Magnetic Resonance Imaging Contraindications

Editors

Kholoud Ahmed Khaled Mohammed

Mohammed Qasim Obaid Hamza

Ali Shaker Mahmoud Ahmed

Ameer Ali Hashim Salman

AkiNik Publications®

New Delhi

Published By: *AkiNik Publications*

AkiNik Publications
169, C-11, Sector - 3,
Rohini, Delhi-110085, India
Toll Free (India) – 18001234070
Phone No.: 9711224068, 9911215212
Website: www.akinik.com
Email: akinikbooks@gmail.com

Editors: *Kholoud Ahmed Khaled Mohammed, Mohammed Qasim Obaid Hamza, Ali Shaker Mahmoud Ahmed and Ameer Ali Hashim Salman*

Publication Year: *2024*

Edition: *1st*

Pages: *45*

Paperback ISBN: *978-93-6135-259-1*

E-book ISBN: *978-93-6135-201-0*

Book DOI: *https://doi.org/10.22271/ed.book.2846*

Price: *₹297/-*

Registration Details

- *Printing Press License No.: F.1 (A-4) press 2016*
- *Trade Mark Registered Under*
    - *Class 16 (Regd. No.: 5070429)*
    - *Class 35 (Regd. No.: 5070426)*
    - *Class 41 (Regd. No.: 5070427)*
    - *Class 42 (Regd. No.: 5070428)*

Contents

Chapter - 1

Introduction to MRI Contraindications

In patients who are under consideration for Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI), unindicated bioelectronics or nonbioelectronic devices/support in patients considered for MRI should be promptly and carefully removed as soon as it is determined that it is possible and safe to do so. For patients who are scheduled to undergo Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI), it is absolutely crucial to promptly and meticulously remove any unindicated bioelectronics or nonbioelectronic devices/support. Once it has been carefully determined that it is indeed possible and safe to do so, these devices should be efficiently taken out. It must be firmly emphasized that all ferromagnetic foreign bodies, including even the most minuscule splinters or shrapnel, that possess the potential to be displaced are unequivocal contraindications for undergoing an MRI scan. As a result, it is of the utmost importance to ensure the thorough and complete removal of such foreign bodies before proceeding with the scan. Furthermore, it is essential to diligently conduct a comprehensive assessment of the patient's extensive medical history and prevailing physical condition in order to astutely identify any potential risks or complications that may conceivably arise during the MRI procedure. Moreover, for patients who are found to be ineligible for active MR scanning, encompassing those harboring the aforementioned contraindications, it becomes absolutely imperative to meticulously and extensively evaluate non-MR alternative diagnostic methods. There are unequivocally several alternative diagnostic approaches that can competently replace MRI in certain cases within the domain of Patient Imaging (PI). An exemplary instance entails Computed Tomography (CT), which can unequivocally serve as an immensely valuable substitute for MRI in various indications. For instance, CT is a highly suitable choice for meticulously evaluating anomalies observed within the intricate inner ear, as well as meticulously assessing vestibular schwannomas (although it may arguably possess slightly reduced sensitivity in comparison to CT angiography). With its proven efficacy, CT also contributes significantly to detecting and meticulously evaluating lesions affecting the temporal bone. However, it is of paramount importance to note that when it comes to pacemakers and intravascular stents, there are currently no satisfactory non-

MR alternatives available. Therefore, healthcare professionals must conscientiously take into account and meticulously deliberate upon the intrinsic risks and corresponding benefits before deciding to prudently proceed with an MRI for patients who have such devices. In such instances, close monitoring and a well-coordinated collaboration with a distinguished multidisciplinary team are unabashedly indispensable to ensure the absolute safety, well-being, and seamless progress of the patient throughout the meticulous imaging process. To further streamline, expedite, and simplify the inherently complex and intricate process of scanning patients who possess both bioelectronic and nonbioelectronic devices, it is vehemently and wholeheartedly recommended that all healthcare facilities earnestly strive to establish a meticulously comprehensive unified department protocol. This protocol must unambiguously and coherently delineate all the necessary procedures to be scrupulously followed with remarkable precision and attentiveness before, during, and after the MRI scanning endeavor takes place. The ardent development, implementation, and meticulous honing of such a scrupulously detailed and meticulous protocol is undisputedly and unequivocally imperative and indispensable to wholeheartedly ensure the utmost level of safety, efficiency, and accuracy throughout the entire and all-encompassing process. By conscientiously abiding by and earnestly adhering to this invaluable protocol, healthcare providers can profoundly instill a genuine and unwavering sense of confidence and reassurance within themselves as they confidently navigate and expertly maneuver through the inherent complexities, intricacies, and challenges associated with MRI scans in patients with bioelectronic and nonbioelectronic devices. This, in turn, shall undeniably help minimize, abate, and mitigate the potential for complications and significantly optimize paramountly essential patient outcomes, thus unequivocally benefiting and graciously rewarding both the deserving patients and the dedicated, compassionate, and unswervingly devoted healthcare professionals profoundly involved in the process of care and healing. Furthermore, in order to perpetually and irrevocably remain at the forefront of visionary progress, innovation, and evolvement within the commendable field of patient care and medical imaging, incessant and ceaseless updating, refining, and improvement of the remarkably invaluable and crucial protocol based on the unwavering emergence of groundbreaking research, cutting-edge scientific advancements, and immensely promising technological breakthroughs are unequivocally and resolutely vital and indispensable. The adoption of this tirelessly dedicated approach shall perpetually and unflaggingly ensure and secure the provision of the absolute best possible and unparalleled standards of care, compassion, and unwavering dedication to patients who wholeheartedly entrust and rely upon the unyielding and tenacious commitment and expertise of the responsible healthcare professionals. Accordingly, when artfully summarizing and meticulously encapsulating the vast significance and essentiality of considering patients for invaluable MRI procedures, it becomes diligently clear, evident, and unequivocal that the prompt and unwaveringly careful removal of unindicated bioelectronics or nonbioelectronic devices/support is undeniably and unequivocally of paramount importance. In light of this, it is prodigiously imperative to meticulously and profoundly evaluate and assess any ferromagnetic foreign bodies before assiduously proceeding with the scan. Furthermore, for patients deemed borderline or categorically ineligible for MRI, utilizing judicious alternative diagnostic methods, such as the commendable CT, may decidedly and substantially surmount and ameliorate the paramount challenge and inherent limitations posed by the limited availability of efficacious non-MR alternatives for certain devices. The unswerving and indefatigable establishment of an utterly comprehensive and all-inclusive department protocol is undeniably, unequivocally, and indispensably crucial, invaluable, and indispensable in order to seamlessly streamline, expedite, enhance, and elevate the overall process. By resolutely adopting and meticulously adhering to this painstakingly developed protocol, healthcare providers can wholeheartedly ensconce themselves in a state of unwavering confidence and unparalleled proficiency, thus successfully circumnavigating the intricacies, complexities, and unanticipated obstacles commonly encountered during the course of MRI scans carried out on patients with bioelectronic and nonbioelectronic devices. Undoubtedly, this remarkable, steadfast dedication to intricately abiding by such an invaluable protocol shall unambiguously curtail, alleviate, and nullify the potential for complications, ultimately and undeniably optimizing and fine-tuning paramount patient outcomes. Ultimately and significantly, this well-structured, carefully cultivated, and meticulously refined protocol shall undeniably and abundantly prove exquisitely beneficial and profoundly rewarding to both the deserving patients and the compassionate, selfless, and unwaveringly dedicated healthcare professionals wholeheartedly and meticulously partaking in and orchestrating the entire process of diagnostic care and healing. Refreshingly, the ever-vigilant and incessantly evolving nature of progress, excellence, and innovation necessitates and mandates the perpetual, unwavering, and resolute updating, enhancement, and purification of the illustrious protocol. Anchored and guided by the unwavering commitment to delivering the absolute best possible standards of care to patients and embracing the unprecedented advancements within the realm of medical imaging, all healthcare facilities shall remain resolute, steadfast, and determined in their unwavering pursuit of incessant improvement, inexorable excellence, and relentless evolution. In conclusion, the culmination of substantial, extensive, and meticulously crafted wisdom, gleaned from the intricate art of considering patients for invaluable MRI procedures, underscores and reinforces the unequivocal urgency with which one must address the speedy, efficient, and painstaking removal of unindicated bioelectronics or nonbioelectronic devices. Without exception or compromise, ferromagnetic foreign bodies deserve unequivocal scrutiny, meticulous evaluation, and concerted removal to holistically safeguard and fortify the patient's overall safety. When patients are deemed ineligible for a crucial MRI procedure, consequential and substantially valuable alternative diagnostic methods, such as CT, should be methodically and thoughtfully entertained, notwithstanding the acknowledged limitations inherent to non-MR alternatives. Evidently, the establishment of an all-encompassing department protocol emerges as an interdisciplinary and indispensable pathway to streamline, maximize efficacy, and secure unparalleled precision when conducting MRI scans on patients who bear either bioelectronic or nonbioelectronic devices. Unavoidably, the relentless optimization of this transcendent protocol should remain an irreplaceable anchor, consistently fine-tuned and refined through tireless learning, research, and breakthroughs, guaranteeing nothing short of meticulous, groundbreaking care, and disease remission for brave individuals entrusting healthcare providers with their lives (Pavlović *et al.*, 2020; Nair & Roguin, 2005; Pavlović *et al.*, 2020; Nair & Roguin, 2005).

Chapter - 2

Physiological Principles of MRI

Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) is a diagnostic technique used to obtain high-quality images of the human body. Its key to clinical MR imaging is the structure and abundance of water in different tissues. The basic concept of MR is the absorption or emission of electromagnetic energy by atomic nuclei in a static magnetic field after excitation by a radiofrequency (RF) pulse. Similarly-sized atomic nuclei in different chemical environments have different frequencies. A powerful magnet generates a magnetic field roughly 10,000 times stronger than the natural background magnetism from the earth. Such a strong static magnetic field magnetizes the hydrogen nucleus of the abundant water molecules in the body. Each water molecule has two hydrogen nuclei. The resonance frequency depends on the strength of the magnetic field and is about 63.9 MHz at a magnetic field strength of 1.5 tesla. The protons used in clinical imaging are only 0.5% of the minute positive charges in the body. Therefore, clinical MR imaging does not involve significant interference of the body's physiological or biophysics mechanisms.

Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) is a diagnostic technique used to obtain high-quality images of the human body. The structure and abundance of water in different tissues is key to clinical MR imaging. The basic concept of MR is the absorption or emission of electromagnetic energy by atomic nuclei in a static magnetic field after excitation by a radiofrequency (RF) pulse. A powerful magnet generates a magnetic field roughly 10,000 times stronger than the natural background magnetism from the earth. MR imaging has many advantages, including its non-ionizing nature and the unparalleled ability to discriminate different soft tissues without contrast media. MR imaging has now become the image modality of choice for imaging the brain, spine, musculoskeletal system, head and neck, complex pediatric heart malformations, and other tissue structures. More recently, MR imaging has been applied successfully to assess myocardial structure, wall motion, perfusion, viability, as well as for various research purposes related to neuroscience, neurology, orthopedics, cardiology, and oncology, among others. The continuous advancements in MR technology and techniques have significantly improved image quality, resolution, and diagnostic accuracy in the field of medical imaging. With its remarkable versatility and diagnostic capabilities, MR imaging continues to play a crucial role in modern medicine, aiding in the diagnosis, monitoring, and treatment of various conditions and diseases (Nair & Roguin, 2005).

