Transferring principles of solid-state and Laplace NMR to the field of \textit{in vivo} brain MRI
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Abstract. Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) is the primary method for non-invasive investigations of the human brain in health, disease, and development, but yields data that are difficult to interpret whenever the millimeter-scale voxels contain multiple microscopic tissue environments with different chemical and structural properties. We propose a clinically feasible MRI framework to quantify the microscopic heterogeneity of the living human brain as spatially resolved five-dimensional relaxation-diffusion distributions by augmenting a conventional diffusion-weighted imaging sequence with signal encoding principles from multidimensional solid-state nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) spectroscopy, relaxation-diffusion correlation methods from Laplace NMR of porous media, and Monte Carlo data inversion. The high dimensionality of the distribution space allows resolution of multiple microscopic environments within each heterogeneous voxel as well as their individual characterization with novel statistical measures that combine the chemical sensitivity of the relaxation rates with the link between microstructure and the anisotropic diffusivity of tissue water.

1 Introduction

The structure of the brain is shaped by both disease and normal developments on a wide range of length scales. To measure and map the cellular architecture and molecular composition of the living human brain is a challenging experimental endeavor that promises far-reaching implications for both clinical diagnosis and our understanding of normal brain function. Over the last decades, Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) methods have been crucial for the progress of neuroanatomical studies (Lerch et al., 2017). Most clinical MRI applications rely on detecting $^1$H nuclei of water molecules to produce three-dimensional images of the human brain with a spatial resolution on the millimeter scale. Even though the attainable resolution is clearly insufficient for direct observation of individual cells, chemical and cellular features can be investigated by probing their effect on magnetic resonance observables such as nuclear relaxation rates (Halle, 2006) and the translational diffusivity (Callaghan, 2011) of water. Relaxation and diffusion parameters can thus indirectly report on various microscopic
properties, including cell density (Padhani et al., 2009), orientation of nerve fibers (Basser and Pierpaoli, 1996), and presence of nutrients (Daoust et al., 2017). Current quantitative relaxation (Tofts, 2003) and diffusion (Jones, 2010) MRI observables are exquisitely sensitive to the cellular processes associated with knowledge acquisition (Zatorre et al., 2012), neuropsychiatric disorders (Kubicki et al., 2007), and different tumor types (Nilsson et al., 2018a), but suffer from poor specificity and the same experimental data may support several distinct biological scenarios (Zatorre et al., 2012).

More detailed information can be obtained by taking into account that each MRI voxel comprises hundreds of thousands of cells with potentially different properties, implying that the per-voxel signal may include contributions from multiple microenvironments with distinct values of the MRI observables. To resolve the various microenvironments within a single voxel remains a highly challenging problem of vital importance for the progression of quantitative MRI studies. The signals from heterogeneous materials are often approximated as integral transformations of nonparametric distributions of relaxation rates or diffusivities (Istratov and Vyvenko, 1999), which may be estimated by Laplace inversion of data acquired as a function of the relevant experimental variable (Whittall and MacKay, 1989). Within the context of human brain MRI, the components of the distributions have been assigned to water populations residing in specific tissue microenvironments such as myelin (Mackay et al., 1994) and tumors (Laule et al., 2017). The power to resolve and individually characterize the different components can be boosted by combining multiple relaxation- and diffusion-encoding blocks and analyzing the data as joint probability distributions of the relevant observables (English et al., 1991). These ideas follow the principles of multidimensional nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) spectroscopy and form the basis for multidimensional Laplace NMR which has become routine in the field of porous media (Galvosas and Callaghan, 2010;Song, 2013) and is now being combined with MRI (Zhang and Blumich, 2014;Benjamini and Basser, 2017).

Recently, similar relaxation-diffusion correlation protocols have been translated to in vivo studies using model-based rather than nonparametric data inversion (De Santis et al., 2016;Veraart et al., 2017). So far, relaxation-diffusion correlation studies have relied on the Stejskal-Tanner experiment (Stejskal and Tanner, 1965), a spin-echo diffusion-weighted sequence that has been in use for more than 50 years and where the signal is encoded for diffusion along a single axis using a pair of collinear magnetic field gradient pulses. The limitations of the conventional experimental design become apparent when considering a white matter voxel comprising anisotropic domains with multiple orientations. When projected onto the measurement axis defined by the magnetic field gradients, the combination of diffusion anisotropy and orientation dispersion gives rise to a broad distribution of effective diffusivities (Topgaard and Söderman, 2002) that is challenging to retrieve with nonparametric Laplace inversion and, most importantly, impossible to differentiate from a spread of isotropic diffusivities (Mitra, 1995). Consequently, despite the fact that the relaxation-diffusion correlation yields more detailed information than conventional quantitative MRI, the inherent limitations of the Stejskal-Tanner experiment prevent unambiguous discrimination between isotropic and anisotropic contributions to the diffusivity distributions as well as model-free resolution of tissue microenvironments for heterogeneous anisotropic materials such as brain tissue.

We have recently shown that data acquisition and processing schemes for correlating isotropic and anisotropic nuclear interactions in multidimensional solid-state NMR spectroscopy (Schmidt-Rohr and Spiess, 1994) can be translated to
diffusion NMR (de Almeida Martins and Topgaard, 2016), relaxation-diffusion correlation NMR (de Almeida Martins and Topgaard, 2018), and diffusion MRI (Topgaard, 2019), yielding nonparametric diffusion tensor distributions (Jian et al., 2007) with resolution of multiple isotropic and anisotropic diffusion components. These “multidimensional diffusion MRI” methods (Topgaard, 2017) rely on varying both the amplitude and orientation of the magnetic field gradients within a single encoding block in order to mimic the effects of sample reorientation (Frydman et al., 1992) and rotor-synchronized radio frequency pulse sequences (Gan, 1992) in multidimensional solid-state NMR to target specific aspects of the tensorial property being investigated. Here, we incorporate these ideas into a clinically feasible relaxation-diffusion correlation MRI protocol to quantify the microscopic heterogeneity of the living human brain. The suggested acquisition and analysis protocols resolve tissue heterogeneity on a five-dimensional space of transverse relaxation rates and axisymmetric diffusion tensors that report on the underlying chemical composition and microscopic geometry. Nonparametric relaxation-diffusion distributions are obtained for each voxel in the three-dimensional image using Monte Carlo data inversion to deal with the non-uniqueness of the Laplace inversion and estimate the uncertainty of quantitative parameters derived from the distributions (Prange and Song, 2009). Sub-voxel tissue environments are resolved without limiting assumptions on the number or properties of the individual components and characterized with statistical measures that have intuitive relations with the local microstructure.

