ARTICLE IN PRESS

NeuroImage xxx (2015) xxx-xxx



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

NeuroImage



YNIMG-12655; No. of pages: 14; 4C: 3, 6, 8, 9, 10

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ynimg

Matched signal detection on graphs: Theory and application to brain imaging data classification

Q2 Chenhui Hu^{a,b}, Jorge Sepulcre^c, Keith A. Johnson^c, Georges E. Fakhri^a, Yue M. Lu^b, Quanzheng Li^{a,*}

4 ^a Center for Advanced Medical Imaging Science, NMMI, Radiology, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA

5 ^b School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, USA

6 ^c NMMI, Radiology, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA

8 ARTICLE INFO

Article history: 0 10 Received 6 April 2015 Accepted 11 October 2015 11 Available online xxxx 1213 Keywords: Matched signal detection 14 15 Graph-structured data Spectral graph theory 1617 Brain networks Classification 18 19 Alzheimer's disease

37

20

21

7

39 40

42 Introduction

PIR-PFT

R-fMRI

ABSTRACT

Motivated by recent progress in signal processing on graphs, we have developed a matched signal detection 22 (MSD) theory for signals with intrinsic structures described by weighted graphs. First, we regard graph Laplacian 23 eigenvalues as frequencies of graph-signals and assume that the signal is in a subspace spanned by the first few 24 graph Laplacian eigenvectors associated with lower eigenvalues. The conventional matched subspace detector 25 can be applied to this case. Furthermore, we study signals that may not merely live in a subspace. Concretely, 26 we consider signals with bounded variation on graphs and more general signals that are randomly drawn 27 from a prior distribution. For bounded variation signals, the test is a weighted energy detector. For the random 28 signals, the test statistic is the difference of signal variations on associated graphs, if a degenerate Gaussian dis- 29 tribution specified by the graph Laplacian is adopted. We evaluate the effectiveness of the MSD on graphs both 30 with simulated and real data sets. Specifically, we apply MSD to the brain imaging data classification problem 31 of Alzheimer's disease (AD) based on two independent data sets: 1) positron emission tomography data with 32 Pittsburgh compound-B tracer of 30 AD and 40 normal control (NC) subjects, and 2) resting-state functional 33 magnetic resonance imaging (R-fMRI) data of 30 early mild cognitive impairment and 20 NC subjects. Our results 34 demonstrate that the MSD approach is able to outperform the traditional methods and help detect AD at an early 35 stage, probably due to the success of exploiting the manifold structure of the data. 36

© 2015 Published by Elsevier Inc.

Matched subspace detection is a classic tool that determines 43 whether a multidimensional signal lies in a given linear subspace or 44 not (Scharf and Friedlander, 1994). It has achieved great success in ap-45 46 plications such as radar, hyperspectral imaging (Manolakis and Shaw, 2002) and medical imaging (Li et al., 2009). The subspace is either 47known from the physical system that generates the signal, or can be in-48 ferred from training data. Subspace learning is a natural way of data di-49 50mension reduction and can be achieved by principal component analysis (PCA), which projects the original data to a linear subspace 51spanned by the leading eigenvectors of the covariance matrix (Jolliffe, 52532005). While a common assumption of PCA is that the data come from a linear subspace, many real data are lying in or close to a nonlinear 54manifold, which is a topological space that resembles Euclidean space 5556around each point (Belkin and Niyogi, 2003). Examples of the latter 57case include brain images (Liu et al., 2013), genetic data (Lee et al., 582008), social network records, and sensor network measurements. In 59this setting, the low-dimensional subspace that best preserves the

Corresponding author.
E-mail address: Li.Quanzheng@mgh.harvard.edu (Q. Li).

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.10.026 1053-8119/© 2015 Published by Elsevier Inc. intrinsic geometry of the data can be effectively learned by graph spec- 60 tral methods, e.g., isomap, locality linear embedding (LLE), Laplacian 61 eigenmaps (Belkin and Niyogi, 2003; Roweis and Saul, 2000; Saul 62 et al., 2006; Tenenbaum et al., 2000). 63

In neuroimaging, as more and more nonlinear data are collected by 64 multiple imaging modalities, there is a need for classifying data with 65 complex intrinsic structures. For instance, the analysis and classification 66 of positron emission tomography (PET) images or functional magnetic 67 resonance imaging (fMRI) data may facilitate the prediction and early 68 detection of Alzheimer's disease (AD). Concurrently, an emerging area 69 of signal processing on graphs is developed for handling these challeng-70 ing data through the combination of algebraic and spectral graph theo-71 retic concepts with computational harmonic analysis (Shuman et al., 72 2013). Signals are assumed to reside on vertices of weighted graphs 73 which are often naturally defined by the application. The weight associ-74 ated with a certain edge in the graph represents the similarity between 75 the two vertices joined by the edge. We refer to graph supported data 76 as graph-signals, to differentiate them from conventional signals in 77 Euclidean spaces. In the brain imaging classification, we could view 78 the PET/fMRI data as graph-signals on weighted graphs describing the 79 affinity between each pair of brain regions.

