CHAPTER 1

Molecular Diffusion and Nuclear Magnetic Resonance

Denis Le Bihan and Peter J. Basser

The purpose of this chapter is to review how molecular diffusion can be measured using nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR). The concept of molecular diffusion is introduced, and various methods to measure it are motivated from the basic equations governing diffusive transport. The measurement of molecular diffusion using NMR is presented. The effect of molecular diffusion on the NMR signal is described, and each paradigmatic pulse sequence used to measure diffusion with NMR is introduced. In the following chapters, these pulse sequences will be described in more detail, especially in the context of NMR imaging (see Chapter 2). Finally, we discuss specific problems encountered when studying diffusion in biological tissues. These problems will be analyzed more thoroughly in Chapters 7 and 8.

THE MOLECULAR DIFFUSION PROCESS

Diffusive transport is readily observed in steady-state, non-equilibrium systems, such as in cells. Here, a concentration difference is established between two compartments, and a macroscopic diffusive flux can be observed between them. Fick's law describes how the molecular flux density, \( J \), depends on the molecular concentration gradient, \( \nabla C \):\n
\[
J = -D \nabla C
\]  

[1]

The diffusion coefficient, \( D \), is a proportionality constant that can be determined experimentally from the ratio of the flux and the concentration gradient, measured using either physical or chemical methods (2). By combining the equation of conservation of mass,

\[
\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} = -\nabla J
\]

[2]

with Fick's law, one obtains the diffusion equation:

\[
\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} = -\nabla J = \nabla(D \nabla C). \tag{3}
\]

For a constant (spatially uniform) diffusivity, solutions are readily obtained for various paradigmatic initial concentration profiles and boundary conditions. For example, the solution of the diffusion equation in an unbounded medium for particles satisfying the initial condition \( C(r, 0) = \delta(r - r_0) \) is (2):

\[
C(r, t) = \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi Dt}} \right)^3 \exp \left( -\frac{(r - r_0)^2}{4Dt} \right)
\]

[4]

The diffusion equation suggests other well-known methods to determine \( D \) employing radioactive or fluorescent tracers. Here, the concentration profiles of the tracer are monitored over time, and its diffusivity is inferred from them (1). Microscopic displacements can be seen with tracers on the scale of millimeters. Spatially resolved methods can also be used, such as infrared spectroscopy or Rayleigh scattering (3), allowing resolution in the micrometer range. Such tracer techniques have been successfully applied in biological systems, such as the brain (4,5). However, because of the inherent invasiveness of using exogenous tracers, such techniques cannot be used \textit{in vivo} with humans.

An alternative approach to measuring diffusivity is to monitor the diffusion process itself, i.e., the random
motions of an ensemble of particles. Einstein (6) showed that the diffusion coefficient measured in the nonequilibrium concentration cell experiments described above is the same quantity that appears in the variance of the conditional probability distribution, \( P(r | r_0, t) \), the probability of finding a molecule at a position \( r \) at a time \( t \), which was initially at a position \( r_0 \). For free diffusion, this conditional probability distribution obeys the same diffusion equation as the particle concentration given. It follows that

\[
\langle (r - r_0)(r - r_0) \rangle = 6D t \tag{5}
\]

The Einstein equation, which relates \( D \) to the root mean square of the diffusion distance (Fig. 1), suggests that by measuring the second moment of the conditional probability distribution of the diffusing species, one could infer the diffusivity directly. This approach is amenable to measurements using NMR methods.\(^1\) In fact, NMR provides the only existing method with which to characterize molecular displacements over distances larger than the mean free path. This justifies the considerable success of diffusion NMR in physics and chemistry. In some cases, it is desirable to monitor individual molecular pathways (for instance in terms of mean elementary diffusion steps) NMR must be replaced by other techniques, although some information can be derived from relaxation NMR studies. The relaxation times \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) depend to some extent on diffusion-driven molecular mobility, as can be seen in the Bloom-Purcell-Bloembergen equations (7,8). However, \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) are influenced by many other processes besides diffusion, so that this approach is extremely indirect. It may be inferred that \( T_1 \) or \( T_2 \) are generally not suitable for estimating diffusivity. In biological tissues, the diffusion mechanism that predominates for relaxation is rotational, not translational diffusion. One may thus expect to see that \( T_1 \) or \( T_2 \), and diffusive relaxation are different in tissues.

The methods to measure diffusion at microscopic length scales are limited. Laser and neutron scattering techniques are both unsuitable for \textit{in vivo} human studies. Owing to the high degree of photon scattering in turbid tissues, light scattering is not an efficient means to probe diffusivity \textit{in vivo}, except, perhaps, superficially (9). Moreover, it is limited in spatial resolution to a few microns by the wavelength of the laser beam used. Neutron scattering allows a spatial resolution in the nanometer range, which is highly desirable for probing biological tissues at the molecular scale; but its obvious main limitation, for any \textit{in vivo} application is that it requires neutron beams. To conclude this section, we are fortunate that NMR is available as a tool for the completely noninvasive investigation of molecular displacements in the micron range (and possibly the sub-micron range) encompassing the size of most biological tissue structures.