2 Methods

2.1 Multidimensional relaxation-diffusion encoding

Figure 1A displays a pulse sequence wherein the signal $S(\tau_E, b)$ from a given voxel is encoded for information about the transverse relaxation rate $R_2$ and diffusion tensor $D$ by the experimental variables echo time $\tau_E$ and diffusion encoding tensor $b$ according to (de Almeida Martins and Topgaard, 2018)

$$\frac{S(\tau_E, b)}{S_0} = \int_0^{\tau_E} \int_{\text{Sym}_3} P(R_2, D) K(\tau_E, b, R_2, D) dD dR_2,$$

where $P(R_2, D)$ is a joint probability distribution of $R_2$ and $D$, the kernel $K(\tau_E, b, R_2, D)$ links the acquisition space $(\tau_E, b, R_2, D)$ to the acquisition space $(\tau_E, b, R_2, D)$, $S_0$ denotes the signal amplitude at $(\tau_E = 0, b = 0)$, and Sym$_3$ represents the mathematical space containing all $3 \times 3$ symmetric positive-definite matrices. The two sets of magnetic field gradient waveforms define an axially-symmetric $b$-tensor that is parameterized by its trace ($b$), orientation ($\Theta, \Phi$), and normalized anisotropy ($b_\Delta$) (Eriksson et al., 2015), the latter controlling the influence of diffusion anisotropy on the detected signal in a manner corresponding to the effect of the angle between the main magnetic field and the rotor spinning axis in solid-state NMR (Frydman et al., 1992). While conventional diffusion encoding is limited to a single $b$-tensor “shape” ($b_\Delta = 1$), we have shown that variation of $b_\Delta$ enables model-free separation and quantification of the isotropic and anisotropic contributions to the diffusion tensors (de Almeida Martins and Topgaard, 2016). In this work, we used the numerically optimized gradient waveforms displayed in
Figure 1B (Sjölund et al., 2015) to generate b-tensors at four distinct values of \(b_D\). In common with conventional diffusion MRI, our method requires a minimum echo time of \(\approx 50\) ms to accommodate diffusion encoding, causing the signal contributions from components with \(R_2 < 60\) s\(^{-1}\) to be reduced to less than 5\% of their initial amplitude. This means that the proposed protocol would require substantial signal averaging in order to quantify the fractions of fast relaxing components, thus precluding a mapping of myelin water \((R_2 \approx 70\) s\(^{-1}\)) – one of the primary focuses of early multi-echo MRI methods (Mackay et al., 1994) – within a clinically viable time.

Throughout the signal encoding process, the relaxation and diffusion of water are both affected by molecular exchange between chemically different sites and interactions with cell membranes. Averaging all these complex effects into sets of effective relaxation rates and apparent diffusion tensors, sub-voxel composition can be reported as a collection of independent tissue microenvironments, each of which characterized by a set of \((R_2, \mathbf{D})\) coordinates (de Almeida Martins and Topgaard, 2018). Assuming axial symmetry, the various microscopic diffusion tensors are parameterized by four independent dimensions: two eigenvalues corresponding to the axial and radial diffusivities, \(D_1\) and \(D_\perp\), and the polar and azimuthal angles, \(\theta\) and \(\phi\), describing the orientation of \(\mathbf{D}\) relative to the laboratory frame of reference. The \(D_1\) and \(D_\perp\) diffusivities can be combined to define measures of isotropic diffusivity, \(D_{\text{iso}} = (D_1 + 2D_\perp)/3\), and normalized diffusion anisotropy, \(D_A = (D_1 - D_\perp)/3D_{\text{iso}}\) (Eriksson et al., 2015), which report on the “size” and “shape” of the corresponding microscopic diffusion patterns (Topgaard, 2017). Tissue microscopic heterogeneity is therefore characterized with \(P(R_2, D_{\text{iso}}, D_A, \theta, \phi)\) distributions, whose dimensions directly correspond to those of the 5D acquisition space \((\tau_\ell, b, b_A, \Theta, \Phi)\):

\[
\frac{S(\tau_\ell, b, b_A, \Theta, \Phi)}{S_0} = \int \int \int K(\tau_\ell, b, b_A, \Theta, \Phi, R_2, D_{\text{iso}}, D_A, \theta, \phi) \times P(R_2, D_{\text{iso}}, D_A, \theta, \phi) d\phi \sin \theta \, d\theta \, dD_A \, dD_{\text{iso}} \, dR_2.
\]

The relaxation-diffusion encoding kernel is defined as

\[
K(\ldots) = \exp(-\tau_\ell R_2) \exp(-b_{D_{\text{iso}}} \left[1 + 2b_A P_2(\cos \beta)\right]),
\]

where \(P_2(x) = (3x^2 - 1)/2\) denotes the 2\(^{\text{nd}}\) Legendre polynomial, and \(\beta\) is the arc-angle between the major symmetry axes of \(b\) and \(\mathbf{D}\), given by \(\cos \beta = \cos \Theta \cos \theta + \cos(\Phi - \phi) \sin \Theta \sin \theta\). According to Eq. (3), each \((\tau_\ell, b, b_A, \Theta, \Phi)\) coordinate establishes correlations across the separate dimensions of the \(R_2-\mathbf{D}\) space. Consequently, sampling various combinations of echo times and \(b\)-tensor parameters facilitates a comprehensive mapping of tissue-specific relaxation and diffusion properties.

