ARTICLE IN PRESS

[NeuroImage xxx \(2014\) xxx](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.05.026)–xxx

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

NeuroImage

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

¹ Subject-specific functional parcellation via Prior Based Eigenanatomy

Q1 Paramveer S. Dhillon a,b, *,1, David A. Wolk ^c, Sandhitsu R. Das ^a, Lyle H. Ungar ^b, James C. Gee ^a, Brian B. Avants a

^a Penn Image Computing and Science Laboratory (PICSL), Department of Radiology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

^b Department of Computer & Information Science, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA
⁵ Department of Neurology and Penn Memory Center. University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, I

5 ^c Department of Neurology and Penn Memory Center, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

6 article info abstract

Article history: 8 Accepted 10 May 2014 9 Available online xxxx

10 Keywords:

11 fMRI

12 ROI
13 Data

- Data-driven parcellations
- 14 PCA

15 MCI

- 16 Delayed recall
- 17 Default mode network

Dhillon $a_0x_0x_1$, David A. Wolk ^c, Sandhitsu R. Das⁻³, Lyle H. Ungar^b, James [C](#page--1-0). Gee *yes in these columentos* (*networps*) (*networps*) (*networps*) (*networps*) (*networps*) (*networps*) (*Networps*) (*Networps* We present a new framework for prior-constrained sparse decomposition of matrices derived from the neuroim- 18 aging data and apply this method to functional network analysis of a clinically relevant population. Matrix 19 decomposition methods are powerful dimensionality reduction tools that have found widespread use in neuro- 20 imaging. However, the unconstrained nature of these totally data-driven techniques makes it difficult to interpret 21 the results in a domain where network-specific hypotheses may exist. 22 We propose a novel approach, Prior Based Eigenanatomy (p-Eigen), which seeks to identify a data-driven 23 matrix decomposition but at the same time constrains the individual components by spatial anatomical priors 24 (probabilistic ROIs). We formulate our novel solution in terms of prior-constrained ℓ_1 penalized (sparse) princi- 25 pal component analysis. p-Eigen starts with a common functional parcellation for all the subjects and refines it 26 with subject-specific information. This enables modeling of the inter-subject variability in the functional parcel 27 boundaries and allows us to construct subject-specific networks with reduced sensitivity to ROI placement. 28 We show that while still maintaining correspondence across subjects, p-Eigen extracts biologically-relevant and 29 patient-specific functional parcels that facilitate hypothesis-driven network analysis. We construct default mode 30 network (DMN) connectivity graphs using p-Eigen refined ROIs and use them in a classification paradigm. Our 31 results show that the functional connectivity graphs derived from p-Eigen significantly aid classification of 32 mild cognitive impairment (MCI) as well as the prediction of scores in a Delayed Recall memory task when com- 33 pared to graph metrics derived from 1) standard registration-based seed ROI definitions, 2) totally data-driven 34 ROIs, 3) a model based on standard demographics plus hippocampal volume as covariates, and 4) Ward Cluster- 35 ing based data-driven ROIs. In summary, p-Eigen incarnates a new class of prior-constrained dimensionality re- 36 duction tools that may improve our understanding of the relationship between MCI and functional connectivity. 37 38 Published by Elsevier Inc.

89

41

4243 Introduction & related work

 The presence of large and diverse neuroimaging datasets has brought the importance of data analysis techniques into focus. These is- sues are particularly salient in blood oxygen level dependent (BOLD) fMRI where recent papers have highlighted the sensitivity of this mo- dality to specific analysis choices (Carp, 2012; Haller and Bartsch, [2009\)](#page--1-0). Network analysis of functional connectivity within the brain from BOLD data has received a significant amount of attention and is no- torious for being sensitive to analysis decisions (Dawson et al., 2012; [Eke et al., 2012\)](#page--1-0).

 Functional connectivity is defined as the temporal co-activation of neuronal activation patterns between anatomically separated regions of the brain [\(Aertsen et al., 1989\)](#page--1-0) and is thought to be an indicator of functional communication between these different regions. Typically,

E-mail address: dhillon@cis.upenn.edu (P.S. Dhillon).

 $^{\rm 1}$ Tel.: $+1$ 215 588 9636.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.05.026> 1053-8119/Published by Elsevier Inc.

functional connectivity studies measure the level of correlation be- 57 tween the time-series of the resting state BOLD signal of the different 58 brain regions [\(Biswal et al., 1997; Damoiseaux et al., 2006; Salvador](#page--1-0) 59 et al., 2005). Studying the brain as an integrative network of functionally 60 interacting brain regions can shed new light on large scale neuronal 61 communication in the brain and how this communication is impaired 62 in neurological diseases ([Bullmore and Sporns, 2009; Mohammadi](#page--1-0) 63 et al., 2009; Seeley et al., 2009). 64

There are two predominant approaches for the analysis of functional 65 connectivity: 66

• Seed (ROI) based approaches: These are straightforward and operate 67 in the traditional confirmatory network paradigm ([Tukey, 1977](#page--1-0)). 68 They involve computing the correlation between the time series of a 69 given (preselected) protect seed brain region $(ROI)^2$ against all the 70 other brain regions, resulting in a set of functional connectivity 71

Please cite this article as: Dhillon, P.S., et al., Subject-specific functional parcellation via Prior Based Eigenanatomy, NeuroImage (2014), [http://](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.05.026) dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.05.026

[⁎] Corresponding author at: Penn Image Computing and Science Laboratory (PICSL), Department of Radiology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA.