### DIFFUSION AND NMR

#### The Basic Principles

The effect of diffusion on the NMR signal can be understood from a simple bipolar pulsed gradient experiment (Fig. 2). The purpose of these gradient pulses is to magnetically label spins carried by molecules. Let us denote \( G \) as the gradient strength, \( \delta \) as the gradient duration, and \( \Delta \) as the time interval between the pulse onsets (following Stejskal and Tanner's terminology) (10). The first gradient pulse induces a phase shift \( \phi_1 \) of the spin transverse magnetization, which depends on the spin position (spin labeling). If the gradient is along \( z \):

\[
\phi_1 = \gamma \int_0^\delta G z_1 dt = \gamma G \delta z_1 \tag{6}
\]

where \( z_1 \) is the spin position supposed to be constant during the short duration \( \delta \) of the gradient pulse \( \gamma \) is the gyromagnetic ratio. After the 180° rf pulse, \( \phi_1 \) is transformed into \( -\phi_1 \). Similarly, the second pulse will produce a phase shift \( \phi_2 \) (spin unlabeling):

---

\(^1\) N.B. One must replace the diffusion constant by a diffusion tensor in Eq. [5] when inferring molecular displacements in tissues in which diffusion exhibiting anisotropic diffusion, i.e., the molecular mobility appears to be different in the \( x \), \( y \), or \( z \) directions (1).
\[
\phi_2 = \gamma \int_{\Delta}^{\Delta+\delta} Gz_2 dt = \gamma G\delta z_2 
\]  

[7]

where \( z_2 \) is the spin position during the second pulse. The net dephasing, \( \delta(\phi) \), is therefore:

\[
\delta(\phi) = \phi_2 - \phi_1 = \gamma G\delta(z_1 - z_2). 
\]  

[8]

One immediately sees that for "static" spins \( z_1 = z_2 \), so that the bipolar gradient pair produces no net dephasing. For "moving" spins, however, there is a net dephasing that will depend on the spin history during the time interval \( \Delta \) between the pulses, and which will affect the transverse magnetization. We also see that the position of the two gradient pulses in each half of the spin-echo sequence does not matter, it is the time elapsed between them that affects the net phase. We measure the total magnetization—the vector sum of the magnetic moments of the individual nuclei, which may have different motion histories:

\[
\frac{M}{M_0} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \exp(i\delta(\phi_j)). 
\]  

[9]

This sum can be evaluated once the net phase distribution is known. Assuming free diffusion in a homogeneous domain, the probability of finding a spin at position \( z_1 \) is a constant. If \( P(z_2 | z_1, \Delta)dz_2 \) is the conditional probability of finding a spin initially at \( z_1 \) between positions \( z_2 \) and \( z_2 + dz_2 \) after a time interval \( \Delta \), the amplitude attenuation is:

\[
\frac{M}{M_0} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(i\gamma G\delta(z_1 - z_2)) \times P(z_2 | z_1, \Delta) dz_1 dz_2 
\]  

[10]

For free diffusion in one dimension, the conditional probability is given by:

\[
P(z_2 | z_1, \Delta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi D\Delta}} \exp\left(-\frac{(z_1 - z_2)^2}{4D\Delta}\right) 
\]  

[11]

where \( D \) is the diffusion coefficient. Combining Eqs. [10] and [11], we obtain:

\[
\frac{M}{M_0} = \exp(-\gamma G\delta)^2 D\Delta 
\]  

[12]

Either Eq. [12] or its logarithm,

\[
\ln\left(\frac{M}{M_0}\right) = -(\gamma G\delta)^2 \Delta D 
\]  

[13]

relates the measured signal attenuation to the diffusivity, and is the basis for diffusion measurement using NMR.
Above, γ is the gyromagnetic ratio, T₁ and T₂ are the longitudinal and transverse relaxation times, and M₀ is the equilibrium magnetization in the direction of the static applied magnetic field, B₀.

For a 90°-180° spin-echo sequence, the spins are subjected to an impressed static magnetic field superposed with a linear gradient in the z direction (7):

\[ \mathbf{B}(r, t) = (0, 0, r\mathbf{G}(t) + B_0)^T \]  \[ (15) \]

where \( r \) is the displacement vector, and

\[ \mathbf{G}(t) = (G_x(t), G_y(t), G_z(t))^T. \]  \[ (16) \]

Then, the Bloch equations (12) for the complex-valued transverse magnetization, \( m \):

\[ m(r, t) = M_x(r, t) + i M_y(r, t) \]  \[ (17) \]

can be recast as a transport equation for \( m \) (11):

\[ \frac{\partial m}{\partial t} = -i\omega_0 m - \frac{m}{T_2} - i\gamma r \mathbf{G}(t)m + \nabla \cdot (\nabla m) \]  \[ (18) \]

where the Larmor relation, \( \gamma B_0 = \omega_0 \), was used.