Motivated by the above data classification requirement, we are ins1 terested in developing a detection framework for graph-signals. 82

Please cite this article as: Hu, C., et al., Matched signal detection on graphs: Theory and application to brain imaging data classification, NeuroImage (2015), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.10.026

2

ARTICLE IN PRESS

C. Hu et al. / NeuroImage xxx (2015) xxx-xxx

Specifically, we formulate several hypotheses to decide which graph 83 84 structure is more likely to match a given signal. Moreover, we exploit the matched subspace detection technique and propose different 85 86 types of graph-signal models to make our framework generic to deal with a variety of real situations. The subspace for graph-signal is formed 87 by eigenvectors of the Laplacian matrix L of the graph. The graph 88 Laplacian matrix encodes the structure of the graph concisely. From a 89 graph signal processing point-of-view, eigenvectors of *L* could be treat-90 91 ed as the generalization of the basis of conventional Fourier transform 92 (Agaskar and Lu, 2013; Sandryhaila and Moura, 2013; Shuman et al., 2013). Based on spectral graph theory, we can define the variation of 93 graph-signals. It follows that the variation of an eigenvector of L is 94equal to the associated eigenvalue (Hu et al., 2015a). When we decom-9596 pose a signal containing instantaneous fMRI measurements into linear combination of eigenvectors of Laplacian matrix associated with the 97 brain-region-affinity graph, we might deem that the components in 98 those eigenvectors with larger eigenvalues as being noisier if the true 99 fMRI signal is assumed to be bandlimited on the graph (Gadde et al., 100 2013; Kim et al., 2013; Meyer and Shen, 2014). 101

Our first hypothesis test model simply assumes that the signal lies in 102 a subspace spanned by the first few Laplacian eigenvectors correspond-103 ing to smaller eigenvalues. The traditional matched subspace detection 104 105 could be applied directly to this case. Furthermore, we consider two categories of graph-signal models: deterministic signals with constraints 106 and probabilistic signals with prior distributions. For deterministic sig-107 nals, we impose a bounded variation on the signal with respect to the 108 graph. The penalized maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) of the true 109110 signal is derived by solving a constrained optimization problem. We find that the test is a weighted energy detector. For probabilistic signals, 111 when we choose a certain degenerate Gaussian distribution as the prior 112 of the projection coefficients of the signal onto the graph Laplacian ei-113 114 genvectors, the decision ends up comparing the signal variations on 115the two hypothetic graphs in a noise-free case.

We evaluate the effectiveness of the matched signal detection 116 (MSD) theory on both synthetic and real data sets. Simulations based 117 on randomly generated graphs demonstrate the feasibility of our ap-118 proaches even if we do not know the exact probability distributions 119 120 of the testing signals. Then, we apply the proposed detection algorithms to brain imaging classification tasks of AD. As one of the most 121 prevalent forms of dementia, AD is believed to be a brain network asso-122ciated disease (Gomez-Ramirez and Wu, 2014; Raj et al., 2012; 123 124 Sepulcre et al., 2013), and is characterized by progressive impairment of memory and other cognitive capacity. It affects nearly 36 million 125people worldwide with an expected number of cases to be 65.7 million 126 127by 2030 (Brookmeyer et al., 2007). The development of neuroimaging classification techniques may enable us to monitor the functional and 128129anatomical changes of the brain in vivo and discover reliable biomarkers for identifying AD at an early stage. In this study, we have 130compared a novel MSD approach with other widely used methods in-131cluding principle component analysis (PCA), support vector machine 132(SVM) and linear discriminant analysis (LDA) on two data sets: one is 133134PET imaging of brain amyloid using Pittsburgh compound-B (PIB) trac-135er of AD and normal control (NC) subjects; the other contains restingstate fMRI (R-fMRI) images of early mild cognitive impairment (EMCI) 136and NC subjects in the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative 137(ADNI) database. For the MSD, we compute the similarity between 138139each of two brain regions with the Gaussian radial basis function (RBF) kernel. This simple way of building brain networks avoids esti-140 mating network structures by solving inverse problems, which often 141 requires more data; yet the weighted graphs associated with the net-142 works approximate the data manifolds. Experimental results show 143 that when using the MSD on graphs, we can achieve significantly better 144 classification performance than the compared algorithms. The results 145indicate that our method provides an effective way for brain imaging 146 classification, probably due to the capability of exploiting the manifold 147 148 structure of the data.