Chapter - 3

Common Contraindications to MRI

Pacemakers and Implantable Defibrillators Permanent pacemakers (PPM) asynchronous or programmable with a pulse generator located outside of the MRI room are considered a relative contraindication for MRI investigation. However, recent advancements in technology have introduced MR compatible PPMs that enable patients with ICU dependent PPMs on ECG telemetry monitoring to be examined in the MRI room. These new PPM models, equipped with MR conditional pacing mode, can be safely applied in such cases. It is important to note that during the MRI scan, the magnetic field should be avoided in proximity to the impulse generator and pacing leads. Therefore, reprogramming the PPM in asynchronous mode before investigation is necessary to ensure patient safety. Moreover, the recognition algorithm of the system applies the telemetry mode during the MRI scan. Post-investigation reprogramming of the PPM should also be conducted. When it comes to patients with implantable cardioverter-defibrillators (ICDs), the presence of programmable ICD pulse generators and electrodes implanted intra-vascularly or in proximity to the heart is considered a relative contraindication for MRI investigation. However, it is crucial to highlight that the use of active ICD transvenous electrodes is an absolute contraindication due to safety concerns. Additionally, ICDs containing ferromagnetic materials, such as St Jude Medical devices, that have been implanted within 6 years before the MRI investigation are strictly refused for scan. Only patients with single chamber ICDs without ferromagnetic materials can be examined with the ICD generator externalized and probed by a physician. To ensure the safe and effective use of pacemakers and implantable defibrillators in MRI investigations, it is of utmost importance to adhere to these guidelines. Healthcare professionals should follow the proper protocols and utilize MR compatible devices to minimize any potential risks associated with the interaction between these devices and magnetic fields. Patient safety should always be the top priority. With advancements in technology, it has become possible to perform MRI scans on individuals with certain types of pacemakers and implantable defibrillators. However, it is essential to carefully evaluate each patient's specific situation and medical history before proceeding with an MRI examination. By doing so, healthcare providers can make informed decisions and provide the best possible care for their patients. Furthermore, it should be noted that in recent years, there have been significant developments in the field of pacemakers and implantable defibrillators, leading to improved safety and efficacy in MRI investigations. These advancements have allowed for more efficient and accurate diagnoses and treatment planning, ultimately benefiting patients in need. It is crucial for healthcare professionals to stay updated with the latest technology and guidelines to ensure the best outcomes for their patients. Additionally, patient education plays a pivotal role in the successful implementation of MRI scans for individuals with pacemakers and implantable defibrillators. Properly informing patients about the procedure, its potential risks, and necessary precautions can help alleviate any concerns or anxiety they may have. Furthermore, involving patients in the decision-making process and addressing their questions and concerns can foster a sense of trust and collaboration in the healthcare journey. Overall, the integration of MRI technology and pacemakers/implantable defibrillators has revolutionized the field of diagnostics and treatment, allowing for more personalized and effective care. The continuous advancements in this area hold promise for further improving patient outcomes and enhancing the overall quality of healthcare (Pavlović *et al*., 2020; S Shinbane *et al*., 2011; Michal, 2020; Courteau *et al*. 2020; Zhang *et al*. 2021; Dong *et al*. 2023; Granziera *et al*. 2021).

Cochlear Implants The implantation of cochlear devices, also known as vagal nerve stimulators, with ferromagnetic coil in perilymph, along with the copper wire, are considered an absolute contraindication for Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) investigations. These devices, which have been implanted after the year 2000 and consist of a pulse generator made of titanium, are considered a relative contraindication. It is crucial to conduct the examination of this specific group of patients in close collaboration with an otorhinolaryngologist, a specialist in ear, nose, and throat (ENT) conditions. Prior to the investigation, a pre-investigation Computed Tomography (CT) scan should be performed to accurately determine the position of the coil, particularly on the cranio-cord area, which refers to the area surrounding the head and spinal cord. In cases where the examination is deemed necessary, MRI scans should only be conducted without the presence of the coil, which is made of titanium endo-cochlear pumps. It is vital to note that, since at least 2009, active devices in implantable vagal devices, such as those manufactured by Medtronic and Bard, are an absolute contraindication for MRI scans. On the other hand, devices implanted prior to 2009 are considered a relative contraindication, but it is mandatory to inform the respective company and seek device alteration or modification before undergoing an MRI examination (Jaimes *et al.* 2021; Fussell *et al.* 2021).

3.1 Ferromagnetic implants

Individuals who have a ferromagnetic implant have a clear contraindication because imaging cannot be performed due to the high risk involved. The presence of ferromagnetic implants poses a significant danger during MRI scans as these implants are strongly attracted to the magnetic field inside the scanner. Consequently, the attracting force becomes exceedingly powerful in the vicinity of the scanner, putting the individual at considerable risk. There is a possibility that the ferromagnetic substance may shift or move, potentially leading to severe accidents such as damage to vital organs and blood vessels. Moreover, the presence of these implants can negatively impact the functionality of certain implanted medical devices, which can result in their deactivation, impairment, or even false readings.

The types of ferromagnetic implants commonly encountered include needles used in loco-regional anesthesia, temporary wires, implants utilized for fracture treatment, certain guided wires, and specific vascular clips. Additionally, it is crucial to exclude any metal objects that carry a risk during MRI scans. Several past incidents serve as a testament to the potential dangers posed by these implants. For instance, an iron oxygen monitor incident involved the monitor entering the scanner bore and becoming trapped. There have also been cases where intrauterine devices were embedded in the uterus and incidents where the probe of a muscle stimulator became unintentionally extended. Therefore, it is of utmost importance to exercise extreme caution and exercise special care when dealing with the aforementioned implants. It is worth noting that even non-ferromagnetic implants may carry certain risks, albeit in rare circumstances (Iwatsuki *et al.*, 2020; Nair & Roguin, 2005).

3.2 Pacemakers and implantable cardioverter-defibrillators

Pacemakers and implantable cardioverter defibrillators (ICDs) are widely utilized medical devices that are implanted in humans for the purpose of permanent stimulation and resynchronization of their cardiac activity. Due to their effectiveness, they are considered the most frequently employed devices of this nature. Additionally, they are utilized to provide appropriate therapy for life-threatening arrhythmias, particularly in individuals experiencing ventricular fibrillation (vfib) and/or ventricular tachycardia (vtach). Pacemakers possess a well-established role in the treatment of bradyarrhythmias, while ICDs have an additional indication for patients who are at high risk of sudden cardiac death caused by ventricular tachyarrhythmias. As a result, these devices have gained widespread utilization over the past decade. At present, there is a growing interest in performing magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) in patients with pacemakers and ICDs, despite the fact that there are relatively few reports describing the conduct of MRI under special circumstances. It is important to consider the potential adverse effects that MRI can have on these devices. These effects encompass various aspects, including:

1) The possibility of MRI affecting the pacemaker threshold, which can result in a loss of capture or the induction of inappropriate stimulation due to rapid pacing.
2) The potential for heating the leads at the junction between the lead and myocardium, which can pose a risk to the integrity and functioning of the device.
3) The alteration of the programming of the device, which may lead to the occurrence of inappropriate shocks or pacing.
4) Possible damage to different electronic components, including the circuitries of the device, which may necessitate surgical replacement.
5) The likelihood of movements of the device itself due to the forces exerted by the magnets during the MRI procedure.

Given these potential complications, it is crucial that all devices be thoroughly interrogated both before and after the MRI scan. This interrogation is performed to assess the integrity of the device, evaluate pacing parameters, verify programming, determine the battery status, and delete any inappropriate shocks that may have been recorded. Moreover, it is imperative to provide thorough patient education regarding the risks and benefits associated with MRI in the presence of pacemakers and ICDs. Patients should understand the potential impact on their devices and be informed about the importance of close monitoring during and after the procedure. Comprehensive evaluation and precautions are essential to ensure the safety and efficacy of both the devices and the MRI procedure. Ultimately, it is vital for healthcare professionals to work collaboratively to weigh the risks and benefits, and to tailor individualized patient care plans that prioritize patient safety while maintaining the integrity of these life-saving devices. Hence, a multidisciplinary approach involving cardiologists, radiologists, and other relevant healthcare professionals is crucial in optimizing the management of patients with pacemakers and ICDs who require MRI scans. In conclusion, while the use of pacemakers and ICDs has become increasingly common, caution must be exercised when considering the possibility of conducting MRI scans in patients with these devices. Comprehensive evaluation and precautions are essential to ensure the safety and efficacy of both the devices and the MRI procedure (Prashant & Ariel, 2005)

On the other hand, it is important to mention that in addition to the wide variety of safe cochlear implants (CI) available on the market, there is also an abundance of options that have been thoroughly tested and proven to have absolutely no effect on magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). These reliable and state-of-the-art CIs, specifically those manufactured by industry leaders such as Cochlear and Med-El, employ the use of specially designed magnets that are composed of a meticulously engineered combination of ceramic material and a magnet alloy known as pam. These magnets, which are expertly integrated into the CI system, have been extensively studied and have consistently demonstrated no propensity for movement or migration during the MRI procedure. It is worth highlighting that, despite the presence of an alloy in these magnets, the risk of demagnetization is exceedingly minimal. In fact, it is so negligible that most radiologists tend to disregard it completely. The design and construction of these magnets are of such exceptional quality that they are highly resistant to any magnetic interference or disturbances that may occur during an MRI scan. However, it is important to recognize that every case is unique and can have its own set of considerations. As with any procedure that involves safety measures, individuals who are affected by this matter should take proactive steps to engage in early communication with the relevant parties, namely the implant manufacturer and the radiologist. By establishing a personalized safety protocol that aligns with their specific circumstances, individuals can ensure that their CI system remains secure and unaffected during the MRI scan. This open and collaborative approach will provide them with the utmost peace of mind and ensure a seamless and worry-free experience. In summary, individuals can rest assured that there is a wide selection of safe cochlear implants available on the market that are MRI-compatible. These implants, manufactured by reputable companies such as Cochlear and Med-El, utilize highly advanced magnets that have been crafted with precision and expertise. With their unparalleled design and construction, these magnets exhibit no movement or migration during an MRI scan, providing patients with a secure and reliable solution. Although there is an incredibly minimal risk of demagnetization, it is advised that individuals communicate with the relevant parties to establish a customized safety protocol. By doing so, individuals can confidently undergo an MRI scan, knowing that their cochlear implant will not be compromised (M. Young *et al.*, 2020; Baumann *et al.* 2020; Eerkens *et al.*, 2021; Jaimes *et al.* 2021; Dhanasingh & Hochmair, 2021).

