

Magnetic resonance enterography of Crohn's disease

Expert Rev. Gastroenterol. Hepatol. 9(1), 37–45 (2015)

Makoto Naganuma*¹,
Tadakazu Hisamatsu²,
Takanori Kanai² and
Haruhiko Ogata¹

¹Center for Diagnostic and Therapeutic Endoscopy, School of Medicine, Keio University, 35 Shinanomachi, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160-8582, Japan

²Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, School of Medicine, Keio University, 35 Shinanomachi, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160-8582, Japan

*Author for correspondence:

Tel.: +81 333 531 211
nagamakoto@z7.keio.jp

Magnetic resonance enterography (MRE) has been reported to be a useful modality for the evaluation of luminal inflammation and extraintestinal complications in Crohn's disease (CD). A recent study indicated that the diagnostic ability of MRE was comparable to the diagnostic ability of other devices, such as ileocolonoscopy. MRE can be performed repeatedly because there is no radiation exposure. Therefore, MRE is useful as a method of follow-up for younger patients with established CD. It is useful for evaluating the efficacy of medical treatments, such as biologics. MRE can detect small intestinal lesions even if the endoscope does not pass through the stenosis. The concerns of availability of expertise and the costs associated with MRE should be addressed so MRE can be widely used for CD patients in the near future.

KEYWORDS: Crohn's disease • diagnostic accuracy • endoscopic remission • enteroscopy • magnetic resonance enterography

Crohn's disease (CD) is an immune-mediated disease with abdominal symptoms that include diarrhea, abdominal pain and perianal fistulas. Inflammation in CD involves the entire gastrointestinal tract, especially the small intestine. Ileocolonoscopy is useful for detecting inflammation in the colon and the terminal ileum; however, this technique is unable to assess the mid-small intestine. More recently, novel technologies to enable inflammatory bowel disease diagnosis have been developed, such as capsule endoscopy (CE) and balloon-assisted enteroscopy (BAE). These technologies have been established as useful modalities for the diagnosis and assessment of disease extent and severity. However, CD lesions are typically transmural and lead to progressive damage and complications, such as fistulas and abscesses. Thus, cross-sectional imaging is critical for the assessment of CD lesions. Computed tomographic and magnetic resonance enterography (CTE and MRE) have been reported to be useful modalities for the evaluation of luminal inflammation and extraintestinal complications in CD. MRE can be performed without radiation exposure, making it the preferred imaging technique for the evaluation of CD in children and adolescents. In this article, we

have reviewed recent trends and topics regarding MRE for patients with CD.

MRE protocol

In reviewing the diagnostic accuracy of MRE, we should note the heterogeneity of MR imaging protocols, such as the use of different MRI magnets (1.5 Tesla [1.5T] or 3 Tesla [3T]), enteral contrasts and preparations for bowel distention. The diagnostic accuracy might differ according to the protocol of MRE. The 3T magnet increases the signal-to-noise ratio and reduces the time of image acquisition compared with the 1.5T magnet [1]. The 3T MRI is superior to 1.5T for detecting ulcers, whereas 3T is as accurate as 1.5T in detecting bowel wall thickness, enhancement and fistulas.

MRE requires the administration of a large amount of contrast medium orally. Typically, transit to the right colon has been observed within at least 40–60 min [2]. A recent review stated that MRE performed 40 min after the ingestion of oral contrast material is practical for patients' compliance and for providing effective MRE imaging [3,4]. In the authors' institution, patients are typically ordered to ingest 1500 ml of polyethylene glycol within 60 min prior to scanning.




Figure 1. Coronal true imaging with T1-weighted images revealed that mural enhancement is observed in the proximal ileum after injection of gadolinium.

Bowel distention with MR enteroclysis is superior to distention with MRE in most studies [5–8]. However, the use of MRE is associated with reduced abdominal discomfort and nausea compared with MR enteroclysis. Patients are exposed to radiation during the placement of the naso-jejunal catheter when MR enteroclysis is performed [9]. Furthermore, a prospective randomized study showed that the diagnostic accuracy of MR enterography was comparable to the accuracy of MR enteroclysis [6,10]. Thus, MRE could be used to follow-up patients without proximal small intestinal lesions of CD [3].

Rectal contrast might increase the diagnostic accuracy in detecting lesions in the rectum and distal colon; however, rectal contrast causes more patient discomfort than MRE procedures done without using rectal contrast. For patients undergoing

colonoscopy, the requirement for colonic distention during MRE is reduced [11]. Intravenous gadolinium chelate contrast agent is used to differentiate between active and inactive disease. Gadolinium chelate given to patients (approximately 60 s) prior to 3D T1-weighted image with fat suppression was acquired in the authors' institution.

The main limitation of MRE is bowel motion, which could potentially obscure relevant findings. Thus, anti-peristaltic agents such as scopolamine butylbromide or glucagon are used to minimize bowel motion just before MRE is performed. A recent study indicated that the quality of the MRE without anti-peristaltic agents was judged to be inferior to CTE, although the diagnostic results were equivalent [12]. The authors typically used anti-peristaltic agents for MRE to obtain high-quality imaging except in patients with contraindications for these agents.

