Clinical fMRI as a quantitative imaging biomarker of brain function

James Voyvodic, Ph.D. Brain Imaging and Analysis Center Duke University Medical Center

Med Physics, Apr 2018

Collaborators

Jeffrey Petrella, MD, Duke Radiology
Allan Friedman, MD, Duke Neurosurgery
James Carter, PA, Duke Neurosurgery

QIBA fMRI Biomarker Committee

Functional MRI (fMRI) is primarily used clinically to map speech and motor function prior to brain surgery



fMRI – Patient performs tasks using simple visual cues and alternating block designs

Bilateral hand motion task





Silent sentence-completion task



How does fMRI work?

T2*-weighted imaging is sensitive to susceptibility changes caused by local blood oxygenation level dependent (BOLD) changes in cerebral blood flow



"Rest"



from Mosley

Image acquisition

During a ~5-minute fMRI scan the patient performs many cycles of a simple task. 20-30 echo-planar images are acquired every TR (~1.5s), This yields a time series of ~200 brain image volumes. Image intensity varies with the task in some voxels.



Voxel time courses

And In And Mar And And And

where the where the second

Man Mark Mark Mark Mark Mark

Mar har marker present depertion of the second

the method when we have been and

 Image signal pre-processing
 Filter out known nuisance signals (usually) Head motion (measure motion - realign images) Regression filter (heartbeat, respiration, drift)

 Filter out high-frequency noise (always) Spike filter
 Spatial smoothing Temporal smoothing

Statistical image processing

Compare the timing of the observed fluctuations in the fMRI images to the expected fluctuations of the BOLD response.

Task timing

Predicted response

Actual response

Comparison methods:

- image subtraction
- t-test differences
- frequency analysis (FFT)
- temporal correlation
- General Linear Model (analysis of variance)

Statistical significance identifies "active" voxels (statistical value above some minimum threshold)

Thresholded "map" of active voxels is overlaid on MR images



Functional maps can be overlaid on brain anatomical images, resampled, and viewed from any orientation



Motor cortex mapping prior to neurosurgery





T = 4.5 s





T = 13.5 s



T = 18.0 s



T = 22.5 s



T = 22.5 s



T = 31.5 s



T = 38.0 s

Clinical fMRI exam

- 10 min pre-scan assessment and training
- 45 min MRI session
 - 10 min anatomical scans (T1 & FLAIR)
 - 15-20 min fMRI 3-4 tasks (4 min each)
 - 5 min 30-direction DTI scan
- 30-60 min post-scan image analysis
 - Registration of fMRI and DTI with T1 images
 - Definition and statistical analysis of "active" voxels
 - Overlay of fMRI and DTI on anatomical images
- Neuroradiological interpretation

Clinical fMRI images

Anatomy & pathology



DTI Maps & Fiber tracks

















Diffusion tensor imaging (DTI) is used to map major white matter tracts



When all goes well fMRI is easy Statistical significance provides map of brain activity



This fMRI map was computed from ~13,000 images. Clinically, how do we assess whether all went well?

fMRI -- Clinical goals

Determine location and borders of eloquent (essential) cortical areas relative to lesions Determine location of major white-matter tracts connecting eloquent areas Evaluate risk of post-surgical functional deficits Decide whether surgery is advisable Plan surgical approach and extent of resection Decide whether intraoperative mapping is necessary

fMRI -- Technical goals

Tasks that selectively activate eloquent brain areas [appropriate and effective] Detect BOLD signals to identify eloquent brain areas [sensitivity & specificity] Map location relative to anatomy and pathology [image registration] Evaluate laterality of language dominance [relative activation] Map edges of areas and proximity to lesion [thresholding & quantitative reproducibility] Measure brain function (or change in function)

How to do quantitative fMRI?

How best to acquire images?
How best to analyze images?
How to assess image quality?
What data quality metrics can distinguish good scan from bad?