To eliminate the attenuation due to transverse relaxation and signal modulation by Larmor precession, the following substitution is used:

\[ m(r, t) = \psi(r, t) \exp \left( -\left( i\omega_0 + \frac{1}{T_2} \right) t \right) \]  \[ (19) \]

so that

\[ \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = -i\gamma r \mathbf{G}(t) \psi + \nabla \cdot (\nabla \psi) \]  \[ (20) \]

For a spin-echo sequence, one can further simplify the transport equation by separating \( \psi(r, t) \) into an imaginary part, which represents the solution to Eq. (20) without diffusion, and a real, time-dependent part that represents the attenuation due to diffusion:

\[ \psi(r, t) = M(t) \exp(-ir\mathbf{k}(t)) \]  \[ (21) \]

where

\[ \mathbf{k}(t) = \gamma \int_0^t \mathbf{G}(t') \, dt'. \]  \[ (22) \]

The resulting equation for \( M(t) \) is:

\[ \frac{dM}{dt} = M(t) \nabla \cdot (\nabla \exp(-ir\mathbf{k}(t))) \]  \[ (23) \]

\[ = -M(t) \mathbf{k}(t)^T \nabla \mathbf{k}(t) \]

which has a solution for an anisotropic medium with uniform diffusivity:

\[ M(t) = M(0) \exp \left( -\int_0^t \mathbf{k}(u)^T \nabla \mathbf{k}(u) \, du \right) \]  \[ (24) \]

Equations Governing the Diffusive Transport of Magnetization

The Bloch equations (12) with diffusion (11) relate the applied magnetic field vector, \( \mathbf{B} = (B_x, B_y, B_z) \) to the net (nuclear) magnetization vector, \( \mathbf{M} = (M_x, M_y, M_z) \) in the laboratory frame of reference:

\[
\frac{\partial \mathbf{M}}{\partial t} = \gamma \mathbf{M} \times \mathbf{B} - \left( \begin{array}{ccc}
\frac{1}{T_2} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \frac{1}{T_2} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \frac{1}{T_1}
\end{array} \right) \mathbf{M} + \mathbf{M}_0 \left( \begin{array}{c}
0 \\
0 \\
1/T_1
\end{array} \right) \\
+ \nabla \cdot (\nabla \mathbf{M}). \]  \[ (14) \]
Above, $M(0)$ is the amplitude of the initial transverse magnetization (at $t = 0^+$) just after the 90° pulse is applied.

For an isotropic medium the echo intensity, $M(TE)$, in a spin-echo experiment is then given by:

$$\frac{M(TE)}{M_0} = \exp \left( -D \int_0^T \kappa(t') \kappa(t') \, dt' \right). \quad [25]$$

This relation is valid for a spin-echo gradient pulse combination. If refocusing 180° rf pulses are used in the sequence, the sign of $G$ is inverted for all gradient pulses following the 180° pulse. When only the diffusion sensitizing gradient pulses are present and $\delta \ll \Delta$, Eq. [25] simplifies to Eq. [12], as expected. Evaluating Eq. [25] becomes more complicated when many gradient pulses are involved, as in MR imaging. A useful quantity that characterizes the sensitivity of NMR sequences to diffusion is the “gradient factor,” $b$, (13) defined as (14,15):

$$b = \int_0^{TE} \kappa(t') \kappa(t') \, dt'. \quad [26]$$

The signal attenuation is then reduced to a simpler expression:

$$\frac{M(TE)}{M_0} = \exp(-bD). \quad [27]$$

One must remember that Eq. [25] is strictly valid for diffusion in infinite, homogeneous, and isotropic media. Then, no cross-terms exist between gradient pulses, i.e., the contributions to the measured NMR signal from each gradient axis are uncoupled, and may be determined separately (14). If diffusion is restricted by impermeable barriers, or if it is anisotropic, the signal attenuation must be calculated differently. As we will see, in anisotropic media, additional cross-terms, must be taken into account in both diffusion spectroscopy and imaging (16).

**NMR Diffusion Experiments: The Different Approaches**

Several NMR diffusion sequences based on fundamental principles have been proposed in the literature, all of which are more or less compatible with NMR imaging. A more extensive analysis of the effects of diffusion in these sequences when used in the imaging mode will be given in the following chapters.

**Constant Field Gradient Spin-echo Method**

The effect of diffusion and other molecular translational motions on spin-echo signals in the presence of a constant background magnetic field inhomogeneity has already been described in Hahn’s paper (17), and later analyzed by Carr and Purcell (18). If this inhomogeneity is a simple linear gradient $G_0$, or if such a gradient is purposely applied, the echo attenuation can easily be derived from Eq. [25] (Fig. 2) (18,19):

$$\frac{M(nTE)}{M_0} = \exp \left( -\gamma G_0^2 \frac{DTE^3}{12n} \right), \quad [28]$$

where $TE$ is the echo time, and $n$ is the echo number in a multiple echo experiment. This technique gives the highest accuracy for the diffusion coefficient (20), provided that the relaxation time $T_2$ of the medium is not too short to allow enough diffusion attenuation to occur during TE. However, the diffusion time of this experiment is not well characterized. As spins diffuse for the duration of the sequence, i.e., TE, the effect of their displacement on the signal attenuation is a function of time, resulting in an “effective” diffusion time of only $2TE/3$, as it can be seen by comparing Eqs. [28] and [12], where we assumed that $\delta = \Delta = TE/2$ and $n = 1$.

