF measurements for quantification of CMRO₂ in grey matter (Fan et al., 2012).

The aim of the present study was to further evaluate MRI susceptometry, combined with CBF data, with regard to long-term repeatability (in 20 healthy volunteers) and MRI readout technique. The short-term repeatability (i.e., only a couple of minutes between measurements) has previously been investigated (Jain et al., 2010), while we present a study design with at least one week between the scans. In addition, the method was applied not only to high-resolution (HR)-GRE phase images, but also to non-contrast-enhanced echo planar imaging (EPI) phase images from the baseline part of a DSC-MRI study. The EPI phase images were thus obtained as part of a regular DSC-MRI experiment, and did not require extra scan time. The venous oxygen saturation levels were converted to OEF, and the availability of global cerebral blood flow (CBF) information, from the DSC-MRI experiment, enabled additional calculation and analysis of CMRO₂ (under the assumption that oxygen saturation levels in the vein of Galen can represent global levels in normal subjects). Hence, we evaluated and compared OEF and CMRO₂ results extracted from both HR-GRE and EPI phase data in the same volunteers, at two different scanning sessions.
Theory

The difference in magnetic susceptibility between oxyhemoglobin and de-oxyhemoglobin leads to differences between the phase shifts of the MRI signals in arterial and venous blood. Assuming that arterial blood is fully oxygenated, the measured difference in phase between venous blood and the surrounding tissue is converted to magnetic susceptibility and this provides the blood oxygen saturation, which in turn can be translated into information about the uptake or extraction of oxygen in the brain.

The phase difference $\Delta \Phi$ between venous blood and surrounding tissue is given by:

$$\Delta \Phi = \gamma \cdot \Delta B \cdot TE,$$

(1)

where $\Delta B$ is the difference in local magnetic field between the vein and the surrounding tissue, $\gamma$ is the gyromagnetic constant and TE is the echo time. The difference in local magnetic field will depend on the oxygen saturation level of the venous blood and the orientation of the vein relative the static external magnetic field. Assuming an infinitely long cylindrical vessel, the difference in magnetic field is given by:

$$\Delta B = \frac{\Delta \chi}{6} \cdot (3 \cos^2 \Theta - 1) \cdot B_0,$$

(2)

where $\Delta \chi$ is the difference in magnetic susceptibility between the venous blood and the surrounding tissue and $\Theta$ is the angle between the vessel and the external magnetic field $B_0$. The difference in magnetic susceptibility is related to the oxygen saturation level of the venous blood and the hematocrit (Hct) level (assuming an arterial oxygen saturation of 100 %):

$$\Delta \chi = \Delta \chi_{do} \cdot Hct \cdot (1 - Y_v),$$

(3)

where $\Delta \chi_{do} = 4\pi \cdot 0.18$ ppm per unit Hct is the difference in blood magnetic susceptibility between deoxygenated and oxygenated blood (Haacke et al., 1999), and $Y_v$ is the venous oxygen saturation level. According to Eqs 1-3, the relationship between measured phase difference and venous oxygen saturation level is given by:
\[ Y_v = 1 - \frac{6 \cdot \Delta \Phi}{\gamma \cdot \Delta \chi_{do} \cdot (3 \cos^2 \theta - 1) \cdot Hct \cdot B_0 \cdot TE} \]  

(4)

The oxygen extraction fraction (OEF) is defined as:

\[ OEF = 1 - Y_v. \]  

(5)

The OEF can, in combination with the corresponding CBF data, be used to calculate the cerebral metabolic rate of oxygen (CMRO$_2$). Again, assuming the arterial oxygen saturation to be equal to 100% , the CMRO$_2$ is given by:

\[ CMRO_2 = OEF \cdot CBF \cdot C_a = OEF \cdot CBF \cdot MCHC \cdot Hct \cdot c \]  

(6)

\( C_a = [Hb] \cdot c = MCHC \cdot Hct \cdot c \) is the oxygen concentration of the blood, where [Hb] is the concentration of hemoglobin in the blood, \( c \) is the Hb-carrying capacity of oxygen and MCHC is the mean corpuscular Hb concentration in red blood cells. In the present study, we used Hct=0.4 (Guyton & Hall, 2000a), MCHC=34 g/dl (Guyton & Hall, 2000b), and \( c = 1.368 \text{ ml/g} \) (Dijkhuizen et al., 1977).
Methods