Findings of MRE

The MRE findings for CD include wall thickness, wall hyper-signal, extravasularity, swelling of lymph nodes, ulcerations, fistulas, edema, strictures and extraintestinal complications. In patients with active intestinal inflammation, mural enhancement is observed after the injection of gadolinium (FIGURE 1). Mural hyperenhancement is related to active inflammation and is the most sensitive finding of active CD lesions [3,13,14]. Wall thickness is also frequently observed; however, wall thickness without high intensity remains in responders after medical treatment in some cases (FIGURE 2).

Intestinal strictures can be detected on MRE. MRE enables the assessment of proximal small intestinal lesions beyond severe strictures even if the endoscope does not pass through the stenosis (FIGURE 3). This is the advantage of MRE for the assessment of intestinal lesions in patients with CD, compared with ileocolonoscopy and BAE. Moreover, while BAE has been available for evaluating small intestinal lesions of CD, it is hard to observe the mucosa along the entire length of the small intestine using either the oral or anal approach in one session of BAE. Intestinal strictures with marked intestinal distension suggest moderate-to-severe strictures, resulting in indications for surgery if the patients have any abdominal symptoms. Strictures with hypoenhancement are typically observed in fibrotic strictures, whereas inflammatory strictures have wall thickness with mural hyperenhancement and edema [15]. However, it is not easy to distinguish fibrotic strictures from inflammatory strictures on MRE in some cases, because the strictures are usually constructed of both fibrotic and inflammatory lesions.

Fistulas could be detected on MRE (FIGURE 4), although early fistulas might be difficult to detect because of the lower spatial resolution of MRE.




Figure 2. Comparison between ileal lesion on MRE and endoscopic finding. (A) Increased wall thickness was observed at the terminal ileum. However, mural and transmural enhancement is minimal. (B) The endoscopic findings revealed no inflammation at same area.




Figure 3. Ileal stricture in patients with Crohn's disease. (A) A moderate stricture was found at the proximal ileum, and balloon-assisted enteroscopy did not pass through the stenosis. (B) Ileal lesions with mural enhancement and (C) severe strictures with bowel distention were observed on the T1-weighted image.

Extraintestinal complications, such as abscesses, could also be detected on MRE. It is important to assess fistulas and abscesses because these lesions are frequently associated with medical treatment failure, including secondary loss of responsiveness for anti-TNF- α agents [16].

MRE could be used as an observer-independent diagnostic device for the evaluation of CD lesions, although there have been few studies to assess the interobserver agreement in MRE for diagnostic assessments in patients with CD. A recent study indicated that high interobserver agreements for mural inflammation and lymphadenopathy were found in patients with active CD lesions [17]. Another study indicated that wall thickness, the presence of edema, enhancement patterns and length of the disease in each segment showed good interobserver variability between all investigators [18].

The diagnostic accuracy of MRE

Previous reports regarding the diagnostic accuracy of MRE are summarized in TABLE 1 [12,14,19–28]. MRE has been shown to have excellent sensitivity and specificity for CD lesions. In most studies, the diagnostic accuracies of MRE were assessed by comparing the findings on ileocolonoscopy and the findings on MRE. A recent systematic review showed that the sensitivity and specificity of MRE for the diagnosis of suspected CD was 78 and 85%, respectively [29]. For the extension of CD lesions, the sensitivity and specificity of MRE for small bowel lesions were 74 and 91%, respectively [29]. The diagnostic accuracy for the extension and disease severity of MRE was comparable to the accuracy of CTE [20–23,25,27,28]. No significant differences were observed between MRE and CTE in detecting fistulas [30]. MRE might be preferred to CTE to assess the location and severity of the disease because of the reduced radiation exposure for young patients.

Ultrasonography (US) and MRE are safe and non-invasive devices; however, US is less expensive compared with MRE and could be performed at the bedside. Recently, a diagnostic study for patients with suspected CD was performed to compare the accuracy of MRE and US [25]. For the detection of

small intestinal lesions of CD, the sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value and negative predictive value for MRE and US were high (94–97%). However, US was less accurate than MRE in defining CD extension. A recent systematic review indicated that US, computed tomography and MRE have high accuracy for detecting fistulas, abscesses and strictures, whereas US has high false positives for abscesses [29]; MRE is preferred to US for deep-seated fistulas [31].

The advantages of CE and BAE are that they can directly observe mucosal inflammation, whereas MRE is particularly useful for detecting transmural inflammation, stenosis and extraintestinal lesions, including abscesses and fistulas [32]. MRE is useful when evaluating small and large intestinal lesions even in cases with severe strictures, where full evaluation of the small




Figure 4. Coronal true imaging with T1-weighted images revealed an ileoileal fistula with inflammation.

Table 1. Summary of the accuracy of magnetic resonance enterography for Crohn's disease lesions by comparing the findings of conventional diagnostic devices.