**Bipolar Gradient Pulse Spin-echo Technique**

This technique, suggested by Stejskal and Tanner (10), is the most widely used sequence to measure diffusion by NMR. Equation [12] only gives an approximation of the echo attenuation, since the duration $\delta$ of each pulse may not be negligible as compared to the pulse interval $\Delta$. The exact solution can be obtained from Eq. [25] (Fig. 2):

$$\frac{M}{M_0} = \exp(-\gamma G_0^2 (\Delta - \delta/3) D). \quad [29]$$

The residual background gradients $G_0$ that are constantly present during the sequence may also be taken into account, so that the signal attenuation is (10):

$$\frac{M}{M_0} = \exp\left(-\gamma^2 D(t_1^2 + t_2^2 + t_1 t_2)G_0^2 + 2\delta^2(\Delta - \delta/3)G_0^2 - \delta(t_1^2 + t_2^2 + \delta(t_1 + t_2) \right) \quad [30]$$

where $t_1$ is the time between the 90° pulse and the onset of the first gradient pulse, and $t_2$ is the time between the end of the second gradient pulse and the top of the echo. The terms containing $G_0$ may represent a significant contribution that can be difficult to evaluate. Equation [30] reduces to Eq. [12] if $\delta \ll \Delta$, and $G_0 \ll G$ (negligible background gradients). The diffusion time can be formally defined as $(\Delta - \delta/3)$ (10), but it is physically meaningful only when $\delta \ll \Delta$.

A classical source of error is to determine the diffu-
Fig. 4. Minimum measurable diffusion coefficient as a function of $T_2$ and gradient strength. The minimum diffusion coefficient measurable from a spin-echo sequence was calculated as a function of maximum gradient strength available ($G = 10$ mT/m or $G = 50$ mT/M) and $T_2$ in two different cases. The assumptions are that diffusion related echo attenuation must be at least 20% and that TE is equal to $T_2$, to maintain sufficiently high signal-to-noise ratio and good accuracy on diffusion. Best sensitivity is obtained for the constant gradient scheme ($\delta = \Delta = TE/2$). It would be impossible to measure diffusion in brain ($TE = 100$ ms, $D = 1 \times 10^{-9} mm^2/s$) with short gradient pulses ($\delta = \Delta/10$), unless much larger gradients are used.

Diffusion coefficient by this method when $k(TE) \neq 0$. This produces an artifactual echo attenuation due to incomplete spin refocusing, which could be misinterpreted as arising from diffusion. In this sequence, any mismatch between the two gradient pulses (amplitude, $G_1$, $G_2$, and/or duration $\delta_1$, $\delta_2$) resulting in the condition that $G_1\delta_1 \neq G_2\delta_2$ will result in incomplete spin refocusing. Unfortunately, this mismatch naturally arises in the presence of background gradients or eddy currents. Tweaking gradients may ameliorate the problem. Nevertheless, careful hardware calibration is essential in diffusion NMR experiments.

To access the precision of this method, let us calculate the smallest diffusion coefficient one can measure using Eq. [29] given hardware limitations (maximum gradient strength achievable) and experimental constraints (diffusion time with respect to $T_2$). If we accept a 20% minimum signal attenuation and a 30% maximum signal loss from transverse relaxation to obtain reasonable accuracy for $D$, we find that the minimum measurable diffusion coefficient $D_{\text{min}}$ is more than 16 times the diffusion coefficient of free water (Fig. 4):

$$D_{\text{min}} = 37 \times 10^{-3} \text{ mm}^2/\text{s}$$  \hspace{1cm} [31a]

with $\delta = \Delta/10$, $\Delta = T_2$, $T_2 = 100$ ms, and $G = 10$ mT/m. However, $D_{\text{min}}$ is about $\frac{1}{3}$ the diffusion coefficient of water when different parameters are used:

$$D_{\text{min}} = 0.4 \times 10^{-9} \text{ mm}^2/\text{s}$$  \hspace{1cm} [31b]

with $\delta = \Delta$ (equivalent to a constant gradient), $\Delta = T_2/2$, $T_2 = 100$ ms, and $G = 10$ mT/m. Thus, $T_2$ is the main limiting factor of the accuracy of this method for a given available gradient power. The problem is further complicated by the fact that media with low diffusion coefficients generally have low $T_2$s owing to their low mobility. The accuracy of $D$, which can reach 1%, decreases with the signal-to-noise ratio. Tissues with short $T_2$s, as in the body, require short TEs that may not allow sufficient time to produce enough signal attenuation by diffusion. A solution to this problem is to use a scheme like the stimulated-echo sequence, which increases the effective diffusion time without signal attenuation by $T_2$ relaxation.