3.3 Pregnancy

Exposure of the fetus to electromagnetic fields is widely perceived as potentially harmful and raises significant concerns among expectant mothers and the general public. Maternal hyperthermia, exposure to loud noises, and the utilization of radiation therapy (RT) and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) are commonly cited as worrisome factors. However, it is important to acknowledge that the level of worry and the implementation of initiatives to address these concerns vary drastically worldwide. In the case of RT exposure, apprehension stems from the well-documented genotoxic effects it can have. Extensive scrutiny has been dedicated to studying the survivors of the atomic bombings in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, as these investigations shed light on the cancer risks associated with maternal RT exposure. Factors such as maternal age, genetic susceptibility, the timing of exposure, and the stage of fetal development all play a role in shaping the potential risks. Nevertheless, conclusive evidence linking maternal MR imaging during the second and third trimesters to childhood cancer development is currently lacking. Moreover, the impact of maternal MR imaging on the development of childhood cancer is a topic that requires further investigation and research.

Although it is known that high static magnetic fields can influence various cellular and molecular processes, the resulting changes typically occur at levels below the threshold for eliciting health effects. On the other hand, exposure to gradients and radiofrequency (RF) fields encompasses an even broader range of field strengths, yet the evidence linking these exposures to adverse health effects remains limited. The potential risks associated with these exposures require continued study and examination to ensure the safety and well-being of both expectant mothers and their developing fetuses. Despite the current understanding, it is crucial to adhere to established guidelines, especially during the gestational age period spanning from 0 to 22 weeks. These guidelines provide valuable information and recommendations for healthcare professionals and expectant mothers to follow in order to minimize potential risks. Further studies on fetal exposure need to focus on situations where exposure is most prevalent and cumulative exposures are more likely to occur. By prioritizing research in these areas, it will be possible to gain a better understanding of the long-term implications and consequences of fetal exposure to electromagnetic fields. Moreover, monitoring and measuring exposure during procedures such as RF ablation, the use of linear accelerators, and incidents involving ferromagnetic materials are recommended to gain greater clarity on the effectiveness of control measures implemented to mitigate risks. These measures play a crucial role in ensuring the safety of both expectant mothers and healthcare professionals working in these environments. In conclusion, the concern surrounding fetal exposure to electromagnetic fields is a topic of significant importance. While there is ongoing research and scientific studies dedicated to understanding the potential risks and effects, the current body of evidence is still evolving. It is essential for expectant mothers, healthcare professionals, and policymakers to remain vigilant and informed about the latest research findings and recommended guidelines to ensure the well-being of pregnant women and their developing fetuses. By prioritizing research, implementing effective control measures, and promoting awareness, we can work towards minimizing potential risks and optimizing the safety of pregnant individuals and their unborn children (Rima Valevičienė *et al*., 2019; Gatta *et al*., 2021).

MRI is considered a gold standard when it comes to visualizing soft tissues, particularly detecting small lesions on the brain, spinal canal, joints, or muscles due to its high-resolution imaging capabilities. This advanced medical technology employs a powerful electromagnetic field incorporated in what is known as a bore, which is a cylindrical chamber specifically designed for imaging purposes. It also utilizes RF pulses and cutting-edge computer-processing technologies for accurate and detailed imaging reconstruction. Considered a valuable diagnostic tool, MRI is compatible with alternative and holistic medical practices, including acupuncture, aromatherapy, floral therapy, guided imagery, hypnotherapy, music therapy, and many more. These complementary approaches enhance the overall patient experience and contribute to their well-being. However, it is important to note that this diagnostic imaging technique may have an undesired adverse effect, particularly on mentally challenged patients. Claustrophobia, which is an anxiety disorder defined as a persistent fear of confined spaces, can significantly impact individuals during an MRI procedure. It manifests as extreme discomfort in enclosed spaces such as elevators, tunnels, trains, and airplanes. In some cases, it can even lead to panic attacks or severe anxiety in extreme conditions. According to studies conducted in the UK, approximately 13% of the population avoids MRI procedures due to feelings of claustrophobia or anxiety. For claustrophobic patients or those with a fear of small closed places, staying in the MRI bore cylindrical chamber can be extremely challenging. This can result in incomplete data acquisition or abnormal data collection, which may affect the accuracy of the diagnostic results. Claustrophobia can manifest in various forms, including classic claustrophobia, where patients experience intense fear and discomfort, pain-related claustrophobia, embarrassment-related claustrophobia, and time-related claustrophobia. In most cases, claustrophobic patients start experiencing discomfort as soon as they enter the MRI bore chamber. To address this issue, advancements in technology have enabled the use of cameras within the MRI scanner to capture the behavior of claustrophobic patients. This provides valuable insights and hints that can be used to automatically detect and classify claustrophobia. Furthermore, understanding the supportive needs of claustrophobic patients during an MRI procedure can also contribute to enhancing their experience and overall well-being. In conclusion, MRI is a highly effective imaging technique for visualizing soft tissues and detecting abnormalities. However, the impact of claustrophobia on certain individuals should not be overlooked. By incorporating innovative technologies and considering the unique needs of claustrophobic patients, healthcare providers can work towards improving the overall patient experience and ensuring accurate diagnostic outcomes. With careful consideration and support, individuals with claustrophobia can undergo MRI scans with confidence and ease, allowing for more comprehensive and reliable medical evaluations. This can lead to better treatment plans, improved patient outcomes, and overall enhanced healthcare delivery. As medical technology continues to advance, it is crucial to prioritize patient comfort and well-being to ensure optimal healthcare experiences for all individuals (Enders *et al*., 2011; Bose *et al*. 2020; Sajid *et al*., 2021; Stogiannos *et al*. 2022; Taschereau-Dumouchel *et al*. 2022; Lima *et al*. 2022).

3.4 Severe obesity

Severe obesity is not an absolute contraindication to perform magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), but should be considered a technical challenge due to the increased complexity it presents. In cases where the normal MRI setting cannot be followed, it becomes necessary to seek informed consent from both the patients and their referring physician. It is crucial to thoroughly counsel the patient beforehand about the potential risks associated with their condition, including reduced image quality and the possible need for additional investigations. Special preparations before the scan become indispensable in such cases, which involve ensuring optimal patient positioning despite the challenges posed by severe obesity. To minimize micromotion within the machine, support cushions need to be strategically inserted under the knees, lower back, and neck. Additionally, immobilization techniques such as the application of belts or tapes should be employed to further stabilize the patient.

These measures ensure a safe and accurate MRI procedure, even in the presence of severe obesity.

It is important to note that image noise tends to be more pronounced in patients with a higher body mass index (BMI). Therefore, extreme values of the standard setting should be avoided when adjusting the parameters, especially when it comes to the radio frequency power. By carefully calibrating the MRI machine, radiologists can optimize image quality and minimize artifacts, thus improving diagnostic accuracy for patients with severe obesity.

To enhance image quality further, it is advisable to apply additional imaging averaging techniques. These techniques involve taking multiple images and averaging them to reduce random noise, leading to clearer and more detailed MRI scans. By utilizing these advanced imaging strategies, radiologists can obtain high-quality results even in challenging cases.

Furthermore, in order to address any concerns about potential bias arising from imaging challenging subjects, it is recommended that investigators reach out to the principal investigator of the study from which they intend to publish data. This collaborative approach allows for a constructive discussion regarding these concerns before proceeding with the imaging process. By involving multiple experts and validating the approach, the scientific integrity of the research can be upheld, ensuring accurate and unbiased results.

Considering the complexities involved, it is essential to carefully deliberate on the economical and time implications that performing an MRI on patients with severe obesity may bring forth. Additional time and resources may be required for patient preparation, scans, and analysis. However, with proper planning and a comprehensive approach that puts the patients' well-being at the forefront, these challenges can be overcome.

In conclusion, performing MRI on patients with severe obesity presents technical challenges that require careful consideration and planning. With the implementation of specialized patient positioning, immobilization techniques, appropriate parameter adjustments, and advanced imaging strategies, the quality and accuracy of MRI scans can be optimized. Collaboration with study investigators and a thorough evaluation of the economic and time implications are crucial steps in providing effective care for patients with severe obesity (Pavlović *et al*., 2020; Goyal *et al*., 2024; Barison *et al*. 2021; Hosten *et al*. 2021; Lewis *et al*. 2022).

3.5 Metallic foreign bodies

Any metallic foreign body, even a non-radiopaque one, is a strict contraindication for Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) examination. This signifies that the presence of any metallic substrates in a patient's body can potentially give rise to irreversible dangers and grave complications during the MRI scan. Consequently, it becomes absolutely crucial and paramount to effectively identify and precisely locate any metallic foreign bodies before the magnetic field is initiated. In order to comprehensively and completely ensure the utmost safety and well-being of patients, various industries such as shipyards, steel mills, and construction sites can effectively implement and deploy meticulous pre-questionnaires that encompass comprehensive checklists. This judicious implementation of pre-questionnaires enables the precise assessment and evaluation of the risk associated with metallic foreign bodies. By conducting these meticulous assessments and evaluations even before the patients' physical examination by astute and proficient physicians, all necessary and essential precautions can be meticulously taken to avoid, mitigate, and avert any potential hazards and detrimental consequences that may arise from the presence of metallic foreign bodies. Retained metal is a pervasive and widespread condition that is commonly diagnosed through the utilization and application of electrodiagnostic techniques. However, if this prevailing and prevailing condition is not conscientiously considered and effectively addressed, it has the potential to severely jeopardize the overall health, well-being, and ultimate prognosis of patients. While foreign bodies may be distinctly visible and evident in customary and conventional medical examinations, their presence can at times be overshadowed and sublimated by more dominant signals emanating from the parenchymal regions and subsequent ultrasonography imaging techniques. Therefore, it becomes of paramount and pivotal importance for meticulous and diligent physicians to pay paramount attention to every intricate detail and exercise comprehensive and all-encompassing scrutiny in order to correctly and accurately ascertain the presence of these foreign metallic bodies. In certain circumstances where the metallic foreign bodies are genuinely unobservable and undetectable through conventional and customary methods and means, the only remaining recourse and alternative is to largely depend and rely on the cleaning process and conduct rigorous prior questioning of the patients during the examination process. Although it is commonly presumed, and often established, that all patients are troubled and afflicted by metallic lesions that necessitate surgical excision or removal, magnetic resonance images, due to their exceptional and unique attributes, often serve as the sole and solitary means of accurately detecting and identifying these metallic bodies. Consequently, it becomes the absolute and urgent priority of healthcare practitioners, medical professionals, and medical personnel to imbibe and adhere to meticulousness, scrupulousness, and indefatigable dedication and diligence in order to consistently ensure precise and accurate diagnoses and highly effective and efficacious treatment plans that encompass and encompass the complete and comprehensive removal or eradication of these metallic bodies (Nordbeck *et al*., 2015; Prashant & Ariel, 2005; Ahmed *et al*., 2020; Mauro *et al*., 2021; Rahman, 2023).

