Superparamagnetic nanoparticles are used as contrast agents in magnetic resonance imaging and allow, for example, the detection of tumors or the tracking of stem cells in vivo. By producing magnetic inhomogeneities, they influence the nuclear magnetic relaxation times, which results in a darkening, on the image, of the region containing these particles. A great number of studies have been devoted to their magnetic properties, to their synthesis and to their influence on nuclear magnetic relaxation. The theoretical and fundamental understanding of the behavior of these particles is a necessary step in predicting their efficiency as contrast agents, or to be able to experimentally obtain some of their properties from a nuclear magnetic resonance measurement. Many relaxation models have been published, and choosing one of them is not always easy, many parameters and conditions have to be taken into account. Relaxation induced by superparamagnetic particles is generally attributed to an outersphere relaxation mechanism. Each model can only be used under specific conditions (motional averaging regime, static regime, high magnetic field, etc.) or for a particular sequence (Carr-Purcell-Meiboom-Gill, spin echo, free-induction decay, nuclear magnetic relaxation dispersion profile, etc.). The parameters included in the equations must be carefully interpreted. In some more complex conditions, simulations are necessary to be able to predict the relaxation rates. A good agreement is usually observed between the theoretical predictions and the experimental results, although some data still cannot be fully understood, such as the dependence of the transverse relaxation on the magnetic field. © 2017 Wiley Periodicals, Inc.
A NEW IMAGING TECHNIQUE BASED ON SPM NPs: MPI

While SPM NPs are indirectly detected by their influence on water protons in MRI, a new and recent imaging technique called MPI has been elaborated based on their direct detection. The principle of MPI is to put the SPM NPs under an oscillatory exciting magnetic field: if the oscillation is slower than the magnetic NP relaxation, the NP magnetic magnetization will follow the oscillation. The amplitude of the excitation field is chosen as larger than the magnetic field at which the particles saturate, which means the SPM response is not a pure sine oscillation. This specific response can thus be exploited to distinguish regions without SPM NPs and regions containing SPM NPs. Additional gradients and more complex excitations can be used to localize the signal and the SPM NP concentration and to obtain a gray scaled image.

MPI is therefore an imaging tracer-based method which is able to provide a quantitative measurement of SPM NP concentration with high sensitivity and is characterized by high spatial (<1 mm) and temporal (<0.1 s) resolutions. As in MRI, MPI only uses non-ionizing radiation meaning that it is safe for the patient. Since it is a recent imaging technique, only a few studies focus on the in vivo medical application of this technique. Preliminary studies for cardiovascular blood flow imaging, cell labeling and tracking have provided promising results for the use of MPI in future human diagnosis.

SUPERPARAMAGNETIC PARTICLES

In this section, the magnetic properties of SPM NPs will be discussed. Before reading further, it is important to note that the magnetic moment discussed in this section belongs to the SPM NP itself. It is often mentioned in the literature as ‘electronic’ or ‘SPM’ magnetic moment which must be distinguished from the proton magnetic moment arising from its spin. The signal in MRI or nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) is exclusively due to the proton spins.

Superparamagnetism

A magnet is characterized by its magnetic moment, a vector whose magnitude indicates its magnetic intensity and whose direction points from south to north poles. The ratio between the amplitude of the magnetic moment and the volume of a material defines its ‘magnetization.’ A magnet is either ferromagnetic or ferrimagnetic: its electron spins interact with the applied external magnetic field (Zeeman interaction) as well as with each other (exchange interaction). In a ferromagnetic material, each electron spin tends to be aligned with its neighbor. A ferrimagnetic material is composed of electrons, which tend to be unequally anti-aligned with their neighbors, giving rise to a non-null total magnetic moment.

A magnet is featured by a magnetic hysteresis curve (Figure 1(a)): its magnetization dependence on
the applied magnetic field presents a remnant magnetization and an irreversible evolution. These materials are composed of magnetic domains, called ‘Weiss domains,’ in which the electron spins are aligned with each other (Figure 1(c)). It is important to note that the magnetic moment of these particles is far larger than the proton magnetic signal detected in NMR, which is produced by the nuclei.

A superparamagnetic particle is defined as a magnetic particle which

1. is composed of a single Weiss domain
2. has no remnant magnetization and thus presents a reversible magnetization curve

Property (1) leads to a huge particle magnetic moment compared to the magnetic moment of a single magnetic ion. As all the electron spins are always aligned with each other in a single magnetic domain, the magnitude $|\mu_{\text{SPM}}|$ of the magnetic moment of a single SPM NP is always constant. Property (2) means that whatever the particle history is, the measurement always provides the equilibrium state of the sample (Figure 1(b)). Thus, at zero applied field, the magnetic moment of one nanoparticle in the sample jumps from one direction to another so that its magnetic moment is time averaged to zero. This is only possible if the characteristic relaxation time of the SPM NPs of the sample is very small compared to the measurement time.

**Anisotropy Energy**

The magnetic moment of an SPM NP is preferentially aligned in specific directions. These directions depend on several parameters, such as the crystallographic structure and shape of the particle. In the simplest case of uniaxial anisotropy, there is only one easy-direction and the tendency for the magnetic moment to be aligned—or anti-aligned—with this axis depends on its anisotropy energy

$$H_A = KV\sin^2\theta$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $K$ is the anisotropy constant proper to the material, $V$ is the particle volume, and $\theta$ is the angle between the anisotropy axis and the magnetic moment vector. The energy is minimum when the magnetic moment is aligned ($\theta = 0^\circ$) or anti-aligned ($\theta = 180^\circ$) with the easy axis and flipping from one
minimum position to another requires overcoming an energy barrier of $KV$.

**Néel and Rotational Brownian Relaxations**

To be considered as superparamagnetic, the relaxation of the magnetic moment of the NP must be faster than the measurement time. Two main relaxation processes occur in a liquid sample containing SPM NPs: the Néel and the rotational Brownian relaxations.

If the thermal fluctuations are large enough, the magnetic moment of an SPM NP has sufficient energy to overcome the anisotropy energy barrier and can jump from one minimum-energy position to another—leading to a null time average magnetization, if the measurement time is long enough. This characteristic jumping time is called the ‘Néel relaxation time’; it exponentially depends on the nanoparticle volume

$$\tau_N = \tau_0 e^{KV/k_B T}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where $T$ is the sample temperature and $k_B$ is the Boltzmann constant. $\tau_0$ is usually considered as a constant depending on the considered material at first approximation, but actually depends on several particle parameters, such as its volume, anisotropy energy, temperature, etc. Equation (2) is also only strictly valid when assuming a zero applied magnetic field and only for non-interacting particles. In case of interparticle interactions (occurring at high particle concentrations), a Vogel-Fulcher model must be used. The Néel relaxation is dominant when the Néel time is short, i.e., when the particle is sufficiently small or when the temperature is high enough.