Study (year)	Diagnostic devices as gold standard	Number of cases	Location of assessment on MRE	Accuracy of MRE for CD lesions (%)	Ref.
Schreyer <i>et al.</i> (2005)	Ileocolonoscopy	30	Colon, TI	Sen 55, Spe 98	[19]
Lee <i>et al.</i> (2009)	Ileocolonoscopy	30	TI	Sen 83, Spe 100	[20]
Rimola <i>et al.</i> (2009)	Ileocolonoscopy	50	Colon, TI	Sen 81, Spe 89	[14]
Siddiki <i>et al.</i> (2009)	Ileocolonoscopy	44	TI	Sen 91, Spe 67	[21]
Fiorino <i>et al.</i> (2011)	Ileocolonoscopy	44	TI, colon	For TI Sen 81, Spe 93 (MRE) Sen 81, Spe 91 (CTE)	[22]
Grand <i>et al.</i> (2012)	Ileocolonoscopy	310	TI, colon	Sen 85, Spe 80	[12]
Grand <i>et al.</i> (2012)	Histological findings	310	TI	Sen 87, Spe 88	[12]
Jensen <i>et al.</i> (2011)	Ileocolonoscopy/surgery	50	SI	Sen 74, Spe 80 (MRE) Sen 83, Spe 70 (CTE)	[23]
Hyun <i>et al.</i> (2011)	Ileocolonoscopy/BAE	30	SI, colon	For SI lesions Sen 62, Spe 93 For colonic lesions Sen 86, Spe 95	[24]
Castiglione <i>et al.</i> (2013)	Ileocolonoscopy	249	SI	Sen 96, Spe 94 (MRE) Sen 94, Spe 97 (bowel sonography)	[25]
Takenaka <i>et al.</i> (2014)	BAE	100	SI	Ulcerative lesions: Sen 82, Spe 88 Major stricture Sen 59, Spe 90	[26]
Quencer <i>et al.</i> (2013)	Histological findings	23	SI	Sen 88, Spe 79 (MRE) Sen 100, Spe 62 (CTE)	[27]
Dillman <i>et al.</i> (2011)	Histological findings	22	SI, colon	Sen 66, Spe 90	[28]

BAE: Balloon-assisted enteroscopy; CTE: Computed tomographic enterography; MRE: Magnetic resonance enterography; SI: Small intestine; Sen: Sensitivity; Spe: Specificity; TI: Terminal ileum.

bowel would be virtually impossible to achieve using CE or even BAE. Thus, these technologies appear to complement each other. The diagnostic accuracy of CE and MRE has been compared in the recent studies [33–38]. Recent meta-analysis demonstrated that the diagnostic yield for CE and MRE were comparable [33]. Albert *et al.* investigated the detection rate of small intestinal lesions on CE, MRI and double-contrast fluoroscopy in patients with suspected CD [34]. CE was not accomplished in approximately one-third of patients (14/41) due to bowel strictures in this study. CE was slightly more sensitive than MRI, whereas MRE detected inflammatory conglomerates and enteric fistulae in five cases [34]. In another study, CE was found to be superior to MRE in detecting mucosal lesions in patients with CD; however, MRE could detect severe inflammatory lesions within the bowel wall [33]. These results suggested that CE is capable of detecting mucosal lesions that may be missed by MRE, while MRE is helpful in identifying transmural CD and extraluminal lesions.

Takenaka *et al.* recently compared the diagnostic accuracy of MRE with BAE [26]. In this prospective study, MRE and single BAE were performed in 100 patients. Ulcerative lesions, mucosal lesions and intestinal damage were evaluated. MRE detected ulcerative lesions in the small intestine with a sensitivity of 82%. The specificity for ulcerative lesions and mucosal lesions were 88 and 95%, respectively. MRE detected major stenosis (stricture that the scope could not pass) with a sensitivity of 59% and a specificity of 90%, and strictures were detected with a sensitivity of 41% and a specificity of 94%. MRE is useful for detecting active lesions in the small intestine. However, MR imaging is less sensitive for detecting strictures, which single BAE is able to detect. BAE is preferred for identifying intestinal damage.

When the lesions identified by MRE were compared with the surgical findings in patients with CD, MRE could identify small bowel CD lesions, such as fistulas and abscesses; the results showed that 27 of 30 ileoenteric or ileocolonic fistulas

and 8 of 9 abscesses were detected using MRE in patients who required surgery [39]. Discrete proximal small intestinal lesions might not be detected in all cases because of insufficient bowel distension at the proximal small bowel. Another study using surgical pathological inflammatory grading was significantly associated with MRI findings such as the wall thickness, degree of wall enhancement on delayed phase, pattern of enhancement on both parenchymatous, T2 relative hypersignal wall, blurred wall enhancement, comb sign, fistula, and abscess [40]. The contrast enhancement ratio of abnormal distal ileal segments with inflammation was higher than that with fibrosis only [39], suggesting that strictures with inflammation could be distinguished from fibrotic strictures. However, these studies were not confirmed by another study, which indicated that fibrosis was not associated with wall thickness or with T2 hypersignal [41]. Another study showed that fibrotic lesions alone were also associated with wall thickness, T2 wall hypersignal, comb sign, fistula and abscess [40]. Inflammation with fibrotic changes is frequently observed at the strictures and it is not easy to distinguish inflammatory strictures from fibrotic strictures; recent consensus guidelines from the European Crohn's and Colitis Organisation stated that no validated criteria have been established to determine the fibrotic lesions on MRE [31].