3.6 Renal insufficiency

Renal insufficiency is a major contraindication to magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) in patients with unclear or elevated renal function, as the use of contrast agents can cause serious complications. In the field of MRI imaging, the standard practice involves the utilization of intravenous paramagnetic contrast agents. These agents, which are classified as low-to-moderate relaxation and non-ionic, are responsible for suppressing native tissue signals by shortening the T1 relaxation times. The most common application of these contrast agents is in contrast-enhanced Magnetic Resonance Angiography (MRA). Some of the available contrast agents include gadopentetate dimeglumine, gadodiamide, gadobutrol, gadobenate dimeglumine, and gadoterate meglumine. As for the elimination of gadolinium-based contrast agents, renal excretion serves as the predominant route. However, it is essential to note that these agents may also have adverse effects. Anaphylactoid reactions, cardiovascular reactions, and renal reactions such as nephrogenic systemic fibrosis (NSF) are among the potential adverse reactions associated with MR contrast agents. NSF is a relatively rare and slowly progressive multifocal scleroderma-like condition that exclusively affects patients with severe renal insufficiency who have been exposed to gadolinium-based agents. The reporting of NSF cases has prompted the reevaluation of all patients who have undergone MR procedures. In the year 2000, gadodiamide received a Boxed Warning indicating its incompatibility with patients who have chronic kidney disease. Subsequently, after gadodiamide, all gadolinium-based contrast agents have been labeled as "not recommended" for MR examinations in patients with an eGFR (estimated glomerular filtration rate) equal to or less than 30 mL/min/1.73 m2. Careful assessment of a patient's renal function by healthcare professionals is crucial prior to administering any contrast agents in order to minimize the risk of complications. If necessary, alternative imaging methods should be considered to ensure patient safety (Schieda *et al*., 2018; I Attenberger *et al*., 2011; Iacobellis *et al*. 2024; Chmielewski *et al*. 2024; Zhong *et al*. 2024).

3.7 Allergies to contrast agents

Allergic reactions to the contrast agent used during magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) are included in the contraindications. This is primarily due to the possibility of predisposed allergies or even the possibility of allergic reactions in previously healthy individuals. Most patients with a history of hypersensitivity reactions to contrast agents are at a considerable risk of experiencing a similar reaction during the examination. However, the ability of local hospitals to monitor patients undergoing diagnostic tests may differ, ranging from basic monitoring to full resuscitation and emergency management. Furthermore, patients who are allergic pose a higher-than-usual risk to the overall process. It is often challenging to obtain the hospital policy on which patients may undergo the examination and which may not, and, unfortunately, additional information is not readily available prior to the procedure in most cases. Therefore, it is of utmost importance to proactively identify patients considered at risk prior to the examination. As it stands, there are currently no concrete guidelines on how to proceed with these high-risk patients. Given the increased possibility of complications during the examination, it becomes necessary to identify these patients at an earlier stage so that alternative methods of diagnostic imaging can be promptly sought out and implemented. A potential approach for patients with known or suspected allergies could involve consultation with an allergologist. However, it is crucial to acknowledge that this may not always be viable. Consequently, the identification of at-risk patients usually becomes a responsible task for the radiologists who perform the examination. Such individuals at risk could be classified into three main categories. First, those who have a history of adverse reactions to other types of contrast agents such as iodinated or intravascular contrast media would be deemed at risk of reacting to GBCAs as well. Secondly, patients with allergies to fish, shellfish, latex, or Calcium dobesilate should also be considered high-risk individuals. Third, those with atopic diseases such as asthma, allergic rhinitis, or eczema should also raise concerns. To ensure comprehensive care, these at-risk patients would be appropriately flagged before admittance so that their case could be thoroughly reviewed either by an experienced colleague or by an appropriate radiologist. Should the examination still proceed for any reason, additional measures could be implemented to minimize the risk of a reaction. However, it is important to note that patients with a known allergy to GBCAs or gadopentetate should generally abstain from undergoing the examination altogether. Ultimately, prioritizing patient safety and taking the necessary precautions remains paramount in order to prevent any potential harm during the MRI procedure (Davenport *et al*. 2020; Rudnick *et al*. 2020; Woolen *et al*. 2020).

Allergic reactions to MRI Musculoskeletal Electronic Devices (MEDs), such as Bone Growth Stimulators, Functional Electrical Stimulators, Orthoses, and others offer beneficial therapeutic support. They employ an electric field to stimulate bone growth or muscle contraction, resulting in disruption of electrical current around the patients' anatomical systems. The disruption and alteration of the body's electromagnetic (EM) field will likely affect the quality of MR images since MRI imaging relies on the body's electromagnetic characteristics. Furthermore, the peripheral circuit of the electric MEDs can heat up, posing a burn risk to the patient and compromising safety during the procedure. Therefore, it is essential to carefully assess and manage the presence of MEDs in patients undergoing MRI examinations. Adequate precautions should be taken to minimize the risks associated with the interaction between MEDs and the MRI machine. Insulating materials can be used to mitigate the electromagnetic interference caused by MEDs, ensuring that the image quality remains optimal. Additionally, regular monitoring of the patient's body temperature is crucial to prevent any potential burns caused by excessive heat generated by the peripheral circuit of the MEDs. It is important for healthcare providers to be aware of the specific characteristics and potential risks associated with different types of MEDs to make informed decisions regarding their use during MRI procedures. By prioritizing patient safety and closely managing the presence of MEDs, healthcare professionals can ensure accurate diagnostic imaging while minimizing any potential harm to the patient (Farling *et al*., 2010; Teresa Gracia Bara *et al*., 2022; Pavlović *et al*., 2020).

Some temporary elevation of the temperature is generally tolerable by tissues. Bone heating is also tolerable by tissues. However, the combination of several factors can lead to an increase in the average power absorbed in the bone. Other recent studies showed that implantable devices and MR systems with field strength of 3T are compatible. However, MR scan time using a 3 Tesla (3T) MR unit is much shorter compared to that of a 1.5 Tesla (1.5T) MR unit (Sayed *et al*. 2020).

Chapter - 4

Certain Neurological Conditions

There are numerous brain, head, and spine conditions in which magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) is not recommended due to contraindications. These contraindications encompass patients with external devices or devices implanted in the body, excluding the standard EP devices within the heart. This category includes pacemakers, implanted defibrillators, most neuromodulation devices, vagus nerve stimulators, and cochlear implants. Prior to conducting an MRI scan, it is necessary to gather specific MRI information related to these devices. However, there is no evidence suggesting that a scan of any kind is contraindicated in patients with an implanted loop recorder. Additionally, there are several neurosurgical conditions and devices that should not undergo MRI, such as individuals with a craniotomy who have clips made of certain materials. These materials include any clip that is ferromagnetic in nature or made of titanium, even if it is non-ferromagnetic. The use of stainless steel or fabricated braided materials for fa/vein grafts is also contraindicated. Furthermore, any brain/VP shunt connection that features a passive valve with a titanium ball should not undergo MRI. It is important to note that this list of contraindications is subject to change as technology advances. Therefore, when approaching MRI, caution should always be exercised, and patients should undergo a comprehensive evaluation prior to proceeding with a scan. Healthcare professionals must remain up-to-date with the latest contraindications and guidelines for MRI to ensure the safety of their patients. Regularly reviewing and revising the list of contraindications is crucial to provide optimal care. Although MRI is a valuable diagnostic tool, it must be used judiciously and in adherence to established protocols. By staying informed and following best practices, healthcare professionals can effectively manage the contraindications and prioritize the well-being of their patients (Pavlović *et al.*, 2020; Erhardt *et al.*, 2018).

Recent surgery can create complications in preparing and performing MRI because immobilization during MRI can affect wound healing, as it slows down the natural process of tissue regeneration. This delay in healing can be exacerbated by the discomfort and pain that patients experience during an MRI examination. Additionally, the presence of compressive bandages used to secure electrodes or dressings can be disturbed, leading to suboptimal imaging quality and potentially compromising the accuracy of the MRI results. Another challenge is that postoperative MRI scans cannot be immediately performed after surgery. Instead, a waiting period of several days is typically required to allow the initial healing process to take place. Moreover, MRI scans in the area of recent surgery may not be feasible due to the potential interference caused by surgical materials or prosthetic devices. The specific waiting time for MRI scans varies depending on the type of surgery. For patients who underwent neurosurgical operations under general anesthesia, it is recommended to wait at least seven days before undergoing an MRI examination. Similarly, individuals who have had spinal surgery involving bone grafts or instrumentation should wait for a minimum of three months to allow for proper bone healing. In the case of orthopedic surgery performed on the extremities, such as knees or shoulders, a waiting period of 24 to 48 hours is typically necessary before an MRI can be safely conducted. This waiting period allows the surgical site to stabilize and reduces the risk of complications during the imaging procedure. Furthermore, after surgery on the joints, MRI scans involving electrode wires are not advisable due to potential safety concerns.

To address some of these challenges, advancements have been made in MRI technology. One such development is the utilization of a fluoroscopic technique as an alternative to conventional CT scans. This technique offers certain advantages and may serve as a viable option in cases where MRI is contraindicated due to recent surgical procedures. However, it is important to acknowledge that MRI remains the gold standard imaging modality in many cases, and fluoroscopic MRI is not applicable in all situations.

Due to the complexities involved, patients with recent surgery often face a prolonged waiting period before they can undergo the necessary preparation and examination for an MRI. In the future, it is hoped that hospitals and healthcare management will actively work towards implementing measures to improve the process and reduce waiting times for these patients. By doing so, the overall quality of care can be enhanced, ensuring timely and accurate diagnosis for individuals who have recently undergone surgery (Iwatsuki *et al*., 2020; Nordbeck *et al*., 2015).

3.2 History of metalworking

Avoiding the MRI procedure is absolutely crucial for applicants with a compelling history of metalworking. Metalworking, comprising the fundamental processes of turning, milling, grinding, chasing, riveting, welding, and soldering metals of all kinds, regardless of their distinct characteristics, should never be overlooked. It is of utmost importance to also highlight work tasks revolving around the manufacturing, repairing, or maintenance of vehicles, encompassing personal vehicles, tractors, trucks, small engines, lawnmowers, motorcycles, and similar equipment. These tasks must not be underestimated and should be explicitly mentioned. It is worth mentioning that, despite everyone's assertion of 'no metallic foreign bodies,' particles or fragments can potentially dislodge and become trapped in or around the eyes or face, thereby posing a significant risk. Moreover, steel welders need to express with utmost clarity the specific type of welders they are, whether they are proficient in wire feed welding, stick welding, or any other variations. Finally, the last set of screening questions must be intelligently directed towards occupations that have the potential to expose applicants to hazardous items that could project or foreign body dangers that may arise. In addition, it is important to emphasize the necessity of proper safety gear and precautions when engaging in metalworking activities. These precautions include wearing protective goggles, gloves, aprons, and helmets to reduce the risk of injury or exposure to harmful materials. Furthermore, it is essential to regularly inspect and maintain tools and equipment to ensure their proper functioning and prevent any potential accidents. Additionally, it is prudent for metalworkers to undergo regular medical check-ups to monitor and address any health issues that may arise from their profession. This includes periodic eye examinations to detect and treat any eye injuries or conditions that may develop over time. To further mitigate risks, metalworkers should also receive proper training and education on safe work practices, such as proper lifting techniques and the correct use of machinery. It is crucial to have a comprehensive understanding of the potential hazards and safety guidelines associated with metalworking to minimize the risk of accidents and injuries.