In a liquid, SPM NPs are submitted to collisions with the solvent molecules which makes the particle rotate randomly. The corresponding rotational Brownian relaxation time is given by

$$\tau_B = \frac{3\eta V_H}{k_B T}$$ \hspace{1cm} (3)

where $\eta$ is the dynamic viscosity of the carrier fluid and $V_H$ is the hydrodynamic volume of the particle. This relaxation is efficient when the anisotropy energy is very high: in this case, the magnetic moment of the NP is blocked along its easy axis since the Néel relaxation time is enormous. The only way to reorient the magnetic moment of the particle is to physically rotate the NP. Of course, when particles are not in a liquid (e.g., if they are in ice, in a dried powder), no Brownian relaxation occurs and only the Néel relaxation has to be considered. This rotational relaxation is also less effective when the particles are constrained in tissues.

When both relaxation mechanisms are of the same order of magnitude, an effective relaxation time $\tau$ can be introduced and it obeys the equation

$$\frac{1}{\tau} = \frac{1}{\tau_N} + \frac{1}{\tau_B}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (4)

$\tau$ can be interpreted as the characteristic time for the system to exponentially evolve from its initial state to the equilibrium state. Equation (4) shows that it is the shortest relaxation time which is dominant. To know if a particle is in the superparamagnetic regime, one only needs to compare the shortest relaxation time to the measurement time.

**Magnetization Curve**

As shown in Figure 1(b), when a sample containing superparamagnetic particles is exposed to an increasing magnetic field, the sample magnetization increases up to a saturation value, corresponding to the case in which the magnetic moment of each particle is aligned with the external magnetic field. This curve is usually well described by a Langevin function

$$L(x) = \coth x - \frac{1}{x} ; x = \frac{\mu_{SPM} B_0}{k_B T}$$ \hspace{1cm} (5)

where $B_0$ is the external field and $\mu_{SPM}$ is the SPM NP’s magnetic moment. This equation is obtained by considering the thermal energy and the coupling energy between the magnetic moments and the external field $B_0$

$$H_0 = -\mu_{SPM} B_0.$$ \hspace{1cm} (6)

The Langevin function neglects the anisotropy energy and is thus only valid if the anisotropy energy is very small compared to the thermal fluctuations. For larger anisotropy energy, deviation from the Langevin law can be observed.

**Iron Oxides**

Among all the SPM NPs used in the medical field, iron oxides—especially ferrimagnetic magnetite and maghemite—are certainly the most popular CAs. Magnetite ($\text{Fe}_3\text{O}_4$) is a hard black mineral while maghemite ($\gamma\text{-Fe}_3\text{O}_4$) appears red-brown, and has the same crystalline structure as magnetite, but with cation vacancies. As maghemite can result from the oxidation of magnetite, pure magnetite does not exist in the medical field, where water is omnipresent and causes the oxidation of magnetite. However, the
The size of a magnetite Weiss domain is about 0.1 μm. For magnetite, $\tau_0 \approx 10^{-9}$ s and $K \approx 13,500$ J m$^{-3}$ and Eq. (2) leads to a Néel time of 700 years for a 15nm-particle radius and to 0.5 ms for a 10 nm-particle radius at 310 K; the Néel time of a particle is strongly dependent on its size and is the dominant relaxation mechanism for particles smaller than 10 nm. For larger particles, the Brownian relaxation will be dominant.

**NUCLEAR MAGNETIC RELAXATION INDUCED BY SUPERPARAMAGNETIC PARTICLES**

When an NMR experiment is carried out on an aqueous sample containing SPM NPs, the corresponding longitudinal and transverse nuclear magnetic relaxation times $T_1$ and $T_2$ get shorter compared to the sample without any SPM NPs. While a fully quantum theory should be used to rigorously model what microscopically happens in the sample, in the case of SPM NPs, a classical view is enough to qualitatively understand the relaxation mechanisms involved in the sample.$^{19,20}$

**Microscopic Origins: Fundamental Hypothesis**

**Magnetic Inhomogeneities and Fluctuations**

In a classical view, a proton spin can be represented by a nuclear magnetic moment vector. Exposed to a local magnetic field $B_{loc}$, a single proton magnetic moment rotates around the field at the local Larmor frequency $\nu_p = \gamma_p B_{loc}/2\pi$ where $\gamma_p$ is the proton gyromagnetic ratio. Relaxation is caused by (1) the presence of magnetic field inhomogeneities and (2) the fact that each single proton is exposed to magnetic fluctuations (Figure 2(a) and (b)). These two conditions imply a possibly irreversible proton spin dephasing which results in an evolution of the average proton magnetization of the sample.

**Outersphere Mechanism**

In the case of SPM NPs, most of the theoretical models postulate that relaxation arises from the magnetic inhomogeneities produced by the dipolar magnetic field of the particles. This dipolar magnetic field depends on the magnetic moment of the SPM NP. In an aqueous sample, each proton experiences magnetic fluctuations because of (1) its free bulk diffusion in these magnetic inhomogeneities (this is called the outersphere mechanism, see Figure 2(c)) and (2) the Néel and Brownian relaxation of the SPM magnetization.

**Fundamental Assumptions**

These two simple assumptions actually hide other hypotheses that the reader must take into account before using the models:

- Water diffusion is modeled by the diffusion equation, and water molecules are supposed to approach the particle at a minimal distance $R_{NMR}$ (a spherical symmetry is supposed). Thus the ‘radius’ of the SPM NP obtained in NMR is
not necessarily the same as the radius obtained in transmission electron microscopy (TEM), i.e., the real radius of the SPM nanocrystal. For example, if the NP is covered by an impermeable coating, \( R_{\text{NMR}} \) will be the sum of coating thickness and of the NP crystal radius.\(^{21-23}\)

- Concentration of SPM NPs in water is supposed to be very low and NPs are supposed to be homogeneously distributed in the sample. In case of aggregation of SPM NPs, a modification of the standard theories presented in this section is absolutely necessary.
- The SPM magnetic moment is supposed to be submitted to a Néel and/or Brownian rotation depending on the considered sample. It is also supposed to rotate around the magnetic field at the electronic Larmor frequency at low anisotropy energy.
- The SPM magnetic moment is supposed to follow a Boltzmann distribution—i.e., it tends to get aligned with the applied magnetic field.
- For the sake of calculus simplicity, only uniaxial anisotropy is considered.