Our contributions in this paper are three-fold: first, we have developed a matched signal detection theory for graph-signals which are ubiquitous in medical imaging applications; second, we keep the framework generic and simple by proposing a variety of signal models and using simple similarity metrics to construct graphs; third, we demonstrate that the detection theory is particularly suitable for neuroimaging classifications.

Theory

To formulate the framework of matched signal detection on graphs, 157 we first introduce the concept of graph-signals. We extend the traditional Fourier transform to a graph Fourier transform and define a notion of graph-signal frequency based upon spectral graph theory. 160 Then, to model different real data, we propose three classes of signal models on graphs. Finally, we derive the signal detection criterion under each signal model. 163

Weighted graphs and graph-signals

Many contemporary applications such as social, power grid, sensor, 165 and brain networks involve high-dimensional data with natural structures defined by weighted graphs. To efficiently process such signals 167 on graphs, an emerging field of signal processing on graphs integrates 168 the graph spectral theory with computational harmonic analysis. Here we present basic concepts of signal processing on graphs in the context 170 of neuroimaging data analysis. 171

A brain network can be represented by a *weighted graph* $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathbf{W})$ 172 containing a vertex set $\mathcal{V}(|\mathcal{V}| = N)$, an edge set \mathcal{E} and a weighted adja-173 cency matrix \mathbf{W} . The vertices typically indicate a group of predefined 174 brain regions or a set of image voxels (Stanley et al., 2013; Zalesky 175 et al., 2010). If there is an edge between vertices *i* and *j*, then W_{ij} denotes 176 the weight of the edge; otherwise, $W_{ij} = 0$. We assume the similarity 177 metric is symmetric and non-negative, namely $W_{ij} = W_{ji} \ge 0$ for all *i* 178 and *j*. Meanwhile, it is reasonable to assume that no brain region is iso-179 lated. Therefore, \mathcal{G} should be undirected and connected. Physiologically, 180 W_{ij} may quantify the similarity of two brain regions in terms of their bio-181 chemical measurements (such as the amyloid deposition revealed by PIB-PET) or anatomical properties (such as the number of fiber path-183 ways connecting those regions). The exact formula of the weights 184 could be chosen flexibly based on different applications.

In addition to the adjacency matrix, we introduce the graph 186 Laplacian as another important graph associated matrix. We denote by 187 D the degree matrix which is diagonal with $D_{ii} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} W_{ij}$. Then, the 188 graph Laplacian is defined as $L^{\text{def}}_{=} D - W$. Because L is a real symmetric 189 matrix, it has a complete set of orthonormal eigenvectors $\{f_i\}_{i=1,...,N}$ 190 If \mathcal{G} is connected, the associated eigenvalues $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1,...,N}$ are real non-191 negative with the unique smallest eigenvalue being zero (Chung, 192 1997). We assume that the eigenvalues are increasingly sorted as 0 = 193 $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq ... \leq \lambda_N$. By eigendecomposition, we can decompose the 194 graph Laplacian into $L = F \Lambda F^T$, where Λ is diagonal with $\Lambda_{ii} = \lambda_i$ being 195 the ith smallest eigenvalue of L and the *i*th column of F, f_i , is the associated eigenvector.

A signal *x* defined on the vertices of graph \mathcal{G} is a function from \mathcal{V} to \mathbb{R} . 198 This *graph-signal* could be expressed as a vector in \mathbb{R}^N with the *i*th ele-199 ment of the vector being a real value assigned to the *i*th vertex. We will also denote this vector by **x** and use x(i) to indicate both the func-201 tion value at the *i*th vertex and the *i*th element of the vector. Examples of the graph-signal are in Fig. 1. In practice, we could view PET scans or 190 fMRI time series as graph-signals defined on vertices of the brain con-204 nectivity network that is constructed by connecting edges between dif-205 ferent brain regions or image voxels. For a graph-signal **x**, the graph Laplacian behaves as a difference operator on it: 207

$$(\boldsymbol{L}\boldsymbol{x})(i) = \sum_{j \sim i} W_{ij}[\boldsymbol{x}(i) - \boldsymbol{x}(j)], \tag{1}$$

Please cite this article as: Hu, C., et al., Matched signal detection on graphs: Theory and application to brain imaging data classification, NeuroImage (2015), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.10.026

156

164

Download English Version:

https://daneshyari.com/en/article/6024145

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/6024145

Daneshyari.com