**Stimulated Echo Technique**

A stimulated echo is generated from a sequence consisting of three radiofrequency (rf) pulses separated by time intervals $\tau_1$ and $\tau_2$ (Fig. 5) [17]. The remarkable feature of this sequence results from the magnetization evolution during the period $\tau_2$ between the second and the third rf pulse. After the end of the second rf pulse, part of the transverse magnetization (exactly half in the case where 90° pulses are used) is stored as longitudinal magnetization, which becomes insensitive to field inhomogeneities and which decays according to $T_1$. As $T_1$ is usually much longer than $T_2$ in biological tissues, longer evolution times can be achieved than with a spin-echo sequence without the usual signal penalty due to $T_2$ decay. The third rf pulse returns the stored magnetization to the transverse plane at time $\tau_1$ after the third pulse. The amplitude of the stimulated echo is, in the case where the three rf pulses are 90° pulses [17]:

$$\frac{M}{M_0} = \frac{1}{2} \exp \left( -\frac{\tau_2}{T_1} \right) \exp \left( -\frac{2\tau_1}{T_2} \right).$$  \hspace{1cm} [32]

This property is particularly useful for diffusion measurements where long diffusion times are required. Gradient pulses must be inserted within the first and the third periods of the stimulated echo sequence (Fig. 5). The diffusion time then includes $\tau_2$ and thus can be much longer than with a spin-echo sequence. The Stejskal-Tanner relation (Eq. [25]) still applies, provided that the period $\tau_2$ is included in $\Delta$ [21]. The longer diffusion time is useful in studying very slow diffusion rates or in compensating for unavailability of large gradients. Unfortunately, there is a signal reduction by one-half when compared to the spin-echo signal, since only half of the magnetization generated at the end of the $\tau_1$ period contributes to the echo intensity. The stimulated echo scheme has been proposed for diffu-
Diffusion imaging methods (22). Due to signal-to-noise considerations, it appears that this sequence is useful primarily in the presence of tissues with short T2's or when the spin-echo sequence cannot be used (23).

**Gradient Echo Technique**

The effect of diffusion on the amplitude of a gradient echo formed by a bipolar gradient pulse pair of reversed polarity does not differ from that of a spin echo sequence. It is straightforward to use Eq. [25] in this case; it gives the same expression as Eq. [29]. However, a dramatic deviation from Eq. [29] can be seen if the gradient echo is part of a steady-state free precession (SSFP) sequence, where some degree of phase coherence is propagated throughout successive cycles, especially when low flip angles are used. Due to multiple echo paths that are then formed, a SSFP train can be considered for diffusion as a mixture of different schemes, i.e., gradient echo, spin echo, stimulated echo, and higher order echoes, with different diffusion times and different diffusion weightings. Kaiser et al. (24) have provided a detailed theoretical analysis of this problem. In the imaging domain, some work has been done, mainly using the CE-FAST scheme (25–28), with the hope that the speed of the SSFP techniques would decrease motion artifacts. Indeed, the effects of involuntary macroscopic motion are just as important as in spin-echo sequences, although ghosting is significantly reduced, because any motion related phase shift will propagate through all acquisition cycles. Moreover, the effects of diffusion and relaxation are no longer nicely separable in a multiplicative manner, as with spin echoes, so that diffusion measurements are always contaminated by relaxation effects (26,29).

**Diffusion Measurements with B1 Field Gradients**

Diffusion gradients can also be developed by the rf (B1) field produced by a NMR rf coil (30,31). It has been suggested that this method of producing diffusion gradients overcomes the hardware problems encountered when using strong static magnetic field (B0) gradients. The idea is that an rf field gradient pulse $G_t = dB_1/dr$ of duration $\delta$, as induced by a surface coil oriented perpendicularly to the main transmit/receive NMR coil, will flip the magnetization within the sample by an angle $Q$ which depends on position $r$:

$$Q = \frac{\gamma \delta}{d} \frac{dB_1}{dr}. \quad [33]$$

This flip angle dispersion, which should be made linear, is canceled after a time interval $\Delta$ using a symmetric rf pulse. As in the case of the $B_0$ gradient pulse sequence, moving spins will be incompletely refocused by the sequence, which results, here, in a loss of longitudinal magnetization. This longitudinal magnetization loss, $M_z/M_0$, can be probed using either an observed pulse (30) or an imaging sequence (31). This signal loss will depend on the diffusion coefficient and relaxation ($T_1$).

With rf gradients, extremely short switching times can
be achieved, since there are no eddy currents. Furthermore, substantial gradient strength may be produced, depending on the output available from the rf transmitter, allowing measurements of very low diffusion coefficients. Unfortunately, such strong and long rf field pulses may result in high power deposition that may be incompatible with clinical use. Furthermore, the coil itself is subject to power dissipation problems that may alter its performance (tuning/matching, linearity) during the experiment.