These assumptions were progressively introduced into the models to refine the understanding of the different experimental data. Renshaw et al. were the first to suggest applying the outersphere mechanism for SPM samples\(^{34}\) based on the relaxation models of paramagnetic ions.\(^{25-28}\) Gillis and Koenig extended the model for all magnetic fields.\(^{29}\) An assumption about the dependence of the SPM magnetization on the applied magnetic field was then introduced by Koenig and Brown.\(^{30}\) Roch et al. proposed the first model which fitted experimental data for high anisotropy\(^{31}\) and which inspired Koenig and Kellar for a low anisotropy model\(^{32}\)—failing to completely fit the data.\(^{33}\) A full quantum model was then proposed by Roch et al.\(^{34}\) which was able to fit experimental data presenting high or low anisotropy. More recently, a new model has been presented by Levy et al.,\(^{35}\) which is more suited to high anisotropy SPM NPs. Considerable theoretical work has also been achieved for the transverse relaxation rate at high fields—which is easier to model—using simulations or different mathematical methods; experimental data were successfully reproduced.\(^{36-43}\) These models will be explained in more detail in the next sections and are summarized in Table 1.

NMRD Profiles: Longitudinal Relaxation

Nuclear magnetic relaxation dispersion (NMRD) profiles are curves describing the dependence of the relaxation rates on the applied external magnetic field \( B_0 \) (expressed in proton Larmor frequency). From a fundamental point of view, they provide interesting information on the microscopic mechanisms occurring in the sample.\(^{36}\) In practice, fitting the experimental NMRD data with the right model equations allows the microscopic parameters of the sample to be extracted. Almost all the current formulas used for NMRD profiles are restricted by the ‘Redfield condition’: they are only valid if the magnetic fluctuations are very fast and if their amplitude is small. In the case of SPM NPs dispersed in water, this condition—called the ‘motional averaging regime’ (MAR)—is given by

\[
\frac{\gamma_p \mu_0 M_{\text{NMR}}}{3} \frac{R_{\text{NMR}}^2}{D} \ll 1
\]

where \( \mu_0 = 4\pi \times 10^{-7} \text{ H m}^{-1} \) is the vacuum magnetic permeability, \( R_{\text{NMR}} \) is the minimal NP-proton distance of approach, \( D \) is the water diffusion coefficient, \( \gamma_p = 267,522 \text{ rad s}^{-1} \text{T}^{-1} \) is the proton gyromagnetic ratio, \( M_{\text{sat}} \) is the saturation magnetization of the nanocrystal given by

\[
M_{\text{NMR}}^{\text{sat}} = \frac{\mu_{\text{SPM}}}{2\pi R_{\text{NMR}}^3}
\]

which is the effective magnetization felt by the protons. The condition in Eq. (7) must always be checked before a fitting of the experimental data.

Low Anisotropy Energy (Dominant Néel Relaxation)

For particles with low and intermediate anisotropy energies, Néel relaxation is fast and dominates the rotational Brownian relaxation (i.e., \( \tau_N \ll \tau_R \)). In this case, the low anisotropy model\(^{34}\) can be applied and the longitudinal relaxation rate is given by

\[
R_1 = \frac{1}{T_1} = \frac{32\pi}{135} \left( \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \right)^2 \frac{\mu_{\text{SPM}}}{R_{\text{NMR}}^3} \frac{C}{R_{\text{NMR}} D}
\]

with

\[
R_{\text{Néel}}(P, \omega_r, \omega_p, \tau_D, \tau_N, \xi) = 7P \frac{L(x)}{x^2} J_e(\omega_r, \tau_D, \tau_N) + \left[ 7(1-\rho) \frac{L(x)}{x} + 3 \left( 1-2\frac{L(x)}{x} - L^2(x) \right) \right] J_e(\omega_p, \tau_D, \tau_N) + 3L^2(x) J_e(\omega_p, \tau_D)
\]

\( C \) is the nanoparticle concentration, i.e., the number of particles per volume (in m\(^{-3}\)).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Name</th>
<th>Equation Number</th>
<th>Model Conditions—Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NMRD</td>
<td>$R_1\colon \text{Eq. (9)}$</td>
<td>MAR condition (Eq. (7)) Low SPM NP concentration No SPM NP aggregation Low anisotropy energy/dominant Néel relaxation NMRD prediction: can be used to calculate the relaxation at any static magnetic field $B_0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R_2 = R_2^*\colon \text{Eq. (17)}$</td>
<td>Low SPM NP concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid Dipole Model$^{35}$</td>
<td>$R_1\colon \text{Eq. (14)}$</td>
<td>MAR condition (Eq. (7)) Low SPM NP concentration No SPM NP aggregation High anisotropy energy/dominant Brownian rotational relaxation NMRD prediction: can be used to calculate the relaxation at any static magnetic field $B_0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R_2 = R_2^*\colon \text{Eq. (19)}$</td>
<td>Low SPM NP concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-Phase Iron Model$^{44}$</td>
<td>$R_1\colon \text{Eq. (21)}$</td>
<td>MAR condition (Eq. (7)) Low SPM NP concentration No SPM NP aggregation Low anisotropy energy/dominant Néel relaxation NMRD prediction: can be used to calculate the relaxation at any static magnetic field $B_0$ The SPM NP is supposed to be composed of an SPM, an antiferromagnetic, and a paramagnetic phases Ideally requires other measurement methods to extract the values of the additional parameters of the model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R_2\colon \text{Eq. (22)}$</td>
<td>Low SPM NP concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPMG—FID</td>
<td>Theoretical prediction: Eq. (25)</td>
<td>MAR condition (Eq. (7)) Low SPM NP concentration No SPM NP aggregation Available only at high applied magnetic field $B_0$ In the MAR condition, $R_2 = R_2^*$ (if the echo time is longer than the correlation time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empirical scaling law: Eq. (26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID</td>
<td>Static Model$^{39}$</td>
<td>Static condition (Eq. (27)) Low SPM NP concentration Available only at high applied magnetic field $B_0$ Available only for an FID sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R_2^*\colon \text{Eq. (28)}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPMG</td>
<td>Partial Refocusing Model$^{37}$</td>
<td>Static condition (Eq. (27)) Low SPM NP concentration Available only at high applied magnetic field $B_0$ Available only for a CPMG sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R_2\colon \text{Eq. (29)}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spin Echo</td>
<td>Spin Echo Kurz Model$^{41}$</td>
<td>The model should be valid in the static and MAR regimes, but with the parameters used in this article, only the simulation points in the static region were in agreement with the prediction of this model Available only at high applied magnetic field $B_0$ Available for a spin echo sequence The $\kappa$ parameter can be approximated by Eq. (31) but its exact value is given by the solution of the transcendental Eq. (5) in Ref 41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CPMG, Carr-Purcell-Meiboom-Gill; FID, free-induction decay; MAR, motional averaging regime; NMRD, nuclear magnetic relaxation dispersion; SPM NP, superparamagnetic nanoparticle.
\[ C = \frac{N_{\text{SPM}}}{V_{\text{sample}}}, \quad \tau_D = \frac{R_{\text{NMR}}^2}{D} \]  

