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Gd-EOB-DTPA DCE-MRI biomarkers in a rabbit model of liver fibrosis
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Abstract: The purpose of this study was to investigate the correlations between Gd-EOB-DTPA DCE-MRI biomarkers and histopathologic biomarkers of liver fibrosis progression in a rabbit model of liver fibrosis. Thirty-Six New Zealand white rabbits were randomly divided into control (n = 6) and liver fibrosis group (n = 30). Each rabbit in the liver fibrosis group received a weekly subcutaneous injection in the back comprising 50% carbon tetrachloride (CCl4) in oily solution. Control rabbits received subcutaneous injections with the same amount of normal saline solution instead. MR imaging was performed in control and fibrotic rabbits were conducted by MRI at week 0 (n = 36). The fibrotic rabbits were performed MR imaging on 6 weeks, 9 weeks, and 12 weeks after modeling of fibrosis. Before each MRI, peripheral blood was collected, and several biochemical tests are performed. The thirty-four rabbits completed this study. They were then divided into three subgroups according to fibrotic stage: no fibrosis (F0, n = 12), mild fibrosis (F1+F2, n = 14), and advanced fibrosis (F3+F4, n = 8). DCE-MRI measurements show increasing Ktrans and Ve while decreasing iACU90 with increasing fibrosis stage. The significant correlations were observed between mean Ktrans, Ve, iACU90 and percentage of the animal with mild liver fibrosis. For blood biomarkers, there were significant differences between F0 and F1+F2, and between F0 and F3+F4 in the serum levels of ALT (all P < 0.05), and TB (F0 vs. F1+F2, P = 0.004), while no differences were found between F1+F2 group and F3+F4 group (all P > 0.05). There were significant differences between F0 and F1+F2 (P = 0.02). Gd-EOB-DTPA DCE-MRI is a promising method for the noninvasive diagnosis and staging of liver fibrosis. Future studies to evaluate the effectiveness of these techniques in patients with liver fibrosis are warranted.
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Introduction

Advanced liver fibrosis can lead to cirrhosis, liver failure, portal hypertension, and liver cancer, which often requires liver transplantation as a life-saving procedure [1]. It is reversible in the early stages of liver fibrosis because the liver functions relatively well; therefore, early detecting of liver fibrosis is essential for treatment and prognosis [2]. Liver biopsy is the standard method for the diagnosis and staging of liver fibrosis. However, it is invasive, with associated pain and major complications reportedly occurring in 40.0% and 0.5% of patients, respectively [3]. Sampling errors can occur owing to the heterogeneous distribution of fibrosis in the liver and the relatively small biopsy samples [3]. Intra- and interobserver variations in histologic examinations can also lead to diagnosis error. Noninvasively quantitative imaging biomarkers would be particularly useful for serial evaluation of the effectiveness of liver fibrosis therapies [4].

Several magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) techniques have been used to assess liver fibro-
sis in preclinical and clinical settings, including MR elastography (MRE), diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI), Carbogen gas-challenge blood oxygen level-dependent (BOLD), and dynamic contrast-enhanced MRI (DCE-MRI) [4]. Meta-analysis studies show that MRE has high accuracy for the diagnosis of liver fibrosis and cirrhosis. Measurement of liver stiffness in MRE can be affected by several factors, including the cause of fibrosis, inflammation, hepatic metabolic and synthetic function, and technical limitations [5]. Compared with MRE, DWI has moderate accuracy for assessment of liver fibrosis, and calculation of the apparent diffusion coefficient can be affected by perfusion effects, liver inflammation, and liver steatosis [6]. Carbogen gas-challenge BOLD MR imaging can depict hepatic hemodynamic alterations during the progression of fibrosis [7]. However, it is difficult to co-register the MR images with the histologic specimens and because fibrosis would progress homogeneously in each animal’s liver. DCE-MRI approaches have been used for assessment of liver fibrosis. Liver fibrosis assessment using pharmacokinetic parameters (imaging biomarkers), including the volume transfer constant ($K_{\text{trans}}$), the flux rate constant ($k_{\text{ep}}$), the volume fraction $V_e$ of the extravascular extracellular space (EES), and the plasma volume fraction ($v_p$) [8].