Metalworking, as a versatile field encompassing various techniques and tasks, demands utmost attention and caution due to the potential risks involved. It is crucial for applicants with a background in metalworking to prioritize their safety and wellbeing by avoiding the MRI procedure entirely. The intricacies of metalworking, including turning, milling, grinding, chasing, riveting, welding, and soldering, require unwavering diligence and expertise. Regardless of the unique properties of the metals being worked on, the significance of these processes should never be underestimated. Furthermore, it is imperative to shed light on the specific work responsibilities that revolve around the manufacturing, repairing, or maintenance of vehicles. This includes not only personal vehicles but also tractors, trucks, small engines, lawnmowers, motorcycles, and similar equipment. Such tasks should be explicitly acknowledged and their importance highlighted. It is crucial to recognize that even with assertions of "no metallic foreign bodies," there is still a potential risk of particles or fragments becoming dislodged and trapped in or around the eyes or face. Therefore, caution must be exercised to avoid any potential hazards (Jabehdar *et al*. 2020; Bwanga *et al*., 2023; Gerhardsson, 2022; Prado-Rico *et al*. 2022 on2023).

Moreover, steel welders need to clearly articulate the type of welding they specialize in, whether it be wire feed welding, stick welding, or any other variations. This clarity ensures that their skills and expertise are properly understood and evaluated. Additionally, the screening questions should be intelligently directed towards professions that expose applicants to hazardous items projecting or foreign body dangers that may arise. This strategic approach helps identify potential risks and take appropriate measures to counteract them effectively.

In addition to these precautions, it is essential to emphasize the significance of wearing suitable safety gear and practicing precautionary measures while engaging in metalworking activities. This includes prioritizing the use of protective goggles, gloves, aprons, and helmets to mitigate the risk of injuries or exposure to harmful materials. Regular inspection and maintenance of tools and equipment are also crucial to ensure their optimal functionality and prevent any accidents that may be caused by malfunctioning equipment.

Furthermore, regular medical check-ups are recommended for metalworkers to monitor and address any potential health issues that may arise due to their profession. Periodic eye examinations play a vital role in early detection and treatment of any eye injuries or conditions that may develop over time. Safeguarding one's well-being requires comprehensive knowledge and adherence to safety guidelines in metalworking. Proper training and education on safe work practices, including correct lifting techniques and the appropriate use of machinery, are vital to minimize the risk of accidents and injuries.

In conclusion, the expansion of the text emphasizes the paramount importance of avoiding the MRI procedure for applicants with a history of metalworking. It provides a comprehensive understanding of the various facets of metalworking, highlights specific work tasks, acknowledges potential risks, emphasizes safety gear and precautions, underscores the significance of regular medical check-ups, and emphasizes the necessity of training and education on safe work practices. By adhering to these guidelines and prioritizing safety, metalworkers can significantly reduce the likelihood of accidents and injuries in their profession (Nair & Roguin, 2005; Prashant & Ariel, 2005; Jabehdar *et al.* 2020; Phang *et al.*, 2023; Dalili *et al.* 2021; Licata and Pinto, 2020).

4.2 Inability to remain still

It can be quite challenging and difficult for patients, especially infants, the elderly, and those with claustrophobia or experiencing pain, to remain perfectly motionless for extended periods of time while undergoing magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) procedures. Fortunately, there is a solution to this problem. The accuracy and dependability of the imaging results can be greatly affected by even the most minimal movement during the scan. To overcome this hurdle, the implementation of sedation can be a highly effective approach. Through the administration of a precise and meticulously monitored dosage of sedative medication, patients are able to achieve the necessary level of stillness, all while maintaining their utmost safety. This ensures that their MRI experience is both efficient and optimally productive (Artunduaga *et al*. 2021; Vinson *et al*. 2021; Xu *et al*. 2020).

Chapter - 5

Special Considerations for Pediatric Patients

Pediatric patients (< 18 years old) have a unique physiology, disease process, and imaging needs that impact every component of a pediatric MRI service, from machine selection to staffing to quality assurance and safety considerations. Patient age, anxiety level, and body habitus impact the design of the imaging exam, choice of protocol parameters, and use of sedation/anesthesia. Children are not small adults; they require age-appropriate imaging equipment, protocols, and patient care. Pediatric patients have different disease presentations than adults. They have a higher prevalence of congenital and neurodevelopmental disorders, the effects of which can evolve over time and so dictate the frequency of follow-up imaging. Pediatric malignancies induce a different pattern of secondary effects from chemotherapy and radiation, with their own imaging needs, and a higher risk for fibrosis and growth abnormalities secondary to abdominal and craniofacial surgery. The distinction between evaluable and unevaluable patients and the decision to sedate is often made by family members with limited understanding of the risks and benefits involved. Decisions surrounding sedation and anesthesia must take immediate practical considerations into account. Pediatric patients do not understand the need for stillness and often do not respond to verbal instructions. Neonates and infants will often be unsedatable due to their short sleep cycles and high arousal rates. Young children and the developmentally disabled may exhibit highly unpredictable behaviors and be incapable of complying with detailed instructions. Pediatric patients spend longer times on the scanner and are more susceptible to the examination, which may last many minutes, than adult patients (Camoni *et al*. 2023; Badawy *et al*. 2022; Meijer *et al*. 2021; Jarosz *et al*., 2022).

In addition, pediatric imaging requires specialized training and expertise to ensure accurate diagnosis and interpretation of findings. Radiologists who specialize in pediatric radiology possess the knowledge and skills necessary to address the unique challenges that arise in imaging children. They are familiar with the developmental stages and anatomical variations in pediatric patients, allowing them to interpret images in the context of age-appropriate normal anatomy and identify abnormalities specific to pediatric diseases.

Furthermore, the use of child-friendly imaging techniques, such as distraction techniques or the presence of a parent or guardian during the procedure, can help alleviate anxiety and increase cooperation in pediatric patients. Another important aspect of pediatric MRI is radiation dose optimization. Children are more sensitive to radiation than adults, and excessive exposure to ionizing radiation can have detrimental effects on their long-term health. Therefore, radiologists and technologists must be mindful of using the lowest possible radiation dose while still obtaining high-quality images. This requires careful modulation of exposure parameters and the use of advanced imaging techniques, such as iterative reconstruction algorithms, to reduce noise and improve image quality.

Moreover, the interpretation of pediatric MRI findings often requires collaboration with other specialties, including pediatricians, pediatric surgeons, and pediatric oncologists. Through multidisciplinary discussions and consultations, a comprehensive understanding of the patient's clinical history and management plan can be achieved. This collaboration ensures that the imaging findings contribute to the overall care of the pediatric patient and guide appropriate treatment decisions.

In summary, pediatric MRI is a specialized field that recognizes the unique needs and challenges of imaging children. From equipment selection to image acquisition and interpretation, every step in the process is tailored to the pediatric population. With a focus on patient comfort, radiation safety, and accurate diagnosis, pediatric MRI plays a crucial role in the medical management of pediatric patients, allowing for timely intervention and improved outcomes (Xu *et al.*, 2022; 2013; Ng, 2022; Marcu *et al.*, 2021; Martin *et al.*, 2020).

Chapter - 6

Safety Precautions and Protocols

Introduction of Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) led to the revolutionary development of safe imaging protocols for various patient groups. These include individuals with Ferromagnetic Foreign Bodies, Radiocomfort Patients, Obese Patients, Someone Under Injection of IntraVenous Contrast-Medium, Electroconvulsive Therapy (ECT) Patients, and even Neonates. Adhering to the established guidelines on electronic devices in MRI, it has been determined that Magnetic Resonance imaging can be carefully considered for patients with Multi-Lead Vascular Stents, although utmost vigilance is required in such cases. However, it is crucial to highlight that certain conditions are considered absolute contraindications for MRI in patients with Cardiac Implantable Electronic Devices (CIEDs). Such contraindications encompass the presence of epicardial, fractured, and abandoned intracardiac leads. Until larger studies confirm the safety of MRI in these specific scenarios, they remain firmly and unequivocally contraindicated. When it comes to CIED patients undergoing MRI, a multitude of concerns arise.

One significant worry is the potential interaction between the pacemaker and the powerful magnetic field within the MRI environment. This interaction carries the risk of device movement, which can lead to device failure. Additionally, the movement of the magnetic field in the conducting leads can induce electrical currents, which may trigger harmful arrhythmias. Furthermore, thermal injury of the myocardium due to radiofrequency (RF) energy exposure is a legitimate concern. The presence of metals within the CIED, juxtaposed with the magnetic field, can also result in reed switch phenomena. This phenomena can potentially cause problems such as electromagnetic interference leading to oversensing and loss of pacing. Additionally, the presence of metals can lead to imaging artifacts, potentially compromising the accuracy of the MRI results. These concerns emphasize the need for meticulous evaluation and management of CIED patients during MRI procedures. The comprehensive understanding of potential risks and benefits, alongside strict adherence to safety protocols, are paramount in ensuring the well-being of patients with CIEDs undergoing MRI examinations. It is crucial for healthcare providers to recognize the unique challenges posed by CIED patients and to implement appropriate strategies for their care. Engaging in clear and open communication with patients, explaining the potential risks and benefits of undergoing an MRI, is essential in establishing trust and informed decision-making. Collaboration between different healthcare specialties, including radiologists, cardiologists, and electrophysiologists, is vital to optimize patient outcomes and reduce the potential for adverse events. By continuously updating and refining MRI protocols and safety guidelines, healthcare providers can strive to ensure that patients with CIEDs receive the necessary imaging studies while minimizing potential risks.

In conclusion, Magnetic Resonance Imaging has revolutionized the field of diagnostic imaging, allowing for safe and effective evaluation of various patient groups. While certain patient populations, such as those with Cardiac Implantable Electronic Devices, require careful consideration and adherence to specific guidelines, MRI remains an invaluable tool in healthcare. With ongoing research and advancements in technology, the future holds promise for further optimizing MRI protocols and expanding its applications, ultimately benefiting patients worldwide (Pavlović *et al*., 2020; Prashant & Ariel, 2005).

Because of the potential for injury to patients and disruption of the MMethod of operation of the MRI system, it is important to thoroughly assess and screen patients prior to the MRI scan (Prashant & Ariel, 2005). A proper assessment and screening process consists of two key elements: (1) The process of conducting a thorough review of every patient's medical history, medications, and the pertinent MRI safety screening questions in order to identify potential contraindications to the scan; (2) Communicating the results of this evaluation to the patients in plain language (e.g., explaining the risks) and offering them an excellent opportunity to ask questions (Schaller *et al*. 2021; Bhuva *et al*. 2024; Navarro-Valverde *et al*. 2022; Vigen *et al*. 2021; Yang *et al*. 2022).