Subjects and MRI experiments

All experiments were performed on a 3 T MRI scanner with an 8-channel head coil (Philips Healthcare, Best, The Netherlands). A total of 20 healthy volunteers (10 males, 10 females, age 25-84 years) were included in the study, after participation in a neurological physical examination, including basic cognitive testing. Each subject was examined on two occasions (test-retest), separated by 7-20 days. The study was approved by the local ethics committee, and written informed consent was obtained from each volunteer. Calculations of CMRO$_2$ in the present study required knowledge of CBF results collected in connection with a previous study (Knutsson et al., 2014), and this is indicated by appropriate citations below.

For high-resolution phase mapping, 3D double-echo GRE images with flow compensation were acquired using TEs of 20 ms and 40 ms. Magnitude as well as phase images were collected for 50 axial slices orthogonal to the external magnetic field, with spatial resolution $0.98 \cdot 0.98 \cdot 1.15 \text{ mm}^3$, field of view (FOV) = $220 \cdot 220 \text{ mm}^2$, repetition time (TR) = 45 ms, flip angle (FA) = 20°, bandwidth = 218 Hz/pixel.

For EPI phase mapping (using the DSC-MRI protocol further described below), 2D single echo images with flow compensation were acquired using a TE of 29 ms. Magnitude and phase images were collected for 20 axial slices, with spatial resolution $1.72 \cdot 1.72 \cdot 5 \text{ mm}^3$, FOV = $220 \cdot 220 \text{ mm}^2$, FA = 60°, SENSE factor = 2.5, bandwidth = 1256 Hz/pixel.

Perfusion measurements for global CBF quantification were carried out using the DSC-MRI protocol: Single-shot GRE EPI at a temporal resolution of 1.24 s. Contrast agent (0.1 mmol/kg, Dotarem, Guerbet, Paris, France) was injected at an injection rate of 5 mL/s followed by a saline flush. In the DSC-MRI experiment, Smart-Exam (Young et al., 2006) was used for planning of the slice orientation.
A pre-bolus administration approach for AIF rescaling was also carried out prior to the conventional DSC-MRI experiment (Knutsson et al., 2014). A pre-bolus dose of contrast agent (0.02 mmol/kg b.w) was injected at a rate of 5 mL/s. Segmented EPI was used to track the pre-bolus passage through the sagittal sinus in one single slice, at a temporal resolution of 0.81 s, in order to acquire a venous output function (VOF). The imaging parameters of the pre-bolus experiment were FOV 220×220 mm², image matrix 128×128, slice thickness 5 mm, EPI factor 7, flip angle 22°, TR 135 ms, TE 15 ms, SENSE factor 2.2.

MRI data post-processing

Estimates of CBF were calculated according to Eq. 7:

\[
CBF = \frac{(1 - H_{\text{large}})R_{\text{max}} \int_{0}^{\infty} C_{t}(t)dt}{\rho(1 - H_{\text{small}}) \int_{0}^{\infty} R(t)dt \cdot 5 \int_{0}^{\infty} \text{VOF}(t)dt}
\]

where the tissue impulse response function R(t) was obtained by block-circulant singular value decomposition deconvolution of measured tissue concentration time curves C_t(t) with an AIF, and R_{\text{max}} is the peak value of R(t). VOF(t) is the first-pass venous concentration curve from the pre-bolus experiment, H_{\text{large}} and H_{\text{small}} are the haematocrit values in large and small vessels, respectively, and ρ is the whole-brain mass density, and the numerical value of \((1 - H_{\text{large}})/[\rho(1 - H_{\text{small}})]\) was set to 0.705 cm³/g. A global AIF, used in the deconvolution, was obtained from middle cerebral artery branches in the Sylvian fissure region. CBF was calculated pixel by pixel, and a global mean CBF value was extracted for calculation of global CMRO₂. Further details of CBF data acquisition and calculation are given by Knutsson et al. (2014).