### 2.2 MRI measurements

A healthy volunteer (female, 31 years) was scanned on a Siemens Magnetom Prisma 3T system equipped with a 20-channel receiver head-coil, and capable of delivering gradients of 80 mT/m at the maximum slew rate of 200 T/(m·s). The
measurements were approved by a local Institutional Review Board (Partners Healthcare System), and the research subject provided written informed consent prior to participation. Experimental data were acquired using the prototype spin-echo sequence (Lasić et al., 2014) and gradient waveforms shown in Figure 1. All images were recorded using a repetition time of 3 s, and an echo-planar readout with a 220×220×66 mm³ field of view, spatial resolution of 2×2×6 mm³, and a partial Fourier factor of 6/8. The depicted waveforms give four distinct \( b \)-tensor anisotropies \( (b_\Delta = \{-0.5, 0.0, 0.5, 1.0\}) \), which were probed at varying combinations of echo-times, \( b \)-values, and \( b \)-tensor orientations. The waveforms giving \( b_\Delta = -0.5, 0.0, \) and \( 0.5 \) (see Figure 1B) were calculated with a numerical optimization package (Sjölund et al., 2015) (https://github.com/jsjo/NOW), including compensation for the effects of concomitant gradients (Szczepankiewicz et al.). This procedure yielded a pair of asymmetric gradient waveforms lasting 30.8 ms and 25.0 ms, separated by approximately 8.0 ms. Linear encoding \( (b_\Delta = 1) \) was implemented with two separate gradient waveforms; a symmetric bipolar gradient waveform whose encoding blocks lasted \( \tau = 25.1 \) ms and were separated by 8.0 ms (see Figure 1B), and a pair of \( \tau = 15.1 \) ms single-pulsed gradients bracketing a time-period of 13.7 ms. The spectral profile of the bipolar gradient waveform was tuned to that of the asymmetric gradient waveforms in order to reduce the influence of time-dependent diffusion (Woessner, 1963; Callaghan and Stepišnik, 1996).

A total of 852 images were recorded at different combinations of \((t_E, b_\Delta, \Theta, \Phi)\) throughout the entire scan time of 45 minutes. The acquisition protocol is summarized in Figure 2A. Briefly, \( b_\Delta = 1 \) was acquired over 72 directions distributed over four \( b \)-values \((6, 10, 16, \) and 40 directions at \( b = 0.1, 0.7, 1.4, \) and \( 2\times10^3 \) sm⁻², respectively), both \( b_\Delta = -0.5, \) and \( 0.5 \) were collected across 64 directions spread out over four \( b \)-values \((6, 10, 16, \) and 32 directions at, respectively, \( b = 0.1, 0.7, 1.4, \) and \( 2\times10^3 \) sm⁻²), and \( b_\Delta = 0 \) was acquired for a single gradient waveform orientation, repeated 6 times over six \( b \)-values \((b = 0.1, 0.3, 0.7, 1, 1.4, \) and \( 2\times10^3 \) sm⁻²). For each \((b, b_\Delta)\) coordinate, the set of directions was optimized using an electrostatic repulsion scheme (Bak and Nielsen, 1997; Jones et al., 1999). The various \((b, b_\Delta, \Theta, \Phi)\) sets were then repeatedly acquired at three different echo-times \((t_E = 80, 110, \) and 150 ms) using the spectrally-tuned waveforms. The non-tuned Stejskal-Tanner waveform was used to acquire \( b_\Delta = 1 \) data at \( t_E = 60 \) and 80 ms. Comparison between data acquired with the bipolar and the Stejskal-Tanner gradient waveforms at \( t_E = 80 \) ms allowed us to assess the validity of the Gaussian diffusion approximation (Callaghan and Stepišnik, 1996). The acquired images were not subjected to any additional corrections (e.g. denoising or motion correction) before data inversion.

2.3 Nonparametric Monte Carlo inversion

Algorithms designed to solve Eq. (2) have been reviewed in both general (Istratov and Vyvenko, 1999) and magnetic resonance (Mitchell et al., 2012) literature. While classical inversion methods can be successfully used to estimate the 5D \( P(R_2, D_{iso}, D_b, \theta, \phi) \) distribution, they become memory costly at the high dimensionality of our protocol. To circumvent this difficulty, we introduced an inversion approach wherein our correlation space is explored through a directed iterative
The algorithm, explained in ref. (de Almeida Martins and Topgaard, 2018). The algorithm starts by randomly selecting 200 points from the \(0 < \log(R_2/s^1) < 1.5, -10 < \log(D_p/m^2s^1) < -8.5, -10 < \log(D_q/m^2s^1) < -8.5, 0 < \cos \theta < 1, 0 < \phi < 2\pi\) space. A discrete \(P(R_2,D)\) distribution is then estimated by solving Eq. (2) via a non-negative least squares algorithm. Points with non-zero weights are stored and subjected to a loop where they sequentially compete with newly generated points in the 5D distribution space. Following 20 rounds, the surviving points are selected and subjected to small random mutations. Another iteration is then initialized, wherein mutated points compete amongst themselves for 20 additional rounds in order to find the local solution with the lowest residual value. A final solution is then estimated by selecting the 10 \((R_2,D_{||},D_{\perp},\theta,\phi)\) coordinates with the highest weights.

The procedure described above is performed voxel-wise, resulting in an array of spatially resolved \(P(R_2,D_{||},D_{\perp},\theta,\phi)\) discrete distributions. Owing to the stochastic nature of the inversion protocol, we may fail at retrieving a non-trivial solution, which produces a small number of randomly located black voxels in the parameter maps. To correct for this, we combine the points from each voxel with the ones from its six nearest-neighbors, subsequently fitting the set of 7×10 points to the underlying signal in order to find the 10 most likely points. The new \((R_2,D_{||},D_{\perp},\theta,\phi)\) set is fitted to the signal, and the resulting \(P(R_2,D)\) is taken as the solution of the analyzed voxel. Finally, the \(P(R_2,D_{||},D_{\perp},\theta,\phi)\) distribution is mapped onto the \((R_2,D_{||},D_{\perp},\theta,\phi)\) space.