For pediatric CD, MRE is more useful in detecting small intestinal lesions than it is in adolescents because MRE is less complicated than colonoscopy and could be performed without radiation exposure. In some cases of CD, frequent assessment of disease severity and extension of the disease is necessary; therefore, examinations without radiation exposure are important especially for children. A recent systematic review indicated that the pooled sensitivity and specificity for MRE detection at the terminal ileum of CD were 84 and 97%, respectively, in pediatric CD patients [42]. In all studies, ileocolonoscopy was used as the reference test. The diagnostic accuracy for barium enteroclysis was assessed and compared with that of colonoscopy in 3 of the 11 studies in this systematic review. The sensitivity and specificity (72 and 73%) for barium enteroclysis was lower than that for MRE in pediatric CD patients [43–45]. Even if a patient is younger than 10 years old, MRE could be performed without sedation [46]. For children, it is important to perform the MRE procedure in a short time. To reduce the number of MRE sequences, the performance of contrast-enhanced T1-weighted MR alone in the evaluation of CD lesions was compared with the performance of all MRE imaging sequences [47]. This study indicated that the sensitivity, specificity and diagnostic accuracy for detecting active inflammation using contrast-enhanced T1-weighted MR alone were 83, 87 and 85%, which were inferior compared with using all MRE sequences. A higher false-positive rate of abscesses was observed from contrast-enhanced imaging alone, and the absence of abscesses were confirmed when non-fat-suppressed Half fourier Acquisition Single shot Turbo spin Echo (HASTE) was conducted in addition to the contrast-enhanced imaging. It is important to reduce the time of the MRE procedure (reduce the number of MR sequences), especially for pediatric patients. However, non-fat-suppressed

HASTE imaging might be needed to maintain diagnostic accuracy of MRE in patients with CD.

Comparison of MRE findings with biomarkers

It is important to assess the disease activity of CD for appropriate management of the disease. Clinical symptoms and clinical activity indexes such as the Crohn's disease activity index and Harvey–Bradshaw index are important markers for evaluating the severity of CD. However, these indexes are subjective and are affected by psychological factors. It is necessary to assess biological markers, such as C-reactive protein, white blood cell counts and fecal calprotectin; these biological markers might be elevated in infectious diseases and other chronic inflammatory diseases. MRE enables the simultaneous assessment of the extension and severity of CD. The findings on MRE are closely correlated to clinical severity and serological markers with the previously described reference standards. The wall thickness, T2 signal intensity, T1 enhancement and presence of lymph nodes on MRE are related to Crohn's disease activity index, endoscopic severity (Crohn's disease endoscopic index of severity [CDEIS], simple endoscopic score for Crohn's disease) and histological examinations from biopsy or surgical specimens [48] and to Inflammatory Bowel Disease Questionnaire. MRE could also assess the Montreal classification-based disease behavior in patients with CD [49]. However, assessments using imaging such as endoscopy and CT/MR enterography in addition to clinical symptoms and biological markers are necessary for the management of CD to guide therapeutic decisions.

Assessment of disease severity using scores on MRE

Many investigators have scored disease severity on MRE in patients with CD. More recently, the magnetic resonance index of activity score (MaRIA) was developed by comparing the MRE findings with the CDEIS [14]. After assessment with logistic regression, MRE findings, such as the wall thickness, relative contrast enhancement, edema and ulceration, were selected as independent factors for the prediction of endoscopic severity. The MaRIA score was constructed using these four factors. The MaRIA score had a significant correlation with the CDEIS, C-reactive protein and clinical activity score [14,50]. Macarini *et al.* developed the MRE score by assessing disease severity in 100 patients with CD [51]. The MRE score is composed of multiple MRE parameters, such as wall thickness, wall enhancement, enhancement pattern (transmural, layer), fibrofatty proliferation and local complications [45]. The MRE score was correlated to the Crohn's disease activity index and Inflammatory Bowel Disease Questionnaire. Steward *et al.* developed the Crohn's Disease Activity score, which was derived with reference standards of histological scores in surgical specimens [52]. They demonstrated that the mural thickness and T2 signal were the best predictive factors for histological severity.

Using the scoring system on MRE, disease severity and responsiveness for medical treatments could be objectively assessed (TABLE 2). Ordás *et al.* demonstrated a significant decrease in the mean MaRIA score at 12 weeks after treatment with anti-TNF- α

Table 2. Responsiveness of MRI lesions or indexes to medical treatment.

