

**OPEN ACCESS**

**Repository of the Max Delbrück Center for Molecular Medicine (MDC)  
in the Helmholtz Association**

<http://edoc.mdc-berlin.de/16346>

**Histopathologic assessment of neurotoxicity after repeated  
administration of gadodiamide in healthy rats**

---

Schlemm, L. and Radbruch, H. and Brandt, A.U. and Scheel, M. and Paul, F.

This is a copy of the original article which is published here with the permission of the publisher 12 month after the official publication date. The original article has been published in final edited form in:

Radiology  
2017 MAR; 282(3): 925-926  
2017 MAR (first published online)  
doi: [10.1148/radiol.2017162394](https://doi.org/10.1148/radiol.2017162394)

Publisher: [Radiological Society of North America \(U.S.A.\)](#)

© 2016 Radiological Society of North America (RSNA)

Currently, no consensus on the exact implementation of kinetic modeling of subtle BBB leakage has been reached and in vivo validation remains difficult. Some of the suggested corrections would influence the numerical values, but the group effects and conclusion of increased BBB leakage in Alzheimer disease will remain the same, which is confirmed by another research site (10).

**Disclosures of Conflicts of Interest:** W.H.B. disclosed no relevant relationships. M.J.P.v.O. disclosed no relevant relationships. H.J.v.d.H. disclosed no relevant relationships. J.F.A.J. disclosed no relevant relationships.

## References

- van de Haar HJ, Burgmans S, Jansen JFA, et al. Blood-brain barrier leakage in patients with early Alzheimer disease. *Radiology* 2016; 281(2):527–535.
- Wong SM, Zhang CE, Jansen JFA, et al. Measuring subtle leakage of the blood-brain barrier in cerebrovascular disease: how reproducible is DCE-MRI? *JMRI* doi: 10.1002/jmri.25540.
- Garpebring A, Wirestam R, Ostlund N, Karlsson M. Effects of inflow and radiofrequency spoiling on the arterial input function in dynamic contrast-enhanced MRI: a combined phantom and simulation study. *Magn Reson Med* 2011;65(6):1670–1679.
- Roberts C, Little R, Watson Y, et al. The effect of blood inflow and B(1)-field inhomogeneity on measurement of the arterial input function in axial 3D spoiled gradient echo dynamic contrast-enhanced MRI. *Magn Reson Med* 2011;65(1):108–119.
- Barnes SR, Ng TSC, Montagne A, et al. Optimal acquisition and modelling parameters for accurate assessment of low Ktrans blood-brain barrier permeability using dynamic contrast-enhanced MRI. *Magn Reson Med* 2016;75(5):1967–1977.
- Cramer SP, Larson HBW. Accurate determination of blood-brain barrier permeability using dynamic contrast-enhanced T1-weighted MRI: a simulation and in vivo study on healthy subjects and multiple sclerosis patients. *J Cereb Blood Flow Metab* 2014;34(10):1655–1665.
- Larsson HBW, Courivaud F, Rostrup E, et al. Measurement of brain perfusion, blood volume, and blood-brain barrier permeability, using dynamic contrast-enhanced T1-weighted MRI at 3 Tesla. *Magn Reson Med* 2009;62(5):1270–1281.
- van de Haar HJ, Jansen JFA, van Osch MJ, et al. Neurovascular unit impairment in early Alzheimer's disease measured with magnetic resonance imaging. *Neurobiol Aging* 2016; 45:190–196.
- Heye AK, Thrippleton MJ, Armitage PA, et al. Tracer kinetic modelling for DCE-MRI quantification of subtle blood-brain barrier permeability. *NeuroImage* 2016;125:446–455.
- Montagne A, Barnes SR, Sweeney MD, et al. Blood-brain barrier breakdown in the aging human hippocampus. *Neuron* 2015;85(2): 296–302.