DIFFUSION IN BIOLOGICAL SYSTEMS: EFFECTS OF MICRODYNAMICS AND MICROSTRUCTURE

Biological tissues differ largely from the condition of an "infinite, homogeneous medium" that we have considered so far. They are heterogeneous, containing multiple subcompartments (microstructure). Depending on the permeability of the barriers that divide these compartments, we have to consider exchange and transport between them (microdynamics). A classic treatment of the NMR signal may not properly reflect tissue structure or properties. Diffusion coefficients may be meaningless under these conditions if the measurement time scale or the measurement direction is not provided. The main difficulty is that the medium structure is generally not known in detail, so that modeling is required. In particular, one must be cautious to use Fick's law and derived relations (Eqs. [1]–[3]). The conditional probability distribution governing the diffusion process may now deviate from a Gaussian distribution appropriate for free diffusion (Eq. [11]). Most successful analyses start from the conditional probability distribution, taking into account the medium’s structure and particular boundary conditions. We consider the simplest NMR sequence, the bipolar gradient spin echo sequence, in which the pulse duration $\delta$ is negligible with respect to pulse separation $\Delta$. Equation [8], where now $P(z_1)$, the probability to find a spin initially at position $z_1$, has been incorporated, may be used as a starting point:

$$\frac{M}{M_0} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(iyG\delta(z_1 - z_2))$$

$\times P(z_2 | z_1, \Delta) P(z_1) dz_1 dz_2$ \[34\]

Another approach, suggested by Callaghan, and used by Cory et al. (32), is to invert this problem—to determine the probability distribution of the molecular displacements, $P(z, \Delta)$, from the NMR data. By rewriting Eq. [36] in a more suggestive form:

$$\frac{M(yG\delta)}{M_0} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(iyG\delta z) P(z, \Delta) dz \ [35]$$

we can see immediately that $P(z, \Delta)$ is the Fourier transform of the measured magnetization intensity. In measuring the displacement distribution, we make no a priori assumption that diffusion is free, and thus characterized by a Gaussian distribution with a single diffusion coefficient. Although apparent diffusion coefficients may be easier to use and understand, they may not always be meaningful, this is particularly true when there is complete restriction.

Restricted Diffusion

Diffusion is restricted when boundaries in the medium prevent molecules from moving freely across them (33–38). The observation of restriction must be related to the experimental parameters. When measurement times are very short, most molecules do not have enough time to reach boundaries, so that they behave as though they were diffusing freely. As the diffusion time increases, however, a larger fraction of molecules will strike the boundaries, and their displacement distribution will deviate from its behavior in an unbounded medium. The diffusion distance, $\sqrt{<z^2>}$ calculated for free diffusion using Einstein’s relation $\sqrt{<z^2>} = \sqrt{2Dt}$ (Eq. [5]) deviates from linearity with respect to $\sqrt{T_d}$, finally leveling-off as the diffusion distance reaches the size of the restricting compartment (Fig. 6). The effects of restriction will thus appear in the NMR signal when mean diffusion distances are

![FIG. 6. Restricted diffusion and diffusion time. The diffusion distance is plotted against the square root of the diffusion time using Einstein’s relation (Eq. [5]), similar to Fig. 1, for water in vitro and for phosphocreatine in vivo in rat muscle using $^{31}$P spectroscopy. The leveling-off of the curve for phosphocreatine suggests that diffusion of this molecular species in muscle cell is restricted. The size of this restricted volume can be roughly estimated to 20 $\mu$m. (From Moonen et al., ref. 47, with permission.)]
of the order of the characteristic length of the restricted compartment. These effects will depend on the type of restriction (impermeable or permeable barriers, attractive centers, etc.), the shape of the restricting volumes (spherical, cylindrical, planar, etc.), and the type of NMR experiment (constant or pulsed gradients), so that there is no single analytical expression to describe every configuration.

A simple example is represented by molecules diffusing between two impermeable parallel walls separated by a distance \( a \) (33). If the theoretical, free diffusion distance greatly exceeds \( a \), the echo attenuation in the case of the bipolar gradient pulse experiment significantly deviates from an exponential decay and becomes independent of the diffusion time (33), implying that molecules are trapped in the direction of the applied gradient:

\[
\frac{M(\gamma G\delta)}{M_0} = \left( \frac{\sin(\gamma G\delta a/2)}{(\gamma G\delta a/2)} \right)^2
\]  

[36]

For a constant gradient \( G_0 \), the attenuation is (34,36):

\[
\frac{M(\gamma G\delta)}{M_0} = \exp\left( -(TE - 17a^2/56 D)a^4(\gamma G_0)^2/120 D)\right)
\]

[37]

Another interesting but more complicated case is represented by restricted diffusion in a spherical cavity of radius \( R_0 \). In the limit where the theoretical, free diffusion distance largely exceeds \( R_0 \), the attenuation is again independent of the diffusion time (33,36), so that the measured apparent diffusion coefficient decreases as the diffusion time is increased:

\[
\frac{M(\gamma G\delta)}{M_0} = \exp\left( -\frac{(R_0\gamma G\delta)^2}{5\Delta} \right)
\]

[38]

corresponding to an asymptotic apparent diffusion coefficient \( D_{\text{asym}} = R_0^2/(\Delta 5) \) with the factor 5 replaced by 3 when diffusion is confined to the surface of the sphere. For a constant gradient \( G_0 \), one obtains:

\[
\frac{M}{M_0} = \exp\left( -(TE - 581 R_0^2/1,260 D)8R_0^4(\gamma G_0)^2/175 D)\right)
\]