In this study, gadolinium ethoxybenzyl diethylentriaminepentaacetic acid (Gd-EOB-DTPA), a newly developed MR contrast agent, was used. Gd-EOB-DTPA is an ionic complex consisting of gadolinium (III) and the ligand ethoxybenzyl-diethylenetriaminepentaacetic acid (EOB-DTPA). The purpose of our study was to investigate the correlations between Gd-EOB-DTPA DCE-MRI biomarkers and histopathologic biomarkers of liver fibrosis progression in a rabbit model of liver fibrosis.

Materials and methods

All studies were approved by our institutional animal care and use committee and were performed in accordance with the NIH guidelines.

Animal model and experimental design

Thirty-six male/female healthy New Zealand white rabbits (5 months age from Experimental Animal Center of Lanzhou University) that initially weighted 1.8-2.7 kg were used for this study. The rabbits were randomly divided into control ($n = 6$) and liver fibrosis group ($n = 30$). Each rabbit in the liver fibrosis group received a weekly subcutaneous injection in the back comprising 50% carbon tetrachloride (CCl$_4$) in oily solution (ratio 1:1) (0.2 ml/kg) [9]. Control rabbits received subcutaneous injections with the same amount of normal saline solution instead.

MR imaging was performed in control and fibrotic rabbits conducted by MRI at week 0 ($n = 36$). The fibrotic rabbits were performed MR imaging on 6 weeks, 9 weeks, and 12 weeks after modeling of fibrosis (each $n = 10$).

Blood tests for assessment of liver function

The peripheral blood (3-5 ml) was collected via the ear border vein after modeling of fibrosis at 0, 6, 9, and 12 weeks (control rabbit at week 0). Blood samples were sent to the core facilities and several biochemical tests are performed including alanine aminotransferase (ALT), aspartate transaminase (AST), and total bilirubin (TB) levels. The levels of serum hyaluronic acid (HA), collagen type IV (IV-C), and procollagen type III (PC III) were also measured.

MRI examinations

All MRI examinations were performed by using a 3.0-T clinical MR unit (Verio 3.0T, Siemens Medical Solutions, Erlangen, Germany) with a 32-channel head phased-array coil (Siemens Medical Solutions, Erlangen, Germany). Before being imaged, rabbits were anesthetized with intramuscular administration of 0.3 mL per kilogram of body weight of 2% xylazine hydrochloride and 30 mg/kg of ketamine hydrochloride. Additional xylazine hydrochloride was given intravenously as required. Animals were fixed on rabbit holder. Following acquisition of coronal and transverse turbo spin-echo (TSE) T1-weighted (T1W) and T2W anatomical images, transverse T1 mapping and T2 mapping were obtained with fat suppression. For Gd-EOB-DTPA DCE-MRI, administration of Gd-EOB-DTPA was done as a bolus with a total 0.025 mmol/kg and injection within 3 s through the ear vein, followed by 2 ml saline chaser at the same rate. For all animals, T1W volumetric interpolated breath-hold examination (VIBE) was performed for T1W from pre-contrast 2 mins topost-contrast 20 mins. The MRI parameters were shown in Table 1.
Histologic evaluation

After modeling of fibrosis at 6 weeks, 9 weeks, and 12 weeks, each rabbit was euthanized with an i.v. administration of 150 to 200 mg/kg sodium pentobarbital (Euthasol, Delmarva Laboratories, Midlothian, VA) 3 hours after MR examinations. Three histologic slices excised from the left lateral, right lateral, and medium lateral liver lobes of each rabbit were fixed in 10% buffered formaldehyde solution, embedded in paraffin, and sliced (4 μm slice thickness). The slides were submitted to the pathology core facility for Masson’s trichrome staining which was used to identify collagen tissue. A pathologist who specializes in gastrointestinal oncology (L.W., > 10 years’ experience) first assessed the stage of liver fibrosis according to the METAVIR scoring system: Stage F0 indicates no fibrosis; stage F1, portal fibrosis without septa; stage F2, portal fibrosis with few septa; stage F3, numerous septa without cirrhosis; and F4, cirrhosis. These slides (4 slices/each animal) were scanned at 200 × magnification.