Following the works of Prange and Song (Prange and Song, 2009), we replace traditional regularization constraints (Whittall and MacKay, 1989) with an unconstrained Monte Carlo approach that estimates voxel-wise ensembles of \(N\) distinct \(P(R_2,D)\) solutions consistent with the primary data (de Almeida Martins and Topgaard, 2018). In this study, we estimated ensembles of \(N = 96\) solutions per voxel. The level of dispersion within a given solution set characterizes the uncertainty of the inversion procedure, and can thus be used to estimate the uncertainty of any quantities derived from \(P(R_2,D)\) (Prange and Song, 2009; de Almeida Martins and Topgaard, 2018). Readers interested in a MATLAB implementation of the algorithm are directed to our GitHub repository https://github.com/JoaoPdAMartins/md-dmri (Nilsson et al., 2018b).

3 Results

3.1 Spatially-resolved 5D relaxation-diffusion distributions

The proposed acquisition protocol translates into distinctive signal decay curves for each of the main components of the human brain. Indeed, voxels encompassing either white matter WM, gray matter GM, or cerebrospinal fluid CSF, are all characterized by clearly distinct signal patterns (see Figure 2B). The observed differences can be used to infer the gross \(R_2\)-\(D\) properties of the various cerebral constituents: WM signals are highly sensitive to both \(b_3\) and \((\Theta,\Phi)\), indicative of anisotropic diffusion along coherently aligned microscopic domains; GM signal patterns are rather insensitive to \(b_3\) and \((\Theta,\Phi)\), consistent with isotropic diffusion; and CSF data decays quickly with increasing \(b\) while remaining mostly unaffected by the other acquisition variables, features that suggest an isotropic medium characterized by relatively low \(R_2\)-values.
Voxels comprising mixtures of WM, GM, and/or CSF generate patterns that can be interpreted as a superposition of the signal data from the pure components.

Spatially resolved 5D $R_2$-$D$ nonparametric distributions are retrieved from the experimental data using the model-free inversion approach described in the Methods section. Figure 2C displays the solution ensembles for voxels containing WM, GM, and CSF, as well as combinations of those components: WM+GM, WM+CSF, and GM+CSF. Brain tissue possesses various microscopic components, whose relaxation and diffusion properties differ over various orders of magnitude.

Therefore, tissue heterogeneity is more suitably described with logarithmic distributions, where pore anisotropy is parameterized with $\log(D_{||}/D_{\perp})$ instead of $D_\lambda$. The distinctive characters of the raw signal patterns in Figure 2B result in unique voxel-wise distributions that capture the gross microscopic features of the main cerebral components. Namely, CSF is characterized by high $D_{\text{iso}}$, low $R_2$, and $D_{||} \sim D_{\perp}$; in contrast, GM and WM both exhibit lower $D_{\text{iso}}$ and higher $R_2$, with WM being differentiated by its high $D_{||}/D_{\perp}$. As expected, voxels comprising mixtures of WM, GM, and CSF yield a linear combination of the distributions from the individual components.

Voxels containing pure GM or WM yield bimodal and unimodal distributions, respectively, that feature clusters of points covering a significant range of the $R_2$-$D$ space. Because both tissue types comprise a plethora of cells with varying geometries or chemical compositions (e.g., axons with various amounts of myelin, dendrites, or glial cells), the observed spread may be interpreted as a direct consequence of the underlying cellular heterogeneity. However, similar broad distributions were also observed in spectroscopic multidimensional diffusion correlation measurements of discrete-component phantoms (de Almeida Martins and Topgaard, 2016, 2018), hinting that the solution spread additionally reflects the measurement and inversion uncertainty. This intrinsic uncertainty masks the effects of finer cellular details like the intra- and extra-axonal components modeled in previous diffusion-relaxation correlation MRI methods (Veraart et al., 2017). The bimodality of the GM distribution is attributed to the fact that prolate ($D_\lambda > 0, D_{||}/D_{\perp} > 1$) and oblate ($D_\lambda < 0, D_{||}/D_{\perp} < 1$) diffusion tensors with similar $D_{\text{iso}}$ yield signal patterns that are only clearly discerned when $D_\lambda > 0.5$ or, equivalently, $D_{||}/D_{\perp} > 4$ (Eriksson et al., 2015). Earlier MRI studies demonstrated that water diffusion in GM tissue is consistent with a low, yet non-negligible, anisotropy (Assaf, 2018). Our results are consistent with those findings, with the intrinsically low anisotropy preventing a distinction between prolate or oblate solutions, and consequently producing a nearly symmetric spread of components around the $\log(D_{||}/D_{\perp}) = 0$ plane.

### 3.2 Statistical measures of tissue heterogeneity

The $R_2$-$D$ distribution ensembles provide a wealth of information that is challenging to visualize in spatially resolved datasets with large image matrices. Drawing inspiration from the field of porous media, where ensembles of distributions have been converted into ensembles of scalar parameters such as total porosity or fraction of bound fluid (Prange and Song, 2009), we extract statistical measures from the $R_2$-$D$ distributions. A multitude of statistical functionals can be computed from the same distribution, meaning that the per-voxel $P(R_2,D)$ ensembles generate a comprehensive set of distinct voxel-
wise parameters. As shown in Figure 3, the Monte Carlo realizations of $P(R_2, D)$ are translated into ensembles of statistical measures, with 96 individual estimates being extracted for each measure. For compactness, the ensembles of statistical parameters are reduced to an average $\langle \cdot \rangle$ and a dispersion measure $\sigma[\cdot]$ that is interpreted as the uncertainty of the estimated functional (Prange and Song, 2009). To render the results more robust to outliers, we report $\langle \cdot \rangle$ as the ensemble median and estimate $\sigma[\cdot]$ as a median absolute deviation. The calculation of averages (as measured by the median) reduces the underlying ensemble of solutions into a single scalar, and allows us to convey intra-voxel composition with parameter maps of average mean values $\langle E[x] \rangle$, average variances $\langle \text{Var}[x] \rangle$ and average covariances $\langle \text{Cov}[x,y] \rangle$ of all the relevant dimensions of the 5D $R_2$-$D$ space (see Figure 3). All of the statistical measures derived in this work parameterize diffusion tensor anisotropy with $D_2$, rather than $D_\lambda$; this is motivated by the intrinsic difficulty of distinguishing between prolate and oblate tensors (Eriksson et al., 2015).