Study (year)	Medical treatment	Assessment of activity index for MRE	Change of MRE parameter over time during medical treatment	Ref.
Ordás <i>et al.</i> (2014)	Corticosteroids (n = 14) Adalimumab (n = 34)	MaRIA score (wall thickness, RCE, edema, ulcers)	Mean MaRIA score (baseline → at 12 weeks) Endoscopic healed 18.9 → 8.7 Non-healed 22.1 → 20.8	[53]
Assche <i>et al.</i> (2013)	Infliximab (n = 20)	MICD (transmural inflammation, extramural lesion, sign of obstruction)	Median MICD (baseline → 2 weeks → 26 weeks) 7.0 → 6.5 → 5.0	[54]
Tielbeek <i>et al.</i> (2013)	Adalimumab (n = 30) Infliximab (n = 20)	Inflammatory score (mural thickness, mural T2 signal, perimural T2 signal T1 contrast)	Mean inflammatory score (first MRE → second MRE) Clinical responder 5.19 → 3.12 Non-responder 5.55 → 5.92	[55]

MICD: MRE score of severity in ileal Crohn's disease; MRE: Magnetic resonance enterography.

agents or steroids compared with the score at baseline if endoscopic healing was obtained; the mean score was not significantly changed among patients without endoscopic healing [53]. The magnitude of change in the CDEIS scores correlated to those in the MaRIA scores. Another study indicated that the clinical effects of infliximab (IFX) could be assessed by MRE in patients with ileal CD. In this study, the MRE index improved in 44% at 2 weeks and in 80% at 26 weeks after treatment with IFX, and the improvement of ileal lesions on MRE correlated to clinical responses after 2 weeks of IFX treatment [54]. Although the median inflammatory score significantly decreased from 7.0 to 5.0, the obstructive score did not change (3.0 → 3.0) after treatment with IFX. Tielbeek *et al.* demonstrated the usefulness of MRE in examining the treatment effect in patients with CD who were treated with IFX/adalimumab [55]. The mean Crohn's disease activity score in anti-TNF responders

significantly improved, whereas the scores did not change significantly in non-responders. Thus, MRE could be used as a complementary approach to measure transmural inflammation in patients with CD and could guide the optimal use of TNF antagonists in daily clinical practice [55]. MRE could evaluate the effects of medical treatments at ileocolonic lesions and at the proximal ileum, where conventional ileocolonoscopy is unable to reach (FIGURE 5).

Could MRE assess mucosal healing in patients with CD?

Recent studies have indicated that endoscopic improvement after medical treatment reduced hospitalizations and surgeries [56,57]. Endoscopy has been the key device for predicting the long-term prognosis of CD. Because MRE could be repeatedly performed to confirm the effects of medical treatment, a question is raised regarding whether MRE could predict endoscopic remission or ulcer healing.

A recent study demonstrated that the MaRIA score had high sensitivity (85%), specificity (78%) and accuracy (83%) for the diagnosis of mucosal healing with a cutoff of 7. A MaRIA score <11 has a high sensitivity for ulcer healing (90%); however, the specificity is moderate [53]. Another study showed that the CDEIS had a sensitivity of 87% and specificity of 70% for predicting acute inflammation with a cutoff of 3 [52]. These results suggest that MRE might predict endoscopic remission in patients with CD.

Expert commentary & five-year view

A recent study indicated that the diagnostic ability of MRE was comparable to the diagnostic ability of other devices, such as ileocolonoscopy and CTE. The advantage of MRE is the ability to detect small and large intestinal lesions at the same time




Figure 5. A case of clinical improvement by infliximab in patients with Crohn's disease. (A) Prior to the administration of infliximab, magnetic resonance enterocolonography could detect deep mucosal lesions in the terminal ileum and the middle ileum. **(B)** Magnetic resonance enterocolonography revealed that inflammation was improved in the colon and in the small intestine.

without radiation exposure. MRE is also useful for the simultaneous evaluation of luminal inflammation, transmural lesions and extraintestinal complications in CD. For these reasons, the European Crohn's and Colitis Organisation guidelines recommend MRE as the imaging technique with the highest diagnostic accuracy for the detection of intestinal involvement in CD, including extramural complication [31]. Nevertheless, MRE has not been widely used in actual clinical settings because MRE might be an expensive device and it requires increased time for all sequences to be performed compared with other devices. Moreover, there are few experts who evaluate CD lesions on MRE. If the concerns for expertise and cost could be solved, MRE would be widely used for CD patients in the near future.

Conventional ileocolonoscopy has been performed in most medical institutions; however, only colonic lesions could be assessed with this, and additional diagnostic tools might be required to evaluate the lesions in other parts of the small intestine. BAE could be used to simultaneously assess lesions in the small and large intestines. The advantage of BAE is being able to obtain biopsy specimens of small intestine and to treat for intestinal strictures by endoscopic dilation. BAE can directly observe small intestinal lesions, such as erosions and small ulcerations. BAE is preferred for identifying intestinal damage and strictures [58], although this technique might be operator dependent. Severe adhesions, strictures and fistulas are frequently observed in CD patients and result in technical difficulties of observing the entire small intestine when BAE is performed. MRE is less invasive and is not dependent on the operators' technique. MRE is useful for assessing therapeutic efficacy in the small and large intestine simultaneously. A recent study suggested that endoscopic remission might be predicted by MRE. In our experiment regarding MRE, a transmural lesion with increased wall thickness

and hyperintensity could be observed even though endoscopic remission was obtained at the same area. The significance of the discrepancy between endoscopic healing and transmural lesions on MRE [59] should be clarified in a future study.

