

Altered Lateralization of the Cingulum in Deployment-Related Traumatic Brain Injury: An ENIGMA Military-Relevant Brain Injury Study

Emily L Dennis^{1,2}, Mary R Newsome^{3,4}, Hannah M Lindsey^{1,2}, Maheen M Adams^{5,6}, Tara A Austin⁷, Seth G Disner^{8,9}, Blessen C Eapen^{10,11}, Carrie Esopenko¹², Carol E Franz^{13,14}, Elbert Geuze^{15,16}, Courtney Haswell¹⁷, Sidney R Hinds II¹⁸, Cooper B Hodges¹⁹, Andrei Irimia^{20,21}, Kimbra Kenney^{18,22}, Inga K Koerte^{23,24}, William S Kremen^{13,14,25}, Harvey S Levin^{3,4*}, Rajendra A Morey^{17,26,27}, John Ollinger²², Jared A Rowland²⁷⁻²⁹, Randall S Scheibel^{3,4}, Martha E Shenton^{23,30}, Danielle R Sullivan^{31,32}, Leah D Talbert³³, Sophia I Thomopoulos³⁴, Maya Troyanskaya^{3,4}, William C Walker^{19,35}, Xin Wang³⁶, Ashley L Ware^{1,37}, J Kent Werner¹⁸, Wright Williams³, Paul M Thompson^{34,38}, David F Tate^{1,2}, Elisabeth A Wilde^{1,2,4}

- 1 Department of Neurology, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, UT.
- 2 George E. Wahlen Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Salt Lake City, UT.
- 3 Michael E. DeBakey Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Houston, TX.
- 4 H. Ben Taub Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, TX.
- 5 Rehabilitation Department, VA Palo Alto, Palo Alto, CA.
- 6 Neurosurgery, Stanford School of Medicine, Stanford, CA.
- 7 The VA Center of Excellence for Research on Returning War Veterans, Waco, TX.
- 8 Minneapolis VA Health Care System, Minneapolis, MN.
- 9 Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, University of Minnesota Medical School, Minneapolis, MN.
- 10 Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, VA Greater Los Angeles Health Care System, Los Angeles, CA.
- 11 Department of Medicine, David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA, Los Angeles, CA
- 12 Department of Rehabilitation and Human Performance, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY.
- 13 Department of Psychiatry, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA.
- 14 Center for Behavior Genetics of Aging, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA.
- 15 University Medical Center Utrecht, Netherlands.
- 16 Brain Research and Innovation Centre, Ministry of Defence, Utrecht, The Netherlands.
- 17 Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Duke University, Durham, NC.
- 18 Department of Neurology, Uniformed Services University, Bethesda, MD.
- 19 Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA.
- 20 Ethel Percy Andrus Gerontology Center, Leonard Davis School of Gerontology, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA.
- 21 Department of Biomedical Engineering, Viterbi School of Engineering, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA.
- 22 National Intrepid Center of Excellence, Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, Bethesda, MD.
- 23 Psychiatry Neuroimaging Laboratory, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA.
- 24 Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Psychosomatics and Psychotherapy, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Munich, Germany.
- 25 Center of Excellence for Stress and Mental Health, VA San Diego Healthcare System, La Jolla, CA.
- 26 Duke-UNC Brain Imaging and Analysis Center, Duke University, Durham, NC.
- 27 VA Mid-Atlantic Mental Illness Research Education and Clinical Center (MA-MIRECC), Durham, NC.
- 28 W.G. (Bill) Hefner VA Medical Center, Salisbury, NC.
- 29 Department of Neurobiology & Anatomy, Wake Forest School of Medicine, Winston-Salem, NC.
- 30 VA Boston Healthcare System, Boston, MA.
- 31 National Center for PTSD, VA Boston Healthcare System, Boston, MA.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

- 32 Department of Psychiatry, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, MA.
- 33 Department of Psychology, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT.
- 34 Imaging Genetics Center, Stevens Neuroimaging & Informatics Institute, Keck School of Medicine of USC, Marina del Rey, CA.
- 35 Hunter Holmes McGuire Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Richmond, VA.
- 36 Department of Psychiatry, University of Toledo, Toledo, OH.
- 37 Department of Psychology, University of Calgary, Alberta, Canada.
- 38 Departments of Neurology, Pediatrics, Psychiatry, Radiology, Engineering, and Ophthalmology, USC, Los Angeles, CA.

Please address correspondence to:

Dr. Emily L Dennis
TBI and Concussion Center, Dept of Neurology
University of Utah School of Medicine
emily.dennis@hsc.utah.edu

Abstract

Traumatic brain injury (TBI), a significant concern in military populations, is associated with alterations in brain structure and function, cognition, as well as physical and psychological dysfunction. Diffusion magnetic resonance imaging (dMRI) is particularly sensitive to changes in brain structure following TBI, as alterations in white matter (WM) microstructure are common. However, dMRI studies in mild TBI (mTBI) are conflicting, likely due to relatively small samples, sample heterogeneity (demographics, pre- and comorbidities) and injury characteristics (mechanism; chronicity). Furthermore, few studies account for brain asymmetry, which may impact cognitive functions subserved by WM tracts. Examining brain asymmetry in large samples may increase sensitivity to detect heterogeneous areas of subtle WM alteration in mTBI.

Through the Enhancing Neuroimaging and Genetics through Meta-analysis (ENIGMA) Military-Relevant Brain Injury working group, we conducted a mega-analysis of neuroimaging and clinical data from 16 cohorts of Active Duty Service Members and Veterans ($n=2,598$; 2,321 males/277 females; age 19-85 years). 1,080 reported a deployment-related TBI, 480 had a history of only non-military-related TBI, 823 reported no history of TBI, and 215 did not differentiate between military and non-military TBI. dMRI data were processed in a harmonized manner along with harmonized demographic, injury, psychiatric, and cognitive measures. Hemispheric asymmetry of fractional anisotropy (FA, a common proxy for myelin organization) was calculated for 19 WM tracts and compared between those with and without TBI history.

FA in the cingulum showed greater asymmetry in individuals with a history of deployment-related TBI; this effect was driven by greater left lateralization in the group with TBI. There was a trend towards lower FA of the right cingulum in the TBI group. These results remained significant after accounting for potentially confounding variables including posttraumatic stress disorder, depression, and handedness and were driven primarily by individuals who had sustained their worst TBI before age 40. We further found that alterations in the cingulum were associated with slower processing speed and poorer set shifting.

The results indicate an enhancement of the previously reported natural left laterality, possibly due to vulnerability of the non-dominant hemisphere or compensatory mechanisms in the dominant hemisphere. The cingulum is one of the last WM tracts to mature, reaching peak FA around 42 years old. This effect was primarily detected in individuals whose worst injury occurred before age 40, suggesting that the protracted development of the cingulum may lead to increased vulnerability to insults, such as TBI.

Introduction

Traumatic brain injury (TBI) has been a common battlefield injury throughout history, but has recently received increased attention due to its high prevalence in recent military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Traumatic Brain Injury Center of Excellence reports that Service Members (SM) experienced 450,000 TBIs between 2000-2021,¹ the majority of which were classified as mild TBIs (mTBIs). While many patients appear to recover from these “invisible injuries”² - typically within weeks - some continue to report somatic, cognitive, and psychological symptoms even several years later.³ TBI occurring during deployment has been associated with a greater variety of outcomes than TBI sustained outside deployment.⁴⁻⁸ Blast-related TBI in particular has been called the “signature injury” of post-9/11 conflicts (e.g., OEF/OIF/OND). Understanding brain structural changes and their relation to neurobehavioral sequelae following blast-related injuries, however, requires further elucidation as research on mTBI due to impact may not apply as the injury mechanisms differ.

Neuroimaging has revealed persistent alterations in brain structure and function long after other extracranial injuries have healed.⁹ Diffusion magnetic resonance imaging (dMRI) is particularly sensitive to the axonal neuropathology of TBI, but there is mixed evidence for alterations in white matter (WM) organization after injury, especially after mTBI.¹⁰⁻¹⁶ Heterogeneity among patients may make effects of mTBI especially difficult to detect in group analyses, leading some researchers to take the “pothole” approach, i.e., reporting global WM disruption irrespective of location.^{11,12,17} Larger sample sizes may also partially address the issue of heterogeneity, and big data approaches could facilitate sophisticated modeling to identify patient clusters with different patterns of WM disruption. One prior analysis on a subset of the cohorts included in this analysis used non-negative matrix factorization (NMF), a data-driven approach, to reduce measurements along the WM core (the skeleton) to a set of components that accounted for a large amount of the variance. This analysis revealed an age-dependent effect of TBI on FA (fractional anisotropy, a common proxy for WM integrity), such that the age-related decreases in FA were steeper than expected after TBI.¹⁸ Here we included the full available sample of size near 2,600.