The three maps in the first column of Figure 3 provide a rough spatial overview of the principal tissue types: $\langle E[R_2] \rangle$ and $\langle E[D_{\text{iso}}] \rangle$ clearly identify CSF-rich areas (low $\langle E[R_2] \rangle$ and high $\langle E[D_{\text{iso}}] \rangle$), while high $\langle E[D_2^2] \rangle$ values separate WM from the two other main cerebral tissues. However, mean parameter maps alone cannot identify or characterize intra-voxel heterogeneity, and their use should be complemented with dispersion measures including, but not limited to, the (co)variance elements displayed in columns 2 and 3 of Figure 3. For example, voxels surrounding the ventricles do not show a truly distinctive feature in maps of mean values but are characterized by non-zero covariance matrix elements. To understand the origin of the non-zero values, let us focus on the WM+CSF and GM+CSF voxels indicated in Figure 3. The corresponding $P(R_2, D)$ distributions (displayed in Figure 2C) comprise two populations at distant ($R_2, D_{\text{iso}}$) coordinates, and both voxels are thus characterized by high values of $\text{Var}[R_2]$ and $\text{Var}[D_{\text{iso}}]$ (see histograms of Figure 3). As CSF and GM are both characterized by a low anisotropy, GM+CSF exhibits low values of $\text{Var}[D_2]$; in contrast, WM+CSF displays a significant dispersion along $D_\lambda$, which results in high $\text{Var}[D_\lambda]$ values. Covariance measures inform about the correlations across the various dimensions of the $R_2$-$D$ space. In WM+CSF distributions, for instance, higher values of diffusion anisotropy are correlated with higher $R_2$ and lower $D_{\text{iso}}$, which results in positive $\text{Cov}[R_2,D_\lambda]$ and negative $\text{Cov}[D_{\text{iso}},D_\lambda]$. The elevated $\langle \text{Var}[R_2] \rangle$ and $\langle \text{Var}[D_{\text{iso}}] \rangle$, and negative $\langle \text{Cov}[R_2,D_{\text{iso}}] \rangle$ values found in the ventricular regions are thus interpreted as a product of sub-voxel combinations of CSF with other components. A combination of high $\langle \text{Var}[D_\lambda] \rangle$, positive $\langle \text{Cov}[R_2,D_\lambda] \rangle$, and negative $\langle \text{Cov}[D_{\text{iso}},D_\lambda] \rangle$ locate WM+CSF voxels in those same regions, while low values of $\langle \text{Var}[D_\lambda] \rangle$ indicate the existence of deep gray matter in the vicinity of the ventricles.

The maps displayed in Figure 3 can also be used to identify voxels containing WM+GM mixtures. Because WM and GM distributions are characterized by similar values of $R_2$ and $D_{\text{iso}}$, WM+GM voxels result in nearly zero values of $\text{Var}[R_2]$, $\text{Var}[D_{\text{iso}}]$, $\text{Cov}[D_{\text{iso}},y]$ and $\text{Cov}[R_2,y]$. Instead, WM+GM voxels are signaled by finite values of $\langle \text{Var}[D_\lambda] \rangle$, originated by the $\log(D_0/D_\lambda)$ spread observed in the underlying $R_2$-$D$ distribution (see the WM+GM distribution in Figure 3C).
3.3 Bin-resolved metrics of tissue heterogeneity

A more detailed picture of intra-voxel heterogeneity is obtained by dividing the distribution space into smaller subspaces (‘bins’). Based on the diffusion properties of $P(R_2;D)$ distributions from voxels containing a single tissue type, we define three bins that loosely correspond to the main brain components (see Figure 4A). The ‘Big’ bin ($-3.5 < \log(D_{iso}/m^2s^{-1}) < 3.5$, $-8.7 < \log(D_{iso}/m^2s^{-1}) < -8$, $-0.5 < \log(R_2/s^{-1}) < 2$) contains CSF contributions, whereas the ‘Thin’ ($0.6 < \log(D_{iso}/m^2s^{-1}) < 3.5$, $-10 < \log(D_{iso}/m^2s^{-1}) < -8.7$, $-0.5 < \log(R_2/s^{-1}) < 2$) bins capture the signal fractions from WM and GM, respectively. The names ‘Big’, ‘Thin’, and ‘Thick’ are inspired by the geometric properties of the microscopic diffusion tensors that are captured by each individual bin. Visual inspection of Figure 4B reveals that the spatial distributions of the three bins are consistent with the expected distributions of the corresponding tissues, providing more evidence that the coarsely defined bins allow a separation of the main cerebral constituents. Parameter maps of the per-bin means of the relaxation and diffusion properties are more straightforwardly interpreted than the heterogeneity measures derived from the entire distribution space: for example, the deep gray matter inferred in the previous paragraph is easily identifiable at the center (white arrows) of the ‘Thick’ maps of Figure 4B. Further, the correlations across the various dimensions of the diffusion space allow the resolution of subtle differences in relaxation rates. Focusing on the first column of Figure 4B, we notice that the ‘Thick’ fraction exhibits a slightly lower $R_2$ rate than that of the ‘Thin’ fraction. This behavior is in accordance with previous literature (Tofts, 2003) and is consistently observed across the entire slice.

Global and bin-resolved averages for all the analyzed voxels of the entire 3D image matrix are compiled in Figure 5, where per-voxel average means of $R_2$, $D_{iso}$, and $D_{ax}^2$ are plotted against their respective uncertainties, $\sigma[E[R_2]]$, $\sigma[E[D_{iso}]]$, and $\sigma[E[D_{ax}^2]]$, and average signal amplitudes $\langle S_0 \rangle$. Although the displayed statistical analysis is restricted to mean values, similar calculations can be done using any other scalar measure derived from the 5D $R_2$-$D$ distributions. Examination of the scatter plots in Figure 5 shows that microscopic populations with low signal fractions generate statistical measures with significantly higher uncertainties. While no immediate correlation is discerned between the estimated mean values and their corresponding uncertainty, the negative correlation between uncertainty and signal fractions introduces a significant dispersion of $\langle E[x] \rangle$ at $\langle S_0 \rangle / \max(\langle S_0 \rangle) < 0.1$ (see, for example, the $D_{iso}$ scatterplots for the “Thin” and “Thick” populations).

