



Gadolinium Toxicity and Non-contrast MRI



David V. Schacht, MD MPH Breast and Women's Imaging Associate Professor Northwestern Memorial Hospita Chicago International Breast Course The Westin Chicago River North November 1-3, 2019



No real or apparent relationships to report.



## Outline

- Describe the types of Gadolinium contrast agents (GBCAs)
- · Understand their known side effects
- Review public policy regarding GBCAs and how toxicities may differ between types
- Review reasons to pursue DWI / non-contr MRI methods
- Review technical aspects of DWI / non-( ntrast methods
- Review current and potential future res or TWI methods

# Why GBCAs?

Eservitial to many clinical MRI protocols, Including DCE MRI

 Enhanced MRI images obtain information not obtainable through other imaging modalities, or non-contrast MRI

## Wh GBC 's?

- Over, favorz /e safety profile
   >450 /, v es given worldwide
- Breast MRI <u>without</u> contrast currently not standard of care for most indications (exception: implants)
  - High (enough) relaxivity needed from a contrast agent to make lesions conspicuous

# What is Gadolinium?



**国** 



#### **Differences between GBCAs:**

- Well publicized:
   Linear vs. Macrocylic
   Neutral vs. lonic (perhaps not as important as w I-, due to small dose volume)
  - Neutral vs. Ionic (pernaps not as important as wir, due to small dose volum Degree of protein binding, cellular interactions, kinetic and

| Chemical Name             | Structure   | Ionicity  | Protein<br>Bindleg | 4 <sub>ab</sub> (sec <sup>-1</sup> ); T1/2 | Log K | Log K. | Elimination<br>Half-Life<br>(mto) | Injectual Disa<br>Eliminated<br>within 24<br>Hours (%)   |
|---------------------------|-------------|-----------|--------------------|--|-------|--------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Gadodiamide               | Lincar      | Nonionic. | No                 | 12.7; <5 sec                               | 16.9  | 14.9   | 77.8 = 16                         | 105月土方5  |
| Gadovenetamide*           | Linear      | Nonionic  | No                 | 8.6; <1 sec                                | 16.6  | 15.0   | NA                                | NA   |
| Gadopenterate dimeglumine | Linces      | lank      | No                 | 0.58; <5 int                               | 22.5  | 18.4   | 96 ± 7.8                          | 11213  |
| Gadaxenate dimeglamine    | Lines       | lonic     | Ye                 | 0,161×3 sec                                | 23.5  | 18.3   | 54.6-57                           | Amount ro-<br>maining was<br>too small to<br>be detected |
| Gadobenate dimeglumine-   | Linear      | linite    | Yes                | 0.41; <1 sec                               | 22.6  | 18.4   | 70 = 16<br>to 121 ± 36            | 80-98  |
| Gadofosyeset trisodium?   | Linear      | Ionic     | Yes                | 2.9 × 10 12 24 sec                         | 22.1  | 18.9   | NA                                | NA   |
| Gadoteridal               | Macrocyclic | Nonienic  | No                 | 2.6×10-53.9 hr                             | 23.8  | 17.1   | 54.2 = 4.8                        | 944 1 48   |
| Gadohumol                 | Macrocyclic | Nonionic  | No                 | 2.8 × 10 % 43 kr                           | 21.8  | 14.7   | 108<br>(72-393)                   | >90  |
| Gadoterate meglamine      | Macrocyclic | lonie     | Ne                 | 2-8 × 10 *: 358 hr                         | 25.6  | 19.3   | 84 ± 12 (F),<br>120 ± 42<br>1M)   | 72.9 ± 17.0<br>(F), 84,4 ±<br>9.7 (M)                    |

# Chicago International Breast Course The Westin Chicago River North November 1-3, 2019

# Differences between GBCAs: Well publicized: Hear vs. Macrovic Combination of these differences leads to differences in ADME Absorption Heatbolism Bistribution Class differences and inc. Content micro Class differences and inc. Content micro



| Differences between GBCAs: |  |  |  |  |  |
|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Relaxivity                 |  |  |  |  |  |
|                            |  |  |  |  |  |