There are inherent asymmetries in the typically-developed, healthy brain, many of which appear reliably across individuals.¹⁹ Several WM tracts have well-established asymmetry, such as left lateralization of the cingulum and of the arcuate fasciculus, while asymmetry-related findings for other tracts have been mixed.²⁰ This asymmetry may explain some of the functional lateralization of the brain.²¹ We examined asymmetry of lateralized tracts to reduce the number of statistical tests and to be more sensitive to heterogeneity among patients. Asymmetry standardizes measures to the individual, to a degree, making each his/her own reference and thus increasing sensitivity to subtle, heterogeneous effects.²²

The Enhancing NeuroImaging Genetics through Meta-Analysis (ENIGMA) Military-Relevant Brain Injury working group is part of the broader ENIGMA Brain Injury working group

(<https://enigma.ini.usc.edu/ongoing/enigma-tbi/>), a global collaboration among neuroimaging researchers focusing on various TBI patient populations.^{23–25} It was built on the framework created by the ENIGMA consortium, which seeks to achieve greater statistical power through harmonized image processing and meta/mega-analysis.²⁶ The ENIGMA Diffusion Tensor Imaging (DTI) workflow²⁷ has been used to identify altered WM organization across a range of disorders, including moderate/severe TBI in pediatric patients,²⁸ post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD),²⁹ major depression,³⁰ and other conditions.³¹ We used the ENIGMA DTI workflow to analyze asymmetry of WM organization in military brain injury across sixteen cohorts. We hypothesized that there would be some structures displaying greater asymmetry in participants with a history of TBI.

Materials and Methods

Study Samples

The ENIGMA Military-Relevant Brain Injury dMRI analysis included 16 cohorts from two countries, totalling 1,775 participants with a history of TBI and 823 comparison participants with no history of TBI. Of the 1,775 participants reporting a history of TBI, 1,080 had at least one deployment-related injury, 480 had only a history of non-military TBI, and 215 did not have information regarding injury context (military vs. non-military). Cohorts included both Veteran and Active Duty SM. While the majority of cohorts focused on OEF/OIF/OND Military SM, two cohorts focused on Vietnam Veterans, thus including a significantly older population. Across the cohorts, the age range was 18-85 years, with an average age of 41.7 ± 12.7 years. **Table 1** provides basic demographic and clinical details on the cohorts, and inclusion and exclusion criteria for each study are in **Supplementary Table 1**. All participants provided written informed consent approved by local institutional review boards. Some cohorts shared raw imaging data with the central site (University of Utah), where they were processed and analyzed, while others processed data locally and shared the summary measures with the central site for mega-analysis.

Harmonizing Injury Data

Details on injuries were collected using a range of tools across sites (see **Table 1** and **Supplementary Table 2**). From these disparate scales we extracted a number of common variables, not all of which were available for all cohorts: history of TBI (any; Y/N), history of deployment-related TBI (Y/N), history of blast-related TBI (Y/N), number of reported TBIs, history of TBI with loss of consciousness (LOC; Y/N), history of TBI with post-traumatic amnesia (PTA; Y/N), number of TBIs with LOC/PTA, longest reported duration of LOC/PTA, and time since first, worst, and most recent TBI. Longest reported LOC/PTA were largely self-reported and binned into the following categories: LOC - none, <1 min, 1-10 min, 10-30 min, 30 min-1 day, >1 day; PTA - none, <1 hour, 1 hour - 1 day, 1-7 days, >7 days.

Image Acquisition and Processing

The acquisition parameters for each cohort are provided in **Supplementary Table 3**. Preprocessing, including eddy current correction, echo-planar imaging-induced distortion correction, and tensor fitting, was completed at the University of Utah for those sites sharing raw data, or locally for the others. Recommended protocols and quality control procedures are available on the ENIGMA-DTI and NITRC (Neuroimaging Informatics Tools and Resources Clearinghouse) webpages. These procedures were recommended but harmonization of preprocessing schemes was not enforced across sites to accommodate site- and acquisition-specific pipelines. Once tensors were estimated, they were mapped to the ENIGMA-DTI template, projected onto the ENIGMA-DTI template, and then averaged within regions of interest (ROIs; <http://enigma.ini.usc.edu/protocols/dti-protocols/>) in a TBSS-based approach.³² Further details and ROI abbreviations can be found in **Supplementary Note 1**. In a subset of sites, we extracted motion parameters from the eddy current correction step to determine if motion played a role in our case-control findings. We compared rotation and translation averaged across the X, Y, and Z axes and found no significant differences in motion between groups (all $p>0.05$). We calculated both FA lateralization index and asymmetry for each lateralized ROI:

$$\text{Lateralization index} = (FA_{\text{Left}} - FA_{\text{Right}}) / (0.5 * (FA_{\text{Left}} + FA_{\text{Right}}))$$

where asymmetry was simply the absolute value of the lateralization index. Significant effects with asymmetry were followed *post hoc* with examinations of the lateralization index. Asymmetry was the primary measure as it would detect alterations irrespective of direction.

Statistics

As each site shared the individual-level ROI data, mega-analysis was possible. Linear mixed effects models were implemented with *lme* in R 3.1.3. Nested random effects were used to control for cohort and site, as some studies included multiple data collection sites. The average correlation in asymmetry between all ROIs was $r=0.13$. A Bonferroni correction is overly conservative when there are correlations between the multiple dependent measures being tested. Therefore, we followed recent ENIGMA analyses²⁹ and calculated the effective number of independent tests based on the observed correlation structure between the alternate responses using two different methods. The equation of Li and Ji³³ yielded an effective number of tests of $V_{\text{eff}}=16$, giving a significance threshold of $p<0.05/16=0.003125$. Results that did not pass correction for multiple comparisons ($0.05>p>0.003125$) are reported for completeness, but not interpreted. Across analyses, Cohen's *d* statistics are reported for group comparisons and unstandardized betas (*b*) are reported for linear regressions.

Quadratic Age Term

We first conducted analyses to determine whether a quadratic age term, age^2 , should be included in statistical models along with age and gender, as age has a nonlinear effect on FA.³⁴ The effect of this term upon the regression was not significant, so age^2 was not included in subsequent analyses.

Primary Group Comparisons

As our focus is military-relevant TBI, our primary analysis compared participants with a history of deployment-related TBI to those with no history of TBI, excluding individuals reporting a history of only non-military TBI and participants whose records did not specify the source of TBI. Deployment-related TBI included both combat and non-combat injuries. As a specificity analysis, we examined group differences between participants with a history of only non-military TBI to non-TBI. We also compared individuals with a history of blast-related TBI to those with no history of TBI, for whom that information was available.

Subgroups: Two cohorts focused on Vietnam Veterans. These cohorts were significantly older than the other cohorts, generally had more severe injuries, and were far more temporally remote from their injuries. We repeated group analyses without these two cohorts as well. We also conducted group analyses by gender.

Interactions: We analyzed potential interactions between group and age or gender.

Injury Variables

We analyzed two other groupings based on injury data: any TBI with LOC and any TBI with PTA. We also examined potential linear relationships with several variables of interest: longest reported LOC/PTA, time since first/worst/most recent injury, and number of TBIs reported.

Symptom Inventories

Current PTSD and depression symptoms were assessed using different scales across sites yielding categorical variables (Y/N), summarized in **Supplementary Note 2**. For sites that collected versions of the PTSD Checklist (PCL), we were able to calculate a harmonized PCL score based on recent work from our group.³⁵ As there was more variety in the depression inventories collected across sites, we did not have a harmonized measure of depression severity. Seven sites collected the Symptom Checklist 90 (SCL-90), Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI), or Neurobehavioral Symptom Inventory (NSI). From these, we extracted two harmonized factors, based on past published work,^{36–40} one for somatic symptoms and one for affective symptoms, detailed in **Supplementary Note 2**.

Cognitive Function

Across the 16 cohorts included in this study, seven cohorts collected the Trail Making Test (TMT). TMT Part A measures visual search and motor speed, Part B measures set shifting, and subtracting Part A from Part B gives a more specific measure of executive control.⁴¹ Participants with Part A or Part B completion times greater than 3 SD above the study-wide mean were winsorized to 3 SD above the mean.

Other Potential Confounds

Three additional potential confounds were also analyzed in our analyses: education, motion, and handedness. We examined whether the number of years of education was associated with asymmetry or was different between the TBI and control groups, and whether motion during the scan was different between TBI and control groups. Details on how motion was assessed may be found in **Supplementary Note 1**. Two sites (Chronic Effects and Rover Wiser) enrolled only right-handed individuals.

Data Availability

Researchers interested in accessing the data described here must first join the ENIGMA Military-Relevant Brain Injury group and agree to abide by the Memorandum of Understanding governing data sharing and authorship. All projects are opt-in, so the specific cohorts available will differ.