The HR-GRE phase images with TE=40 ms suffered from severe aliasing effects (which the unwrapping algorithm failed to resolve) near large vessels, and were not suitable for further analysis, leaving only phase images with TE=20 ms (HR-GRE phase images) and TE=29 ms (EPI phase images). These phase images were unwrapped using a region-growing algorithm (Cusack & Papadakis, 2002),
and subsequently filtered to remove background gradients, using the "projection onto dipole fields (PDF)" method (Liu et al., 2011).

ROIs were drawn by hand in both the vein of Galen and in tissue surrounding the vessel (Figure 1). The ROIs included, for the HR-GRE phase images, 1-9 voxels in the vein of Galen and about 120-170 voxels in the background tissue. Due to slice gaps and lower spatial resolution in EPI, the ROIs in the EPI phase images typically included 1-3 voxels in the vein of Galen and about 24-45 voxels in the background tissue. To compensate for the small number of voxels in the EPI vessel ROIs, the ROI was applied to as many of the EPI volumes in the time series as possible (varying from 3 to 13), and a mean phase value over the different time points was extracted.

The angle of the vein of Galen relative the external magnetic field was determined by visual inspection of the HR-GRE image volume (where slices were orthogonal to the main magnetic field) using image-viewing software (ImageJ, 1.47v, Wayne Rasband, National Institutes of Health, USA) (Figure 2). The extracted phase values and the vessel angle were then used to calculate OEF according to Eqs 4-5. The OEF estimates were, in combination with CBF (Eq. 7), subsequently used for calculation of CMRO₂ according to Eq. 6.

Statistics

Repeatability was assessed by comparing visit 1 with visit 2 using the intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) (Two-Way Mixed Model, Consistency, Single Measure). The spread was evaluated by the coefficient of variation (CV). Bland-Altman plots (Bland & Altman, 1986) were used to compare pairs of resulting datasets (i.e., test versus retest and HR-GRE versus EPI). For the HR-GRE versus EPI Bland-Altman analyses, standard deviations were compensated for repeated measurements in each subject (denoted SD_c). In order to further analyze the HR-GRE versus EPI groups, linear correlation analyses of Bland-Altman data as well as t-tests of mean values (two tailed, two sampled, paired) were performed.
Results

The angle between the vein of Galen and the external magnetic field could, for each volunteer, be approximated to 0° in the OEF calculations. The results from the \textit{in vivo} measurements of OEF and CMRO\textsubscript{2} are summarized in Table 1.

HR-GRE phase data as well as EPI phase data provided good OEF repeatability, with ICCs above 0.8, as seen in Table 1 (ICCs of 0.95 and 0.81, respectively). The OEF variability between volunteers, however, was somewhat large for both datasets, as can be seen in Table 1 (CVs of 0.26 and 0.23, for HR-GRE and EPI, respectively). These results imply a slightly larger spread between volunteers in the HR-GRE phase data, and in Fig. 3 a larger range of OEF values can be seen for HR-GRE. Similar conclusions can be drawn regarding the CMRO\textsubscript{2} repeatability, as both HR-GRE and EPI provided high ICCs (0.90 and 0.84, respectively). The CMRO\textsubscript{2} spread between volunteers was, however, heavily increased compared to the OEF spread as can be seen in Table 1 (CVs of 0.40 and 0.33, for HR-GRE and EPI, respectively). In the calculation of CMRO\textsubscript{2}, the same CBF values were used for both HR-GRE and EPI, so the increases in CMRO\textsubscript{2} variability were about the same for both methods, and more or less the same relationship between the two datasets is maintained as for OEF, i.e., a slightly larger spread between volunteers for HR-GRE (\textit{cf.} Figure 4).

