Fat-suppression failure artifacts simulating pathology on frequency-selective fat-suppression MR images of the head and neck.
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Purpose: To describe fat-suppression failure artifacts and to caution against their misinterpretation. 
Method: Magnetic-susceptibility artifacts were studied in a phantom model and the results were compared to MR images obtained in clinical cases. Findings: Artifacts manifested themselves as regions of focal fat-suppression failure and appeared as bright signals without geometric distortions at magnetic-susceptibility interfaces along the static field (z) direction. The location and extent of these artifacts were independent of either frequency or phase-encoding direction and are different from those observed in gradient-echo images. Conclusion: In representative clinical MR exams, these artifacts were identified in the high nasopharynx and low orbit and should not be misinterpreted as pathology.
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Fat-suppression magnetic resonance (MR) imaging is a recently available technique that can distinguish the signal of fat from water and diminish chemical shift misregistration artifacts. This technique has been applied to several areas of the body and has been found useful for the detection and delineation of pathology. Fat-suppression techniques are particularly valuable in regions where nonfatty tissues are surrounded by fat (ie, the orbit, head and neck, and spine), since the high signal intensity of fat can often obscure adjacent pathologic processes.

A variety of fat-suppression techniques have been described, including those based on chemical shift-selective presaturation pulses (1–8), phase-difference discrimination (9–13), saturation of signals from short T1-relaxation tissue (14–16), and variation of frequency encoding gradients (17–18). Fat suppression with frequency-selective presaturation is a simple and valuable technique that requires minor modification of the standard multislice spin-echo technique, but no additional postprocessing. However, focal failure of fat suppression can occur with this technique, which results in high signal at the air/fat interfaces. The main purpose of this report is to describe this artifact so that it is not misinterpreted as pathology. In this study, both specially designed phantom and clinical studies are presented.

Materials and Methods

All images were obtained on a 1.5-T superconducting magnet (General Electric Medical Systems, Milwaukee, WI; 4.0 Advantage). The fat-suppression technique used in this study is achieved by means of a frequency-selective presaturation pulse centered on the fat resonance followed by a homospoil gradient (6–8). The presaturation pulse converts the bulk z-magnetization of fat into xy-magnetization, whereas the water magnetization remains along the z-axis (the physical z axis is aligned parallel to the long axis of the magnet bore in our superconducting magnet). A homospoil slice-selection gradient is then applied, which dephases the xy-magnetization of fat. Thus no coherent
magnetization of fat remains. At this point, implementation of the usual spin-echo sequence gives only signals that originate from the water peak. The presaturation and homospoil gradient are repeated immediately before the beginning of each excitation pulse of a given repetition time (TR), insuring that no longitudinal magnetization from the saturated fat is present. The presaturation pulse and homospoil gradient precede each slice-selective pulse in the multislice sequence.

For the phantom studies, T1-weighted SE images (600/20/2 (TRmsec/TEmsec/excitations)) sequences and T2-weighted SE images (2000/80/1) were obtained with fat-suppression technique in axial, coronal, and sagittal planes. Three fields of view (FOV) (16, 20, and 30 cm) were tested. A 256 × 192 matrix size was used in conjunction with a standard head coil. The slice thickness was 5 mm, with a 1.5-mm gap.

The phantom consisted of three plastic containers of different sizes. An innermost, empty container was fixed within the middle-sized container of vegetable oil. An outermost container was filled with saline. This phantom provided air/fat and fat/water interfaces respectively (Fig. 1). The fact that the fat/water/air interfaces used in the phantom are not contiguous but are actually separated by thin layers of plastic results in a model that is not "perfect." For the purposes of this paper, we accept this limitation as not being unlike the clinical situations that we encounter.

In addition, MR scans of two patients with this artifact who were being examined for unrelated pathology are included as clinical examples.

**Results**

Phantom images showed artifacts manifested as regions of fat-suppression failure at the air/fat interfaces along the static magnetic-field direction (z-direction). This occurred regardless of the image acquisition plane. Fat signal at the air/fat interfaces along the xy-direction was completely suppressed (Fig. 2). The focal fat-suppression failure was not associated with any geometric distortions. The location and extent of this artifact were independent of either phase encoding or frequency axis.

Conventional chemical shift-misregistration errors were seen along fat/water interfaces along the frequency-encoded axis. They were independent of the fat-suppression failure artifacts (Fig. 3).

The fat-suppression failure artifacts were observed in both T1- and T2-weighted fat-suppression images to the identical extent, implying that they are independent of pulse-sequence timing considerations. The extent of the artifact was independent of gradient amplitude along xy-direction, since no significant change of the artifact was identified with varying the FOV (Fig. 4). This is in distinction to the chemical shift-misregistration-
tion errors that increased as the gradient amplitude was lowered to produce larger FOVs. (Fig. 4). By repositioning the phantom such that one air/fat interface was in the center of the head coil and the other was at the edge of the coil along the z-direction, the artifact still appeared at the same location (Fig. 5). This result suggests that the artifact appearance is not related to the position of the phantom relative to the isocenter of the magnet.

On fat-suppression MR images of the skull base, artifactual high signal was observed at the junction of well-pneumatized sphenoid sinus and bone marrow of clivus (Fig. 6). However, the signal from the fat posterior to the antrum, which is not oriented along the z (craniocaudal) axis relative to the maxillary antrum, was well-suppressed. In another example of fat-suppression MR images of the orbital region, bright signal was identified in the retrobulbar space. This could be mistaken for orbital pathology (Fig. 7), but is due to the artifact at the high-susceptibility interface between air and fat. The orbital fat in this area was located above (along the z axis) the maxillary sinus. These artifacts were identified at the inferior aspect of orbital fat as well as the bone marrow of the skull base in cases with well-developed paranasal sinuses and large pharyngeal airway.