(11)

where \( N_{\text{SPM}} \) is the total number of SPM NPs in the sample, \( V_{\text{sample}} \) is the sample volume, \( x = \mu_{\text{SPM}}B_0/ k_B T, \) \( \omega_0 = \gamma B_0 \) is the angular electronic Larmor frequency, \( \omega_p = \gamma_p B_0 \) is the angular proton Larmor frequency, \( \gamma_p = 1.76086 \) \( 10^{11} \) C kg\(^{-1}\) is the electronic gyromagnetic ratio, \( \tau_N \) is the Néel time, \( P \) is an empirical parameter which depends on the SPM anisotropy energy.\(^{34,47} \) In Eq. (10), the Freed and Ayant spectral densities\(^{48,49} \) are defined as

\[
J_F(\omega, \tau_D, \tau_N) = \text{Re}\left(\frac{1 + \frac{z^{1/2}}{\tau_D}}{1 + \frac{z^{1/2}}{\tau_D}}\right) \quad \text{with} \quad z = \frac{\tau_D}{\tau_N} + \omega \tau_D i
\]

(12)

\[
J_A(\omega, \tau_D) = \frac{1 + \frac{z^2}{\tau_D}}{1 + \frac{z^2}{\tau_D}} \quad \text{with} \quad z = \sqrt{2\omega \tau_D}
\]

(13)

where \( \text{Re}(z) \) is the real part of the imaginary number \( z \). Equation (9), derived by Roch et al.,\(^{34} \) is semi-empirical: it is a linear combination of contributions with a zero, and with an infinite anisotropy energy. It was able to reproduce the predictions of the full-quantum calculation. A simplified version of their expression (using \( Q = 1 - P \) and \( \omega_0 = 0 \) in Eq. (31) of Ref 34) is proposed here because it is able to reproduce most of the fittings.\(^{50} \)

Typical curves are shown in Figure 3. Néel relaxation influences only the low-field part of the curve, which increases when the Néel time is larger. The first minimum of the NMRD is due to the anisotropy energy through the empirical parameter \( P \); it disappears if the anisotropy energy is sufficiently high (corresponding to \( P = 0 \)). The increase of the relaxation rate can be attributed to the reorientation of the SPM magnetic moment with the applied magnetic field and is mathematically related to the Langevin function. Then the final decrease of the relaxation rate is caused by the shape of the spectral densities which tend to zero when the Larmor frequencies tend to infinity. The position of the last inflection point is reached when \( \omega_p \tau_D = \gamma B_0 R_{\text{NMR}}^2/D \approx 1 \) which gives a visual indication on the proton minimal distance of approach \( R_{\text{NMR}} \): the more the inflection point is shifted to the low magnetic field \( B_0 \), the larger \( R_{\text{NMR}} \) is (Figure 3(a)).

In this model, the Néel time is considered as independent of the magnetic field—a strong (and often invalid) assumption. Moreover, it neglects the interaction between the SPM NPs which can influence the Néel time at high particle concentrations.\(^{51} \) The obtained Néel time from this model has to be carefully interpreted and actually only provides a rough qualitative estimation of its real value\(^{47} \)—this discrepancy still remains unclear. Another model was also proposed by Levy et al.\(^{35} \) it directly introduces the anisotropy energy into the model and takes into account the dependence of the Néel time on the magnetic field. However, it is less easy to implement than the low anisotropy model because of a non-analytical integral.

### High Anisotropy Energy (Dominant Brownian Relaxation)

When the anisotropy energy of the SPM NP is very high compared to thermal fluctuations, the SPM magnetic moment is blocked on its anisotropy axis. In this case, Lévy et al. introduced the ‘rigid dipole model’ which can be applied when the rotational Brownian relaxation is dominant: the longitudinal relaxation rate is then given by

\[
R_1 = \frac{1}{T_1} = \frac{16\pi^2}{135} \left(\frac{\mu_0}{4\pi}\right)^2 \mu_{\text{SPM}}^2 \gamma_p^2 D \frac{C}{R_{\text{SPM}} D}
\]

\[
R_{\text{Brown}}(x, \omega_p, \tau_D, \tau_L, \tau_\parallel)
\]

(14)

with

\[
R_{\text{Brown}}(x, \omega_p, \tau_D, \tau_L, \tau_\parallel) = \left[ 14 \frac{L(x)}{x} J_F(\omega_p, \tau_D, \tau_L) + 6 L^2(x) J_A(\omega_p, \tau_D) \right]
\]

\[
+ 6 \left( 1 - \frac{2 L(x)}{x} - L^2(x) \right) J_F(\omega_p, \tau_D, \tau_\parallel)
\]

(15)

\[
\tau_\parallel = \frac{2 L(x)}{x - L(x)} \tau_B; \tau_\parallel = \frac{d \ln L(x)}{d \ln x} \tau_B
\]

\[
= \frac{x}{L(x)} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\sinh^2(x)} \right) \tau_B; \tau_B = \frac{4\pi \eta R_{\text{NMR}}^2}{k_B T}; x = \frac{\mu_{\text{SPM}} B_0}{k_B T}
\]

(16)

where \( \eta = 0.6915 \times 10^{-3} \) Pa s is the water viscosity at 37°C.\(^{52} \)

Typical NMRD curves of this model are shown in Figure 4: the curves are characterized by a simpler decreasing shape and do not present any maximum.
The inflection point is radius dependent and is shifted to lower magnetic fields for larger radii. The nanoparticle magnetization only influences the magnitude of the curve without changing its shape.