Despite the lower precision at low $\langle S_0 \rangle$, the various average mean values are observed to be nearly constant throughout the $\langle S_0 \rangle / \max(\langle S_0 \rangle) > 0.1$ region; the only exception is $\langle E[D_{ax}^2] \rangle$ for the ‘Thin’ fraction, which shows a higher susceptibility to noise as evidenced by its positive correlation with $\langle S_0 \rangle$.

The minor differences between the relaxation rates of the ‘Thin’ and ‘Thick’ components are also observed in the scatter plots of Figure 5. A more detailed analysis shows that distinct $R_2$-rates can be consistently detected in voxels containing GM+WM mixtures (see Figure 6A), where conventional 1D $R_2$ distributions fail to resolve the subtle differences between components (Whittall et al., 1997). The second and third columns of Figure 6A display mixed voxels, where the ‘Thin’ and
‘Thick’ populations each account for at least 30% of the total measured signal. Approximately 75% of the mixed voxels exhibit $R_2$ differences greater than the estimated uncertainties, thus providing evidence that the differentiation between the $R_2$-rates of the two bins is indeed a meaningful result.

All bin-resolved $\langle E[R_2]\rangle$ plots in Figure 5 display a secondary cluster at high $R_2$-values. Inspection of Figure 6B reveals that the fast relaxing cluster corresponds to the non-masked extra-meningeal tissues and, for the ‘Thin’ fraction, to the pallidum (region 1 in Figure 6B), a major component of the basal ganglia structures located deep in the brain. We also observe that the $\langle E[R_2]\rangle$ map of the ‘Thick’ component features three main $R_2$ populations: high $R_2$ in the skull region (red voxels), low $R_2$ in peripheral brain regions (green voxels), and intermediate $R_2$ values in the inner brain regions (yellow voxels). The various populations within the ‘Thick’ bin motivate the demarcation of three separate $R_2$ regions within the $(-3.5 < \log(D_H/D_L) < 0.6$, $-10 < \log(D_{iso}/m^2/s) < -8.7)$ space; we then define the ‘Low’ ($-0.5 < \log(R_2/s^2) < 1.2$), ‘Medium’ ($1.2 < \log(R_2/s^2) < 1.4$), and ‘High’ ($1.4 < \log(R_2/s^2) < 2$) sub-bins of Figure 6C. To assign cerebral components to each of the sub-bins, we compare bin-resolved maps with a high-resolution longitudinal relaxation ($R_1$) weighted image segmented in four tissue classes: WM, cortical GM, deep GM, and CSF. As evidenced by Figure 6C, the spatial distributions of the ‘Low’, and ‘Medium’ sub-fractions roughly correspond to the expected distributions of cortical GM, and deep GM structures, respectively. Despite the similarities between bin-resolved and segmentation maps, the former possesses a grainier appearance and seem to miss a significant portion of deep GM tissue at the center of the slice. While the grainier aspect is caused by the higher noise of the $R_2$-D correlation dataset, the absence of central GM is explained by the presence of anisotropic tissues in structures such as the pallidum (region 1 in Figure 6B) and the thalamus (region 2 in Figure 6B). Those two deep GM structures may then be contained within the ‘Thin’ bin, and not within the ‘Thick’ bin from which we defined the $R_2$ sub-spaces. Joining the contributions of cortical and deep GM within a single tissue class offers further insight on the link between microscopic tissue composition and binning (see Figure 6D). Comparing the 3-tissue segmentation with maps of the ‘Big’, ‘Thin’, and ‘Thick’ fractions confirms that the pallidum and part of the thalamus are captured by the ‘Thin’ bin. The two maps of Figure 6D also demonstrate that the ‘Big’, ‘Thin’, and ‘Thick’ bins are indeed capable of resolving the contributions from CSF, WM, and GM, respectively.

4 Discussion and Conclusions

The proposed framework resolves intra-voxel heterogeneity on a 5D space of transverse relaxation rates $R_2$ and diffusion tensor parameters ($D_{iso}, D_H, \theta, \phi$). Per-voxel brain composition is broken down into a non-predefined number of microscopic environments with clearly distinct relaxation and diffusion properties. The heterogeneity within a voxel is thus resolved as linear combinations of independent microscopic components that can be assigned to local tissue environments; on a global scale, the sub-voxel environments can be grouped into more general tissue classes. For healthy brain tissue, the detected microenvironments were classified into three broad bins whose diffusion properties respectively match those of the main
constituents of the brain: WM, GM, and CSF. The separation between contributions from the three bins provides a clean 3D mapping of WM, GM, and CSF that agrees well with a conventional $R_1$-based tissue segmentation. Unlike automatic segmentation approaches, our protocol resolves tissue environments on a continuous scale defined by microscopic MRI properties, thereby allowing for a natural mapping of heterogeneity within a single tissue class, e.g., resolving anisotropic and isotropic regions within the thalamus. Hence, the presented protocol shows promise for neuroanatomy studies dealing with specific microscopic features such as nerve fiber tracking or free water mapping (Pasternak et al., 2009). Within a clinical setting, the ability to disentangle different tissue signals is expected to be useful for pathological conditions associated with intra-voxel tissue heterogeneity, e.g., tumor infiltration in surrounding brain tissue, inflammation of cerebral tissue, or replacement of myelin with free water. In the latter example, the proposed echo-times lead to an almost complete decay of the signal contributions from myelin domains, meaning that the effects of axonal demyelination would have to be probed indirectly by tracking a reduction of the signal fraction from anisotropic sub-voxel components. Besides resolving the various microscopic domains within a voxel, we were also capable of observing subtle differences in component-specific relaxation rates. As mentioned before, this information is unattainable with classical $R_2$ distribution protocols (Whittall et al., 1997), and its extraction relies on both the high dimensionality of our diffusion-encoding scheme and the sparsity of the $(R_2, D_{iso}, D_{D}, \theta, \phi)$ space (de Almeida Martins and Topgaard, 2018). The measurement of $D$-resolved transverse relaxation rates may complement previous work on tract-specific $R_1$ rates (De Santis et al., 2016).