Results

Primary Group Comparisons

We found significantly greater FA asymmetry in the group with a history of deployment-related TBI compared to the group with no history of TBI in the cingulum ($d=0.18$, $p<0.001$), along with greater asymmetry in the superior longitudinal fasciculus (SLF), although this did not survive multiple comparisons correction ($d=0.10$, $p=.027$). *Post hoc* analysis of the cingulum revealed greater left lateralization in the TBI group ($d=0.15$, $p=.001$; **Figure 1**). We further examined group differences in the FA of the left and right cingula and found a trend toward lower FA of the right cingulum in the TBI group ($d=-0.07$, $p=.11$). The higher asymmetry was also present in the blast-related TBI vs. no TBI comparison, although it did not survive correction for multiple comparisons ($d=0.11$, $p=.019$). CENC was the only cohort with a variable for (ostensibly) pure blast-related TBI, so as an exploratory analysis we examined cingulum asymmetry between individuals with history of pure blast-related TBI compared to individuals with no TBI history, finding no significant group difference in cingulum asymmetry ($d=-0.06$, $p=.226$). In a *post hoc* analysis of the cingulum, the differences in the deployment-related TBI group remained when covarying for current PTSD ($d=0.16$, $p<0.001$), current depression ($d=0.16$, $p=.001$), and both current PTSD and current depression ($d=0.15$, $p=0.002$). Comparing individuals with a history of only non-military TBI to the non-TBI group, the cingulum effect was not significant ($d=0.08$, $p=.134$), suggesting that our result is specific to deployment-related TBI and not mTBI in general. These results are summarized in **Table 2** and **Supplementary Table 4**.

Subgroups

When the two Vietnam Veteran cohorts were excluded, cingulum results remained significant ($d=0.17$; $p<.001$). Among Vietnam Veterans, differences in the cingulum were not significant ($d=0.25$, $p=.051$), but there was significantly greater asymmetry in the SLF of participants with a history of deployment-related TBI ($d=0.39$, $p=.003$), although this was in a much smaller sample ($n=253$). The cingulum is one of the last tracts to mature⁴², which suggests that it exhibits prolonged vulnerability to environmental insults such as injury. To test

this hypothesis, we examined group differences *post hoc* in (A) individuals whose worst injury occurred when they were younger than 40 separately from (B) those whose worst injury occurred when they were older than 45, excluding the two samples with Vietnam Veterans. The cingulum effect remained significant among those injured at a younger age ($d=0.12$, $p=.017$). It was not significant (while the SLF effect was) among those injured at an older age ($d=0.01$, $p=.83$). When males and females were separated, the cingulum effect remained significant in males ($d=0.17$, $p<.001$), but not in females ($d=0.26$, $p=.077$). These results are summarized in **Supplementary Table 4**.

Interactions

There were no significant interactions between diagnosis (based on deployment-related TBI history) and age or gender. These results are summarized in **Supplementary Table 5**.

Injury variables

LOC/PTA: Loss of consciousness (LOC): There was significantly more asymmetry in the SLF in participants who had experienced at least one TBI with LOC ($d=0.13$, $p=.0018$, **Figure 2**), as well as in the corticospinal tract (CST), although this association did not survive correction for multiple comparisons ($d=0.11$, $p=0.0090$). *Post hoc* analyses revealed greater right lateralization in the SLF of participants in the LOC group. Examining the FAs of the left and right SLF did not reveal significant results. Longer LOC (longest reported) was associated with greater asymmetry in the uncinate fasciculus (UF), although this did not survive correction for multiple comparisons ($n=646$; $b=0.0077$, $p=.046$). A larger number of reported TBIs with LOC was associated with greater asymmetry in the CST, although this did not survive correction for multiple comparisons ($n=2,058$; $b=0.0025$, $p=.034$). **Post-traumatic amnesia (PTA):** There were no significant associations between participants who had experienced at least one TBI with PTA and participants with no TBI history. Longer duration of PTA (longest reported) was associated with greater asymmetry in the CGH (hippocampal cingulum), superior *corona radiata* (SCR), SLF, and with lower asymmetry in the PCR, although these did not survive correction for multiple comparisons ($n=1,028$; $b=0.0087$, $p=.022$; $b=0.0043$, $p=.009$; $b=0.0053$, $p=.008$; $b=-0.0044$, $p=0.036$, respectively). Greater number of TBIs with PTA was associated with greater asymmetry in the CST, although this did not survive correction for multiple comparisons ($n=1,577$; $b=0.0036$, $p=0.0060$). **Time since injury:** None of the associations with time since injury survived multiple comparisons corrections. **Time since first injury:** There was a negative association with asymmetry of the UF ($n=1,519$; $b=-2.8 \times 10^{-4}$, $p=0.047$), and positive associations with asymmetry of the posterior *corona radiata* (PCR) and SLF ($b=1.0 \times 10^{-4}$, $p=0.049$; $b=1.2 \times 10^{-4}$, $p=0.016$, respectively). **Time since worst injury:** There was a negative association with asymmetry of the superior fronto-occipital fasciculus (SFOF; $n=2,266$; $b=-2.9 \times 10^{-4}$, $p=0.021$) and a positive association with asymmetry of the SLF ($b=1.4 \times 10^{-4}$, $p=0.025$). **Time since most recent injury:** There was a negative association with asymmetry of the internal capsule (IC) and SFOF ($n=2,238$, $b=-2.0 \times 10^{-4}$,

$p=.041$; $b=-2.9 \times 10^{-4}$, $p=.033$, respectively), and a positive association with the asymmetry of the PCR and SLF ($b=1.2 \times 10^{-4}$, $p=.034$; $b=1.4 \times 10^{-4}$, $p=.018$, respectively). **Number of TBIs:** There were no significant relationships with number of TBIs (general) or number of blast-related TBIs. These results are summarized in **Supplementary Table 5**.

Cognitive Function

Seven of 16 cohorts in our sample collected the Trail Making Test (TMT, parts A and B), including 1,613 participants, 676 of whom had a history of deployment-related TBI. In the no-TBI group ($n=506$), there were no detectable significant associations between cingulum FA and TMT performance. We examined the cingulum effect *post hoc* to test whether there were functional consequences of the shift in asymmetry. There were no significant associations with asymmetry in the deployment-related TBI group. There were borderline negative associations in the deployment-related TBI group between the lateralization index of the cingulum and TMT-A and TMT-B time ($b=-5.5 \times 10^{-4}$, $p=.071$; $b=-1.8 \times 10^{-4}$, $p=.082$, respectively, **Supplementary Figure 1**). Within the deployment-related TBI group, the FA of the left cingulum was negatively associated with TMT-A, TMT-B, and TMT-BsubA ($b=-5.0 \times 10^{-4}$, $p=.008$; $b=-1.7 \times 10^{-4}$, $p=.011$; $b=-2.0 \times 10^{-4}$, $p=.016$, respectively, **Figure 3**). When covarying for handedness, only the association with TMT-A remained ($b=-5.9 \times 10^{-4}$, $p=.032$), but the sample was also much smaller ($n=331$).

Symptoms

Somatic symptoms: Examining somatic symptoms ($n=1,446$), we found significantly greater asymmetry in the UF with greater symptom burden ($b=0.055$, $p<.001$). *Post hoc* analyses did not reveal specific lateralization (**Figure 4**). We also found greater asymmetry in the anterior *corona radiata* (ACR), but this did not survive correction for multiple comparisons ($b=0.012$, $p=.024$). **Affective symptoms:** Examining affective symptoms ($n=1,447$), we found greater asymmetry in the ACR, SS, and UF with greater symptom burden, but these did not survive correction for multiple comparisons ($b=0.0091$, $p=.018$; $b=0.029$, $p=.009$; $b=0.010$, $p=0.041$, respectively). **PTSD:** We examined current PTSD both as a categorical variable (Y/N) and a continuous variable, for those sites that collected the PCL. For sites that did, a cutoff score of 33 was used to create a categorical variable. Current PTSD was associated with lower asymmetry in the SCR and higher asymmetry in the sagittal stratum ($n=2,546$; $d=-0.08$, $p=.035$; $d=0.11$, $p=.004$, respectively) although neither of these survived corrections for multiple comparisons. Eight of 16 cohorts collected a version of the PCL, which we harmonized as detailed elsewhere.³⁵ Current PTSD severity (within the past month) was associated with higher asymmetry in the UF and sagittal stratum ($n=1,791$; $b=3.2 \times 10^{-4}$, $p=.0036$; $b=1.8 \times 10^{-4}$, $p=0.0034$, respectively), although neither of these survived corrections for multiple comparisons. **Depression:** We examined current depression as a categorical variable (Y/N), finding no significant associations with asymmetry. These results are summarized in **Table 3**.

Potential Confounds

Education: Years of education did not differ between the TBI and control groups and was not associated with tract asymmetry. *Motion:* Motion parameters were not significantly in individuals with a history of deployment-related TBI. As neither of these variables was significantly related to our measures of interest, they were not included in any analyses. *Handedness:* Handedness was not significantly associated with cingulum asymmetry ($n=1,876$, $d=0.02$, $p=.73$). When covarying for handedness, the group difference in the cingulum remained significant ($n=1,351$, $d=0.20$, $p<.001$). When limiting the analysis to only right-handed individuals, the group difference remained significant (618 v. 565, $d=0.23$, $p<.001$; see **Supplementary Table 4**).