The first component is a three-part pre-imaging assessment (1) review of the medical history, including the concomitant medications (2) review of the safety screening questions, and (3) thorough review of any diagnostic imaging reports that are pertinent to the MRI procedure (e.g., prior CT scans). As part of this comprehensive screening process, the physician is responsible for obtaining the pertinent medical history and MRI safety screening questions and documenting the results of the review. The biomedical engineering technician is responsible for reviewing pacemaker or ICD records, recent X-ray studies, and records of any recent surgical procedures on the patient.

Finally, one individual is tasked with reviewing the results of the records to ensure that adequate safety precautions have been observed.

Chapter - 7

Alternative Imaging Modalities

There are several alternative modalities of imaging that can be used to circumvent these contraindications of MRI. A few suitable options are discussed in this section. As a first precaution, thoracic radiography should be done to ascertain that there is no chance of gross pathology in the thorax. This is done because it is dangerous to put anyone with a hidden but potentially life-threatening pulmonary problem in an MR scanner for several hours. However, subtle lung nodules would not be seen with conventional radiography, particularly if the examination was performed in a fluoroscopy room close to the CT machine. Computed tomography is the modality of choice as the second option and is predominantly used for the thorax, abdomen, and head. More recently, 4th and 16-sectored helical spiral CT machines have been commissioned providing high-quality images in as little as 10 seconds, allowing for faster and more accurate diagnoses. However, a negative CT/MRI hardly ever occurs and with advancements in technology, more structures can now be imaged with CT, expanding its diagnostic capabilities significantly. Hence, for maximum chances of success and comprehensive evaluation, several modalities of imaging should be used preferably in the following order; conventional films, MRI, CT, and finally tomography or other advanced imaging techniques. All types of imaging use ionizing radiation. Radiography (X-ray) makes use of ionizing radiation (X-rays) passed through tissues to create images. Different tissues absorb X-rays to varying degrees depending on their atomic structure. Radiography is primarily used to visualize thoracic anatomy, but there are also applications for the abdomen and musculoskeletal system. Fluoroscopy, on the other hand, is a dynamic (real-time) form of X-ray imaging where a rotating beam passes through structures, producing images in succession. It has valuable applications in several aspects of radiology and interventional procedures, allowing for real-time monitoring and guidance during surgeries or other medical interventions. Computed tomography (CT) imaging, considered a significant advancement in imaging technology, incorporates many aspects of conventional radiography and fluoroscopy. It provides detailed cross-sectional images of the body, revealing intricate anatomical structures and abnormalities that may not be clearly visualized with other modalities. With its ability to capture images from multiple angles and viewpoints, CT imaging offers a comprehensive view of the organs, aiding in accurate diagnoses and treatment planning. Additionally, the image quality provided by CT machines has significantly improved with the introduction of 4th and 16-sectored helical spiral CT machines. These machines can produce high-quality images in as little as 10 seconds, facilitating faster and more accurate diagnoses. Furthermore, advancements in technology have expanded the diagnostic capabilities of CT imaging, allowing for the visualization of a wider range of structures and abnormalities. Therefore, when it comes to achieving successful and comprehensive evaluation, it is recommended to utilize multiple imaging modalities in the following order: conventional films, MRI, CT, and finally tomography or other advanced imaging techniques. It is important to note that all types of imaging involve the use of ionizing radiation. Radiography, also known as X-ray imaging, utilizes ionizing radiation (X-rays) that pass through tissues to create images. The absorption of X-rays by different tissues varies based on their atomic structure, enabling the visualization of thoracic anatomy, as well as applications in the abdomen and musculoskeletal system. On the other hand, fluoroscopy is a real-time form of X-ray imaging where a rotating beam passes through structures, producing images in succession. This dynamic imaging technique has valuable applications in various aspects of radiology and interventional procedures, providing real-time monitoring and guidance during surgeries and other medical interventions. Computed tomography (CT) imaging represents a significant advancement in imaging technology, combining elements of conventional radiography and fluoroscopy. By capturing detailed cross-sectional images of the body, CT imaging reveals intricate anatomical structures and abnormalities that may not be clearly visualized with other imaging modalities. The ability to capture images from multiple angles and viewpoints offers a comprehensive view of the organs, facilitating accurate diagnoses and treatment planning (Bhargava *et al*., 2013; K.M. Shadekul Islam *et al*., 2023; Hussain *et al*. 2022; Ben *et al*. 2022; Morales-Espino *et al*. 2024; Kim *et al*. 2021; Raffy *et al*. 2023).

Chapter - 8

Emerging Technologies in MRI Safety

As the applications of MRI (Magnetic Resonance Imaging) continue to expand and evolve, there is an increasingly pressing need to address the various safety considerations that arise alongside these advancements. In particular, the development of hybrid PET/MR scanners holds immense promise within the realm of nuclear medicine. However, the integration of these two modalities undoubtedly gives rise to unique safety challenges that must be carefully navigated. One such challenge revolves around the compatibility of the PET detector technology with the static magnetic field of the MR scanner. Ensuring that these components seamlessly work together without compromising patient safety demands meticulous attention and sophisticated engineering. Furthermore, managing patient access to both the PET and MR fields of view (FOV) without exposing them to any safety constraints associated with the other modality emerges as another critical consideration. This entails implementing comprehensive protocols and guidelines that address the specific safety concerns that arise when combining PET and MR technology. For instance, specialized shielding and insulation may be necessary to prevent any interference or compromise in the functionality of each modality. Additionally, the positioning and arrangement of the PET and MR components within the hybrid scanner must be optimized to minimize the potential for collisions or unsafe interactions. Additionally, there are practical concerns that come into play when implementing hybrid scanners in both research and clinical environments. The maintenance of separate and specialized R&D spaces for these hybrid modalities poses pecuniary and spatial challenges that must be effectively managed. This requires careful coordination and allocation of resources to ensure that the necessary facilities and equipment are available to support the ongoing development and utilization of hybrid PET/MR scanners. Furthermore, the question of liability and responsibility becomes crucial when multiple facilities or sub-divisions within a single institution jointly own and operate a hybrid scanner while running different modalities. Clear protocols and agreements must be established to outline the respective roles and obligations of each party, as well as establish mechanisms for resolving potential conflicts or disputes. Moving beyond hybrid scanners, the efficacy of transdermal drug delivery has been a subject of intensive investigation. Researchers are actively exploring non-invasive alternatives to traditional needle insertion for drug delivery, seeking to minimize patient discomfort and enhance treatment accessibility. One potential avenue of exploration involves utilizing ultrahigh frequency (UHF) currents to create permeabilization of the outer dermal layers without resorting to electropolosis. This approach shows promise in improving drug delivery efficiency and reducing the risk of complications associated with invasive procedures.

However, the effects of MR fields on drug delivery, particularly when combined with thermal effects, require rigorous investigation to ensure patient safety. The presence of strong magnetic fields can potentially interfere with the diffusion and distribution of drugs within the body, affecting their efficacy and potentially leading to unpredictable outcomes. Therefore, it is essential to conduct comprehensive studies to understand the precise mechanisms through which MR fields interact with transdermal drug delivery, as well as assess the impact of various factors such as field strength, duration of exposure, and specific drug formulations.

Continual exposure to MRI technology becomes a paramount concern, not just for patients who undergo frequent scans, but also for the clinical and technological staff who operate in close proximity to the scanner. Extended exposure raises questions about the long-term effects, especially for individuals with implanted medical devices. Understanding the potential consequences that arise from chronic exposure is crucial to safeguarding the well-being of those who undergo MRI procedures.

In order to address these multifaceted safety concerns and ensure the utmost patient care, it is imperative to conduct thorough research and analysis. This entails studying the effects of chronic exposure on different patient groups, as well as implementing robust protective measures to minimize any potential risks. For instance, strict guidelines can be established to limit the duration of exposure for both patients and staff, accompanied by regular monitoring and health screenings to detect any emerging issues at an early stage. Additionally, the development of advanced shielding materials and techniques can further enhance safety by reducing the extent of exposure to MR fields without compromising image quality.

By prioritizing safety, continuous monitoring, and thoughtful evaluation, medical professionals can work collaboratively to advance the field of MRI and optimize its applications in healthcare. Through ongoing investment in research and development, as well as unwavering dedication to the development of comprehensive safety protocols and guidelines, we can forge a future where MRI procedures are not just efficient and accurate, but also supremely safe for all individuals involved. By embracing innovation and embracing the principle of "do no harm," we can unlock the full potential of MRI technology and revolutionize the way we diagnose and treat medical conditions (Bogdanovic *et al*. 2022; Courteau *et al*. 2020; Dong *et al*. 2023; Vaska and Saleh, 2022; Choi *et al*. 2022; Morahan *et al*. 2023; Nolte *et al*., 2020; Nishikido *et al*. 2022).

Chapter - 9

Conclusion and Future Directions

The use of magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) is contraindicated in some patients due to the potential for harm to the patient or to the MRI system. Such situations are classified as absolute contraindications and require special measures to ensure the safety of the patient and the success of the examination. Potential dangers associated with MRI procedures that have been considered absolute contraindications include metal foreign bodies in the eyes of patients, patients who have had pacemakers implanted, patients with neurostimulators, patients with certain metallic retention devices, patients with intravenous iron injections within 24 months of the scan, patients who have undergone heart valve replacement, patients with claustrophobia, and patients with high anxiety.

Technological advances of therapeutic and diagnostic systems designed to work in the strong, static magnetic fields generated by MR systems are also being developed, and such devices will be subject to more formal disability and efficacy evaluation. In addition, researchers are exploring new methods to enhance the safety and efficacy of MRI procedures, further expanding the possibilities of its applications. The continuous advancements in MR technology pave the way for better diagnoses, improved treatment plans, and enhanced patient outcomes.

Relative contraindications are conditions in which pre-scan evaluation of the risk of an MRI examination should be performed and taken into account before the procedure. A threat to life is regarded as a contraindication if the patient can only be moved to the MR system or otherwise handled after special procedures, such as ambulance transport to the MR system or intervention in the catheterization laboratory. Otherwise, good clinical reasons would often prevail in favor of an MR examination, and the examination could be carried out after special precautions taken or in cooperation with other special departments (e.g., intensive care units).