NMRD Profiles: Transverse Relaxation
Contrarily to longitudinal NMRD, just a few studies tried to compare the theory and experiments for the transverse relaxation\(^{53-55}\). While theoretical predictions are available, significant variations of the transverse relaxation are expected to occur at fields so low that it is technically difficult to measure the signal decay. In the dominant Néel relaxation model, this is given by\(^{55,56}\):

\[
R_s^2 = \frac{1}{T_s^2} = \frac{16\pi / \mu_0}{135 \left(\frac{4\pi}{\gamma}\right)^2} \mu_{SPM}^2 \frac{C}{R_{SPM}D}
\]

\[
R_{Neel}^s(P, \omega, \omega_p, \tau_D, \tau_N, \tau_x)
\]

\[
R_{Neel}^s(P, \omega, \omega_p, \tau_D, \tau_N, \tau_x) = \frac{1}{x} \left( 13P_{\tau} + 6(1-P)_{\tau} + 2(1-P)_{\tau} \right) + \left( 1 - 2 \frac{L(x)}{x} - L^2(x) \right) (3J_A(\omega_t, \tau_D, \tau_N) + 4J_F(0, \tau_D, \tau_N))
\]

The corresponding curve is shown in Figure 5(a) and can be compared to the analogous longitudinal NMRD profile; the variation between the \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \) curves are well correlated and, as expected, \( r_2 \) reaches a plateau at high magnetic fields.

The dominant Brownian rotation model can also be extended to transverse relaxation and is given by Ref 57:

\[
R_s^2 = \frac{1}{T_s^2} = \frac{16\pi \mu_0}{135 \left(\frac{4\pi}{\gamma}\right)^2} \mu_{SPM}^2 \frac{C}{R_{NMRD}D}
\]

\[
R_{Brown}^s(\omega_p, \tau_D, \tau_L, \tau||, \tau_x)
\]

**FIGURE 3** Nuclear magnetic relaxation dispersion (NMRD) profiles predicted by the low anisotropy model (dominant Néel relaxation). If not explicitly mentioned the used parameters are: \( R_{SPM} = \) 5 nm, \( D = 3 \times 10^{-8} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1} \), \( M_{sat} = 2 \times 10^5 \text{ A m}^{-1} \), \( C_{Fe} = 1 \text{ mM}, \tau_N = 10^{-9} \text{ s} \), and \( P = 0.8 \). (a) NMRD profiles for different radii. The circled last inflection point is shifted to a low magnetic field when the radius increases. (b) When the nanoparticle magnetization increases, the maximum position is shifted to lower fields. (c) The region of influence of the different parameters on the curve.
The equations are deduced from the Redfield formalism, so that they are—strictly speaking—only valid in the MAR (Eq. (7)) and for a free-induction decay (FID) sequence. Nevertheless, if the echo time \( \tau_{\text{echo}} \) (defined as the time between the 90°-pulse and the first 180°-pulse) is longer than the correlation time—i.e., \( \tau_{\text{echo}} > \tau_D \) which is usually the case in the MAR—the corresponding transverse relaxation rate will also be equal to Eq. (19) for a Carr-Purcell-Meiboom-Gill (CPMG) or a spin echo sequence, i.e., \( R^*_{\text{T2}} = R^*_{\text{SE}} = R^*_{\text{CPMG}} \).

These equations are deduced from the Redfield formalism, so that they are—strictly speaking—only valid in the MAR (Eq. (7)) and for a free-induction decay (FID) sequence. Nevertheless, if the echo time \( \tau_{\text{echo}} \) (defined as the time between the 90°-pulse and the first 180°-pulse) is longer than the correlation time—i.e., \( \tau_{\text{echo}} > \tau_D \) which is usually the case in the MAR—the corresponding transverse relaxation rate will also be equal to Eq. (19) for a Carr-Purcell-Meiboom-Gill (CPMG) or a spin echo sequence, i.e., \( R^*_{\text{T2}} = R^*_{\text{SE}} = R^*_{\text{CPMG}} \).
Unfortunately, those equations do not seem able to match the experimental results for transverse relaxation. Indeed, recent studies have shown that it was not possible to fit longitudinal and transverse NMRDs at the same time—indicating that a relaxation mechanism may miss in the models, at least for the transverse relaxation rate.55,56,58 Moreover, most of the experimental $R_2$-NMRDs seem to exhibit a monotonously increase of $R_2$ with $B_0$ while the theoretical predictions predict a decrease of $R_2$ before it reaches a plateau.

The missing mechanism may be for example the one described by the ‘three-phase iron model’44,59: this model is able to fit $T_1$ and $T_2$ NMRD profiles at the same time. In this model, relaxation is supposed to have three contributions (see Ref 44 for more details):

$$R_1 = F_S R_{1S} + F_P R_{1P}$$

$$R_2 = F_S R_{2S} + F_P R_{2P} + F_s R_{2s}.$$  \(21\)  \(22\)

Indeed, one SPM nanoparticle is supposed to be composed of three phases: one superparamagnetic core, antiferromagnetic inclusions in the core and a paramagnetic phase. Including an empirical expression for $R_2$, the authors are able to fit their $T_1$ and $T_2$ NMRDs.

Calculating Relaxivities

To ease the comparison between different types of sample, relaxation rates are often normalized by the magnetic compound concentration—this ratio is called ‘relaxivity.’ For example, in the case of iron oxide NPs, relaxation rates are divided by the iron concentration of the sample and are expressed in $(\text{mM}[\text{Fe}])^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$. Relaxivity provides a quantitative information on the contrast efficiency of the NP: the larger its value is, the more efficient the CA. For the case of iron oxide Fe$_3$O$_4$, the SPM NP concentration $C$ can be expressed as

$$C = \frac{N_{\text{SPM}}}{V_{\text{sample}}} = \frac{C_{Fe}}{1000 V_{\text{crystal}} \rho_{Fe,O_y}} (23)$$

where $V_{\text{crystal}}$ is the volume of the nanocrystal, $\rho_{Fe,O_y}$ is its mass density, both expressed in MKS units. $C_{Fe}$ is the iron concentration in the sample expressed in mM[Fe]. Relaxivities can then be obtained easily, replacing $C$ by Eq. (23) in the expression of the relaxation rates and taking $C_{Fe} = 1 \text{ mM[Fe]}$. The relaxivities of different samples of SPM NPs are provided in Table 2.