- Differences have a critical effect on imaging efficacy
- Relaxivity plus tissue concentration determine degree of signal change
- Relaxivity varies between categories and across individual agents

| Brand Name            | 0.47T |     |     | 4.71 |  |
|-----------------------|-------|-----|-----|------|--|
| Magnevist®            | 3.8   | 4.1 | 3.7 | 3.8  |  |
| MultiHance*           | 9.2   | 6.3 | 5.5 | 5.2  |  |
| Omniscan <sup>™</sup> | 4.4   | 4.3 | 4.0 | 3.0  |  |
| Dotarem®              | 4.3   | 3.6 | 3.5 |      |  |
| ProHance®             | 4.8   | 4.1 | 3.7 | 3.7  |  |
| Gadavist®             | 6.1   | 5.2 | 5.0 | 4.7  |  |
| Eovist*               | 8.7   | 6.9 | -52 | 5.9  |  |

# Differences between GBCAs:

- Gd i sound to an organic ligand to minimize Free Gd toxicity
- · These ligands are either linear or macrocyclic:



Sutions (



# **GBCAs: Side effects**

- Acute Contrast Reactions
- Nephrogenic Systemic Fibrosis (NSF)
- Tissue Deposition (esp GP and DN)



## **GBCAs: Side effects**

- Acute Contrast Reactions:
  - Very rare for GBCAs
  - Estimates of overall likelihood are in the range of 1:10,000 to 1:40,000

Prince MR, Zhang H, Zou Z, Shann RB, Bill IVI, Inoldance of immediate gadolinium contrast medi range JW, Kong HR, Kon HM, Routegala co 2016 (1994) VI, Netrotena VI, Kong HR, Shang HA, Sh

# Chicago International Breast Course The Westin Chicago River North November 1-3, 2019



# **GBCAs: NSF**

- Nephrogenic Systemic Fibrosis
- Fibrosing disease of the skin and connective tissues of internal organs

- Assestated with lower stability agents (most reported cases w/ two of the linear agents)
- Associated with renal dysfunction, though still a rare occurrence in this patient population
- Near elimination of new NSF cases since practices have recognized risk and moved away from linear agents in patients with kidney disease
- From perspective of breast MRI, may be less critical to our breast screening patient population than deposition concerns







## **GBCAs: Side effects**

- · Study of autopsy specimens:
- · Examine specimens from patients exposed to Gd and controls who were not
- "Relatively" normal renal function
- Results:

- Confirms dose dependency of effect
- Tissue deposition correlates with degree of increased T1 signal on MRI Gd deposition in primarily capillary endothelium and interstitium, but also in neurone

McDonald RJ, McDonald JS, Kallmes DF, et al. Intracranial gadolinium deposition after contrast enhanced MR imaging. Radiology. 2015;275:772-782.

# Chicago International Breast Course The Westin Chicago River North November 1-3, 2019

#### GBCAs: Autopsy specimens



No evidence of cellul - njury - H&E (C and L ald RJ, McDonald JS, Ka ed MR imaging, Radiol DF, et al. Intrac 015;275:772-78



## Linear vs. Macrocyclics

- · Class differences in retention and deposition:
  - Retention found after administration with the linear agents Linear binding: No "cage" like macrocyclics could relate to this class difference
- Radbruch (2015): Comparison study of linear vs macrocyclic

  - 50 patients with exposure to each agent SI effects in the GP and DN nucleus compared Significant effects seen with linear, but not macrocyc
- Less significant effect with macrocyclins see other small studies (small T1 changes north in porte some studies)

#### **GBCAs: Policies and Restrictions**

#### U.S.:

- A in 2015: Common sense recommendations
- Limit use unless truly clinically necessary
   Carefully assess need for repeat administrations
- Report possible side effects
- No change in labeling
- FDA update (2017):
- More retention with linear, but no adverse outcomes due to CNS accumulation Continue to evaluate possible NSF risk including in patients with normal renal function
- FDA update (2018): New patient medication guide on 1<sup>st</sup> administration, warning on all GBCA labels
- Europe: Most linear agents restricted and/or removed from markets as of July 2017



DOES IN (TTER? We don't entirely know yet)

HOW CAN WE ABSOLUTELY TELL?

· It will continue to be very difficult to study

Overall safety profile is very strong, yet...

GP /As: L'de enects

Tissu Deposition:

# Why study non-contrast methods

#### "At first, do no harm"

- · Screening MRI is a common test, and will likely only become more common (Breast density, Risk assessment recommendations)
- Women at high risk are likely to have multiple exposures to Gd during a lifetime of screening (recall the dose dependence of the Gd effect)
- · Can we avoid the (potentially harmful) GBCAs altogether?