Table 1. MRI pulse sequences and common scan parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Sequences</th>
<th>Scan parameters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anatomic Imaging</td>
<td>T2W TSE</td>
<td>TR/TE = 4000/30 ms, FOV = 210 × 210 mm, matrix = 256 × 256, ST = 4 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1 mapping</td>
<td>Variable flip angle</td>
<td>TR/TE = 15/2 ms, FA = 5°/26°, FOV = 210 × 210 mm, matrix = 320 × 320, ST = 4 mm, scan time = 2:15 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2 mapping</td>
<td>Multi-echo SE</td>
<td>TR/TE = 2000/10, 21, 31, 42, 52, 63 ms, FA = 180°, FOV = 210 × 210 mm, matrix = 320 × 320, ST = 4 mm, scan time = 2:52 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCE-MRI</td>
<td>VIBE</td>
<td>TR/TE = 4.8/1.4 ms, FA = 5°/15°, FOV = 101 × 140 mm, matrix = 59 × 128, ST = 2 mm, scan time = 2:52 mins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T2W: T2-weighted; TSE: turbo spin-echo; TR: repetition time; TE: echo time; ST: slice thickness; FA: flip angle; FOV: Field of view; ST: scan time; TF: turbo-factor; VIBE: volumetric interpolated breath-hold examination; DCE-MRI: dynamic contrast-enhanced MRI.

Figure 1. Representative Masson trichrome-stained histologic slices of rabbit liver fibrosis. Collagen is identified as blue coloration in the MTR-stained tissues, (A) normal liver tissue, (B) stage F1, collagen with portal and periportal area (arrow), (C) stage F2, collagen with few septa (arrow), (D) stage F3, collagen with bridging (arrow), and (E) stage F4, collagen with cirrhosis nodule.
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Figure 2. DCE-MRI measurements of the rabbit liver. The arterial input function (AIF) was measured at abdominal aorta (A). Three ROIs were drawn by hand in the left lateral, right lateral, and medium lateral liver lobes to measure mean values (B). Each ROI was avoided large vessels. Pharmacokinetic parametric maps for $K_{\text{trans}}$ (C) and $V_c$ (D).

Statistical analyses

The animals were grouped into three: no fibrosis (F0), mild fibrosis (F1 and F2), and advanced fibrosis (F3 and F4) [10]. Data were expressed as mean ± standard deviation (SD). Data were first tested for normality by using a one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. DCE-MRI imaging and blood biomarkers were compared between the three groups at analysis of variance and then at two-by-two comparisons performed with independent-sample t testing. The relationships between percentage of histological liver fibrosis and changes of DCE-MRI biomarkers were assessed by calculating Spearman correlation coefficients. Statistical analysis results were significant at $P < 0.05$. All statistical analyses were performed by using SPSS software (SPSS, Chicago, Ill).

Results

Of the thirty-six rabbits, two rabbits in the liver fibrosis group died during the experiment. A total of thirty-four rabbits completed the study, with twelve of those at stage F0 (control group). In the liver fibrosis group, eight rabbits were stage F1, six were stage F2, five were stage F3, and three were stage F4 (Figure 2). The thirty-four rabbits were then divided into three subgroups according to fibrotic stage: no fibrosis (F0, n = 12), mild fibrosis (F1+F2, n = 14), and advanced fibrosis (F3+F4, n = 8).