At the cellular level, the translational dynamics of water inside the human brain is shaped by interactions with macromolecules and partially permeable membranes forming compartments with barrier spacings ranging from nanometers for synaptic vesicles and myelin sheaths to micrometers for the plasma membranes of the axons. The diffusion of water during the 0.1 s time-scale of MRI signal encoding is thus affected by a myriad of complex phenomena that are not explicitly accounted for in Eq. (2). Instead, we use the well-established approach of approximating the micrometer-scale water displacements as a distribution of anisotropic Gaussian contributions (Jian et al., 2007). The measured diffusivities may depend on the exact choice of experimental variables if the timing parameters of the gradient waveforms match the characteristic time-scales of displacements between cellular barriers (Woessner, 1963) or molecular exchange between tissue environments with distinctly different diffusion properties (Kärger, 1969). By augmenting our acquisition protocol with an experimental dimension in which the spectral profiles of the gradient waveforms are comprehensively varied (Callaghan and Stepišnik, 1996), microscopic barrier spacings could in principle be estimated by explicitly including the effects of restricted diffusion in the kernel of Eq. (2). Here we chose to minimize the influence of time-dependence by designing waveforms with similar gradient-modulation spectra.

In the previous section, we mentioned that prolate ($D_\Delta > 0$) and oblate ($D_\Delta < 0$) diffusion tensors with $|D_\Delta| < 0.5$ result in similar signal decays (Eriksson et al., 2015). In the absence of orientational order, diffusion tensor anisotropy is detected as a deviation from a mono-exponential signal-decay, which, to first order, is proportional to $D_\Delta^2$ (Eriksson et al., 2015). Consequently, the magnitude of $D_\Delta$ can be easily determined at moderate $b$-values while the sign may require data acquired
with $b$-values up to $4 \times 10^9$ sm$^{-2}$ (Eriksson et al., 2015) and echo-times comparable to the ones registered in this work; currently, such acquisition parameters can only be achieved with a specialized scanner (Jones et al., 2018).

Resolving and separately characterizing intra- and extra-axonal compartments in brain tissue has been of long-standing interest in the MRI field (Does, 2018). Recently, Veraart et al. (Veraart et al., 2017) estimated subtle differences in $R_2$ and diffusivity parameters for the intra- and extra-axonal components of human brain white matter by applying a constrained two-component model to data acquired with a conventional relaxation-diffusion correlation protocol relying on the Stejskal-Tanner experiment. The obtained $R_2$-values differ with less than a factor of two while the $D_{iso}$-values are nearly identical and the $D_A$-values are 1 (by constraint) and approximately 0.5 for the intra- and extra-cellular compartments, respectively. Comparing with the non-parametric distributions in Figure 2, we note that components with such similar properties would be virtually impossible to resolve in our minimally constrained approach despite the additional information added by the $b$-tensor shape dimension. The limited resolution is consistent with the fact that Eq. (2) states an ill-posed inverse problem accommodating multiple non-unique solutions – probably also including the one with two ‘Thin’ components as assumed by Veraart et al. We suggest that the unconstrained inversion could be used as a first analysis tool to define the boundaries of a more ambitious model incorporating additional information, e.g. from microanatomy studies that is not directly observable in the MRI data.

This work introduces and demonstrates a novel MRI framework, in which the microscopic heterogeneity of the living human brain is characterized via 5D correlations between the transverse relaxation rate $R_2$, isotropic diffusivities $D_{iso}$, normalized diffusion anisotropy $D_A$, and diffusion tensor orientation ($\theta, \phi$). The correlations allow model-free estimation of per-voxel relaxation-diffusion distributions $P(R_2, D)$ that combine the chemical sensitivity of $R_2$ with the link between microstructure and the diffusion metrics. The rich information content of $P(R_2, D)$ is reported through a set of 21 unique maps obtained by binning and parameter calculation in the 5D distribution space. Being specific to different tissue types while relying on few assumptions, the presented protocol shows promise for explorative neuroscience studies in which microscopic tissue composition cannot be presumed $a$ $priori$. While the data in the main text is acquired with a 45 min protocol that is incompatible with the time frame of clinical MRI, the supplementary material includes parameter maps obtained with an abbreviated protocol in just 15 min. By including multi-band acquisition schemes we expect to speed up the acquisition to a clinically viable time of less than 10 min (Barth et al., 2016). Furthermore, the presented framework can be merged with MRI fingerprinting methodology (Ma et al., 2013), whose pattern matching algorithms may considerably boost the data inversion speed.
Data and Code availability