Discussion

We examined WM asymmetry in 2,598 military SM and Veterans, reporting a primary finding of greater asymmetry in the cingulum among individuals with a history of deployment-related TBI compared to those with no lifetime history of TBI. Greater asymmetry in the cingulum was driven by greater left lateralization in the group with TBI. The cingulum is a key structure in the limbic system, connecting medial aspects of the frontal and parietal lobes (not including the hippocampal cingulum, as the dorsal and hippocampal were distinct in this study)⁴³ and supporting a number of important executive functions, including working memory, inhibition, and processing speed.⁴⁴ The cingulum is also one of the last tracts to mature, with an average age-at-peak FA of 42 years old.⁴² This prolonged maturation may render the cingulum more vulnerable to environmental impacts, and prior structural equation modeling did not show significant genetic contributions to cingulum asymmetry, supporting the hypothesis that environment plays an outsized role.⁴⁵ This age-at-peak happens to coincide with the average age of our sample (41.7 years). Indeed, when we ran the analysis after separating participants whose worst injury occurred before age 40 versus those whose worst injury occurred after age 45 only the comparison in the younger group remained significant. This analysis excluded Vietnam Veterans as the remoteness of their injuries may mean different injury- and age-related processes are occurring. Heterogeneity across cohorts, and the general reliance on self-reports of injuries, including their timing and severity, suggest that this result must be interpreted with caution, but this does present a hypothesis that can be addressed more directly in individual studies. As the sample size differed greatly between these analyses (855 younger TBI participants as opposed to 106 older TBI participants), we cannot rule out the decrease in statistical power as the reason for the difference; however, this result does lend support to the interpretation that the cingulum is particularly vulnerable to injury because of its long maturation.

The length, orientation, and proximity of the cingulum to the falx and the ventricles may contribute to strain and shear forces on the tract during impact.⁴⁶⁻⁴⁸ Disentangling the effects of blast-related versus impact-related TBI is difficult, especially in our analysis of heterogeneous, legacy datasets. The differences

between blast-related TBI and no TBI were not significant after multiple comparisons correction and the effect size was smaller ($d=0.18$ vs. $d=0.11$), but the sample size was smaller (1,080 vs. 734 TBI), and blast-related injuries in military settings often also involve a co-occurring impact. The CENC cohort was the only one to collect information on TBIs that were due primarily to blast. An exploratory analysis in this small subset of the data (146 vs. 191) did not yield significant results for the cingulum, lending support to the interpretation that the acceleration/deceleration/rotational forces of TBI may affect the cingulum more than the pressure forces of blast-related TBI. Targeted analysis in animal studies and well-characterized cohort studies are necessary to confirm this finding.

Left lateralization of the FA of the cingulum is a well-documented phenomenon in healthy (primarily right-handed) individuals,^{20,49,50} and is linked with cingulum cognitive functions.⁵¹ In tracts that are more asymmetric, the non-dominant hemisphere may be more susceptible to damage, as neural resources may be primarily diverted to maintaining integrity of the dominant hemisphere. Lower FA in the right cingulum may be due to less myelination, or to less organized or less densely packed fibers. A large study of young adults using multi-shell dMRI recently showed that the neuronal density of the left cingulum was greater than that of the right cingulum, while the orientation dispersion index (ODI; higher values indicate less coherence in fiber direction) was higher in the right cingulum.⁵² Lower fiber density could mean greater elasticity and thus more stretch during impact; finite element modeling consistently indicates high axonal strain in the cingulum.^{53–55} Some studies have found lower tract asymmetry in women than in men,^{45,56} although such differences may be minor.^{20,49} Less asymmetry may partially explain the lack of significant group differences in females, but the much smaller female sample size ($n=199$) means poorer statistical power and thus limits our ability to draw any conclusions from the female-only analyses.

Alterations in cingulum microstructure have been reported previously in mild TBI,^{57–61} including military-specific mTBI,^{10,62,63} as well as across psychiatric disorders.^{31,64,65} In studies with TBI patients, several have reported associations between WM microstructural organization in the right cingulum and cognitive function, including reaction time and set shifting.^{58,66,67} Prior studies have shown that deployment-related TBI is associated with poorer TMT performance, even when compared to non-deployment TBI.⁸ Altered asymmetry of the cingulum in our sample appeared to be primarily driven by deficits in the right cingulum, leading to an exaggerated laterality index. Lower FA of the left cingulum was linked with slower processing speed and set shifting, as measured by the TMT in the TBI group. This association was not present in the comparison group reporting no history of TBI. Other studies have reported that alterations in WM asymmetry are associated with cognitive deficits.⁶⁸ Two prior studies examined WM asymmetry in mTBI and reported increased asymmetry in the corticospinal tract.^{69,70} Unfortunately this midline tract was not separated into left and right components in the ENIGMA atlas, so we did not have the opportunity to replicate that finding.

We found alterations in the asymmetry of the SLF in individuals who had experienced at least one TBI with LOC. History of TBI with LOC was associated with greater right lateralization of the SLF. In the SLF, reported asymmetry varies in the literature, due in large part to whether the SLF was divided into sub-components and whether it was considered synonymous with the arcuate fasciculus.^{20,71} One current model divides the SLF into SLF I (which may actually be part of the cingulum),⁷² connecting the superior frontal and parietal cortices, SLF II, connecting superior and middle frontal gyri with the angular gyrus, SLF III, connecting the inferior frontal gyrus with the temporo-parietal junction, and the arcuate fasciculus, connecting the inferior frontal gyrus with the temporal cortex.^{71,73} The arcuate fasciculus is strongly left lateralized and may not even exist in the right hemisphere.⁷⁴ The SLF III, however, shows a strong right lateralization.^{20,50,72-74} We did not divide the SLF into multiple components. Similarly to the cingulum findings above, exaggerated lateralization in the expected direction may indicate preservation of the dominant hemisphere at the expense of the non-dominant hemisphere. We did not have any harmonized measures of language function to test whether these alterations had functional consequences.

We also found that greater asymmetry in the uncinate fasciculus was associated with worse somatic symptoms. Studies of asymmetry in the UF have been mixed,^{42,75,76} although this may be because the laterality of the UF varies across tract segments.⁷⁷ As we only considered the UF as a whole, we did not have the ability to identify asymmetry in the UF at a smaller scale. Follow-up analyses did not reveal any pattern in the shift in laterality, which may mean that injury leads to overall disorganization of the UF, or this may parallel prior studies with conflicting findings on the asymmetry of the UF as a whole.

Our study has several limitations. First, as a retrospective analysis of multi-site data collected in different studies, there are many sources of heterogeneity in our data that we cannot fully characterize or account for. Differences in the assessment of TBI history limited the analyses we could do to the most common denominators, which were often more general variables than individual sites collected. Our results present a number of interesting hypotheses that future studies can interrogate in greater detail in their datasets, such as whether the cingulum is vulnerable because it has an extended maturation time, whether females are less vulnerable to alterations in cingulum asymmetry because they have less natural cingulum asymmetry, or whether the right cingulum is more vulnerable to alterations due to less densely packed fibers. Second, most of the TBI history for our cohorts was self-reported, which has inherent issues with reliability. For this reason, we report all analyses of injury variables (such as duration of LOC) for completeness, but do not interpret these results. Third, TBSS is limited as a tensor-based approach when compared to a tractography approach, so we cannot fully attribute results to particular fiber bundles. Fourth, we were limited in the clinical endpoints we could examine to those that were most general (e.g., categorical variable for current depression), most commonly collected (e.g., TMT), or already harmonized (e.g., versions of the PCL). Work is ongoing in the

ENIGMA Clinical Endpoints working group (a subgroup of the Brain Injury working group) to develop additional harmonized measures across multiple domains. Thus, future studies will be able to examine how TBI-related alterations in brain structure and function correspond to changes in memory, attention, and inhibition, among others. Fifth, as a cross-sectional study, we cannot examine whether asymmetry differences predate injury, or how the differences in asymmetry evolve over the lifespan. Lastly, while one cohort came from the Netherlands (BETTER/UMCU), the rest of the cohorts were from the United States, which may limit the generalizability of our results to other military contexts.

The effect sizes we report are small (Cohen's $d=0.18$ for the main comparison), but in line with other ENIGMA analyses.^{29,31} Given the many sources of heterogeneity in our sample, and the existing, and often inconclusive, literature on dMRI alterations in military-relevant TBI (predominantly mTBI), small effect sizes are expected. The necessary sample size to find an effect of this size with 80% power and a significance threshold of 5% is 972, which is far larger than most published work on dMRI in military brain injury, highlighting the importance of collaborative projects, such as ENIGMA. Our work points to subtle alterations in the balance of the brain after TBI, and suggests a phenomenon of heightened vulnerability of the non-dominant hemisphere, perhaps as neural resources are diverted to support the dominant hemisphere. These alterations have functional consequences, as they were associated with slower processing speed and set shifting. Future targeted studies in individual, well-characterized cohorts or in animal models will aid in further elaborating on the specific mechanisms underlying, and on the functional implications for, alterations in tract asymmetry.