Blood biomarkers were shown in Figure 3. There were significant differences between F0 and F1+F2, and between F0 and F3+F4 in the serum levels of ALT (F0 vs. F1+F2, $P < 0.001$; F0 vs. F3+F4, $P = 0.001$), AST (F0 vs. F1+F2, $P < 0.001$; F0 vs. F3+F4, $P = 0.001$), and TB (F0 vs. F1+F2, $P = 0.004$), while no differences
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were found between F1+F2 group and F3+F4 group (all P > 0.05) (Table 2). No significant difference was found between F0 and F3+F4 in TB (P = 0.08). No significant differences were founded in HA levels at the different groups (all P > 0.05). There were significant differences between F0 and F1+F2 (P = 0.02), while no differences were found in IV-C levels between F0 and F1+F2, and between F1+F2 and F3+F4 (all P > 0.05). There are no significant differences in PC III level at the different groups (all P > 0.05).

DCE-MRI measurements show increasing $K_{trans}$ and $V_e$ while decreasing iACU90 with increasing fibrosis stage (Figure 4). In Figure 4A, representative transverse anatomical MR images (T1W and T2W), $K_{trans}$, and $V_e$ maps from no fibrosis group (stage F0, upper row) and advanced fibrosis (stage F3, lower row) animals. Figure 4B shows $K_{trans}$, $V_e$, and iACU90 measurements in no fibrosis group (F0 stage), mild fibrosis group (F1+F2 stages), and advanced fibrosis group (F3+F4 stages). The significant correlations were observed between mean $K_{trans}$, $V_e$, iACU90 and percentage of the animal with mild liver fibrosis (Figure 4C).

**Figure 3.** Rabbit liver function assessment by blood biomarkers. There were significant differences in the serum levels of ALT between F0 and F1+F2, and between F0 and F3+F4 (F0 vs. F1+F2, P < 0.001; F0 vs. F3+F4, P = 0.001) (A), in the serum levels of AST (F0 vs. F1+F2, P < 0.001; F0 vs. F3+F4, P = 0.001) (B), and TB (F0 vs. F1+F2, P = 0.004) (C), while no differences in both the serum levels of ALT and AST between F1+F2 group and F3+F4 group (all P > 0.05). No significant differences were found between F0 and F3+F4 in the serum levels of TB (P = 0.08). There were no significant differences in HA levels at the different groups (all P > 0.05) (D). There were significant differences between F0 and F1+F2 (P = 0.02), while no differences were found in IV-C levels between F0 and F1+F2, and between F1+F2 and F3+F4 (all P > 0.05) (E). There were no significant differences in PC III level at the different groups (all P > 0.05) (F).

**Table 2.** The serum biomarkers measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serum markers</th>
<th>No fibrosis (F0, n = 12)</th>
<th>Mild fibrosis (F1+F2, n = 14)</th>
<th>Advanced fibrosis (F3+F4, n = 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALT (IU/L)</td>
<td>30.08 ± 10.56</td>
<td>113 ± 57.56</td>
<td>175.75 ± 73.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST (IU/L)</td>
<td>45.25 ± 32.49</td>
<td>268.07 ± 154.03</td>
<td>335.5 ± 150.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT (mg/dl)</td>
<td>0.77 ± 0.38</td>
<td>1.38 ± 0.56</td>
<td>1.27 ± 0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA (ng/ml)</td>
<td>1188.67 ± 408.21</td>
<td>1365.57 ± 833.46</td>
<td>1314.25 ± 484.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV-C (ng/ml)</td>
<td>661.5 ± 263.45</td>
<td>987.64 ± 337.80</td>
<td>902.75 ± 510.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC III (ng/ml)</td>
<td>810.08 ± 252.26</td>
<td>957.36 ± 328.02</td>
<td>886.38 ± 468.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ALT: aminotransferase; AST: aspartate transaminase; TB: total bilirubin; HA: hyaluronic acid; IV-C: collagen type IV; PC III: procollagen type III.
Discussion

We have shown that non-invasive Gd-EOB-DTPA DCE-MRI radiologic or serum-based markers are considered categorical parameters of liver fibrosis. There were significant differences between F0 and F1+F2 (P = 0.02) in IV-C levels, while no differences were found between F0 and F1+F2, and between F1+F2 and F3+F4 (all P > 0.05). DCE-MRI measurements show increasing $K^{\text{trans}}$, $V_e$, and decreasing iACU90 with increasing fibrotic stage. The significant correlations were observed between mean $K^{\text{trans}}$, $V_e$, iACU90 and percentage of the animal with mild liver fibrosis.