The t-tests showed that the HR-GRE population mean values of both OEF and CMRO\textsubscript{2} were significantly higher (p < 0.05) than the corresponding OEF and CMRO\textsubscript{2} estimates extracted from EPI data. The OEF Bland-Altman plot (Figure 5b) clearly visualizes one apparent outlier (>2SD), while most of the OEF and CMRO\textsubscript{2} data points show reasonably small differences between HR-GRE and EPI. However, linear regression analysis of the CMRO\textsubscript{2} Bland-Altman data indicated a correlation coefficient of 0.5 (p<0.05), potentially indicating the presence of a systematic effect or proportional error.
Discussion

The test-retest measure ICC was high (>0.8) for both datasets, for OEF as well as CMRO$_2$, which is encouraging considering that several days passed between the imaging sessions. A time span of several days implies slight differences in position as well as fluctuations in overall physiology and cerebral activity of the volunteers between the different scanning occasions. Hence, the method seems to be consistent on an individual level, for both HR-GRE and EPI phase data. Jain et al. investigated the short-term repeatability of a very similar methodology and observed a slightly higher repeatability (ICC = 0.94) for CMRO$_2$ measurements in the superior sagittal sinus (Jain et al., 2010). These volunteers were instructed to rise and reposition between scans (a total of three scans were preformed) and to stay alert during the scans. It is reasonable to assume that the short time between measurements in the study by Jain et al. explains the slightly higher repeatability compared with the present study.

OEF and CMRO$_2$ show a natural biological variation between subjects (Hattori et al., 2004; Lu & Ge, 2008; Jain et al., 2010; Seubert & Mahla, 2014), related to, for example, differences in age and minor fluctuations associated with current state of stress and cerebral activity. It is still fair, however, to conclude that the investigated MRI method returned an inter-individual OEF variation that was slightly high, for both datasets. This excessive inter-individual spread may partly originate from the fact that measurements had to be conducted with slight differences in geometry and vessel availability between volunteers. The exact choice of voxels to be included in the vessel ROI had considerable impact on the resulting phase, probably due to partial volume effects, and this problem mainly affected measurements in volunteers where the vessel showed limited visibility. Due to the low spatial resolution of EPI data, the vessel was often subjectively more difficult to locate in the EPI images but this did not seem to cause any additional variability. Part of the variability was most likely caused by differences in the anatomy of the volunteers. For example, the infinitely long cylinder approximation might not be appropriate for all volunteers. According to Beuf et al., the ratio of the
vessel length to the vessel diameter should be above 4 (Beuf et al., 1996), and this ratio for the vein of Galen was estimated to be between 2 and 4 in the present material. Additionally, beyond the straight segment, the vessel bends and, for some volunteers, it can run relatively close to the straight segment and this might affect the measured phase. One potential solution to avoid these issues would be to try to find other vessel candidates for phase measurements. One obvious candidate is the superior sagittal sinus, which is often regarded to be the standard location, but this vessel is located very close to the interface between soft tissue and bone, which could affect the phase value and create aliasing issues. Another vessel candidate is the internal jugular vein, but phase images of this vessel are known to suffer from severe susceptibility artifacts because the vessel runs close to the air-filled oral cavity and trachea (Jain et al., 2010). Considering the problems associated with other major veins, in combination with the fact that it was indeed possible to identify a large and fairly straight vessel segment of the vein of Galen in all volunteers, the vein of Galen can still be regarded as a good choice, in spite of the geometry issues, although care must be taken to optimize the imaging conditions. Furthermore, although the superior sagittal sinus is more of a standard choice, the direct comparison between HR-GRE and EPI is still relevant since the same vessel was used for both methods.