Transverse Relaxation at High Fields

At the high magnetic field $B_0$, the longitudinal relaxation rate always tends to zero while the transverse relaxation rate converges to a value called ‘secular term.’ This condition is reached when

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2</th>
<th>Relaxivities of Different Samples of SPM NPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>$r_1 (s^{-1} \text{mM}^{-1}[\text{Fe}])$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Commercial Contrast Agents</td>
<td>SPIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHU-555A (Resovist)</td>
<td>25.4 (0.47 T, 37°C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMI-25 (Endorem)</td>
<td>9.95 (1.5 T, 37°C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMI-25 (Endorem)</td>
<td>9.95 (1.5 T, 37°C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USPIO</td>
<td>25 (0.4 T, 37°C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMI-227 (Sinerem)</td>
<td>23.7 (0.47 T, 39°C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMI-227 (Sinerem)</td>
<td>23.7 (0.47 T, 39°C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MION-46</td>
<td>19.5 (1.5 T, 37°C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC100150 (Clariscan)</td>
<td>19.5 (1.5 T, 37°C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential CAs Reported in Literature</td>
<td>Cluster c1c2c3c4paa5k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condense cluster</td>
<td>22.2 (0.47 T, 35°C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magneto-polymeric-nanohybrids using (MnFe$_2$O$_4$)</td>
<td>24.0 (0.47 T, 35°C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CA, contrast agents; SPIO, superparamagnetic particles of iron oxide; SPM NP, superparamagnetic nanoparticle; USPIO, ultrasmall particles of iron oxide.
\[
\omega_p \tau_D = \gamma_p B_0 \frac{R_{\text{NMR}}^2}{D} > 1. \tag{24}
\]

At such fields, the SPM magnetic moment is blocked along the applied magnetic field—the Brownian and Néel relaxation times are infinite—which leads to mathematical simplifications.

**Scaling Law in the MAR**

Both Eqs (17) and (19) tend to the same expression when \( B_0 \) tends to infinity, which yields

\[
R_2^* = \frac{1}{T_2^*} = \frac{64\pi}{135} \left( \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \right)^2 \mu_{\text{SPM}}^2 \gamma_p^2 R_{\text{NMR}}^2 D. \tag{25}
\]

This expression is only valid in the MAR. For single SPM nanocrystals, Eq. (25) can be expressed as a scaling law of the minimal distance of approach and of the magnetization in the case of iron oxide NPs, it can be written as

\[
R_2^* = b C_{T_{\text{NMR}}} R_{\text{NMR}}^2 (M_{\text{sat}}^\text{NMR})^2 \tag{26}
\]

\( b \) is a constant which depends on the diffusion coefficient and the nature of the NPs. For magnetite at 37°C, it was experimentally determined that \( b = 46.4 \times 10^{-12} \) when \( d \) was expressed in nm and \( M_{\text{sat}}^\text{NMR} \) in A m\(^{-1}\).\(^4\) That value is double the theoretical prediction \( (b_{\text{theoretical}} = 23.6 \times 10^{-12}) \)—the reasons for this are still unclear. This expression shows that, in the MAR, \( r_2 \) quadratically increases with increasing radius and magnetization.

**FID in the SDR**

When the size (or the magnetization) of the nanoparticle increases, if the condition

\[
\gamma_p \mu_0 M_{\text{sat}}^\text{NMR} R_{\text{SPM}}^2 \gg 1 \tag{27}
\]

is fulfilled, the nanoparticle properties are out of the MAR and the previous equations are not valid anymore. The system is in the ‘static dephasing regime’ (SDR). The more the size increases, the more the protons seem static during the relaxation compared to the NPs. In this case, the ergodic assumption is not valid anymore and the Redfield formalism cannot be used. This regime is called the ‘static regime’ and the corresponding transverse relaxation rate is given by Ref 39

\[
\frac{1}{T_2} = \frac{2\pi \mu_0}{9\sqrt{3}} C \gamma_p \mu_{\text{SPM}}. \tag{28}
\]

This expression is independent of the NP size and is only related to the NP concentration and its magnetic moment. It is also easy to show that the corresponding relaxivity only depends on the NP’s effective magnetization \( M_{\text{sat}}^\text{NMR} \).

**Partial Refocusing Model (CPMG Sequence) in the SDR**

For a CPMG sequence, when the system is in the SDR condition (Eq. (27)), the partial refocusing model must be used. The transverse relaxation in this case is given by

\[
\frac{1}{T_2^{\text{CPMG}}} = 3\pi x^{1/3} C_{\text{DR}} R_{\text{NMR}} \left[ 1.34 + \frac{4\pi C R_{\text{NMR}}^3}{3 \gamma_{\text{SPM}}^2 \pi} \right]^{5/3};
\]

\[
x = \sqrt{\frac{1}{20 \gamma_{\text{SPM}}^2 \pi R_{\text{NMR}}^2} \tau_{\text{echo}}}; \tag{29}
\]

where \( \tau_{\text{echo}} \) is the echo time—i.e., the time interval between the 90° and the first 180° pulses.

In this model, contrary to the MAR, \( r_2 \) decreases with increasing radius, while it increases when the echo time gets longer.

**Spin Echo Model**

A recent work by Kurz et al.\(^4\) has led to the expression of a transverse relaxation equation obtained by a spin echo sequence in the static regime. They predicted that the maximum of the echo exponentially decays with an increasing echo time and is characterized by a relaxation rate given by

\[
\frac{1}{T_2} = \frac{1}{\tau} \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{1-f}{G(f \delta \omega) - i f G(f \delta \omega)} \right) \right]^{-1} \tag{30}
\]

with

\[
\tau = \frac{1 R_{\text{SPM}}^2}{\kappa D}; \quad \kappa \approx \frac{126f^{2/3}}{18 - 16f^{2/3} [7 - 7f - 18f^{5/3}];} \]

\[
G(z) = \frac{1}{3} + \frac{2}{3} [1 - 2iz] \sqrt{\frac{1}{3} \left[ 1 - \frac{i}{z} \right]} \arcoth \left( \sqrt{\frac{1}{3} \left[ 1 - \frac{i}{z} \right]} \right); \]

\[
f = C \frac{4}{3} \pi R_{\text{NMR}}^3; \quad \delta \omega = \frac{1}{3} \gamma_p \mu_0 M_{\text{sat}}^\text{NMR}. \tag{31}
\]
This equation should be valid in all usually considered regimes, i.e., motional averaging and static regimes. It is obtained supposing that the correlation time is short enough compared to the measurement time, i.e., $\tau \ll T_2$. The expression given for $\kappa$ is an approximation of the solution of a transcendental equation (see Ref 41 for more information). However, even with the exact value of $\kappa$, an agreement within the MAR range (Figure 6) was not achieved in this present study with the simulations. The very low value of $f$ compared to the value used in Ref 41 may explain this discrepancy.

Simulations

As there is no simple analytical equation able to describe the relaxation in the whole radius or magnetization range, many studies use simulations to predict relaxation rates. Simulations can be used as accurate validation tools for the existing models and are able to consider more complex and realistic systems, such as clustered NPs, water diffusion constrained in geometrical tubes, SPM labeled cells, etc.