 $^{\rm 2}$ One can compute these correlations either voxelwise or by averaging over the voxels in an entire ROI.

2 P.S. Dhillon et al. / NeuroImage xxx (2014) xxx–xxx

 maps of the given brain regions ([Biswal et al., 1997; Cordes et al.,](#page--1-0) [2000](#page--1-0)). These functional connectivity maps can then be used to con- struct resting-state-networks of functionally correlated regions in the brain [\(Fox et al., 2005\)](#page--1-0). The ct seed region can either be selected based on prior clinical knowledge or it can be selected from the activa-tion map of a separate task dependent fMRI scan.

[C](#page--1-0)ontrolled internal connected by digital internal connections (and the mean of the same of the proposition of the film of the same of the • Learning based approaches: These approaches use statistical tech- niques to explore functional connectivity in the brain, obviating the need to define a seed region. Typical methods employed are Principal Component Analysis (PCA) [\(Friston, 1998](#page--1-0)), Independent Component Analysis (ICA) or its variants e.g. Group ICA [\(Beckmann and Smith,](#page--1-0) [2004; Beckmann et al., 2005; Damoiseaux et al., 2006; Petrella et al.,](#page--1-0) [2011; Varoquaux et al., 2010b\)](#page--1-0) or hierarchical methods [\(Blumensath](#page--1-0) [et al., 2013; Cordes et al., 2002; Salvador et al., 2005\)](#page--1-0). These methods strive to find a set of orthogonal or independent signals in the time se-87 ries that can explain the resting state activity patterns. ICA based methods are the popular methods in this setting as they can find a set of independent signals from whole brain voxelwise data and also due to the public availability of tools like MELODIC in FSL (Jenkinson [et al., 2012\)](#page--1-0) for ICA and Group ICA of fMRI Toolbox (GIFT) (Calhoun [et al., 2001\)](#page--1-0). Subsequently, one can create brain connectivity networks from the outputs of these approaches by computing correla- tions between the different (independent/orthogonal) signals they 95 find.

 The brain networks found by the above approaches are represented as a set of vertices (brain regions) connected by edges which represent 98 the strength of correlation between those two regions (He and Evans, [2010; Stam et al., 2007\)](#page--1-0). Various independent studies (surveyed here [\(van den Heuvel and Hulshoff Pol, 2010\)](#page--1-0)) have consistently found a set of eight functional connectivity networks in the brain. One can use a set of key properties of the network graph e.g. clustering coefficient, centrality and modularity to get further insights into the flow of neuro-nal signals within a network (He and Evans, 2010; Stam et al., 2007).

105 The above-mentioned approaches for analyzing functional connec-106 tivity and constructing brain networks suffer from a variety of problems. The Group ICA based approaches do a group decomposition of the time series' images of the entire cohort; they have an averaging effect and erode away any subject specific characteristics of the network. So, the Group ICA analysis is usually followed by a back reconstruction step to generate subject-specific functional connectivity maps (Smith et al., [2011](#page--1-0)). However, it is unclear how to choose a statistically justified threshold to binarize these maps.

 The seed based approaches also suffer from the problem of averag- ing the signal and may be sensitive to ROI placement (Zhang et al., [2012\)](#page--1-0), co-registration errors and the specific ROI boundaries. These ap- proaches assume that the signal lies totally within a predefined region. However, the important signal may have slightly different boundaries than the scientist's conception. The data representation (or spatially varying noise) may also lead to strong or weak signal within different 121 parts of the ROI. Such dataset specific information is not taken into ac- count by a traditional seed based approach. When effects are localized to the selected region, and that region is well-defined, a seed based analysis may provide the most sensitive testing method. However, 125 some conditions involve a network of regions that may not be fully identified.

 Furthermore, it has been shown that decreased/impaired functional connectivity in certain brain networks, for instance, the default mode network (DMN) has association with neurodegenerative disorders e.g. Alzheimer's disease (AD) [\(Greicius et al., 2004; Sheline et al., 2010](#page--1-0)), schizophrenia (Liu et al., 2008; Whitfi[eld-Gabrieli et al., 2009\)](#page--1-0), multiple sclerosis (MS) ([Lowe et al., 2008](#page--1-0)), mild cognitive impairment (MCI) [\(Agosta et al., 2012; Bai et al., 2009; Hedden et al., 2009; Petrella et al.,](#page--1-0) [2011\)](#page--1-0). So, it has become even more imperative to improve statistical analysis methods to efficiently leverage the scarce patient BOLD fMRI data that is typically available.