The question of when MRE should be performed in the clinical setting remains. At the time of diagnosis, conventional colonoscopy is needed, especially for pathological diagnosis. CT procedures provide information regarding extraintestinal complications, such as abscesses or fistulas. In actual clinical setting, conventional CT is more widely used than MRI because CT is less expensive and it does not require long time for all sequences. CT is useful to detect CD lesion for patients with moderate-to-severe disease because it can be performed on the same day when patients visit the hospital. MRE could be performed repeatedly because there is no radiation exposure. Therefore, MRE is useful as a method of follow-up for younger patients with established CD. MRE is also useful for evaluating the efficacy of medical treatments, such as biologics. MRE could also detect small intestinal lesions even if stenosis is observed. To obtain detailed information of the mucosa in the small intestine, BAE or CE for small intestinal lesions might be more helpful. For each situation, the appropriate diagnostic tools should be selected to ensure the detection of CD lesions in the small intestine.

Financial & competing interests disclosure

The authors have no relevant affiliations or financial involvement with any organization or entity with a financial interest in or financial conflict with the subject matter or materials discussed in the manuscript. This includes employment, consultancies, honoraria, stock ownership or options, expert testimony, grants or patents received or pending or royalties.

No writing assistance was utilized in the production of this manuscript.

Key issues

- The advantage of magnetic resonance enterography (MRE) for Crohn's disease (CD) patients is that it can evaluate both luminal inflammation and extraintestinal complications of CD in the small intestine.
- Diagnostic accuracy of MRE is comparable with accuracy of ileocolonoscopy and computed tomographic enterography for detecting intestinal lesions of CD.
- MRE is useful as a method of follow-up for younger patients with established CD because of no radiation exposure.
- MRE is also useful for evaluating the efficacy of medical treatments and may predict endoscopic healing in patients with CD.
- The concerns for expertise and cost regarding MRE should be solved to be widely used for CD patients in the near future.

References

Papers of special note have been highlighted as:

- of interest
- of considerable interest

1. Fiorino G, Bonifacio C, Padrenostro M, et al. Comparison between 1.5 and 3.0 Tesla magnetic resonance enterography for the assessment of disease activity and complications in ileo-colonic Crohn's disease. *Dig Dis Sci* 2013;58(11):3246-55
2. Lohan D, Cronin C, Meehan C, et al. MR small bowel enterography: optimization of imaging timing. *Clin Radiol* 2007;62(8):804-7
3. Masselli G, Gualdi G. MR imaging of the small bowel. *Radiology* 2012;264(2):333-48
4. Fidler JL, Guimaraes L, Einstein DM. MR imaging of the small bowel. *Radiographics* 2009;29(6):1811-25
5. Masselli G, Casciani E, Poletini E, Gualdi G. Comparison of MR enteroclysis with MR enterography and conventional enteroclysis in patients with Crohn's disease. *Eur Radiol* 2008;18(3):438-47
6. Negaard A, Paulsen V, Sandvik L, et al. A prospective randomized comparison between two MRI studies of the small bowel in Crohn's disease, the oral contrast method and MR enteroclysis. *Eur Radiol* 2007;17(9):2294-301
7. Schreyer AG, Geissler A, Albrich H, et al. Abdominal MRI after enteroclysis or with