[39]

Whatever the geometry of the restrictive medium, the deviation from linearity in the semilog plot of the signal attenuation versus \( b \) is crucial to determine whether diffusion is restricted, although other causes, such as diffusion in inhomogeneous systems, may produce the same effect. The ultimate test is to show that the measured diffusion coefficient \( D \), or the signal attenuation varies with the diffusion time, \( T_D \) as it is changed. Such studies can, in principle, lead to the determination of the compartmental geometry and size of the restricting boundaries, but experiments are generally less ambiguously. If one wants to avoid restricted diffusion effects, one must decrease the diffusion time \( T_D(\Delta) \), so that the diffusion distance \( \sqrt{\Delta} \) during \( T_D(\Delta) \) remains less than the characteristic length, \( R \) of the restricted region. Unfortunately, the diffusion effect under these conditions becomes small, as can be seen from Eq. [29]. In order to produce more diffusion attenuation, one can use several pairs of gradient pulses. With this configuration (Fig. 7), the diffusion time remains \( \Delta \), the interval between two pulses of the same pair, but the \( b \) factor is \( n \) times larger than with a single pair, where \( n \) is the number of pulse pairs:

\[
\frac{M}{M_0} = \exp\left( -(\gamma G\delta^2(\Delta - 8/3)Dn)\right)
\]

[40]

while the \( b \) factor is, however, \( \sqrt{n} \) times smaller than with a single pair.

### Permeable Barriers

When the restrictive barriers become permeable to diffusing molecules, the qualitative features of the observed displacement distribution change. The mathematical treatment of diffusion in systems partitioned by permeable barriers is far from simple. An example was given by Tanner (39) in the case of equally spaced, plane barriers having a permeability constant \( \kappa \). For short diffusion times, the apparent diffusion coefficient is the free diffusion coefficient \( D_0 \). As the diffusion time is increased, the apparent diffusion coefficient decreases, as expected for restricted diffusion, but it saturates at \( D_{\text{asym}} \), which depends on permeability (Fig. 8):

\[
D_{\text{asym}} = \frac{D_0}{1 - D_0/\kappa a}
\]

[41]

where \( a \) is the barrier spacing, which can be estimated from the equivalent free diffusion distance that would be covered for a diffusion time \( \sqrt{T_D} \), such that \( D(\sqrt{T_D}) = (D_0 + D_{\text{asym}})/2 \). It then becomes possible to estimate the barrier permeability \( \kappa \) (40). This approach, however, is oversimplified, given that the geometrical arrangement of the medium is generally unknown. In particular, this formalism does not apply to the case in which the system consists of spherical cavities separated by permeable barriers.

### Anisotropic Diffusion

Diffusion is a three-dimensional process. However, molecular mobility may not be the same in all directions. This anisotropy may be due to the physical arrangement of the medium (liquid crystal) or to the presence of obstacles that limit diffusion (restricted
FIG. 7. Alternated gradient pulse sequence. To decrease restricted diffusion effects, one may use an alternating gradient pulse pair. The diffusion time is, in this case, reduced to that defined by a single gradient pulse pair, i.e., \((\Delta - \delta/3)\). The b factor, however, is \(\sqrt{n}\) times less than when using an equivalent single pair.

FIG. 8. Restriction by permeable barriers. When diffusion is reduced (restricted) by permeable barriers, the dependence of the diffusion coefficient on the diffusion time is modulated by the permeability of the restrictive barriers. In particular, the measured diffusion coefficient decreases with diffusion time, \(T_d\), but saturates at a level, \(D_{\text{asym}}\). The size of the restrictive volume can be estimated from the freely diffusion distance that would be covered by free diffusing molecules during \(\sqrt{T_d}\), where \(\sqrt{T_d}\) is defined by the diffusion time corresponding to \(D_{\text{measured}} = (D_{\text{asym}} + D_0)/2\).
diffusion). It should be pointed out that diffusion can be both anisotropic and unrestricted. This behavior is well known in nematic liquid crystals (41) and can be found in the water lamellar phase of amphiphilic lyotropic systems (42) in which anisotropic diffusion measurements then could allow the determination of the transbilayer permeation rate. Moreover, structures that exhibit anisotropic diffusion at the molecular level can be isotropic at the microscopic level, resulting in a “powder average” effect that is difficult to sort out. The plot of log(M) versus b may not be linear in this case (42). This deviation from linearity can be ascribed, however, to anisotropy and not to restricted diffusion, because the diffusion measurements are independent of the diffusion time.