In summary, while MRI is a powerful diagnostic tool, its use must be carefully considered based on individual patient characteristics and potential contraindications. The expansion of MR technology, combined with thorough pre-scan evaluations and collaboration among medical professionals, contributes to safer and more effective MRI procedures, ultimately benefiting patients and advancing the field of medical imaging. (Nair & Roguin, 2005)(C Rathebe, 2022)

References

1. Pavlović, N., Đula, K., Kuharić, I., Brusich, S., Velagić, V., Jurišić, Z., Bakotić, Z., Anić, A., Pezo Nikolić, B., Radeljić, V., Čubranić, Z., Zeljković, I., Zadravec, D., & Manola, Šime (2020). MANAGEMENT of patients with cardiac implantable electronic devices undergoing magnetic resonance imaging – proposal for unified hospital protocol: Croatian working group on arrhythmias and cardiac pacing. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
2. Nair, P. & Roguin, A. (2005). Magnetic Resonance Imaging in patients with ICDs and Pacemakers. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
3. S Shinbane, J., M Colletti, P., & G Shellock, F. (2011). Magnetic resonance imaging in patients with cardiac pacemakers: era of MR Conditional designs. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
4. Michal, C. A. (2020). Low-cost low-field NMR and MRI: Instrumentation and applications. Journal of Magnetic Resonance. nih.gov
5. Courteau, A., McGrath, J., Walker, P. M., Pegg, R., Martin, G., Garipov, R., ... & Vrigneaud, J. M. (2020). Performance evaluation and compatibility studies of a compact preclinical scanner for simultaneous PET/MR imaging at 7 Tesla. IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging, 40(1), 205-217. ieee.org
6. Zhang, Y., Le, S., Li, H., Ji, B., Wang, M. H., Tao, J., ... & Kang, X. Y. (2021). MRI magnetic compatible electrical neural interface: From materials to application. Biosensors and Bioelectronics, 194, 113592. ciomp.ac.cn
7. Dong, Q., Adams, Z., Watkins, R. D., Lee, B. J., Chang, C. M., Sacco, I., & Levin, C. S. (2023). Study of compatibility between a 3T MR system and detector modules for a second-generation RF-penetrable TOF-PET insert for simultaneous PET/MRI. Medical Physics, 50(6), 3389-3400. [HTML]
8. Granziera, C., Wuerfel, J., Barkhof, F., Calabrese, M., De Stefano, N., Enzinger, C., ... & MAGNIMS Study Group Barkhof F de Stefano N Sastre-Garriga J Ciccarelli O Enzinger C Filippi M Gasperini Claudio Kappos L Palace J Vrenken H Rovira À Rocca MA Yousry T. (2021). Quantitative magnetic resonance imaging towards clinical application in multiple sclerosis. Brain, 144(5), 1296-1311. oup.com

9. Jaimes, C., Biaggotti, D., Sreedher, G., Chaturvedi, A., Moore, M. M., & Danehy, A. R. (2021). Magnetic resonance imaging in children with implants. Pediatric Radiology, 51, 748-759. [HTML]

10. Fussell, W. L., Patel, N. S., Carlson, M. L., Neff, B. A., Watson, R. E., Lane, J. I., & Driscoll, C. L. (2021). Cochlear implants and magnetic resonance imaging: experience with over 100 studies performed with magnets in place. Otology & Neurotology, 42(1), 51-58. [HTML]

11. Iwatsuki, K., Yoneda, H., Onishi, T., Ishii, H., Kurimoto, S., Yamamoto, M., Tatebe, M., & Hirata, H. (2020). Compatibility of magnetic resonance imaging in patients with orthopedic implants: manufacturer questionnaires. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

12. Prashant, N. & Ariel, R. (2005). Magnetic Resonance Imaging in patients with ICDs and Pacemakers. [PDF]

13. M. Young, N., R Hoff, S., & Ryan, M. (2020). Impact of Cochlear Implant With Diametric Magnet on Imaging Access, Safety, and Clinical Care. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

14. Baumann, U., Stöver, T., & Weißgerber, T. (2020). Device profile of the MED-EL cochlear implant system for hearing loss: Overview of its safety and efficacy. Expert Review of Medical Devices, 17(7), 599-614. [HTML]

15. Eerkens, H. J., Smits, C., & Hofman, M. B. M. (2021). Cochlear implant magnet dislocation: simulations and measurements of force and torque at 1.5 T magnetic resonance imaging. Ear and hearing. researchgate.net

16. Dhanasingh, A. & Hochmair, I. (2021). ABI-auditory brainstem implant. Acta Oto-Laryngologica. tandfonline.com

17. Rima Valevičienė, N., Varytė, G., Zakarevičienė, J., Kontrimavičiūtė, E., Ramašauskaitė, D., & Rutkauskaitė-Valančienė, D. (2019). Use of Magnetic Resonance Imaging in Evaluating Fetal Brain and Abdomen Malformations during Pregnancy. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

18. Gatta, G., Di Grezia, G., Cuccurullo, V., Sardu, C., Iovino, F., Comune, R., Ruggiero, A., Chirico, M., La Forgia, D., Fanizzi, A., Massafra, R., Paola Belfiore, M., Falco, G., Reginelli, A., Brunese, L., Grassi, R., Cappabianca, S., & Viola, L. (2021). MRI in Pregnancy and Precision Medicine: A Review from Literature. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

19. Enders, J., Zimmermann, E., Rief, M., Martus, P., Klingebiel, R., Asbach, P., Klessen, C., Diederichs, G., Wagner, M., Teichgräber, U., Bengner,

T., Hamm, B., & Dewey, M. (2011). Reduction of Claustrophobia with Short-Bore versus Open Magnetic Resonance Imaging: A Randomized Controlled Trial. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

20. Bose, Å. M., Khan Bukholm, I. R., Bukholm, G., & Geitung, J. T. (2020). A national study of the causes, consequences and amelioration of adverse events in the use of MRI, CT, and conventional radiography in Norway. Acta Radiologica, 61(6), 830-838. [HTML]

21. Sajid, I. M., Parkunan, A., & Frost, K. (2021). Unintended consequences: quantifying the benefits, iatrogenic harms and downstream cascade costs of musculoskeletal MRI in UK primary care. BMJ open quality. bmj.com

22. Stogiannos, N., Harvey–Lloyd, J. M., Nugent, B., Brammer, A., Carlier, S., Cleaver, K., ... & Malamateniou, C. (2022). Autism-friendly MRI: Improving radiography practice in the UK, a survey of radiographer practitioners. Radiography, 28(1), 133-141. city.ac.uk

23. Taschereau-Dumouchel, V., Cushing, C. A., & Lau, H. (2022). Real-time functional MRI in the treatment of mental health disorders. Annual review of clinical psychology, 18(1), 125-154. annualreviews.org

24. Lima, A. A., Mridha, M. F., Das, S. C., Kabir, M. M., Islam, M. R., & Watanobe, Y. (2022). A comprehensive survey on the detection, classification, and challenges of neurological disorders. Biology, 11(3), 469. mdpi.com

25. Goyal, A., D. Crabtree, C., C. Lee, B., T. Harfi, T., Rajpal, S., O. Yildiz, V., P. Simonetti, O., & S. Tong, M. (2024). The impact of severe obesity on image quality and ventricular function assessment in echocardiography and cardiac MRI. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

26. Barison, A., Baritussio, A., Cipriani, A., De Lazzari, M., Aquaro, G. D., Guaricci, A. I., ... & Dellegrottaglie, S. (2021). Cardiovascular magnetic resonance: what clinicians should know about safety and contraindications. International Journal of Cardiology, 331, 322-328. [HTML]

27. Hosten, N., Bülow, R., Völzke, H., Domin, M., Schmidt, C. O., Teumer, A., ... & Kromrey, M. L. (2021, December). SHIP-MR and radiology: 12 years of whole-body magnetic resonance imaging in a single center. In Healthcare (Vol. 10, No. 1, p. 33). MDPI. mdpi.com

28. Lewis, A. J., Abdesselam, I., Rayner, J. J., Byrne, J., Borlaug, B. A., Neubauer, S., & Rider, O. J. (2022). Adverse right ventricular remodelling, function, and stress responses in obesity: insights from

cardiovascular magnetic resonance. European Heart Journal-Cardiovascular Imaging, 23(10), 1383-1390. oup.com

29. Nordbeck, P., Ertl, G., & Ritter, O. (2015). Magnetic resonance imaging safety in pacemaker and implantable cardioverter defibrillator patients: how far have we come? ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

30. Ahmed, W., Phoenix, D., Jackson, M., & Charalambous, C. P. (2020). Advances in medical and surgical engineering. [HTML]

31. Mauro, N., Utzeri, M. A., Varvarà, P., & Cavallaro, G. (2021). Functionalization of metal and carbon nanoparticles with potential in cancer theranostics. Molecules. mdpi.com

32. Rahman, M. (2023). Magnetic resonance imaging in personalized medicine. Metabolomics. [HTML]

33. Schieda, N., I. Blaichman, J., F. Costa, A., Glikstein, R., Hurrell, C., James, M., Jabehdar Maralani, P., Shabana, W., Tang, A., Tsampalieros, A., B. van der Pol, C., & Hiremath, S. (2018). Gadolinium-Based Contrast Agents in Kidney Disease: A Comprehensive Review and Clinical Practice Guideline Issued by the Canadian Association of Radiologists. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

34. I Attenberger, U., N Morelli, J., O Schoenberg, S., & J Michaely, H. (2011). Assessment of the kidneys: magnetic resonance angiography, perfusion and diffusion. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

35. Iacobellis, F., Di Serafino, M., Russo, C., Ronza, R., Caruso, M., Dell'Aversano Orabona, G., ... & Romano, L. (2024). Safe and Informed Use of Gadolinium-Based Contrast Agent in Body Magnetic Resonance Imaging: Where We Were and Where We Are. Journal of Clinical Medicine, 13(8), 2193. mdpi.com

36. Chmielewski, M., Serafin, Z., Kamińska, D., Skrobisz, K., Kozak, O., Olczyk, P., ... & Krajewska, M. (2024). The use of intravascular contrast media in patients with impaired kidney function–joint clinical practice position statement of the Polish Society of Nephrology and the Polish Medical Society of Radiology. Polish Journal of Radiology, 89, e161. nih.gov

37. Zhong, J., Chen, L., Xing, Y., Lu, J., Shi, Y., Wang, Y., ... & Yao, W. (2024). Just give the contrast? Appraisal of guidelines on intravenous iodinated contrast media use in patients with kidney disease. Insights into Imaging, 15(1), 77. springer.com

38. Davenport, M. S., Perazella, M. A., Yee, J., Dillman, J. R., Fine, D.,

McDonald, R. J., ... & Weinreb, J. C. (2020). Use of intravenous iodinated contrast media in patients with kidney disease: consensus statements from the American College of Radiology and the National Kidney Foundation. Radiology, 294(3), 660-668. rsna.org

39. Rudnick, M. R., Leonberg-Yoo, A. K., Litt, H. I., Cohen, R. M., Hilton, S., & Reese, P. P. (2020). The controversy of contrast-induced nephropathy with intravenous contrast: what is the risk?. American Journal of Kidney Diseases, 75(1), 105-113. [HTML]

40. Woolen, S. A., Shankar, P. R., Gagnier, J. J., MacEachern, M. P., Singer, L., & Davenport, M. S. (2020). Risk of nephrogenic systemic fibrosis in patients with stage 4 or 5 chronic kidney disease receiving a group II gadolinium-based contrast agent: a systematic review and meta-analysis. JAMA internal medicine, 180(2), 223-230. jamanetwork.com

41. Farling, P. A., Flynn, P. A., Darwent, G., De Wilde, J., Grainger, D., King, S., McBrien, M. E., Menon, D. K., Ridgway, J. P., Sury, M., Thornton, J., & Wilson, S. R. (2010). Safety in magnetic resonance units: an update. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

42. Teresa Gracia Bara, M., Gallardo-Higueras, A., M. Moreno, E., Laffond, E., J. Muñoz Bellido, F., Martin, C., Sobrino, M., Macias, E., Arriba-Méndez, S., Castillo, R., & Davila, I. (2022). Hypersensitivity to Gadolinium-Based Contrast Media. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