In this paper, we propose a method that integrates ideas from both 137 the seed based and learning based approaches. Our contributions in 138 this paper are threefold. This can be a state of the state of the

- (1) We contribute a general method for prior constrained eigen de- 140 composition (p-Eigen) of high-dimensional matrices and a 141 novel algorithm for its optimization. The mass of the state of 142
- (2) Publicly available implementation of our approach in $C++$. 143
- (3) Application of p-Eigen for deriving subject specific functional 144 parcellations from BOLD data (which are later used to derive 145 functional networks) and an evaluation of these novel measure- 146 ments in the context of MCI and prediction of delayed recall in a 147 memory task. 148

Our approach provides a principled way of incorporating priors in an $\frac{149}{150}$ otherwise totally data-driven approach based on Sparse Principal Com- 151 ponent Analysis (SPCA) ([d'Aspremont et al., 2007; Shen and Huang,](#page--1-0) 152 2008; Witten et al., 2009; Zou et al., 2006). 153

p-Eigen allows an initial binary or probabilistic ROI to adapt to the un- 154 derlying subject-specific covariation within the data. At the same time, 155 p-Eigen maintains proximity to (and the locality of) the original region 156 and thus retains the advantages of the standard seed based approach. 157 p-Eigen also maintains non-negativity in the estimated anatomically- 158 constrained eigenvector, thereby keeping ROI interpretability. This 159 allows us to modify the definitions of labels to capture the variation in 160 dataset (a given subject's time series) while still staying close to the ini- 161 tial ROI definitions. p-Eigen therefore produces labelings with "soft" 162 weighted averages and as we show in the experimental section, are 163 more sensitive to the underlying brain data than a standard ROI. 164

Given an ROI set, p-Eigen has only one key parameter to tune the 165 weight of the prior term guiding the decomposition. Therefore, our op- 166 timization objective provides a tradeoff between 1) staying close to the 167 initial ROI definitions and 2) allowing data to lead the exploratory anal- 168 ysis by explaining variance through PCA. A good way to think about this 169 is as ROI definitions forcing us to be conservative and staying close to the 170 initial brain parcellation; on the other hand the SPCA component gives 171 us liberty to be either more exploratory or more focused on the content 172 of the given dataset. The tradeoff between the two competing para- 173 digms is defined by user tunable (prior strength) parameter, which is 174 chosen via cross validation. **175** and the chosen via cross validation.

p-Eigen does a prior constrained sparse decomposition of each sub- 176 ject's time series image separately to create subject-specific functional 177 networks, so it does not suffer from the problem of averaging as 178 Group ICA does. Moreover, the priors help us maintain a direct corre- 179 spondence between the anatomy of the same regions across different 180 subjects hence leading to better clinical interpretability. Our proposed 181 approach is shown in Fig. 1.

We have drawn a clear contrast between our approach and the two 183 related approaches namely seed based approaches (no influence of 184 data) and Group ICA/PCA based approaches (only data driven). That 185 said, there has also been substantial work on incorporating prior infor- 186 mation across subjects to build subject-specific functional networks as 187 proposed by this paper.

Some early work that performed PCA on fMRI signal within ROIs 189 [\(Nieto-Castanon et al., 2003\)](#page--1-0) clearly foreshadowed p-Eigen. [Thirion](#page--1-0) 190 [et al. \(2006\)](#page--1-0) also proposed a spectral learning based technique for 191 parcellation that delineates homogeneous and connected regions across 192 subjects, providing subject-specific functional networks. 193

The research that is perhaps closest to ours is [Ng et al. \(2009a\),](#page--1-0) 194 [Deligianni et al. \(2011\)](#page--1-0) and [Blumensath et al. \(2013\).](#page--1-0) [Ng et al.](#page--1-0) 195 [\(2009a\)](#page--1-0) used group replicator dynamics (GRD) for finding sparse 196 functional networks that are common across subjects but have 197 subject-specific weightings of the brain regions. [Langs et al. \(2010\)](#page--1-0) 198 performed functional alignment across subjects to achieve improved 199 functional correspondences across subjects. [Deligianni et al. \(2011\)](#page--1-0) 200 used brain anatomical connectivity to constrain the conditional 201

Please cite this article as: Dhillon, P.S., et al., Subject-specific functional parcellation via Prior Based Eigenanatomy, NeuroImage (2014), [http://](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.05.026) dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.05.026

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/6027041>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/6027041>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com/)