Acknowledgements

R61NS120249; K99NS096116; This work was supported by U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command (USAMRMC) award #13129004; VA RR&D IK2RX002922; VA R&D SPIRE Award; DOD PRARP; Dutch Ministry of Defence; R01AG058822; R01NS100973, DoD contract W81XWH-18-1-0413, a grant from the James J. and Sue Femino Foundation, a Hanson-Thorell Research Scholarship, the USC CURVE & SURE programs, and the Leonard Davis School of Gerontology; R01NS100952; European Research Council (ERC Starting Grant 804326); VA Rehabilitation Research and Development Service I01RX003443, I01RX003442; VA Health Services Research and Development Service Research Career Scientist Award IK6HX002608; This work was supported in part by Merit Review Award Number I01 CX001820 from the United States (U.S.) Department of Veterans Affairs Clinical Sciences R&D (CSR&D) Service; VA CSR&D Career Development Award VA Career Development Award 5IK2CX001508; VA CSR&D Career Development Award 1IK2CX001772-01; Defense and Veterans Brain Injury Centers, the U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command (USAMRMC; W81XWH-13-2-0025) and the Chronic Effects of Neurotrauma Consortium (CENC; PT108802-SC104835); U54EB020403; K99 MH119314 (NIMH); NARSAD 27786; I01 RX002174

Competing interests

The views expressed in this article are those of the author(s) and do not reflect the official policy of the Department of Army/Navy/Air Force, Department of Defense, or U.S. Government. IKK receives funding for a collaborative project and serves as a paid scientific advisor for Abbott. She receives royalties for book chapters. Her spouse is an employee at Siemens AG. PMT received a research grant from Biogen, Inc., for research unrelated to this manuscript.

References

1. DOD TBI worldwide numbers. Military Health System. Accessed April 20, 2022. <https://health.mil/Military-Health-Topics/Centers-of-Excellence/Traumatic-Brain-Injury-Center-of-Excellence/DOD-TBI-Worldwide-Numbers>
2. Helmick KM, Spells CA, Malik SZ, Davies CA, Marion DW, Hinds SR. Traumatic brain injury in the US military: epidemiology and key clinical and research programs. *Brain Imaging Behav.* 2015;9(3):358-366.
3. Mac Donald CL, Johnson AM, Wierzechowski L, et al. Outcome Trends after US Military Concussive Traumatic Brain Injury. *J Neurotrauma.* 2017;34(14):2206-2219.
4. Stein MB, Ursano RJ, Campbell-Sills L, et al. Prognostic Indicators of Persistent Post-Concussive Symptoms after Deployment-Related Mild Traumatic Brain Injury: A Prospective Longitudinal Study in U.S. Army Soldiers. *J Neurotrauma.* 2016;33(23):2125-2132.
5. Martindale SL, Epstein EL, Taber KH, VA Mid-Atlantic MIRECC Workgroup, Rowland JA. Behavioral and Health Outcomes Associated With Deployment and Nondeployment Acquisition of Traumatic Brain Injury in Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2018;99(12):2485-2495.
6. Stein MB, Kessler RC, Heeringa SG, et al. Prospective longitudinal evaluation of the effect of deployment-acquired traumatic brain injury on posttraumatic stress and related disorders: results from the Army Study to Assess Risk and Resilience in Servicemembers (Army STARRS). *Am J Psychiatry.* 2015;172(11):1101-1111.
7. Yurgil KA, Barkauskas DA, Vasterling JJ, et al. Association between traumatic brain injury and risk of posttraumatic stress disorder in active-duty Marines. *JAMA Psychiatry.* 2014;71(2):149-157.
8. Martindale SL, Ord AS, Lad SS, Miskey HM, Taber KH, Rowland JA. Differential effects of deployment and nondeployment mild TBI on neuropsychological outcomes. *Rehabil Psychol.* 2021;66(2):128-138.
9. Wilde EA, Bouix S, Tate DF, et al. Advanced neuroimaging applied to veterans and service personnel with traumatic brain injury: state of the art and potential benefits. *Brain Imaging Behav.* 2015;9(3):367-402.
10. Mac Donald CL, Johnson AM, Cooper D, et al. Detection of blast-related traumatic brain injury in U.S. military personnel. *N Engl J Med.* 2011;364(22):2091-2100.
11. Davenport ND, Lim KO, Armstrong MT, Sponheim SR. Diffuse and spatially variable white matter disruptions are associated with blast-related mild traumatic brain injury. *Neuroimage.* 2012;59(3):2017-2024.
12. Jorge RE, Acion L, White T, et al. White matter abnormalities in veterans with mild traumatic brain injury. *Am J Psychiatry.* 2012;169(12):1284-1291.
13. Levin HS, Wilde E, Troyanskaya M, et al. Diffusion tensor imaging of mild to moderate blast-related traumatic brain injury and its sequelae. *J Neurotrauma.* 2010;27(4):683-694.
14. Hayes JP, Miller DR, Lafleche G, Salat DH, Verfaellie M. The nature of white matter abnormalities in blast-related mild traumatic brain injury. *Neuroimage Clin.* 2015;8:148-156.
15. Davenport ND, Lim KO, Sponheim SR. White matter abnormalities associated with military PTSD in the

context of blast TBI. *Hum Brain Mapp.* 2015;36(3):1053-1064.

16. Bolzenius JD, Velez CS, Lewis JD, et al. Diffusion Imaging Findings in US Service Members With Mild Traumatic Brain Injury and Posttraumatic Stress Disorder. *J Head Trauma Rehabil.* 2018;33(6):393-402.
17. Taber KH, Hurley RA, Haswell CC, et al. White matter compromise in veterans exposed to primary blast forces. *J Head Trauma Rehabil.* 2015;30(1):E15-E25.
18. Bouchard HC, Sun D, Dennis EL, et al. Age-dependent white matter disruptions after military traumatic brain injury: Multivariate analysis results from ENIGMA brain injury. *Hum Brain Mapp.* Published online March 15, 2022. doi:10.1002/hbm.25811
19. Kong XZ, Mathias SR, Guadalupe T, et al. Mapping cortical brain asymmetry in 17,141 healthy individuals worldwide via the ENIGMA Consortium. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2018;115(22):E5154-E5163.
20. Takao H, Hayashi N, Ohtomo K. White matter asymmetry in healthy individuals: a diffusion tensor imaging study using tract-based spatial statistics. *Neuroscience.* 2011;193:291-299.
21. Ocklenburg S, Friedrich P, Güntürkün O, Genç E. Intrahemispheric white matter asymmetries: the missing link between brain structure and functional lateralization? *Rev Neurosci.* 2016;27(5):465-480.
22. Toga AW, Thompson PM. Mapping brain asymmetry. *Nat Rev Neurosci.* 2003;4:37-48.
23. Tate DF, Dennis EL, Adams JT, et al. Coordinating Global Multi-Site Studies of Military-Relevant Traumatic Brain Injury: Opportunities, Challenges, and Harmonization Guidelines. Published online December 2019. doi:10.31234/osf.io/d4qs8
24. Dennis EL, Baron D, Bartnik-Olson B, et al. ENIGMA brain injury: Framework, challenges, and opportunities. *Human Brain Mapping.* Published online 2020. doi:10.1002/hbm.25046
25. Wilde EA, Dennis EL, Tate DF. The ENIGMA Brain Injury Working Group: Approach, Challenges, and Potential Benefits. *Brain Imaging Behav.* 2019;Under Review(Special Issue).
26. Thompson PM, Jahanshad N, Ching CRK, et al. ENIGMA and global neuroscience: A decade of large-scale studies of the brain in health and disease across more than 40 countries. *Transl Psychiatry.* 2020;10(1):100.
27. Jahanshad N, Kochunov PV, Sprooten E, et al. Multi-site genetic analysis of diffusion images and voxelwise heritability analysis: A pilot project of the ENIGMA-DTI working group. *Neuroimage.* 2013;81:455-469.
28. Dennis EL, Caeyenberghs K, Hoskinson KR, et al. White Matter Disruption in Pediatric Traumatic Brain Injury: Results from ENIGMA Pediatric Moderate to Severe Traumatic Brain Injury. *Neurology.* Published online May 28, 2021. doi:10.1212/WNL.00000000000012222
29. Dennis EL, Disner SG, Fani N, et al. Altered white matter microstructural organization in posttraumatic stress disorder across 3047 adults: results from the PGC-ENIGMA PTSD consortium. *Mol Psychiatry.* Published online December 19, 2019. doi:10.1038/s41380-019-0631-x
30. Kelly S, van Velzen L, Veltman D, et al. 941. White Matter Microstructural Differences in Major Depression: Meta-Analytic Findings from Enigma-MDD DTI. *Biol Psychiatry.* 2017;81(10):S381.