Nuclear Magnetic Relaxation Dispersion

To our knowledge, very few methods allow the simulation of a whole NMRD of a sample containing SPM NPs. In general, NMR simulations consist of numerically solving quantum equations which, in the case of relaxation, requires a lot of computer time. For relaxation, another method consists of simulating some correlation functions but its validity is restricted by the Redfield condition (Eq. (7)).

We recently introduced a new method allowing the simulation of relaxation in the case of SPM NPs, which is valid independently of the Redfield condition. This method is an extension of the $T_2$ simulations (see below) and is not too time consuming. It was shown that each regime (SDR or MAR) was characterized by its own scaling laws and that bigger particles (larger than 40 nm) could not be experimentally detected: the last NMRD inflection point is shifted to a proton Larmor frequency low enough to cancel the relaxation rate at usual imaging frequencies.

$T_2$ at High Magnetic Field

Contrary to NMRD, many simulations have been carried out to predict the value of $T_2$ at high magnetic fields (secular term) for more than 25 years. These types of simulations are less time consuming and are based on the classical idea that under a local magnetic field, the spin rotates around that field at the local Larmor frequency. Magnetic inhomogeneities in the sample lead to spin dephasing which results in the relaxation phenomenon.

In these simulations, in the case of SPM NPs, proton diffusion is modeled by a random walk and thousands of trajectories are simulated to obtain the average proton magnetization. CPMG, FID, or spin echo sequences can be easily implemented. This method was first applied to homogeneously distributed particles and shows the different behaviors of the MAR and the SDR. Simulation results and model predictions are shown in Figure 6. The $R_2$ dependence on the radius follows a bell curve which describes a transition from the MAR to the SDR. In the MAR, $R_2$ increases with the particle size and then reaches a plateau predicted by the static model. For the CPMG and spin echo cases, the relaxation rates then decrease because of the $180^\circ$ pulses which partially refocus the spins. This decrease depends on the inter-echo time in the CPMG case. In the case of the FID, the relaxation rate becomes independent of the radius in the SDR. This curve shows that there is an optimal size to gain a maximum (secular) relaxation rate (see Table 3). In the case of magnetite, the optimal radius is about 20 nm which, from the experimental point of view, is a challenge to synthesize without aggregation and precipitation.
Clustering

In the last decade, more elaborate CAs have been developed to increase contrast efficiency, or to make them suitable for multimodal imaging.⁶⁹,⁷⁰ These CAs are entities which can comprise several nanocrystals and can be coated by an impermeable layer (Figure 7). Clustering nanocrystals can occur both in vitro and in vivo, which could influence the relaxation rate, and finally, the efficiency, of the CAs.⁷¹,⁷²

In such cases, the models must be modified to take NP aggregation into account. Several experimental and theoretical studies have been devoted to understanding and predicting these systems’ behavior.⁷³–⁷⁶ Depending on the nanocrystal or aggregation sizes, clustering can lead to an increase or decrease in the relaxation rate. For the secular term, this can be qualitatively understood through Figure 6. An initial clustering of nanocrystals in the MAR leads to a larger effective cluster radius and thus to an increase of the $R_2$. If the aggregation is too large, the effective cluster will be in the SDR and $R_2$ will then decrease.

More quantitatively, these kinds of systems can be treated as a single particle with an appropriate size and magnetic moment (Figure 7). If we consider an aggregate composed of $N_{\text{agg}}$ nanocrystals of size $R_{\text{SPM}}$ and magnetic moment $\mu_{\text{NP}}$, and with an aggregate effective minimal distance of approach of $R_{\text{agg}}$, $R_{\text{NMR}}$ must be replaced by $R_{\text{agg}}$ and the magnetic moment $\mu_{\text{SPM}}$ must be taken as the sum of all the NP magnetic moments, i.e., $\mu_{\text{SPM}} = N_{\text{agg}} \mu_{\text{NP}}$. It is less clear what must be replaced in the Langevin function: if the NPs interact with each other in each entity, then $\mu_{\text{SPM}} = N_{\text{agg}} \mu_{\text{NP}}$ should be a good approximation, otherwise, it is $\mu_{\text{SPM}} = \mu_{\text{NP}}$ which should define $x$. The particle concentration $C$ must also be replaced by an aggregate concentration: if a number of $N_{\text{agg}}^{\text{tot}}$ clusters composes the sample,

$$C = \frac{N_{\text{agg}}^{\text{tot}}}{V_{\text{sample}}} = \frac{C_{\text{NP}}}{N_{\text{agg}}}$$

which can be related to the nanoparticle concentration in the sample $C_{\text{NP}}$.

**TABLE 3 | Theoretical Prediction of the Maximum $r_2$ Achievable for Different Types of Superparamagnetic Particles⁴⁵**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particle Type</th>
<th>$M_r$ (A m⁻¹)</th>
<th>Optimal Radius (nm)</th>
<th>Predicted $r_2$ (s⁻¹ mM⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maghemite Particles</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters of Maghemite Particles (Volume Dilution of 5)</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron–Iron Oxide Core Shell Particles</td>
<td>660,000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zn–Mn Ferrite Particles</td>
<td>875,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 7 | Clustered and unclustered systems with their associated parameters.**
used with four fitting parameters (SPM radius, magnetization, Néel time, and $P$) to extract the sample properties. The obtained experimental minimal distance of approach is often in the range between the TEM and the hydrodynamic sizes (obtained by dynamic light scattering for example). The extracted Néel time seems to be qualitatively correlated to the Néel time obtained by AC-susceptibility but can be several orders of magnitude different. The model was also successfully tested in different solvents, at different temperatures or with different viscosities. Recently, transverse NMRDs have also been obtained. If the experimental shapes of the curves were qualitatively similar to the theoretical predictions, it was not possible to fit longitudinal and transverse NMRDs with the low anisotropy model at once.

\[ R_2 \]

The models predicting the transverse secular term have also been largely tested. The scaling law (Eq. (26)) predicted in the MAR was checked in our previous work, which compiles a lot of data from the literature. A square dependence on the radius was observed but the coefficient was larger than expected. In the static regime, the partial refocusing model was also successfully qualitatively tested. The trends predicted by the simulations for aggregation or for different particle shapes have also been well reproduced.