In anisotropic diffusion, the effective diffusion coefficient is replaced by an effective diffusion tensor (1). In this situation, Eq. [25] is no longer valid and the diffusion equations must be rewritten using a tensor formulation. In this case the term \( k(t) \cdot k(t) \cdot D \) is replaced by the quadratic form, \( k(t) \cdot D \cdot k(t) \) (10). Equation [24] is used in place of Eq. [25], and Eqs. [26] and [27] must also be changed accordingly. The echo attenuation then becomes (16):

\[
\frac{M(TE)}{M_0} = \exp \left( -\sum_{i=1}^{3} \sum_{j=1}^{3} b_{ij} D_{ij} \right) \tag{42}
\]

where \( b_{ij} \) is a b-matrix, and \( D_{ij} \) is an effective diffusion tensor (16). Its diagonal terms, \( D_{xx}, D_{yy}, \) and \( D_{zz} \), reflect correlations between molecular displacements in the same directions, whereas its off-diagonal terms, \( D_{xy}, D_{xz}, D_{yz} \), reflect correlations between molecular displacements in orthogonal directions. For instance, when observing diffusion in a lattice of semi-permeable parallel layers that are oriented obliquely with respect to the \( x \) and \( y \) axes, macroscopic displacements along \( x \) will appear to be correlated to displacements along \( y \).

In general, we must assume that both diagonal and off-diagonal terms in the diffusion tensor do not vanish, unless we know \emph{a priori} that the gradient (laboratory coordinate) directions coincide with the principal directions of the material—a condition which is rarely satisfied, especially in NMR imaging applications. Referring to Eq. [42], if diffusion gradients are applied simultaneously along the \( x \), \( y \), and \( z \) axes, the measured attenuation will now be a mixture of terms containing both diagonal and off-diagonal elements of the diffusion tensor. The specific problems associated with measurement and assessment of anisotropic diffusion data will be analyzed in greater detail in Chapter 8.

**Diffusion in Multiple Compartment Systems**

Most diffusion measurements in biological tissues are of an “apparent” diffusion coefficient. It is generally assumed that there is a unique diffusion coefficient in each measurement volume (voxel in imaging). We should now check to see if this assumption is valid, since most tissues consist of multiple subcompartments, including at least intracellular and extracellular compartments. Assuming that measurement times are short, so that diffusion is unrestricted in each subcompartment \( i \), and that there is no exchange, the signal attenuation is:

\[
\frac{M(TE)}{M_0} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i \exp (-b D_i) \tag{43}
\]

where \( p_i \) is the density of molecules diffusing in compartment \( i \), \( D_i \) is the associated diffusion coefficient, and \( N \) is the number of subcompartments. In this case, the “apparent” diffusion coefficient that would be measured would depend on the range used for the \( b \) values and would not reflect properly the diffusion in the voxel. Measurements with low \( b \) values would then be more sensitive to fast diffusion components. The ideal approach would be to separate all subcompartments by fitting the data with a multiexponential decay. Unfortunately, the values for \( D_i \) are often low and not very different from each other, so that large \( b \) values and high signal-to-noise ratios would be required. Furthermore, one would have to consider relaxation effects if compartments have different relaxation rates (43).

A different situation occurs when measurement times are longer. First, restricted diffusion may appear in the smallest subcompartments. Second, molecular exchanges may be seen between communicating compartments, so that the analytical treatment becomes difficult. Applying the central limit theorem for \( N \) compartments in the case of long diffusion times, one can justify the use of a single apparent diffusion constant \( D_a \):

\[
D_a = \sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i D_i \tag{44}
\]

This approach is also consistent with NMR dispersion studies (44) that suggest that cell membranes can be ignored on the NMR time scale. In intermediate situations, one must take into account the geometrical arrangement and the diffusion coefficients of each compartment, as well as their rates of exchange (45). A comprehensive analysis of the diffusion attenuation curves obtained with different diffusion times may lead to an accurate description of the medium microstructure.

**Diffusion of Metabolites**

Recent progress made in \emph{in vivo} Fourier NMR spectroscopy allows the extension of diffusion measure-
ments to molecules other than water. NMR can resolve different nuclear species, because they have different Larmor frequencies. For different nuclear species, such as $^{31}$P, $^{19}$F, $^3$H, or $^{13}$C, one can make use of their chemical shift to determine independent diffusion coefficients of compounds in complex mixtures (46). Diffusion of phosphocreatine, for instance, can be studied by $^{31}$P spectroscopy (47,48). Phosphocreatine is a true intracellular space probe (in contrast to water which diffuses across cell membranes), that exhibits true restricted diffusion (Fig. 6). Phosphocreatine (or N-acetylaspartate in neurons) may be used to provide information about the intracellular milieu, such as intercellular viscosity or geometry. Monitoring exchange of metabolites or drugs through cell membranes could also benefit from similar techniques designed to measure molecular flow (49). It is worth mentioning that, for nuclear species with spin $> 1/2$ or for coupled spin systems, multiple quantum experiments would be less demanding on gradient hardware for diffusion measurements, because the effective gradient amplitudes that apply are increased by the power of the coherence order $n$. With $n = 2$, one thus expects a fourfold increase in the diffusion effect. Examples of such studies have been obtained with $^{23}$Na (50) and in coupled spin systems (51) and have been used recently in vivo for lactic acid (52). The feasibility of measurements of metabolite diffusion in vivo using $^1$H-NMR spectroscopy has recently been shown in animals (53) and in the human brain (54), as will be shown in Chapter 3.
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