The model used in this study has been demonstrated that cellular alterations and histologic
patterns are similar to those in human liver fibrosis [9, 11]. However, having considerable individual variation in the speed of fibrosis progression, leads a variable number of rabbits had each stage of fibrosis [9, 11]. Hence, we did not evaluate changes between the acute and chronic stages of liver fibrosis. Future studies to examine the relationship between these functional measurements at the acute and chronic stages are warranted. Due to the extensive individual variation of liver fibrotic progression, we could not compare the DCE-MRI measurements of responses between the five ME-TAVIR stages [12, 13]. However, the significant differences were observed between the animals in each of the three clinically relevant fibrosis groups (no substantial fibrosis, stage F0), mild fibrosis (F1+F2), and advanced fibrosis (F3+F4).

Liver biopsy is considered as the gold standard for diagnosis of and staging of liver fibrosis [14]. However, liver biopsy is an invasive and inaccurate gold standard with numerous drawbacks [14, 15]. To overcome the limitations of liver biopsy, several non-invasive techniques have been investigated for the assessment of liver fibrosis [13, 16]. Non-invasive biomarkers of liver fibrosis can be radiologic [17] or serum-based [18]. Radiologic techniques based on ultrasound, MRI, and elastography have been used to assess liver fibrosis [17]. Serum-based biomarkers of liver fibrosis have also been developed [18, 19]. These are broadly classified into indirect and direct biomarkers. Indirect biomarkers reflect liver function. Direct biomarkers reflect extracellular matrix turnover, and include molecules involved in hepatic fibrogenesis. This study includes both radiologic and serum biomarkers show that both biomarkers of liver fibrosis correlate with histological results. This feature is certainly clinically useful [20].

In previous Gd-EOB-DTPA DCE-MRI studies involving the evaluation of rat and rabbit liver fibrosis [21, 22]. In this study, fibrotic deposition was quantitatively measured and the significant correlations were observed between mean $K^{trans}$, $V_e$, iACU90 and percentage of the animal with mild liver fibrosis, which is early stage of liver fibrosis. Therefore, this study results provide strong evidence of the immediate feasibility of clinical translation because we used a 3.0-T clinical MR unit and standard DCE-MRI sequences that are available on most clinical MR systems. Using serum-based biomarkers to assess liver fibrosis, current studies showed a 50% sensitivity and 61% specificity [23].

There were several limitations to our current study. First, we measured the means of imaging biomarkers for the entire liver rather than for specific liver regions on each image section because it was difficult to co-register the MR images with the histologic specimens. In this case, we assumed a priori that liver fibrosis would progress homogeneously in each animal’s liver. However, variations in imaging biomarkers and liver activation were observed and probably resulted from the differing blood supply in the different liver regions and/or the different levels of fibrosis. Future studies to further investigate these intrahepatic differences in DCE-MRI response in specific regions or lobes in the liver should be performed. Furthermore, we performed MRI studies in each animal at a single time point, not serially follow up each animal because of the logistic complexities involved in serially following up the animals during these processes and our desire for reference-standard histologic confirmation of the fibrosis stages, which required that each animal is sacrificed to harvest their livers. In future studies, fibrosis progression could be followed in each animal.

In conclusion, Gd-EOB-DTPA DCE-MRI is a promising method for the noninvasive diagnosis and staging of liver fibrosis Future studies to evaluate the effectiveness of these techniques in patients with liver fibrosis are warranted.
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