**Discussion**

In this study, phantom and clinical MR images demonstrated potentially confusing focal fat-suppression failure along the static magnetic-field direction where there are large differences in magnetic susceptibility between adjacent regions. This artifact was most troublesome in areas of the nasopharynx and orbits because of their craniocaudal (static magnetic-field direction) orientation in superconducting magnets relative to the paranasal sinuses and nasopharynx. These focal fat-suppression failures are confusing and could simulate pathology in these regions. Our results are largely observational and this paper does not purport to develop a definitive basic understanding of the mechanisms of this artifact.

We hypothesize that this artifact arises from resonant-frequency shifts due to focal magnetic-field inhomogeneity at the air/tissue interfaces, which result in partial local failure of the presaturation pulse. Magnetic-field homogeneity is distorted where adjacent tissues differ greatly in magnetic susceptibility, because spatial variations in magnetic susceptibility produce intrinsic magnetic gradients in these regions. The majority of tissues in the body have a slightly negative sus-
ceptibility and are called diamagnetic (weaken the applied magnetic field). However air has only about 1/1000 the susceptibility of most solids (19). This large difference results in air representing the equivalent of a source of negative magnetization compared with tissue. Therefore, focal magnetic-field inhomogeneity can occur due to intrinsic field gradients across the imaging voxel.

The intrinsic gradient causes shift of the actual resonant frequency of the protons in fat and results in the failure of frequency-selective presaturation pulses. The reason that this artifact was only observed along the static magnetic-field direction is not entirely understood, but may be related to the fact that the static magnetic field of the system is usually two to three orders of magnitude greater than magnetic-field gradients.

The fat-suppression failure artifact that we are describing is different from other forms of magnetic susceptibility artifacts that occur along the frequency-encoded or readout axis. The so called “magnetic-susceptibility artifact” is characterized by geometric distortion of the object along the frequency-encoding axis and signal loss due to rapid-spin dephasing caused by focal magnetic-field inhomogeneity (20-22). This is more pronounced in gradient recalled-echo images than in spin-echo images because of the lack of the 180° refocusing pulse in the former techniques. The artifacts observed in frequency-selective fat-suppression images were due to resonant-frequency shifts caused by focal magnetic-field inhomogeneity. Focal fat-suppression failure showed no significant change with switching phase- and frequency-encoding axis nor with varying the gradient amplitude. The characteristics of this artifact are different from so-called magnetic-susceptibility artifacts (Table 1). How-

Fig. 5. Fat-suppressed image after repositioning one air/fat interface to be located in the center of the field and the other to be at the edge of the field. The artifacts still appear even if the air/fat interface is placed in the center of the field. Thus, the appearance of the artifacts appears to be independent of position relative to the isocenter of the magnet. A water bag is placed above the phantom. The z axis is indicated by the arrow (z).

Fig. 6. Clinical example of fat-suppression failure in the clivus.

A, Conventional axial T1-weighted image of skull base.

B, Fat-suppressed axial T1-weighted image shows a high signal area (arrowheads), which corresponds with a portion of the fatty marrow of clivus overlying the airway.

C, T1-weighted sagittal image shows that the portion of the clivus that showed high signal is located between a well-pneumatized sphenoid sinus and the airway. The z axis is indicated by the arrow (z).
Fig. 7: Example of fat-suppression failure in the orbits.

A, Axial T1-weighted fat-suppression image shows high signal area in the retrobulbar space (arrowhead), which is simulating orbital pathology. This is artifact at susceptibility interfaces between lower part of orbital fat and upper portion of maxillary sinus.

B, Coronal image in the same patient also showing high signal (arrowheads) which is not due to the inferior rectus muscles. The z axis is indicated by the arrow (z).

TABLE 1: Characteristics of magnetic-susceptibility artifacts and fat-suppression failure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Magnetic-Susceptibility Artifacts</th>
<th>Fat-Suppression Failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axis involved</td>
<td>Frequency-encoding direction</td>
<td>Static magnetic-field direction (z axis for superconducting magnets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance</td>
<td>Signal loss with geometric distortion</td>
<td>Focal high signal without geometric distortion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanism</td>
<td>Rapid-spin dephasing, spatial misregistration</td>
<td>Resonant frequency shift causing failure of fat presaturation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Magnetic-susceptibility interfaces</td>
<td>Magnetic-susceptibility interfaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ever, both artifacts are the result of focal magnetic-field inhomogeneity at bulk susceptibility interfaces.

Fat-suppression failure has also been seen in areas of changing tissue geometry such as the submental or submandibular regions with frequency-selective presaturation technique. These artifacts also occur in the craniocaudal (along the static magnetic field) direction. Fat-suppression failure observed in subcutaneous fat may be of little problem in clinical diagnosis. However, these artifacts did occur in areas of constant imaging volume such as the nasopharynx and orbits because of their craniocaudal orientation relative to the paranasal sinuses. Therefore, these regions were most troublesome and could present difficulties in clinical diagnosis. Although the benefit of contrast-enhanced fat-suppression imaging has been reported in the head and neck region (23), these magnetic-susceptibility artifacts could be clinically confusing without the availability of precontrast fat-suppression images for comparison. It should be remembered that all bright lesions on enhanced scans are not necessarily associated with pathologic process. The understanding of the geometric relationship between air and high signal regions in frequency-selective fat-suppression technique is extremely important to prevent misdiagnosis.
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