The CV for CMRO$_2$ was increased compared with OEF. It is not unrealistic for CMRO$_2$ to show large variability in viable brain tissue, when subjects over a large age interval are studied (Powers et al., 1985). However, a large part of the increased variability can most likely be attributed to the fact that the prebolus-calibrated DSC-MRI CBF data, used to calculate CMRO$_2$ from OEF, also shows substantial inherent variability. The pre-bolus version of DSC-MRI, employed in the present study, is expected to perform better than standard DSC-MRI implementations for quantitation of CBF in absolute terms (Knutsson et al., 2010), but uncertainties related to, for example, manual VOF registration, remaining arterial partial volume effects (affecting the AIF shape), competing T1-weighting effects, T2* relaxivity issues and a potentially non-linear relationship between $\Delta R2^*$ and concentration in whole blood are likely to remain (Knutsson et al., 2014).
Another potential reason for the observed OEF and CMRO₂ variability is that constant literature values of Hct, MCHC and c (cf. Eqs. 4 and 6), related to oxygen content of arterial blood, were employed in this study. Although fixed values have been applied also in similar previous studies of OEF determination (e.g., Haacke et al., 1997; Jain et al., 2010), we acknowledge that actual hematocrit/hemoglobin levels, and thus the oxygen contents, differ between men and women and that inter-subject variations may be considerable. However, our assessment of repeatability as well as comparisons between HR-GRE and EPI, which are the primary scopes of this study, should not be substantially influenced by individual variations in Hct and oxygen content. The variability was, in overall terms, very similar between the two datasets (i.e., HR-GRE vs. EPI), although the CV was slightly higher for HR-GRE, for both OEF and CMRO₂. This small difference might be explained by differences in signal to noise ratio (SNR) and/or partial volume effects between the HR-GRE and EPI datasets.

With regard to absolute levels, the OEF population means extracted from HR-GRE phase data and EPI phase data were both in reasonable agreement with the literature. According to standard text books (Patel et al., 2014) the normal OEF is 0.30-0.45, and studies using MRI (Lu & Ge, 2008; Jain et al., 2010) and PET (Hattori et al., 2004) have reported OEF mean values in the range 0.36-0.39. Hattori et al. reported the full range (min-max) of observed OEF values to be 0.30-0.51. The resulting CMRO₂ mean values were also in agreement with the literature, where text books (Seubert & Mahla, 2014) indicate 3.0-3.5 ml O₂/100g/min (or 125-146 μmol O₂/100g/min) as the normal CMRO₂ level, and MRI (Xu et al., 2009; Jain et al., 2010) and PET (Hattori et al., 2004) methods have resulted in mean values ranging from 2.85 to 3.17 ml O₂/100g/min (or 119-132 μmol O₂/100g/min). In the study by Hattori et al., the full range (min-max) of observed CMRO₂ values was 2.35-3.84 ml O₂/100g/min.

Even though HR-GRE phase data and EPI phase data provided OEF and CMRO₂ mean values in general agreement with the literature, it should still be noted that HR-GRE returned significantly higher values than EPI. When observing the Bland-Altman plots (Figures 5b and 6b), one can see that
the results are in reasonable to good agreement between the two datasets, except for a few data points, where HR-GRE phase data showed unexpectedly high values. The overall slightly lower EPI results (compared with HR-GRE) could potentially be explained by more pronounced EPI partial volume effects and a correspondingly lower average phase value in the voxels of the blood vessel. It is difficult, however, to determine the relevance of this effect since both HR-GRE phase data and EPI phase data produced OEF and \( \text{CMRO}_2 \) values in agreement with the literature. The potential issues with the EPI data could be reduced by minor alterations to the EPI scanning protocol, for example, by slightly increasing the spatial resolution to avoid partial volume effects and by eliminating slice gaps, provided, of course, that acceptable SNR and brain coverage can be maintained. As pointed out above, spread and repeatability, for both OEF and \( \text{CMRO}_2 \), were about the same for HR-GRE and EPI results. This implies that, from these aspects, one would not gain much by performing extra HR-GRE scans after the DSC-MRI protocol. The main discrepancy between HR-GRE and EPI in the obtained results is the significant difference in mean values of both OEF and \( \text{CMRO}_2 \).

It is worth noting that only one TE was available for each dataset (20 ms for HR-GRE and 29 ms for EPI), i.e., no subtraction between phase maps with different TEs was performed. Others have used two phase maps with shorter TEs and subsequently used the difference between the two, to avoid phase bias and aliasing issues (Fernandez-Seara et al., 2006; Shmueli et al., 2009; Jain et al., 2010). A phase bias may thus potentially have existed in our phase maps (e.g., arising due to local differences in conductivity), but it has been argued that the effect of this bias is negligible (Haacke et al., 1997; Haacke et al., 1999). Furthermore, the employed TEs were slightly long, leading to some minor aliasing issues that, for some volunteers, caused an unclear vessel structure in the images which made it difficult to find an appropriate location for the measurements (also causing extra variability between volunteers). To address this problem, and thus increase the accuracy of the estimates, the acquisition protocol could be optimized with regard to vessel imaging, for example, by acquiring several phase images with additional TEs, which would allow for better unwrapping and bias reduction. For the EPI acquisition, this could possibly be obtained by using a double echo in the EPI
sequence, to avoid the need for extra scans. If only one or two TEs are to be used, they should be short, due to the aliasing mentioned above. Another source of error is the ROI positioning and the limited ROI size in vessels. Obviously, the ROIs were selected to be as large as possible, but were constrained by the size and visibility of the vessel. This problem would also be reduced by the improvements suggested above.