## DW. Tech vical Aspects

- ADC hap or antifies DWL
  - Can c i hate by using b=0 and b=something else (ex. 800) to avoid microperfusion effects
- B value (=strength of diffusion weighting)
  - Low B values show increased microperfusion effects which cause incoherent motion and signal loss
  - Higher B means more signal but also more T2 Shine through
- Standardization has been lacking, leading to difficulty with optimizing or comparing results from different protocols

#### **DWI: Clinical uses**

- Given high cellularity of malignant lesions, high DWI and low ADC are expected (exceptions exist eg. Mucinous tumors)
- Shown in multiple studies to be true, with various different thresholds applied:
  - Ex. ADC value of less than 1.1 x 10<sup>-3 mm2/s</sup>
- Much initial interest as an added trait for lesion characterization

Habuuchi et al. J. Magn. Reson. Imaging 2008;28:1157–1165



**DWI: Clinical uses** 

**DWI: Clinical uses** 

Signal Is

Low

er, intraductal pilloma, absces die over, alterna

Woodhams et al. DWI of the Breast: Pri Radiographics 2011;31(4):1059-1084

· Combination of findings from DCE MRI and DWI produced a highly accurate test result

- Sensitivity 92%
- Specificity 86% • PPV 97%
- NPV 71%

Habuuchi et al. J. Magn. Reson. Imaging 2008;28:1157-1165

**Chicago International Breast Course** The Westin Chicago River North November 1-3, 2019





#### DWI: Clinical uses: Can it stand alone?

#### Maybe so!

Kazama: DWI as an adjunct to mammo:

- Performed AUC analysis of ROC curves and compared AUC of mammo, DWI and combo
- Not a comparison on DWI to DCE however
- Small reader study (~50 patients)

Kazama, T.et al. (2012), Diffusion-weighted MRI as an adjunct to mammography in women under 50 years of age: An initial study. J. Magn. Reson. Imaging, 36: 139-144. doi:10.1002/jmri.23626



| r. | esult), DWI       | alone also outperformed m                    | ammo alone                                 |
|----|-------------------|--|--|
| ſ  |                   | Sensitivity (false-negatives by each reader) | Specificity (false-positives by earreader) |
|    | Mammography       | 64% (12, 11, 5, 8)                           | 92% (4, 4, 9, 4)                           |
|    | DW<br>imaging 5.6 | 74% (7, 6, 7, 6)                             | 93% (4, 6, 5, 5)                           |
|    | DWI/Cal +++       | 88% (3, 3, 3, 3)                             | 91% (5, 6, 7, 6)                           |
|    | DWI/MMG ***       | 93% (2, 3, 0, 2)                             | 85% (8, 9, 13, 9)                          |

# Chicago International Breast Course The Westin Chicago River North November 1-3, 2019



#### DWI: Clinical uses: Can it stand alone?

• Why does DWI struggle?

- DCIS: Variable appearance, low sensitivity
- Papillomas/High risk lesions: Low ADC, confounders/false positives
- ILC: Discohesive cells, may lead to underestimation on DWI
- Fibrocystic change/fibroadenomas: \ riable appearance, false positives
- Mucinous tumors: Mimics a cyst, Use negatives

#### DWI: Clinical uses: Neoadjuvant setting

DW: changes may pre-date DCE changes

- Theory: Apoptosis, cellular membrane breakdown may be induced before tumor size changes
- Low initial ADC and increased ADC during treatment potential biomarkers

#### DW' Clinica. vses: weoadjuvant setting

- Often these patients will get repeat MRI.
- Consideration could be given to a noncon comparison study when an initial DCE+DWI study was performed and/or to monitor early or inter-regimen progress.

#### Other non-contrast methods:

- HiSS: High spectral and spatial imaging
- ASL: Arterial spin labeling

· EPT: Electrical properties tomography



# Conclusions:

- GBCAs have an overall strong safety record
- There are differences in side effect profiles of the different contrast agents
- Continued research is needed to ensure that we are able to identify rare side effects
- Non-contrast MRI techniques are a potential option for screening MRI that would avoid IV contrast altogether
- DWI and other techniques are promising options for which continued study is warranted

Chicago International Breast Course The Westin Chicago River North November 1-3, 2019



(C) 2019 David V. Schacht, MD MPH.