## Histopathologic Assessment of Neurotoxicity after Repeated Administration of Gadodiamide in Healthy Rats

From

Ludwig Schlemm, MD,\* Helena Radbruch, MD,† Alexander U. Brandt, MD,\* Michael Scheel, MD,\* and Friedemann Paul, MD\*\*§

Departments of Neurology\* and Neuropathology,† NeuroCure Clinical Research Center,\* and Experimental and Clinical Research Center, Max Delbrueck Center for Molecular Medicine,§ Charité–Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany  
e-mail: [friedemann.paul@charite.de](mailto:friedemann.paul@charite.de)

## Editor:

We read with great interest the article by Dr Smith and colleagues on accumulation and partial clearance of gadolinium from the brain after repeated administration of gadodiamide in a rodent model with intact blood-brain barrier, which was recently published online in *Radiology* (1). The authors state that there was no “detectable neurotoxicity” and no “histopathologic consequence” after up to 20 doses of intravenously administered gadodiamide with a cumulative dose of up to 12 mmol/kg. While it is certainly encouraging that the authors could not detect any extensive tissue damage, we are concerned that the histopathologic assessment limits such conclusions.

First, contrary to guidelines for toxicologic histopathology, pathologists were not made aware of the different treatment groups, as is recommended for evaluations where a known toxic syndrome with a defined spectrum of lesions does not exist (2,3).

Second, and more importantly, neurotoxicity assessments were not specified, making comparison with independent studies impossible. Stereological evaluation would allow quantification of neuronal cell number and volume (4). Furthermore, only standard hematoxylin-eosin (H-E) stains were mentioned, which have limited sensitivity in detecting subtle changes associated with potential gadolinium-related neurotoxicity such as impaired mitochondrial function (5). Assessment of pathologic changes on this level would require methods such as lactate dehydrogenase immunoreactivity or electron microscopy. In addition, it is known that glial cells react to neurotoxic events (6), and previous studies found gadolinium to be deposited mostly within or in close proximity to the endothelial wall (7). Therefore, a critical evaluation of potential gadodiamide-related neurotoxicity should include quantitative measures of reactive astrogliosis and microglial activation. While not strictly required for toxicologic assessments according to current guidelines (3), we believe that a statement like the one made by Dr Smith and colleagues would need to be based on appropriate evaluation and quantification of neuronal function.

In addition, gadolinium is regularly used in conditions with an impaired blood-brain barrier, leading to a different risk profile for gadolinium accumulation. For example, we and other investigators recently provided evidence of gadolinium deposition in patients with multiple sclerosis within routine clinical care (8). In conclusion, we do not believe that the shown representative normal-appearing H-E images alone exclude gadolinium-related neurotoxicity, especially in conditions with potentially increased gadolinium uptake in the brain.

**Disclosures of Conflicts of Interest:** L.S. disclosed no relevant relationships. H.R. disclosed no relevant relationships. A.U.B. Activities related to the present article: disclosed no relevant relationships. Activities not related to the present article: is a cofounder of Motognosis; has shares in Motognosis; receives consulting fees from Motognosis, Teva, Novartis, and Biogen. Other relationships: disclosed no relevant relationships. M.S. disclosed no relevant relationships. F.P. Activities

related to the present article: disclosed no relevant relationships. Activities not related to the present article: received grants from various pharmaceutical companies; received personal fees from various pharmaceutical companies. Other relationships: disclosed no relevant relationships.

## References

1. Smith AP, Marino M, Roberts J, et al. Clearance of gadolinium from the brain with no pathologic effect after repeated administration of gadodiamide in healthy rats: an analytical and histologic study. *Radiology* doi: 10.1148/radiol.2016160905. Published online September 27, 2016. Accessed October 13, 2016.
2. Crissman JW, Goodman DG, Hildebrandt PK, et al. Best practices guideline: toxicologic histopathology. *Toxicol Pathol* 2004;32(1):126–131.
3. Bolon B, Garman RH, Pardo ID, et al. STP position paper: recommended practices for sampling and processing the nervous system (brain, spinal cord, nerve, and eye) during nonclinical general toxicity studies. *Toxicol Pathol* 2013;41(7):1028–1048.
4. Bolon B, Garman R, Jensen K, et al. A “best practices” approach to neuropathologic assessment in developmental neurotoxicity testing—for today. *Toxicol Pathol* 2006;34(3):296–313.
5. Feng X, Xia Q, Yuan L, Yang X, Wang K. Impaired mitochondrial function and oxidative stress in rat cortical neurons: implications for gadolinium-induced neurotoxicity. *Neurotoxicology* 2010;31(4):391–398.
6. O’Callaghan JP, Jensen KF, Miller DB. Quantitative aspects of drug and toxicant-induced astrogliosis. *Neurochem Int* 1995;26(2):115–124.
7. McDonald RJ, McDonald JS, Kallmes DF, et al. Intracranial gadolinium deposition after contrast-enhanced MR imaging. *Radiology* 2015;275(3):772–782.
8. Schlemm L, Chien C, Bellmann-Strobl J, et al. Gadopentetate but not gadobutrol accumulates in the dentate nucleus of multiple sclerosis patients. *Mult Scler* doi:10.1177/1352458516670738. Published online September 27, 2016.