31. Kochunov P, Hong LE, Dennis EL, et al. ENIGMA -DTI: Translating reproducible white matter deficits into personalized vulnerability metrics in cross-diagnostic psychiatric research. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2020;7:1.
32. Smith SM, Jenkinson M, Johansen-Berg H, et al. Tract-based spatial statistics: voxelwise analysis of multi-subject diffusion data. *Neuroimage*. 2006;31(4):1487-1505.
33. Li J, Ji L. Adjusting multiple testing in multilocus analyses using the eigenvalues of a correlation matrix. *Heredity*. 2005;95(3):221-227.
34. Kochunov P, Williamson DE, Lancaster J, et al. Fractional anisotropy of water diffusion in cerebral white matter across the lifespan. *Neurobiol Aging*. Published online 2010:1-12.
35. Kennedy E, Dennis EL, Lindsey HM, et al. Harmonizing PTSD Severity Scales Across Instruments and Sites. *Neuropsychology*. Accepted.
36. Li M, Wang MC, Shou Y, et al. Psychometric Properties and Measurement Invariance of the Brief Symptom Inventory-18 Among Chinese Insurance Employees. *Front Psychol*. 2018;9:519.
37. Galdón MJ, Durá E, Andreu Y, et al. Psychometric properties of the Brief Symptom Inventory-18 in a Spanish breast cancer sample. *J Psychosom Res*. 2008;65(6):533-539.
38. Meterko M, Baker E, Stolzmann KL, Hendricks AM, Cicerone KD, Lew HL. Psychometric assessment of the Neurobehavioral Symptom Inventory-22: the structure of persistent postconcussive symptoms following deployment-related mild traumatic brain injury among veterans. *J Head Trauma Rehabil*. 2012;27(1):55-62.
39. Ryttilä-Manninen M, Fröjd S, Haravuori H, et al. Psychometric properties of the Symptom Checklist-90 in adolescent psychiatric inpatients and age- and gender-matched community youth. *Child Adolesc Psychiatry Ment Health*. 2016;10:23.
40. Sereda Y, Dembitskyi S. Validity assessment of the symptom checklist SCL-90-R and shortened versions for the general population in Ukraine. *BMC Psychiatry*. 2016;16:300.
41. Sánchez-Cubillo I, Periañez JA, Adrover-Roig D, et al. Construct validity of the Trail Making Test: role of task-switching, working memory, inhibition/interference control, and visuomotor abilities. *J Int Neuropsychol Soc*. 2009;15(3):438-450.
42. Lebel C, Gee M, Camicioli R, Wieler M, Martin W, Beaulieu C. Diffusion tensor imaging of white matter tract evolution over the lifespan. *Neuroimage*. 2012;60(1):340-352.
43. Budisavljevic S, Kawadler JM, Dell'Acqua F, et al. Heritability of the limbic networks. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci*. 2016;11(5):746-757.
44. Bettcher BM, Mungas D, Patel N, et al. Neuroanatomical substrates of executive functions: Beyond prefrontal structures. *Neuropsychologia*. 2016;85:100-109.
45. Jahanshad N, Lee A, Barysheva M, McMahon K. Genetic influences on brain asymmetry: A DTI study of 374 twins and siblings. *Neuroimage*. Published online 2010. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1053811910006488>
46. Bigler ED. Anterior and middle cranial fossa in traumatic brain injury: relevant neuroanatomy and

- neuropathology in the study of neuropsychological outcome. *Neuropsychology*. 2007;21(5):515-531.
47. Ware AL, Biekman B, Hachey R, et al. A Preliminary High-Definition Fiber Tracking Study of the Executive Control Network in Blast-Induced Traumatic Brain Injury. *J Neurotrauma*. 2019;36(5):686-701.
 48. Zhou Z, Li X, Domel AG, et al. The Presence of the Temporal Horn Exacerbates the Vulnerability of Hippocampus During Head Impacts. *Front Bioeng Biotechnol*. 2022;10:754344.
 49. Gong G, Jiang T, Zhu C, et al. Asymmetry analysis of cingulum based on scale-invariant parameterization by diffusion tensor imaging. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2005;24(2):92-98.
 50. Takao H, Hayashi N, Ohtomo K. White matter microstructure asymmetry: effects of volume asymmetry on fractional anisotropy asymmetry. *Neuroscience*. 2013;231:1-12.
 51. Metzler-Baddeley C, Jones DK, Steventon J, Westacott L, Aggleton JP, O'Sullivan MJ. Cingulum microstructure predicts cognitive control in older age and mild cognitive impairment. *J Neurosci*. 2012;32(49):17612-17619.
 52. Tsuchida A, Laurent A, Crivello F, et al. Changes in regional white matter volumetry and microstructure during the post-adolescence period: a cross-sectional study of a cohort of 1,713 university students. *bioRxiv*. Published online April 14, 2021. doi:10.1101/2021.04.13.439695
 53. Chatelin S, Deck C, Renard F, et al. Computation of axonal elongation in head trauma finite element simulation. *J Mech Behav Biomed Mater*. 2011;4(8):1905-1919.
 54. Zhang L, Gennarelli T. Mathematical modeling of diffuse brain injury: correlations of foci and severity of brain strain with clinical symptoms and pathology. *IRCOBI Impact Biomechanics*. Published online 2011. <http://www.ircobi.org/wordpress/downloads/irc0111/2011/Session1/13.pdf>
 55. Zhao W, Bartsch A, Benzel E, Miele V, Stemper BD. Regional brain injury vulnerability in football from two finite element models of the human head. *IRCOBI Florence*. Published online 2019. <http://www.ircobi.org/wordpress/downloads/irc19/pdf-files/89.pdf>
 56. Thiebaut de Schotten M, Ffytche DH, Bizzi A, et al. Atlasing location, asymmetry and inter-subject variability of white matter tracts in the human brain with MR diffusion tractography. *Neuroimage*. 2011;54(1):49-59.
 57. Wu TC, Wilde EA, Bigler ED, et al. Evaluating the relationship between memory functioning and cingulum bundles in acute mild traumatic brain injury using diffusion tensor imaging. *J Neurotrauma*. 2010;27(2):303-307.
 58. Kinnunen KM, Greenwood R, Powell JH, et al. White matter damage and cognitive impairment after traumatic brain injury. *Brain*. Published online 2010:awq347.
 59. Kraus MF, Susmaras T, Caughlin BP, Walker CJ, Sweeney JA, Little DM. White matter integrity and cognition in chronic traumatic brain injury: a diffusion tensor imaging study. *Brain*. 2007;130(Pt 10):2508-2519.
 60. Niogi SN, Mukherjee P, Ghajar J, et al. Extent of microstructural white matter injury in postconcussive syndrome correlates with impaired cognitive reaction time: a 3T diffusion tensor imaging study of mild traumatic brain injury. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. 2008;29(5):967-973.

61. Rutgers DR, Toulgoat F, Cazejust J, Fillard P, Lasjaunias P, Ducreux D. White matter abnormalities in mild traumatic brain injury: a diffusion tensor imaging study. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. 2008;29(3):514-519.
62. Yeh PH, Wang B, Oakes TR, et al. Postconcussional disorder and PTSD symptoms of military-related traumatic brain injury associated with compromised neurocircuitry. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2014;35(6):2652-2673.
63. Yurgelun-Todd DA, Bueler CE, McGlade EC, Churchwell JC, Brenner LA, Lopez-Larson MP. Neuroimaging correlates of traumatic brain injury and suicidal behavior. *J Head Trauma Rehabil*. 2011;26(4):276-289.
64. Lochner C, Fouché JP, du Plessis S, et al. Evidence for fractional anisotropy and mean diffusivity white matter abnormalities in the internal capsule and cingulum in patients with obsessive-compulsive disorder. *J Psychiatry Neurosci*. 2012;37(3):193-199.
65. Abdul-Rahman MF, Qiu A, Sim K. Regionally specific white matter disruptions of fornix and cingulum in schizophrenia. *PLoS One*. 2011;6(4):e18652.
66. Bonnelle V, Leech R, Kinnunen KM, et al. Default Mode Network Connectivity Predicts Sustained Attention Deficits after Traumatic Brain Injury. *Journal of Neuroscience*. 2011;31(38):13442-13451.
67. Sugiyama K, Kondo T, Oouchida Y, et al. Clinical utility of diffusion tensor imaging for evaluating patients with diffuse axonal injury and cognitive disorders in the chronic stage. *J Neurotrauma*. 2009;26(11):1879-1890.
68. Gómez-Gastiasoro A, Zubiaurre-Elorza L, Peña J, et al. Altered frontal white matter asymmetry and its implications for cognition in schizophrenia: A tractography study. *Neuroimage Clin*. 2019;22:101781.
69. Maruta J, Mallott JM, Sulioti G, Ghajar J, Palacios EM, Mukherjee P. Concussion Disrupts Normal Brain White Matter Microstructural Symmetry. *Front Neurol*. 2020;11:548220.
70. Vakhtin AA, Zhang Y, Wintermark M, et al. White Matter Asymmetry: A Reflection of Pathology in Traumatic Brain Injury. *J Neurotrauma*. 2020;37(2):373-381.
71. Dick AS, Tremblay P. Beyond the arcuate fasciculus: consensus and controversy in the connectional anatomy of language. *Brain*. 2012;135(Pt 12):3529-3550.
72. Wang X, Pathak S, Stefanescu L, Yeh FC, Li S, Fernandez-Miranda JC. Subcomponents and connectivity of the superior longitudinal fasciculus in the human brain. *Brain Struct Funct*. 2016;221(4):2075-2092.
73. De Schotten MT, Dell'Acqua F, Forkel S, et al. A lateralized brain network for visuo-spatial attention. *Nature Precedings*. Published online 2011:1-1.
74. Catani M, Allin MP, Husain M, et al. Symmetries in human brain language pathways correlate with verbal recall. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2007;104(43):17163-17168.
75. Hasan KM, Iftikhar A, Kamali A, et al. Development and aging of the healthy human brain uncinate fasciculus across the lifespan using diffusion tensor tractography. *Brain Res*. 2009;1276:67-76.
76. Hau J, Sarubbo S, Perchey G, et al. Cortical Terminations of the Inferior Fronto-Occipital and Uncinate Fasciculi: Anatomical Stem-Based Virtual Dissection. *Front Neuroanat*. 2016;10:58.
77. Hau J, Sarubbo S, Houde JC, et al. Revisiting the human uncinate fasciculus, its subcomponents and

asymmetries with stem-based tractography and microdissection validation. *Brain Struct Funct.* 2017;222(4):1645-1662.