- oral contrast in patients with suspected or proven Crohn's disease. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2004;2(6):491-7
8. Korman U, Kurugoglu S, Ogut G. Conventional enteroclysis with complementary MR enteroclysis: a combination of small bowel imaging. *Abdom Imaging* 2005;30(5):564-75
 9. Tolan DJ, Greenhalgh R, Zealley IA, et al. MR enterographic manifestations of small bowel Crohn disease. *Radiographics* 2010;30(2):367-84
 10. Negaard A, Sandvik L, Berstad AE, et al. MRI of the small bowel with oral contrast or nasojejunal intubation in Crohn's disease: randomized comparison of patient acceptance. *Scand J Gastroenterol* 2008;43(1):44-51
 11. Makanyanga JC, Taylor SA. Current and future role of MR enterography in the management of Crohn disease. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2013;201(1):56-64
 - **Review study describing the role of magnetic resonance enterography (MRE) in assessing the global disease burden of Crohn's disease and monitoring treatment options.**
 12. Grand DJ, Kampalath V, Harris A, et al. MR enterography correlates highly with colonoscopy and histology for both distal ileal and colonic Crohn's disease in 310 patients. *Eur J Radiol* 2012;81(5):e763-9
 13. Koh DM, Miao Y, Chinn RJ, et al. MR imaging evaluation of the activity of Crohn's disease. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2001;177(6):1325-32
 14. Rimola J, Rodriguez S, Garcia-Bosch O, et al. Magnetic resonance for assessment of disease activity and severity in ileocolonic Crohn's disease. *Gut* 2009;58(8):1113-20
 - **Evidence indicating the high diagnostic accuracy of MR for detecting disease activity and assessing severity.**
 15. Sinha R, Verma R, Verma S, Rajesh A. MR enterography of Crohn disease: part 1, rationale, technique, and pitfalls. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2011;197(1):76-9
 16. Naganuma M, Hisamatsu T, Matsuoka K, et al. Sa1209 MR enterography is useful to detect intestinal lesions of Crohn's disease in patients who are treated with biologics. *Gastroenterology* 2014;146(5 suppl 1):S-231
 17. Schleder S, Pawlik M, Wiggermann P, et al. Interobserver agreement in MR enterography for diagnostic assessment in patients with Crohn's disease. *Rofo* 2013;184(10):992-7
 18. Tielbeek JA, Makanyanga JC, Bipat S, et al. Grading Crohn disease activity with MRI: interobserver variability of MRI features, MRI scoring of severity, and correlation with Crohn disease endoscopic index of severity. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2013;201(6):1220-8
 19. Schreyer AG, Gölde S, Scheibl K, et al. Dark lumen magnetic resonance enteroclysis in combination with MRI colonography for whole bowel assessment in patients with Crohn's disease: first clinical experience. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2005;11(4):388-94
 20. Lee SS, Kim AY, Yang SK, et al. Crohn disease of the small bowel: comparison of CT enterography, MR enterography, and small-bowel follow-through as diagnostic techniques. *Radiology* 2009;251(3):751-61
 21. Siddiki HA, Fidler JL, Fletcher JG, et al. Prospective comparison of state-of-the-art MR enterography and CT enterography in small-bowel Crohn's disease. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2009;193(1):113-21
 22. Fiorino G, Bonifacio C, Peyrin-Biroulet L, et al. Prospective comparison of computed tomography enterography and magnetic resonance enterography for assessment of disease activity and complications in ileocolonic Crohn's disease. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2011;17:1073-80
 23. Jensen MD, Kjeldsen J, Rafaelsen SR, Nathan T. Diagnostic accuracies of MR enterography and CT enterography in symptomatic Crohn's disease. *Scand J Gastroenterol* 2011;46(12):1449-57
 24. Hyun SB, Kitazume Y, Nagahori M, et al. MR enterocolonography is useful for simultaneous evaluation of small and large intestinal lesions in Crohn's disease. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2011;17(5):1063-72
 25. Castiglione F, Mainenti PP, De Palma GD, et al. Noninvasive diagnosis of small bowel Crohn's disease: direct comparison of bowel sonography and magnetic resonance enterography. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2013;19(5):991-8
 26. Takenaka K, Ohtsuka K, Kitazume Y, et al. Comparison of magnetic resonance and balloon enteroscopic examination of deep small intestine in patients with Crohn's disease. *Gastroenterology* 2014. [Epub ahead of print]
 - **Evidence indicating the diagnostic accuracy of balloon-assisted enteroscopy for assessing small intestinal lesion of Crohn's disease (CD).**
 27. Quencer KB, Nimkin K, Mino-Kenudson M, et al. Detecting active inflammation and fibrosis in pediatric Crohn's disease: prospective evaluation of MR-E and CT-E. *Abdom Imaging* 2013;38(4):705-13
 28. Dillman JR, Ladino-Torres MF, Adler J, et al. Comparison of MR enterography and histopathology in the evaluation of pediatric Crohn disease. *Pediatr Radiol* 2011;41(12):1552-8
 29. Panés J, Bouzas R, Chaparro M, et al. Systematic review: the use of ultrasonography, computed tomography and magnetic resonance imaging for the diagnosis, assessment of activity and abdominal complications of Crohn's disease. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2011;34(2):125-45
 - **Review study describing the diagnostic accuracy and clinical usefulness of MRI, CT and ultrasonography for assessing the activity and abdominal complications of CD.**
 30. Papadia C, Maffei E, Del Rio P, et al. Sensitivity and specificity of magnetic resonance enterography in the clinical management of fistulizing Crohn's disease. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2013;19(9):1896-903
 31. Panes J, Bouhnik Y, Reinisch W, et al. Imaging techniques for assessment of inflammatory bowel disease: joint ECCO and ESGAR evidence-based consensus guidelines. *J Crohns Colitis* 2013;7(7):556-85
 32. Naganuma M, Hosoe N, Ogata H. Inflammatory bowel disease and novel endoscopic technologies. *Dig Endosc* 2014;26(Suppl 1):20-8
 33. Dionisio PM, Gurudu SR, Leighton JA, et al. Capsule endoscopy has a significantly higher diagnostic yield in patients with suspected and established small-bowel Crohn's disease: a meta-analysis. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2010;105(6):1240-8
 34. Albert JG, Martiny F, Krummenerl A, et al. Diagnosis of small bowel Crohn's disease: a prospective comparison of capsule endoscopy with magnetic resonance imaging and fluoroscopic enteroclysis. *Gut* 2005;54:1721-7
 35. Tillack C, Seiderer J, Brand S, et al. Correlation of magnetic resonance enteroclysis in the diagnosis of small bowel lesions in Crohn's disease. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2008;14:1219-28
 36. Crook DW, Knuesel PR, Froehlich JM, et al. Comparison of magnetic resonance enterography and video capsule endoscopy in evaluating small bowel disease. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2009;21:54-65
 37. Golder SK, Schreyer AG, Endlicher E, et al. Comparison of capsule endoscopy and