## Response

From

Paul M. Evans, PhD,\* Adrian P. L. Smith, PhD,\* Michael Marino, PhD,<sup>†</sup> and Mark Hibberd, MD, PhD\*  
 GE Healthcare, Life Sciences, White Lion Rd, Amersham HP7 9LL, England\*  
 e-mail: paul.m.evans@ge.com

GE Global Research Centre, Niskayuna, NY<sup>‡</sup>  
 GE Healthcare, Life Sciences, Marlborough, Mass<sup>§</sup>

We thank Dr Schlemm and colleagues for their interest in our article and acknowledge the points they raise. We acknowledge that the current lack of reported neurotoxicity associated with brain gadolinium levels reported to date in both clinical and nonclinical studies is not definitive proof of absence of neurotoxicity and that if there are neurologic effects of gadolinium at the low levels measured they could be subtle in nature. We also acknowledge there are limitations with a standard H-E toxicologic assessment of central nervous system tissue but considered that it is an important first step, as is the case in standard drug development, to conduct a study of this type in the controlled setting of a nonclinical model with superior tissue preservation and morphology afforded by the methods employed. We also recognize the benefits and risks of blinded histopathologic assessments. For clarity, the independent histopathologic assessment was conducted masked to individual animal group assignment to avoid bias in our small cohort, but not to the agents used. The pathologist was then unmasked to groupings to enable interpretation and reporting.

We concur that it is important to systematically assess the potential risk of gadolinium presence in the central nervous system and are undertaking further studies to detect potential subtle lesions or functional deficits that may have no overt histologic footprint. Such studies will include more detailed tissue examination, such as ultrastructure with transmission electron microscopy, detailed behavioral assessments, and other analytic techniques as appropriate. Proving a potentially negative finding requires a high standard of rigor with a weight of evidence approach and multiple studies and/or techniques may be required. Considering gadolinium has been detected in the brain postmortem following administration of all types of contrast

agent (both linear and macrocyclic) (1–3), it is important that all agents are assessed in a systematic way for potential impact.

We also acknowledge that a healthy animal with an intact blood-brain barrier cannot replicate the varied co-morbidities and underlying conditions of the clinic but is likely to be an invaluable tool in elucidating mechanisms of transport into the brain and action of any potential toxicity free of confounding underlying disease states.

**Disclosures of Conflicts of Interest:** P.M.E. Activities related to the present article: disclosed no relevant relationships. Activities not related to the present article: disclosed no relevant relationships. Other relationships: is employed by GE Healthcare. A.P.L.S. Activities related to the present article: disclosed no relevant relationships. Activities not related to the present article: disclosed no relevant relationships. Other relationships: is employed by GE Healthcare. M.M. Activities related to the present article: institution received a financial contribution and support with study design/manuscript preparation from GE Healthcare. Activities not related to the present article: disclosed no relevant relationships. Other relationships: GE Healthcare provides financial support for other medical diagnostics research studies at the GE Global Research Center. M.H. Activities related to the present article: disclosed no relevant relationships. Activities not related to the present article: disclosed no relevant relationships. Other relationships: is an employee of GE Healthcare.

## References

1. Murata N, Gonzalez-Cuyar LF, Murata K, et al. Macrocyclic and other non-group 1 gadolinium contrast agents deposit low levels of gadolinium in brain and bone tissue: preliminary results from 9 patients with normal renal function. *Invest Radiol* 2016;51(7):447–453.
2. Kartamihardja AAP, Nakajima T, Kameo S, Koyama H, Tsushima Y. Distribution and clearance of retained gadolinium in the brain: differences between linear and macrocyclic gadolinium based contrast agents in a mouse model. *Br J Radiol* 2016;89:20160509.
3. McDonald R, McDonald J, Dai D, et al. Comparison of tissue deposition rates in multiple murine organs following intravenous administration of linear vs macrocyclic gadolinium chelates. In: Proceedings of the ASNR 54th Annual Meeting, May 23–26, Washington, DC. <http://ww4.aievolution.com/asn1601/index.cfm?do=abs.viewAbs&abs=1544>.