In conclusion, both HR-GRE and EPI phase data resulted in absolute global OEF and CMRO$_2$ mean values which were consistent with literature data. EPI-based phase acquisition, within a conventional DSC-MRI protocol, worked reasonably well for quantitative global OEF and CMRO$_2$ assessment and showed generally good correspondence with HR-GRE results (Figs. 5-6) This implies that an extra HR-GRE scan is redundant, alternatively that additional global OEF and CMRO$_2$ data can be obtained from an already existing DSC-MRI perfusion measurement (provided that phase maps are made available from the DSC-MRI experiment).
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Table 1

Population mean value, SD, CV and ICC for OEF and CMRO$_2$ results from HR-GRE as well as EPI. SD and CV are based on mean values of results from visit 1 and visit 2. The required CBF estimates from Knutsson et al. (2014) are also provided for completeness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Mean±SD</th>
<th>CV</th>
<th>ICC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR-GRE</td>
<td>0.40±0.11 %</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPI</td>
<td>0.35±0.08 %</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMRO$_2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR-GRE</td>
<td>134±53 µmol O$_2$/100g/min</td>
<td>3.23±1.26 ml O$_2$/100g/min</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPI</td>
<td>116±37 µmol O$_2$/100g/min</td>
<td>2.79±0.89 ml O$_2$/100g/min</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global mean CBF</td>
<td>Pre-bolus DSC-MRI (Knutsson et al., 2014)</td>
<td>43.6±14.6 ml/100g/min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure captions

**Figure 1.**
Illustration of the placement of a typical (a) background ROI (in blue) and (b) vessel ROI (in green) in the HR-GRE phase images. In (b), a zoomed-in view of the red square in (a) is shown. The corresponding ROIs for the EPI data are shown in (c) and (d). Note that white/black represents a phase value of ±1.5 radians or more in (a) and (c), while white/black corresponds to a phase value of ±3.0 radians or more in (b) and (d).

**Figure 2.**
Illustration of how the angle between the vessel and the external magnetic field was determined. By observing the vein of Galen in three different orientations, the angle could be assessed.

**Figure 3.**
OEF test-retest scatter plots (solid line is line of identity) and Bland-Altman plots calculated from (a, b) HR-GRE phase data and (c, d) EPI phase data.

**Figure 4.**
CMRO₂ test-retest scatter plots (solid line is line of identity) and Bland-Altman plots calculated from (a, b) HR-GRE phase data and (c, d) EPI phase data.

**Figure 5.**
(a) The mean OEF value of visit 1 and visit 2 calculated from EPI phase data plotted against the corresponding value calculated from HR-GRE phase data. The blue line is the line of identity. (b) The x-axis of the Bland-Altman plot illustrates the OEF spread amongst the volunteers. The y-axis shows the OEF difference between HR-GRE and EPI phase data. Linear correlation analysis of the displayed Bland-Altman data indicated that the correlation coefficient r was not significantly different from zero (p>0.05).

**Figure 6.**
(a) The mean CMRO₂ value of visit 1 and visit 2 calculated from EPI phase data plotted against the corresponding value calculated from HR-GRE phase data. The blue line is the line of identity. (b) The x-axis of the Bland-Altman plot illustrates the CMRO₂ spread amongst the volunteers. The y-axis shows the CMRO₂ difference between HR-GRE and EPI phase data. Linear correlation analysis of the displayed Bland-Altman data resulted in r= 0.50 (p=0.025).
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