Goal is to make fMRI a quantitative biomarker of brain function

Collaborative efforts to make fMRI quantitative & reproducible

Organizations:

BIRN (Biomedical Informatics Research Network)ASFNR (American Soc. of Functional Neuroradiology)QIBA (Quantitative Imaging Biomarkers Alliance)of the RSNA (Radiol. Soc. of N. America)

Strategies:

Standardize acquisition and analysis Improve quality assessment metrics (QA) Assess and reduce sources of signal variance Determine reproducibilty claims



QIBA Profile Claims (tentative)

On a test-retest basis, BOLD fMRI can be performed reproducibly to a level such that:

- the <u>center of mass of activation</u> of a focus of interest can be determined within 5 mm with 95% confidence
- the <u>spatial extent</u> half-maximum border of activation clusters can be determined within ?? mm with 95% confidence
- the <u>relative magnitude</u> of activation in homologous regions across hemispheres can be determined within ?? % with 95% confidence

Biomarker quantitative properties

 Precision – How similar are multiple measurements? Assumes biological specimen is unchanged
 <u>Repeatability</u> – Measured exactly the same way i.e., Same scanner, same task, same procedures, etc
 <u>Reproducibility</u> – Measured in similar ways e.g. Different scanners, different tasks, etc

Bias – How close is measured value to true value? Assumes there is a true measurable value (thermometer example)

Obstacles to fMRI reproducibility

BOLD is an indirect measure of neural activity Many factors intervene between activity and BOLD Brain function is complex and variable Task design affects activity pattern Task performance affects BOLD signal Traditional analysis methods emphasize statistical significance over signal amplitude Significance is used to define active areas Significance is very sensitive to noise components

Sources of variance affecting fMRI

- Scanner*
- Task design*
- Training procedures*
- Stimulus presentation system*
- Physiology
- Pathology
- Patient movement
- Task performance
- Analysis procedures

* Controlled by standardization

Patient compliance is a bigger issue for fMRI than other scan procedures
Training

Patients must actively participate in fMRI

Tasks must be appropriate and understood

Task fMRI is done on patients 5yo to >80yo

Task performance

Anxiety affects fMRI results

Getting patients relaxed is important

Head motion is most common problem

Important to assess performance in real-time

Real-time monitoring is critical for successful clinical fMRI

Dual screen real-time behavioral display

Real-time MRI analysis



Direct observation of eye and hand movements





Head motion & mean intensity

Voyvodic, NeuroImage (1999)

Voyvodic et al., Frontiers Neuroinfo. (2011)

Traditionally, fMRI is quantitatively not reproducible



Liu et al., "Reproducibility of fMRI at 1.5T in a Strictly Controlled Motor Task", MRM 2004

Language – first scan



Language -- rescan



Overlap of 2 Language t-maps



Statistical thresholding is a major source of variability



Even a constant pattern of brain activity can result in very different activation maps, depending on statistical threshold

Voyvodic, MRI, 2006

Statistical significance of activation changes as a function of scan time





Activation mapping as percentage of local excitation (AMPLE)

AMPLE maps are consistent across scans or scanners



Voyvodic, MRI, 2006

Activation mapping as percentage of local excitation (AMPLE)



Threshold Reproducibility DROs

Generate simulated fMRI data with known activity levels





Conclusion: Once AMPLE time plots stabilize activation is reliable.

Anatomical spread of active voxels



Voyvodic et al, JMRI, 2009



Central sulcus profiles



AMPLE maps improve language reproducibility



Language AMPLE maps improve reproducibility



Upper 40% of AMPLE peaks are most reproducible

Assessing fMRI results: QA metrics Identifying useful metrics Stability of activation signal Head motion Average or Maximum displacement and rotation Fraction of images with motion greater than X Task performance Image SNR BOLD signal contrast (between vs within blocks) Pathology – neurovascular uncoupling **Determining threshold values** E.g. How much motion is too much?