**Experimental Discrepancies**

While the experimental results are qualitatively well described by theory, some discrepancies remain when a more precise quantitative study is made. As the relaxation rates are highly dependent on the NP size (or magnetization), a small difference in size (or magnetization) can lead to a non-negligible variation of the relaxation rates. As a consequence, size polydispersity is often mentioned to justify the disagreement between experimental and theoretical values. Partial aggregation in a sample can also lead to a modification of the relaxation times. This often appears as an evolution of $T_2$ with time, during the measurement. The nature of the coating is also known to influence the proton minimal distance of approach and thus the relaxation rates. Some authors also claim that there could be an exchange between the surface and the bulk water and introduce additional fitting parameters in the models. However, it has not yet been established that such an exchange exists.

When cells are labeled by SPM NPs, the experimental relaxation rates greatly decrease compared to the relaxation rates that the particles induce when they are homogeneously distributed in water. This is of importance for in vivo applications as the particles can be efficient in water alone, but can drastically lose this efficiency in vivo. This decrease of $R_2$ can be understood by a large aggregation of the NPs and by the water compartmentalization due to the cells—but no accurate model describes this case yet.

**BIOMEDICAL APPLICATIONS OF SUPERPARAMAGNETIC NANOPARTICLES**

Superparamagnetic magnetite/maghemite particles, used as MRI contrast enhancers, are classified into two main categories whose applications are different:

1. Superparamagnetic particles of iron oxide (SPIO) containing several magnetite crystals within the same (permeable or impermeable) coating. Their hydrodynamic size is larger than 40 nm. Standard SPIOs are injected intravenously. However, some of them, intended for gastrointestinal imaging and coated within an insoluble and non-biodegradable matrix, are administered orally.

2. Ultrasmall particles of iron oxide (USPIO): particles containing a single magnetite crystal and whose hydrodynamic size is smaller than 40 nm. This type of agent is always injected intravenously.

Maghemite/magnetite CAs (principally SPIOs) were first used 30 years ago for liver imaging. Thanks to the capture of the nanoparticles by Kupffer cells, a major shortening of the transverse relaxation time is observed in liver tissue causing negative contrast because of the large $r_2/r_1$ ratio of SPIOs. Moreover, the signal loss due to this relaxation enhancement is selective, since the particles are not internalized in lesions (void of Kupffer cells), which facilitates the early detection of tumors. Such particles are also captured by the spleen and lymph nodes.

For applications necessitating a longer blood half-life (MR angiography, tissue perfusion imaging,
molecular imaging, etc.), SPIOs are not efficient due to their fast capture by the liver which is related to their rather large hydrodynamic size. USPIOs are better candidates since they stay in the blood longer. Moreover, because of their relaxation properties and especially because of their smaller \( r_2/r_1 \) ratio, they can be used as positive CAs for \( T_1 \)-weighted imaging. \(^{95-99}\)

However, the use of magnetic particles in routine clinical MRI has drastically decreased in recent years. Most of the SPM CAs have been withdrawn from the market, except those intended for imaging the gastrointestinal track. \(^{100}\)

Current applications of magnetite particles in MRI are more related to research in cellular and molecular MR imaging. \(^{101-104}\) Bulte et al.\(^6\) defined molecular imaging as ‘the non-invasive and repetitive imaging of targeted macromolecules and biological processes’ and cellular imaging as ‘the non-invasive and repetitive imaging of targeted cells and cellular processes.’ After grafting a suited vector onto a usual CA, this new type of imaging makes it possible to target specific processes, such as atherosclerosis, \(^{105}\) apoptosis, \(^{104}\) amyloid deposition in Alzheimer’s disease, \(^{103}\) etc. The main problem is getting a large quantity of a CA directly to the targeted zone of the body, in order to obtain a sufficient contrast during the imaging experiment. Magnetite nanoparticles are excellent candidates as base elements for designing molecular or cellular imaging CAs. Their transverse relaxivity is far larger than that of gadolinium chelates and each targeted particle contains many thousands of iron atoms. The MR effect is thus optimum. However, for a good sensitivity they must be used as a negative CA, which induces some specificity problems because of the occurrence of artifacts in \( T_2 \) and \( T_2^* \) weighted images.

SPM NPs are also naturally present in the human body and are stored in ferritin, which can naturally influence the MRI contrast (see Box 2).

### CONCLUSION

Since SPM particles are extensively used as MRI CAs for molecular and cellular imaging, a good understanding of the proton relaxation they induce is needed. Different theoretical models have been developed in order to describe the relaxation mechanism in different situations corresponding to different particle sizes, magnetizations, or different solvent diffusion properties. All these models are conditioned by hypotheses and assumptions that must be carefully taken into account. These theories have been validated thanks to the comparison of their predictions with experimental and computer simulation results. However, the understanding of the relaxation induced by SPM particles in vivo is still hazy since their distribution in cells and tissues is not homogeneous because of clustering. This point merits further study.

---

**BOX 2**

**FERRITIN: THE MAGNETIC PROTEIN**

Ferritin is the iron storing protein of mammals. It is constituted of 24 protein subunits forming a 13 nm spherical shell. Inside ferritin, iron is stored as a ferrihydrite (5Fe\(_2\)O\(_3\)-9H\(_2\)O) nano crystal. \(^{106}\) Ferrihydrite is antiferromagnetic: it contains two sublattices of Fe\(^{3+}\) ions whose resultant magnetic moments are in opposite directions and cancel each other out. \(^{107}\) However, for nanoparticles of ferrihydrite—such as that present inside ferritin—the compensation is not perfect and a small magnetic moment remains for each particle. Because of the nanometric size of the crystal, this magnetic moment has a superparamagnetic behavior. \(^{108}\) At a magnetic field of 1 T, the magnetisation of ferritin is almost two orders of magnitude smaller than that of magnetite particles. Therefore, the presence of ferritin can only be detected by MRI in regions where the protein significantly accumulates, like the liver, spleen, and even some nuclei of the brain. \(^{109}\) Indeed ferritin causes a shortening of \( T_2 \) which results in hypointensities on \( T_2 \) and \( T_2^* \) weighted images. \(^{110,111}\) Many groups have tried to use this property to quantify ferri

\( \text{tin in vivo} \) by MRI with mitigated results. \(^{112-115}\) The effect on \( T_1 \) is almost negligible. It has been shown that the transverse relaxation of water protons in the presence of ferritin is due to an exchange of protons between the surface of the ferrihydrite crystal and bulk water, \(^{116}\) which is clearly different from the relaxation induced by magnetite particles. Moreover, the transverse relaxivity of ferritin is very small compared to that of magnetite nanoparticles, but it increases with the field. \(^{117}\) This increase is linear in aqueous solutions while it can be either linear or quadratic in iron containing tissues, possibly because of protein clustering or degradation into hemosiderin. \(^{118}\)
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