Figure and Table Legends

Table 1. Demographic information across cohorts. Numbers are shown for total sample, TBI (any) and control groups, and male/female. The age range, average age in years with standard deviation (SD), sample TBI severity, and the TBI scale collected are also listed.

Figure 1. Group differences in cingulum asymmetry. Violin plots are shown for the no-TBI group (pink), and deployment-related TBI group (blue) with group *t*-test *p*-values. The values on the *y*-axis are the normalized residuals for cingulum asymmetry, laterality index, left FA, and right FA (left to right panels), accounting for age, gender, and the nested random effects of cohort and site. As the cingulum is generally left-lateralized, actual laterality index values are generally positive, but that is not reflected here due to the adjustments and normalization.

Table 2. Group differences in tract asymmetry. Results from group analyses are shown comparing deployment-related TBI to no TBI, blast-related TBI to no TBI, and pure blast TBI to no TBI, along with total sample size for each comparison. Cohen's *d*, 95% CI, and uncorrected *p*-values are shown, **bolded** statistics are those that survive correction for multiple comparisons, *italicized* statistics are those that do not survive multiple comparisons correction ($0.05 > p > 0.003125$). Region of interest (ROI) abbreviations: anterior corona radiata (ACR), anterior limb of internal capsule (ALIC), cingulum (CGC), hippocampal cingulum (CGH), corticospinal tract (CST), corona radiata (CR), external/extreme capsule (EC), fornix-stria terminalis (FX/ST), internal capsule (IC), posterior corona radiata (PCR), posterior limb of internal capsule (PLIC), posterior thalamic radiation (PTR), retrolenticular limb of internal capsule (RLIC), superior corona radiata (SCR), superior fronto-occipital fasciculus (SFO), superior longitudinal fasciculus (SLF), sagittal stratum (SS), tapetum (TAP), uncinata (UNC).

Figure 2. Group differences (based on LOC) in SLF asymmetry. Violin plots are shown for the no-TBI group (pink), and TBI with loss of consciousness (LOC) group (blue) with group *t*-test *p*-values. The values on the *y*-axis are the normalized residuals for SLF asymmetry, laterality index, left FA, and right FA (left to right panels), accounting for age, gender, and the nested random effects of cohort and site.

Table 3. Associations between tract asymmetry and symptoms. Linear regressions are shown for associations with somatic, affective, and posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) symptoms, with unstandardized β s and uncorrected *p*-values. Group *t*-tests are shown for PTSD and depression categorical variables. Sample sizes are shown for all analysis. **Bolded** *p*-values are those that survive correction for multiple comparisons, *italicized* *p*-values are those that do not survive multiple comparisons correction ($0.05 > p > 0.003125$). Region of interest (ROI) abbreviations can be found in the legend for **Table 2**.

Figure 3. Associations between cingulum microstructure and Trail Making Task (TMT) performance. The three panels (left to right) show significant associations between TMT-A, TMT-B, and TMT-BsubA completion time (in seconds) and left cingulum FA (normalized residuals accounting for age, gender, and the nested random effects of cohort and site). *P*-values are shown for all three regressions. Linear trend line shown with 95% confidence interval, calculated in R 3.6.0. Outliers ($>3SD$) were removed from the plots ($n=2$).

Figure 4. Associations between uncinata asymmetry and somatic symptoms. The left panel shows the significant association between somatic symptoms and uncinata asymmetry (normalized residuals accounting for age, gender, and the nested random effects of cohort and site). The right panel shows the null association between somatic symptoms and uncinata laterality index (normalized residuals accounting for age, gender, and the nested random effects of cohort and site). *P*-values are displayed for both regressions. Linear trend line shown with 95% confidence interval, calculated in R 3.6.0. Extreme outliers ($>5SD$) were removed from the plots ($n=5$).

Table 1. Demographic information across cohorts. Numbers are shown for total sample, TBI (any) and control groups, and male/female. The age range, average age in years with standard deviation (SD), sample TBI severity, and the TBI scale collected are also listed.

Site	Total N	TBI	Control	M	F	Age range	Average age (SD)	Severity	TBI Scale
ADNIDoD	109	67	42	109	0	60-85	69.6 (4.6)	Mod/Sev	Custom
BETTER/UMCU	84	12	72	84	0	21-57	36.2 (9.5)	Mild	Custom
CENC	1,028	837	191	891	137	22-70	40.1 (9.8)	Mild	PCE
Chronic Effects	80	64	16	72	8	23-54	34.7 (7.4)	Mild	Polytrauma
Duke1	105	70	35	86	19	24-46	39.6 (8.8)	Mild	MN-BEST/QCuBE
Duke2	84	50	34	58	26	23-67	40.1 (11.3)	Mild	MN-BEST/QCuBE
HDFT	28	23	5	23	5	24-58	36.9 (8.7)	Mild-mod	Custom
Houston Blast	42	32	10	39	3	21-54	32.4 (8.0)	Mild	Polytrauma
INTRuST	85	54	31	69	16	18-69	39.4 (12.8)	Mild	Custom
iSCORE	101	30	71	88	13	19-51	35.8 (7.7)	Mild	Custom
NICoE	258	210	48	246	12	19-59	39.4 (6.5)	Mild	OSU
Rover Wiser	53	23	30	34	19	21-58	31.4 (6.4)	Mild	Polytrauma
SPIRE/GBET	53	39	14	47	6	24-50	35.3 (6.9)	Mild-severe	Polytrauma
VA Minneapolis1	124	92	32	120	4	23-62	34.3 (8.5)	Mild	MN-BEST
VA Minneapolis2	130	99	31	121	9	22-59	32.8 (8.4)	Mild	MN-BEST
VETSA	234	73	161	234	0	56-66	61.8 (2.6)	Mild	Custom
Total	2,598	1,775	823	2,321	277	19-85	41.7 (12.7)		

Figure 1. Group differences in cingulum asymmetry. Violin plots are shown for the no-TBI group (red), and deployment-related TBI group (blue) with group *t*-test *p*-values. The values on the *y*-axis are the normalized residuals for cingulum asymmetry, laterality index, left FA, and right FA, accounting for age, gender, and the nested random effects of cohort and site. As the cingulum is generally left-lateralized, actual laterality index values are generally positive, but that is not reflected here due to the adjustments and normalization.




Table 2. Group differences in tract asymmetry. Results from group analyses are shown comparing deployment-related TBI to no TBI, blast-related TBI to no TBI, and pure blast TBI to no TBI, along with total sample size for each comparison. Cohen’s *d*, 95% CI, and uncorrected *p*-values are shown, **bolded** statistics are those that survive correction for multiple comparisons, *italicized* statistics are those that do not survive multiple comparisons correction ($0.05 > p > 0.003125$). Region of interest (ROI) abbreviations: anterior corona radiata (ACR), anterior limb of internal capsule (ALIC), cingulum (CGC), hippocampal cingulum (CGH), corticospinal tract (CST), corona radiata (CR), external/extreme capsule (EC), fornix-stria terminalis (FX/ST), internal capsule (IC), posterior corona radiata (PCR), posterior limb of internal capsule (PLIC), posterior thalamic radiation (PTR), retrolenticular limb of internal capsule (RLIC), superior corona radiata (SCR), superior fronto-occipital fasciculus (SFO), superior longitudinal fasciculus (SLF), sagittal stratum (SS), tapetum (TAP), uncinate (UNC).