Determine sources of signal variance

A. Random Rigid Motion: Introduce varying A. Instrument (raw) Noise: Add varving amounts amounts of head motion to shift each voxel's of Rician or 1/f noise to voxel time series. "true" BOLD response to different nearby voxels. Model "partial voluming". -----B. Task Correlated Motion: B. Ghosting: Alias voxels at each time Add additional head motion point along the phase encoding that is correlated with task direction. start and stop times. C. Brain Motion within Skull: C. Geometric Distortion: Local warping Head Motion Scanner Noise Use empirical motion data to of images (due to poor shim or locally Introduce elastic brain heterogeneous susceptibility) A. Instrument Noise A. Random Rigid Motion motion (may be related to ***B.** Ghosting B. Task Correlated Motion respiratory •C. Geometric Distortion .C. Brain Motion within Skull D. Signal Drift: Introduce or regional D. Signal Drift linear and/or low frequency cardiac signal drifts. pulsation). DRO's Physiological Task Dependent A. Network Fluctuations: Based on known brain networks, add Noise Noise random low-frequency signal Synthetic realistic A. Network Fluctuations +A. Attention (within for each network to gray matter A. Attention: fMRI magnitude fMRI time series B. Cardiac Fluctuations scan) voxels. varies within / across task •C. Respiratory B. Arousal (across scan) epochs either **Eluctuations** •C. Response Time B. Cardiac Fluctuations: Use recorded randomlyor D. Neurovascular respiratory data and empirical correlated Uncoupling analyses of respiratory BOLD effects with task and add these to voxel time series. condition. C Respiratory Fluctuations: Use recorded cardiac data and empirical analyses of • B. Arousal: fMRI magnitude cardiac BOLD effects and add these to varies across scans. voxel time series. C. Response Timing: fMRI response waveform shape and timing

·····

Varies relative to task onset/offset. (Behavioral & hemodynamic)

D. Neurovascular Uncoupling: Vary the shape and magnitude of hemodynamic response function across voxels.



Digital reference objects (DROs) Synthetic realistic imaging data

Brain anatomy



Map of active areas



Static EPI images



Physiological noise

en den marketen forse	และสู่สี่งและส่วยเหล่าง _{ได้คำ} ารส่วน	wilder when the second states
ลางประการประสารประสารประสารประสารประสารป	-nutre-sourcestation-security	water in the state of the state of the
Hazabetra, destant er fra standard fra	***	vinter and which the state of t
Hanston, Interindantiputeritation	production and the product	whether a preserve the
สาวมุการระการกระสมุรสมุรสมุรสมุรส	erekteringer-genteren eterrigiene	militanteraction



fMRI maps



Same data analyzed at 8 clinical fMRI sites



Hand-movement task



Sentence language task

"Standard" threshold

AMPLE 50% threshold



Sentence language task "Standard" threshold AMPLE 50% threshold DRO3

Registering functional and anatomical images



Quantifing center of mass of activation (CMA)



Single activation cluster CMA displacement for 8 sites for each DRO

Quantifing spatial extent of activation



Single activation cluster volumes for 8 sites for each DRO

Quantifing language hemispheric dominance



Receptive and expressive laterality for 9 site maps for each DRO

Task performance DROs: Signal consistency

Activation-weighted average time course signal for different patients



Consistency index:



Consistency index (B correl A): 0.64

Simulations using average time course signals from 400 different patients



Conclusion: Consistency index > 0.5 is good task perfomance

Consistency of performance across multiple task cycles

Mean active signal

Cycle amplitude Cycle correlation

Mean single cycle



Head motion is a pervasive problem in fMRI





Examples of different Patterns of head motion.



Motion Issues

How to avoid motion
Head motion complexity
How to measure (estimate) motion
How to compensate for motion
Effectiveness of "motion correction"
How much motion is too much?

Creating motion phantoms (DROs)

Base images

with no activity

and no motion







Add activation pattern, activation time course, and motion







Digital motion phantoms – added motion is very similar to original actual



Motion correction: Motion between volumes is correctable





Realign image volumes to "correct" motion



Choice of reference volume can affect motion correction



Measure "residual motion" by recalculating motion metrics after realignment. Residual motion varies as a function of realignment reference volume.

Motion within volume is not correctable by realignment





Conclusion: Use image registration to reposition volumes between movements, and omit volumes when head is actively moving. Problem scan if more than $\sim 10\%$ of volumes actually moving.

Combining realignment and censoring can enhance signal detection



Conclusions

To be reproducible and quantitative, clinical fMRI should satisfy specific QA metrics:

 BOLD signal amplitude is significantly above noise (AMPLE 50%: p < .05), and

 Task performance is reasonably consistent (CI > 0.5), and



 The spatial pattern stablizes over time, (AMPLE 50% reaches plateau), and

 Residual head motion after correction is minimal (no motion > 1mm?)





Future

- Once it is quantitative and reproducible fMRI will be able to actually measure brain activity (not just locate activity)
- Then fMRI could be used clinically to assess neurological or psychiatric disorders, disease progression, and patient response to therapies