The software analysis tools discussed in this paper are available for downloading from a public GitHub repository: https://github.com/JoaoPdAMartins/md-dmri (Nilsson et al., 2018b). The presented in vivo data may be directly requested from the authors.
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**Figure 1** Acquisition protocol for 5D relaxation-diffusion MRI. (A) Pulse sequence for acquiring images encoded for relaxation and diffusion in a 5D space defined by the echo time $t_E$, and $b$-tensor trace $b$, normalized anisotropy $b_D$, and orientation $(\Theta, \Phi)$. An EPI image readout block acquires the spin-echo produced by slice-selective $90^\circ$ and $180^\circ$ radio-frequency pulses. The $180^\circ$ pulse is encased by a pair of gradient waveforms allowing for diffusion encoding according to principles from multidimensional solid-state NMR (Topgaard, 2017) (red, green, and blue lines). The signal is encoded for the transverse relaxation rate $R_2$ by varying the value of $t_E$. (B) Numerically optimized gradient waveforms (Sjölund et al., 2015) yielding four distinct $b$-tensor shapes ($b_D = -0.5, 0.0, 0.5,$ and $1$) (Eriksson et al., 2015).
Figure 2 Representative 5D relaxation-diffusion encoded signals $S(t_E,b)$ and distributions $P(R_2,D)$ for selected voxels in a living human brain. (A) Acquisition scheme showing $t_E$, $b$, $b_0$, $\Theta$, and $\Phi$ as a function of acquisition point. (B) Experimental (gray circles) and fitted (black points) $S(t_E,b)$ signals from three representative voxels containing white matter (WM), gray matter (GM), and cerebrospinal fluid (CSF). The presented signal data was acquired according to the scheme shown in panel A and is drawn with the same horizontal axis. (C) Nonparametric $R_2$-$D$ distributions obtained for both pure (WM, GM, CSF) and mixed (WM+GM, WM+CSF, GM+CSF) voxels. The discrete distributions are reported as scatter plots in a 3D space of the logarithms of the transverse relaxation rate $R_2$, isotropic diffusivity $D_{iso}$, and axial-radial diffusivity ratio $D_{|a|}/D_{|r|}$. The diffusion tensor orientation ($\theta,\phi$) is color-coded as $[R,G,B] = [\cos \phi \sin \theta, \sin \phi \sin \theta, \cos \theta] \cdot |D_{|a|}-D_{|r|}|/\max(D_{|a|},D_{|r|})$ and the circle area is proportional to the statistical weight of the corresponding component. The contour lines on the sides of the plots represent projections of the 5D $P(R_2,D)$ distribution onto the respective 2D planes. Panels (B) and (C) display the signals $S(t_E,b)$ and corresponding $P(R_2,D)$, respectively, for the same WM, GM, and CSF voxels.
Figure 3 Statistical measures derived from the relaxation-diffusion distributions. The ensemble of 96 distinct $P(R_2,D)$ solutions was used to calculate means $E[x]$, variances $\text{Var}[x]$ and covariances $\text{Cov}[x,y]$ of all combinations of transverse relaxation rate $R_2$, isotropic diffusivity $D_{iso}$, and squared anisotropy $D_{D2}$. The statistical measures were all derived from the entire $R_2$-$D$ distribution space on a voxel-by-voxel basis. Histograms are used to represent the parameter sets calculated for three voxels containing binary mixtures of white matter WM, grey matter GM, and cerebrospinal fluid CSF. Each histogram comprises 96 estimates of a single statistical measure. The averages of statistical measures, $\langle E[x] \rangle$, $\langle \text{Var}[x] \rangle$ and $\langle \text{Cov}[x,y] \rangle$, are displayed as parameter maps whose color scales are given by the bars along the abscissas of the histograms. The crosses and arrows identify the heterogeneous voxels analyzed in the histograms; notice that the signaled points correspond to the average (as measured by the median) of the ensembles of plausible solutions shown in the histograms.
Figure 4 Parameter maps with bin-resolved means of the relaxation-diffusion distributions. (A) Division of the $R_2$-D distribution space into different bins. The distribution space was separated into three bins (gray volumes) named ‘Big’, ‘Thin’, and ‘Thick’ that loosely capture the diffusion features of cerebrospinal fluid CSF, white matter WM, and gray matter GM, respectively. The 3D scatter plots display the nonparametric $R_2$-D distributions corresponding to the CSF (top), WM (middle), and GM (bottom) voxels selected in Figure 2. Superquadratic tensor glyphs are used to illustrate the representative D captured by each bin. (B) Parameter maps of average per-bin means (color) of transverse relaxation rate $\langle E[R_2]\rangle / s^{-1}$, isotropic diffusivity $\langle E[D_{iso}]\rangle$, squared anisotropy $\langle E[D_{is}]^2\rangle$, and diffusion tensor orientation $\langle E[Orientation]\rangle$. The orientation maps (column 4) are color-coded as $[R,G,B] = [D_{xx}, D_{yy}, D_{zz}]/\max(D_{xx}, D_{yy}, D_{zz})$, where $D_{ii}$ are the diagonal elements of laboratory-framed average diffusion tensors estimated from the various distribution bins. Brightness indicates the signal fractions corresponding to the ‘Big’ (row 1), ‘Thin’ (row 2), and ‘Thick’ (row 3) bins. The white arrows identify deep gray matter structures.
Figure 5 Uncertainty estimation of the statistical measures derived from the relaxation-diffusion distributions. 3D density (color) scatter plots show the relationship between average initial signal intensity ($S_0$), the average of mean values derived from the $R_2$-$D$ distributions $\langle E[R_2] \rangle$ (row 1), isotropic diffusivity $\langle E[D_{iso}] \rangle$ (row 2), and squared anisotropy $\langle E[D_{D2}] \rangle$ (row 3) were computed from all voxels whose $S_0$ was greater than 5% of max($S_0$). The resulting dataset comprises 55327 voxels spread throughout all slices of the acquired 3D volume. The uncertainties of $\langle E[R_2] \rangle$, $\langle E[D_{iso}] \rangle$, and $\langle E[D_{D2}] \rangle$ correspond to the median absolute deviation between measures extracted from 96 independent solutions of Equation (2): $\sigma[\langle E[R_2] \rangle]$, $\sigma[\langle E[D_{iso}] \rangle]$, and $\sigma[\langle E[D_{D2}] \rangle]$, respectively. All displayed data was derived from both the entire $R_2$-$D$ space (column 1), and the ‘Big’ (column 2), ‘Thin’ (column 3), and ‘Thick’ (column 4) bins defined in Figure 4A.
Figure 6 Per-bin relaxation properties and tissue composition. (A) Transverse relaxation properties specific to each of the ‘Thin’ (red) and ‘Thick’ (green) bins defined in Figure 4A. The color-coded composite images (top) and histograms (bottom) display the fractional populations and average mean transverse relaxation values $\langle E[R_2] \rangle$ of the two bins. The first column displays all of the ‘Thin’ and ‘Thick’ voxels, while the two other columns focus on ‘Thin’+‘Thick’ mixtures wherein the bin-specific $\langle E[R_2] \rangle$ values exhibit either significant (second column) or non-significant (third column) differences. (B) Bin-resolved signal fractions (brightness) and average per-bin means (color) of $R_2$, and squared anisotropy $D_2$. Regions 1 and 2 identify microstructural properties singled-out in the Results section. (C) Subdivision of the ‘Thick’ bin into three different $R_2$ sub-spaces. The contributions from different sub-bins are compared with a high-resolution $R_1$-weighted image segmented into four different tissues: white matter WM, cortical gray matter GM, deep GM, and cerebrospinal fluid CSF. Additive color maps display the spatial distribution of sub-bin fractions (from low to high $R_2$: green, red, blue), and of cortical (green) and deep (red) GM. (D) Color-coded composite images showing the contributions of different bins (red=Thin, green=Thick, blue=Big) and conventional $R_1$-based segmentation labels (red=WM, green=cortical+deep GM, blue=CSF).
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