ROIs	Deployment-related TBI (<i>n</i> =1,872)		Blast-related TBI (<i>n</i> =1,509)		Pure blast TBI (<i>n</i> =337)		HX of TBI with LOC	
	<i>d</i> [CI]	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i> [CI]	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i> [CI]	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i> [CI]	<i>p</i>
ACR	-0.01 [-0.11, 0.08]	0.75	-0.02 [-0.11, 0.07]	0.63	-0.06 [-0.16, 0.03]	0.17	0.06 [-0.04, 0.15]	0.24
ALIC	0.04 [-0.05, 0.13]	0.35	0.03 [-0.06, 0.12]	0.52	0.05 [-0.04, 0.14]	0.32	0.05 [-0.04, 0.14]	0.29
CGC	0.18 [0.08, 0.27]	0.00015	<i>0.11 [0.02, 0.20]</i>	<i>0.019</i>	-0.06 [-0.15, 0.04]	0.23	0.06 [-0.04, 0.15]	0.25
CGH	0.01 [-0.08, 0.10]	0.81	0.01 [-0.08, 0.10]	0.82	-0.04 [-0.13, 0.05]	0.39	0.02 [-0.07, 0.11]	0.66
CST	-0.08 [-0.17, 0.01]	0.086	-0.05 [-0.14, 0.04]	0.24	-0.07 [-0.16, 0.02]	0.12	-4.1e-3 [-0.09, 0.09]	0.93
CR	0.06 [-0.03, 0.15]	0.2	0.04 [-0.05, 0.13]	<i>0.41</i>	0.04 [-0.05, 0.14]	0.34	<i>0.12 [0.03, 0.21]</i>	<i>0.009</i>
EC	-0.04 [-0.13, 0.05]	0.42	-0.02 [-0.11, 0.07]	0.73	0.09 [0.00, 0.18]	0.056	-0.04 [-0.13, 0.05]	0.39
FX/ST	0.03 [-0.06, 0.12]	0.46	0.02 [-0.07, 0.11]	0.62	-0.07 [-0.16, 0.02]	0.14	0.03 [-0.06, 0.12]	0.54
IC	0.05 [-0.04, 0.14]	0.3	0.04 [-0.05, 0.13]	0.39	<i>0.11 [0.02, 0.20]</i>	<i>0.017</i>	0.02 [-0.07, 0.11]	0.68
PCR	0.04 [-0.05, 0.13]	0.39	0.04 [-0.05, 0.13]	0.42	0.02 [-0.07, 0.12]	0.6	0.06 [-0.03, 0.16]	0.17
PLIC	1.0e-3 [-0.09, 0.09]	0.98	-0.01 [-0.10, 0.08]	0.78	5.1e-3 [-0.09, 0.10]	0.91	-0.03 [-0.12, 0.06]	0.46
PTR	0.07 [-0.02, 0.16]	0.12	0.06 [-0.03, 0.15]	0.19	0.05 [-0.04, 0.14]	0.27	0.07 [-0.02, 0.16]	0.15
RLIC	3.0e-3 [-0.09, 0.09]	0.95	0.02 [-0.07, 0.11]	0.71	0.08 [-0.01, 0.17]	0.088	0.04 [-0.05, 0.13]	0.42
SCR	0.06 [-0.03, 0.15]	0.22	0.09 [0.00, 0.18]	0.055	0.05 [-0.04, 0.14]	0.31	-1.5e-3 [-0.09, 0.09]	0.97
SFO	-0.03 [-0.12, 0.06]	0.55	0.02 [-0.07, 0.11]	0.69	0.02 [-0.07, 0.11]	0.73	0.04 [-0.06, 0.13]	0.44
SLF	<i>0.10 [0.01, 0.19]</i>	<i>0.027</i>	0.06 [-0.03, 0.15]	0.18	0.03 [-0.06, 0.12]	0.57	0.13 [0.05, 0.23]	0.0018
SS	0.07 [-0.02, 0.16]	0.13	0.05 [-0.04, 0.14]	0.26	-0.06 [-0.15, 0.04]	0.24	0.06 [-0.03, 0.15]	0.18
TAP	-0.08 [-0.18, 0.01]	0.068	-0.02 [-0.11, 0.07]	0.63	0.03 [-0.06, 0.12]	0.53	-0.02 [-0.11, 0.07]	0.66
UNC	0.02 [-0.07, 0.11]	0.67	0.02 [-0.07, 0.11]	0.67	0.03 [-0.06, 0.13]	0.45	0.04 [-0.05, 0.13]	0.35

Figure 2. Group differences (based on LOC) in SLF asymmetry. Violin plots are shown for the no-TBI group (red), and TBI with loss of consciousness (LOC) group (blue) with group *t*-test *p*-values. The values on the *y*-axis are the normalized residuals for SLF asymmetry, laterality index, left FA, and right FA (left to right panels), accounting for age, gender, and the nested random effects of cohort and site.




Table 3. Associations between tract asymmetry and symptoms. Linear regressions are shown for associations with somatic, affective, and posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) symptoms, with unstandardized β s and uncorrected p -values. Cohen's d with 95% CI are shown for PTSD and depression categorical variables. Sample sizes are shown for all analysis. **Bolded** p -values are those that survive correction for multiple comparisons, *italicized* p -values are those that do not survive multiple comparisons correction ($0.05 > p > 0.003125$). Region of interest (ROI) abbreviations can be found in the legend for **Table 2**.

ROIs	Somatic symptoms ($n=1,446$)	Affective symptoms ($n=1,447$)	PTSD (Yes/No, $n=2,546$)	PTSD severity ($n=1,791$)	Depression (Yes/No, $n=2,208$)
ACR	0.012 (0.024)	0.0091 (0.018)	1.3e-3 [-0.08, 0.08]	8.6e-5 (0.22)	0.02 [-0.07, 0.10]
ALIC	-1.4e-4 (0.98)	0.0026 (0.53)	0.03 [-0.05, 0.11]	3.4e-5 (0.48)	-5.1e-3 [-0.09, 0.08]
CGC	0.0095 (0.31)	-2.9e-4 (0.97)	0.04 [-0.04, 0.12]	1.4e-5 (0.87)	0.03 [-0.05, 0.11]
CGH	0.0090 (0.33)	0.0087 (0.18)	0.02 [-0.06, 0.10]	9.2e-5 (0.31)	0.03 [-0.05, 0.11]
CST	-0.0033 (0.30)	-0.0015 (0.50)	-0.05 [-0.13, 0.03]	-1.7e-5 (0.48)	-0.03 [-0.11, 0.05]
CR	0.0062 (0.50)	0.0030 (0.66)	-0.01 [-0.09, 0.07]	2.2e-5 (0.81)	-2.6e-3 [-0.09, 0.08]
EC	-0.0046 (0.40)	-0.0015 (0.69)	-7.1e-3 [-0.08, 0.07]	-6.7e-5 (0.11)	-0.02 [-0.11, 0.06]
FX/ST	0.011 (0.14)	0.0058 (0.28)	0.07 [-0.01, 0.15]	3.8e-5 (0.52)	0.05 [-0.03, 0.13]
IC	-8.3e-4 (0.82)	-7.8e-4 (0.76)	-4.0e-3 [-0.08, 0.07]	4.9e-6 (0.86)	0.03 [-0.05, 0.11]
PCR	-9.1e-4 (0.86)	-0.0018 (0.63)	0.04 [-0.04, 0.12]	-1.6e-5 (0.68)	7.7e-3 [-0.08, 0.09]
PLIC	0.0035 (0.57)	-6.9e-4 (0.87)	-6.3e-4 [-0.08, 0.08]	2.9e-5 (0.52)	0.02 [-0.06, 0.11]
PTR	0.0069 (0.26)	0.0024 (0.58)	0.05 [-0.03, 0.13]	4.4e-5 (0.36)	1.1e-4 [-0.08, 0.08]
RLIC	-0.0027 (0.61)	-0.0034 (0.37)	-2.3e-3 [-0.08, 0.08]	1.8e-6 (0.96)	-0.04 [-0.13, 0.04]
SCR	-0.0046 (0.27)	-0.0050 (0.092)	<i>-0.08 [-0.16, -0.01]</i>	-3.8e-5 (0.22)	-0.03 [-0.11, 0.05]
SFO	-0.0042 (0.62)	-0.0039 (0.52)	-0.02 [-0.10, 0.06]	-1.0e-4 (0.29)	4.0e-3 [-0.08, 0.09]
SLF	8.8e-4 (0.86)	-9.2e-4 (0.79)	-0.03 [-0.11, 0.05]	-2.2e-5 (0.52)	-0.01 [-0.09, 0.07]
SS	0.013 (0.076)	0.011 (0.041)	<i>0.11 [0.04, 0.19]</i>	<i>1.8e-4 (0.0034)</i>	0.07 [-0.01, 0.16]
TAP	0.0051 (0.62)	0.0046 (0.53)	-5.2e-3 [-0.08, 0.07]	8.0e-7 (0.99)	-0.06 [-0.14, 0.02]
UNC	0.055 (0.00040)	0.029 (0.009)	0.04 [-0.03, 0.12]	<i>3.2e-4 (0.0036)</i>	0.03 [-0.05, 0.12]

Figure 3. Associations between cingulum microstructure and Trail Making Task (TMT) performance. The three panels (left to right) show significant associations between TMT-A, TMT-B, and TMT-BsubA completion time (in seconds) and left cingulum FA (normalized residuals accounting for age, gender, and the nested random effects of cohort and site). *P*-values are shown for all three regressions. Linear trend line shown with 95% confidence interval, calculated in R 3.6.0. Outliers (>3SD) were removed from the plots ($n=2$).




Figure 4. Associations between uncinate asymmetry and somatic symptoms. The left panel shows the significant association between somatic symptoms and uncinate asymmetry (normalized residuals accounting for age, gender, and the nested random effects of cohort and site). The right panel shows the null association between somatic symptoms and uncinate laterality index (normalized residuals accounting for age, sex, and the nested random effects of cohort and site). *P*-values are displayed for both regressions. Linear trend line shown with 95% confidence interval, calculated in R 3.6.0. Extreme outliers ($>5SD$) were removed from the plots ($n=5$).