- magnetic resonance (MR) enteroclysis in suspected small bowel disease. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 2006;21:97-104
38. Doherty GA, Moss AC, Cheifetz AS. Capsule endoscopy for small-bowel evaluation in Crohn's disease. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2011;74(1):167-75
 39. Fallis SA, Murphy P, Sinha R, et al. Magnetic resonance enterography in Crohn's disease: a comparison with the findings at surgery. *Colorectal Dis* 2013; 15(10):1273-80
 40. Zappa M, Stefanescu C, Cazals-Hatem D, et al. Which magnetic resonance imaging findings accurately evaluate inflammation in small bowel Crohn's disease? A retrospective comparison with surgical pathologic analysis. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2011;17(4): 984-93
 41. Punwani S, Rodriguez-Justo M, Bainbridge A, et al. Mural inflammation in Crohn disease: location-matched histologic validation of MR imaging features. *Radiology* 2009;252(3):712-20
 42. Giles E, Barclay AR, Chippington S, Wilson DC. Systematic review: MRI enterography for assessment of small bowel involvement in paediatric Crohn's disease. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2013;37(12): 1121-31
 - **Review study describing the diagnostic accuracy of MRE for pediatric CD patients.**
 43. Dajia C, Ditchfield M, Kean M, Catto-Smith T. Imaging for Crohn disease: use of 3-T MRI in a paediatric setting. *J Med Imaging Radiat Oncol* 2008;52: 480-8
 44. Horsthuis K, de Ridder L, Smets AM, et al. Magnetic resonance enterography for suspected inflammatory bowel disease in a pediatric population. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr* 2010;51:603-9
 45. Giles E, Hanci O, McLean A, et al. Optimal assessment of paediatric IBD with MRI and barium follow-through. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr* 2012;54:758-62
 46. Absah I, Bruining DH, Matsumoto JM, et al. MR enterography in pediatric inflammatory bowel disease: retrospective assessment of patient tolerance, image quality, and initial performance estimates. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2012;199(3): W367-75
 47. Spieler B, Hindman N, Levy J, et al. Contrast-enhanced MR enterography as a stand-alone tool to evaluate Crohn's disease in a paediatric population. *Clin Radiol* 2013;68(10):1024-30
 48. Makanyanga JC, Taylor SA. Current and future role of MR enterography in the management of Crohn disease. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2013;201(1):56-64
 49. Schill G, Iesalnieks I, Haimerl M, et al. Assessment of disease behavior in patients with Crohn's disease by MR enterography. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2013;19(5):983-90
 50. Rimola J, Ordás I, Rodríguez S, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging for evaluation of Crohn's disease: validation of parameters of severity and quantitative index of activity. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2011;17(8):1759-68
 - **Evidence that new scoring system could validate for assessing severity of disease in patients with CD.**
 51. Macarini L, Stoppino LP, Centola A, et al. Assessment of activity of Crohn's disease of the ileum and large bowel: proposal for a new multiparameter MR enterography score. *Radiol Med* 2013;118(2):181-95
 52. Steward MJ, Punwani S, Proctor I, et al. Non-perforating small bowel Crohn's disease assessed by MRI enterography: derivation and histopathological validation of an MR-based activity index. *Eur J Radiol* 2012;81(9):2080-8
 53. Ordás I, Rimola J, Rodríguez S, et al. Accuracy of magnetic resonance enterography in assessing response to therapy and mucosal healing in patients with Crohn's disease. *Gastroenterology* 2014;146(2):374-82.e1
 - **Evidence indicating the accuracy of MRE in monitoring response to therapy in patients with CD using ileocolonoscopy as a reference standard.**
 54. Van Assche G, Herrmann KA, Louis E, et al. Effects of infliximab therapy on transmural lesions as assessed by magnetic resonance enteroclysis in patients with ileal Crohn's disease. *J Crohns Colitis* 2013; 7(12):950-7
 - **Evidence indicating the role of MRE in monitoring treatment options for inducing remission.**
 55. Tielbeek JA, Löwenberg M, Bipat S, et al. Serial magnetic resonance imaging for monitoring medical therapy effects in Crohn's disease. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2013; 19(9):1943-50
 - **Evidence indicating the role of MRE in monitoring treatment options for inducing remission.**
 56. Frøslie KF, Jahnsen J, Moum BA, Vatn MH; IBSEN Group. Mucosal healing in inflammatory bowel disease: results from a Norwegian population-based cohort. *Gastroenterology* 2007;133(2):412-22
 57. Schnitzler F, Fidler H, Ferrante M, et al. Long-term outcome of treatment with infliximab in 614 patients with Crohn's disease: results from a single-centre cohort. *Gut* 2009;58(4):492-500
 58. Bourreille A, Ignjatovic A, Aabakken L, et al. Role of small-bowel endoscopy in the management of patients with inflammatory bowel disease: an international OMED-ECCO consensus. *Endoscopy* 2009;41(7):618-37
 59. Novak KL, Panaccione R. Will cross-sectional imaging replace endoscopy for monitoring response to therapy in Crohn's disease? *Gastroenterology* 2014; 146(2):334-6