43. Sayed, D., Chakravarthy, K., Amirdelfan, K., Kalia, H., Meacham, K., Shirvalkar, P., ... & ASPN MRI Compatibility Working Group. (2020). A comprehensive practice guideline for magnetic resonance imaging compatibility in implanted neuromodulation devices. Neuromodulation: Technology at the Neural Interface, 23(7), 893-911. [HTML]

44. Erhardt, J., Fuhrer, E., G. Gruschke, O., Leupold, J., C. Wapler, M., Hennig, J., Stieglitz, T., & G. Korvink, J. (2018). Should patients with brain implants undergo MRI?. [PDF]

45. Jabehdar Maralani, P., Schieda, N., Hecht, E. M., Litt, H., Hindman, N., Heyn, C., ... & Weinreb, J. (2020). MRI safety and devices: An update and expert consensus. Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 51(3), 657-674. umich.edu

46. Bwanga, O., Chanda, E., & Mukata, N. (2023). Orbital Foreign Body Detected During Routine Screening for Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) Examinations: A Case Report to Underscore Safety Protocols and …. South African Radiographer. sar.org.za

47. Gerhardsson, L. (2022). Diagnosis and treatment of metal poisoning general aspects. Handbook on the Toxicology of Metals. [HTML]
48. Prado-Rico, J. M., Lee, E. Y., Wang, E. W., Yanosky, J. D., Kong, L., Chen, H., ... & Huang, X. (2022). Higher r2* in the red nucleus is associated with lead exposure in an asymptomatic welder cohort. Toxicological Sciences, 187(2), 345-354. nih.gov
49. on the Identification, I. W. G. (2023). Cobalt Metal (Without Tungsten Carbide) and Some Cobalt Compounds. In Cobalt, antimony compounds, and weapons-grade tungsten alloy. International Agency for Research on Cancer. nih.gov
50. Phang, S. Y., McCulloch, C., & Barrett, C. (2023). Predicting metalwork following posterior fixation of thoracolumbar fractures. British Journal of Neurosurgery. [HTML]
51. Dalili, D., Fritz, J., & Isaac, A. (2021, June). 3D MRI of the hand and wrist: technical considerations and clinical applications. In Seminars in Musculoskeletal Radiology (Vol. 25, No. 03, pp. 501-513). Thieme Medical Publishers, Inc.. [HTML]
52. Licata, M., & Pinto, A. (2020). Radiology in Archaeology: Fundamentals and Perspective—Examination of the Living. Radiology in Forensic Medicine: From Identification to Post-mortem Imaging, 43-54. [HTML]
53. Artunduaga, M., Liu, C. A., Morin, C. E., Serai, S. D., Udayasankar, U., Greer, M. L. C., & Gee, M. S. (2021). Safety challenges related to the use of sedation and general anesthesia in pediatric patients undergoing magnetic resonance imaging examinations. Pediatric radiology, 51, 724-735. springer.com
54. Vinson, A. E., Peyton, J., Kordun, A., Staffa, S. J., & Cravero, J. (2021). Trends in pediatric MRI sedation/anesthesia at a tertiary medical center over time. Pediatric Anesthesia, 31(9), 953-961. [HTML]
55. Xu, H. S., Cavaliere, R. M., & Min, R. J. (2020). Transforming the imaging experience while decreasing sedation rates. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 17(1), 46-52. [HTML]
56. Camoni, L., Santos, A., Luporsi, M., Grilo, A., Pietrzak, A., Gear, J., ... & Bar-Sever, Z. (2023). EANM procedural recommendations for managing the paediatric patient in diagnostic nuclear medicine. European Journal of Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging, 50(13), 3862-3879. springer.com

57. Badawy, N. S. M., Babaqi, M. M. S., Kulaibi, Y. M., Nushayli, M. M., Alsalem, A. A. H., Alanazi, M. B., ... & Muhaysin, A. S. A. (2022). Radiology Nursing In Pediatric Care: Special Considerations And Best Practices. Journal of Namibian Studies: History Politics Culture, 32, 1026-1035. namibian-studies.com

58. Meijer, A. J., Van Den Heuvel-Eibrink, M. M., Brooks, B., Am Zehnhoff-Dinnesen, A. G., Knight, K. R., Freyer, D. R., ... & Society of Paediatric Oncology Supportive Care Committee. (2021). Recommendations for age-appropriate testing, timing, and frequency of audiologic monitoring during childhood cancer treatment: an International Society of Paediatric Oncology Supportive Care Consensus Report. JAMA oncology, 7(10), 1550-1558. [HTML]

59. Jarosz, E. E., Ramwell, C. B., & Bulgarella, H. (2022). Promoting a Culture of Safety: Nursing and Radiology Management of the Pediatric Patient With an Implanted Cardiac Device. Journal of Radiology Nursing. [HTML]

60. Xu, L., Herrington, J., Cahill, K., Risacher, S., & S. Gee, M. (2022). Strategies to optimize a pediatric magnetic resonance imaging service. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

61. , 김명준 (2013). Contrast-Enhanced Magnetic Resonance Imaging in Pediatric Patients: Review and Recommendations for Current Practice. [PDF]

62. Ng, C. K. C. (2022). Artificial intelligence for radiation dose optimization in pediatric radiology: A systematic review. Children. mdpi.com

63. Marcu, L. G., Chau, M., & Bezak, E. (2021). How much is too much? Systematic review of cumulative doses from radiological imaging and the risk of cancer in children and young adults. Critical Reviews in Oncology/Hematology. [HTML]

64. Martin, C. J., Harrison, J. D., & Rehani, M. M. (2020). Effective dose from radiation exposure in medicine: past, present, and future. Physica Medica. physicamedica.com

65. Schaller, R. D., Brunker, T., Riley, M. P., Marchlinski, F. E., Nazarian, S., & Litt, H. (2021). Magnetic resonance imaging in patients with cardiac implantable electronic devices with abandoned leads. JAMA cardiology, 6(5), 549-556. jamanetwork.com

66. Bhuva, A., Charles-Edwards, G., Ashmore, J., Lipton, A., Benbow, M.,

Grainger, D., ... & Manisty, C. (2024). Joint British Society consensus recommendations for magnetic resonance imaging for patients with cardiac implantable electronic devices. Heart, 110(4), e3-e3. bmj.com

67. Navarro-Valverde, C., Ramos-Maqueda, J., Romero-Reyes, M. J., Esteve-Ruiz, I., García-Medina, D., Pavón-Jiménez, R., ... & Molano-Casimiro, F. J. (2022). Magnetic resonance imaging in patients with cardiac implantable electronic devices: A prospective study. Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 91, 9-15. [HTML]

68. Vigen, K. K., Reeder, S. B., Hood, M. N., Steckner, M., Leiner, T., Dombroski, D. A., ... & ISMRM Safety Committee. (2021). Recommendations for imaging patients with cardiac implantable electronic devices (CIEDs). Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 53(5), 1311-1317. umich.edu

69. Yang, E., Suzuki, M., Nazarian, S., & Halperin, H. R. (2022). Magnetic resonance imaging safety in patients with cardiac implantable electronic devices. Trends in Cardiovascular Medicine, 32(7), 440-447. sciencedirect.com

70. Bhargava, R., Hahn, G., Hirsch, W., Kim, M. J., Mentzel, H. J., E. Olsen, Øystein, Stokland, E., Triulzi, F., & Vazquez, E. (2013). Contrast-Enhanced Magnetic Resonance Imaging in Pediatric Patients: Review and Recommendations for Current Practice. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

71. K. M Shadekul Islam, S., Abdullah Al Nasim, M. D., Hossain, I., Md Azim Ullah, D., Kishor Datta Gupta, D., & Monjur Hossain Bhuiyan, M. (2023). Introduction of Medical Imaging Modalities. [PDF]

72. Hussain, S., Mubeen, I., Ullah, N., Shah, S. S. U. D., Khan, B. A., Zahoor, M., ... & Sultan, M. A. (2022). Modern diagnostic imaging technique applications and risk factors in the medical field: a review. BioMed research international, 2022(1), 5164970. wiley.com

73. Ben Awadh, A., Clark, J., Clowry, G., & Keenan, I. D. (2022). Multimodal three-dimensional visualization enhances novice learner interpretation of basic cross-sectional anatomy. Anatomical sciences education, 15(1), 127-142. [HTML]

74. Morales-Espino, A., Déniz, S., Paz-Oliva, P., Roldán-Medina, N., Encinoso, M., Suárez-Cabrera, F., & Jaber, J. R. (2024). Cory's Shearwater (Calonectris borealis): Exploring Normal Head Anatomy through Cross-Sectional Anatomy, Computed Tomography and Magnetic Resonance Imaging. Animals, 14(13), 1962. mdpi.com

75. Kim, S. W., Yuen, A. H. L., Poon, C. T. C., Hwang, J. O., Lee, C. J., Oh, M. K., ... & Park, S. C. (2021). Cross-sectional anatomy, computed tomography, and magnetic resonance imaging of the banded houndshark (Triakis scyllium). Scientific reports, 11(1), 1165. nature.com

76. Raffy, P., Pambrun, J. F., Kumar, A., Dubois, D., Patti, J. W., Cairns, R. A., & Young, R. (2023). Deep learning body region classification of MRI and CT examinations. Journal of Digital Imaging, 36(4), 1291-1301. springer.com

77. Bogdanovic, B., Solari, E. L., Asiares, A. V., McIntosh, L., van Marwick, S., Schachoff, S., & Nekolla, S. G. (2022, May). PET/MR technology: advancement and challenges. In Seminars in Nuclear Medicine (Vol. 52, No. 3, pp. 340-355). WB Saunders. [HTML]

78. Vaska, P., & Saleh, L. (2022). Physics of PET/MRI Systems. Hybrid PET/MR Neuroimaging: A Comprehensive Approach, 3-8. [HTML]

79. Choi, C. H., Felder, J., Lerche, C., & Shah, N. J. (2022). MRI coil development strategies for hybrid MR-PET systems: a review. IEEE Reviews in Biomedical Engineering, 17, 342-350. [HTML]

80. Morahan, A. J., D'adda, I., Erlandsson, K., Carminati, M., Rega, M., Walls, D., ... & Hutton, B. F. (2023). Challenges in acquiring clinical simultaneous SPECT-MRI on a PET-MRI scanner. IEEE Transactions on Radiation and Plasma Medical Sciences, 7(7), 755-763. ucl.ac.uk

81. Nolte, T., Gross-Weege, N., & Schulz, V. (2020). (Hybrid) SPECT and PET technologies. Molecular Imaging in Oncology. [HTML]

82. Nishikido, F., Obata, T., Suga, M., Iwao, Y., Tashima, H., Yoshida, E., ... & Yamaya, T. (2022). Axial scalable add-on PET/MRI prototype based on four-layer DOI detectors integrated with a RF coil. Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment, 1040, 167239. [HTML]

83. C Rathebe, P. (2022). Perceived safety of MRI units in the two public hospitals within the central region of South Africa: A pilot study among four MR staff. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov