A comparison of diffusion MRI presurgical tractography techniques with intraoperative mapping-based validation

Supplementary information

Radwan, A.M.^{1,2}, Emsell, L.^{1,2,3,4}, Vansteelandt, K.^{2,3,4}, Cleeren, E.⁵, Peeters, R.⁶, De Vleeschouwer, S.^{2,7,8}, Theys, T.^{2,7,8}, Dupont P.^{2,9}, Sunaert S.^{1,2,6}

- 1. KU Leuven, Department of Imaging and pathology, Translational MRI, Leuven, Belgium
- 2. KU Leuven, Leuven Brain Institute (LBI), Department of Neurosciences, Leuven, Belgium
- 3. KU Leuven, Department of Neurosciences, Neuropsychiatry, Leuven, Belgium
- 4. KU Leuven, Department of Geriatric Psychiatry, University Psychiatric Center (UPC), Leuven, Belgium
- 5. UZ Leuven, Department of Neurology, Leuven, Belgium
- 6. UZ Leuven, Department of Radiology, Leuven, Belgium
- 7. KU Leuven, Department of Neurosciences, Research Group Experimental Neurosurgery and Neuroanatomy, Leuven, Belgium
- 8. UZ Leuven, Department of Neurosurgery, Leuven, Belgium
- 9. KU Leuven, Laboratory for Cognitive Neurology, Department of Neurosciences, Leuven, Belgium

Tractogram filtering details

In addition to the methods previously described for KUL_FWT we also used templatebased tractogram filtering with RecoBundles[1] as implemented in Scilpy [2] (scil_recognize_single_bundle.py) with model clustering threshold = 4 and pruning threshold = 8. Patient tractograms were warped to the template space prior to template-based filtering by applying ANTs generated warps and transforms to the bundle using MRtrix3.

DES stimulation parameters

DES Stimulation parameters followed the protocol described by Duffau et al. [3] (60 Hz) in anaesthetized patients, and the low frequency protocol described by Zangaladze et al.[4] (5 Hz) in awake patients, stimulation started with 2-4 mA and gradually increased to 20 mA, or until a positive response was found. DES coordinates were considered positive if stimulation interfered with task performance or elicited a motor or sensory effect reported by the patient, observed by the attending neurophysiologist, or recorded on MEP/SSEP. DES coordinates were considered negative if no response could be elicited up to 20 mA in stimulation amplitude, and no effects were found if resection approaches its location.

Baseline cortical DES mapping was done before resection, testing locations were chosen based on visible anatomical landmarks in the surgical field and the coregistered MR images. DES tested locations were marked by sterile square markers, registered in the neuronavigation system, and continuously tested during resection. Coordinates were considered positive if an observable response was elicited, and negative if no response was elicited up to 20 mA nor during resection. Positive DES (pDES) and negative DES (nDES), cortical and subcortical coordinates, were saved and included in this analysis. The choice of DES mapping approach was based on lesion location and awake surgery feasibility. The bundles of interest were defined based on the neurosurgical treatment plan. **S.table 2** lists the details of the DES protocol per patient.

The DES spheres were collapsed to their centers of gravity (COG) after warping to T1 space of each patient and recreated with the same radii to mitigate deformations resulting from registration.

The following Python packages were used in an automated script in Python v3.8 to measure the minimum Euclidean distances between DES coordinates and tractograms: nibabel v3.2.2[5], numpy v1.22.3[6], scipy v1.4.1[7].

Two-part linear model details

The first part (A) used a logit-link for binary response (distance=0 vs. distance >0) and a generalized linear mixed model to predict probability of nonoverlap (distance > 0), and the second part (B) used a log-normal linear mixed model for the distance measures (distance >0) between nonoverlapping tractogram-DES coordinate pairs.

The thresholded distance measures were used as the dependent variable and DES response type (positive and negative), tractography methods (FACT, TP, ATP, iFOD2, and AiFOD2) were used as predictors in both parts of the model. Both models were adjusted for bundle to TIV and lesion to TIV ratios, which were used as covariates, and DES response type x tractography methods interactions were considered but were omitted as they were not significant.

For ease of interpretation, we discuss and plot the probability of overlap (distance = 0) for the first part (A), and log distances (B) from the second part are back-transformed to distance in mm.

Results were interpreted in the following context: Predicted probability of overlap (distance < cutoff) with pDES coordinates was analogous to true-positive rate. Predicted probability of overlap with nDES coordinates was analogous to false-positive rate. Predicted distances to non-overlapping (distance > cutoff) nDES coordinates were analogous to true-negative rate, and predicted distances to non-overlapping pDES coordinates were analogous to false-negative rate.

Supplementary table 1(a): Patient demographics, pathology results, lesion lobe, side and volume											
Patients	Age	Gender	Lesion type	WHO grade	Pathology report	Lesion lobe	Lesion side	Lesion volume (ml)			
PT001	60 - 65	М	Glioma	IV	Glioblastoma	Fronto-parietal	R	66.809			
PT002	5 – 10	F	FCD	Ι	Type I	ype I Frontal		1.200			
PT003	35 – 40	М	Meningio ma		Transitional type meningioma Frontal		L	54.079			
PT004	30 – 35	F	Glioma	II	Oligodendrogliom a Fronto-parietal		L	124.775			
PT005	70 – 75	М	Glioma	IV	Glioblastoma	Parieto- occipital	R	32.382			
PT006	40 – 45	F	Glioma	IV	Glioblastoma	Temporo- fronto-parietal	R	217.077			
PT007	65 – 70	F	Glioma	IV	Glioblastoma	Frontal	R	26.779			
PT008	35 – 40	М	Glioma	IV	Glioblastoma	Temporo- fronto-parietal	L	88.917			
PT009	10 – 15	М	FCD		Type IIB	Frontal	L	15.666			
PT010	60 – 65	М	Glioma	IV	Glioblastoma	Fronto-parietal	R	93.831			
PT011	40 – 45	М	Glioma	Ξ	Multifocal astrocytoma	Fronto- temporo- parieto-occipital	R	123.293			
PT012	60 – 65	F	Glioma	=	Oligodendrogliom a	Frontal	L	53.331			
PT013	45 – 50	F	FCD		Type IIB	Parietal	L	5.224			
PT014	30 – 35	М	Glioma	III	Oligodendrogliom a	Frontal	R	92.154			
PT015	35 – 40	М	Glioma	IV	Glioblastoma	Frontal	R	232.129			
PT016	30 – 35	F	Glioma	II	Oligodendrogliom a	Parietal	L	22.553			
PT017	60 – 65	М	Glioma	IV	Glioblastoma	Parietal	R	42.517			
PT018	30 – 35	F	Glioma		Oligodendrogliom a	Frontal	L	46.887			
PT019	55 – 60	М	Glioma		Astrocytoma	Fronto- temporal	L	40.208			
PT020	55 – 60	М	Glioma	II	Oligodendrogliom a	Frontal	L	11.531			
PT021	15 – 20	М	FCD		Type IIB	Frontal	R	4.806			
PT022	10 – 15	М	DNET	Ι	DNET	Frontal	L	34.207			
PT = pat neuroepith	tient, M = helial tum	· male, F or, WHO	= female = world he	, FCD ealth or	= focal cortical dy ganization, R = rig	/splasia, DNET = jht, L = left, ml	= dysemb = milliliter	ryoplastic rs, IQR =			

interquartile range

Supplementary table 1(b): Summarized demographics, pathological type, distribution and volumes									
Age and Gender	_esion								
	Туре	Side	Cerebral lobar distribution	Lesion volumes					
Age range=8 - 73 years Median age=39.5 years IQR=28 years 14 males 8 females	18 neoplasms: 16 gliomas 1 meningioma 1 dysembryoplastic neuro-epithelial tumor 4 focal cortical dysplasia	10 R 12 L	3 fronto-parietal 1 fronto-temporal 11 frontal 3 parietal 1 parieto-occipital 2 Temporo-fronto- parietal 1 Fronto-temporo- parieto-occipital (multifocal lesion)	Range=1.2 - 232.13 ml Median=44.70 IQR=71.74					
PT = patient, M = male, F = female, FCD = focal cortical dysplasia, DNET = dysembryoplastic neuroepithelial tumor, WHO = world health organization, R = right, L = left, ml = milliliters, IQR = interquartile range									

Supplementary table 2: Direct electrical stimulation (DES) mapping and dMRI and tractography details											
Patients	Awake surgery	DES +ve/-ve	Positive DES effect	Stimulation threshold Ctx/SubCtx	dMRI data	Bundles					
PT001	Y	1/6	Motor dysarthria	20 / -mA	2 shells + RP- B0	AF + CST					
PT002	Ν	4/6	Motor right leg, foot, wrist, and hand	6 / 4 mA	2 shells + RP- B0	CST					
PT003	Y	3/3	Motor right leg, foot, and hand	4 mA	2 shells + RP- B0	CST					
PT004	Y	1/7	Motor face, right hand, and arm	- / 5 mA	1 shell (b2500) + RP-B0	AF + CST					
PT005	Y	2/4	Motor left hand	16 / 5 mA	2 shells + RP- B0	CST					
PT006	Y	2/8	Sensory-Motor left leg	20 / 5 mA	2 shells + RP- B0	CST					
PT007	Y	2/6	Sensory-motor left leg	16 / 10 mA	2 shells + RP- B0	CST					
PT008	Y	2/5	Difficulty finding words, and sensory mouth	20 / 2 mA	1 shell (b1200)	AF + CST					
PT009	Y	2/4	Speech arrest, paraphasia, and motor face	8 / - mA	2 shells + RP- B0	AF + CST					
PT010	Ν	3/0	Motor left leg	Not recorded	2 shells + RP- B0	CST					
PT011	Y	0/6	None	-	2 shells + RP- B0	CST					
PT012	Y	0/7	None	-	1 shell (b1200) + RP-B0	AF					
PT013	Y	7/0	Sensory-motor right arm and hand	10 / 5 mA	2 shells + RP- B0	CST					
PT014	Y	2/6	Motor left hand and foot	12 / - mA	2 shells + RP- B0	CST					
PT015	Ν	2/0	Motor left hand	- / 10 mA	2 shells + RP- B0	CST					
PT016	Y	3/6	Motor right hand	12 / 5 mA	1 shell (b1200) + RP-B0	CST					
PT017	Y	2/2	Motor left foot, leg, hand and arm	4 / 12 mA	2 shells + RP- B0	CST					
PT018	Y	3/8	Motor right hand, lips, and dysarthria	20 / 5 mA	1 shell (b1200)	CST					
PT019	Y	1/6	Motor right hand	20 / 10 mA	2 shells + RP- B0	CST					
PT020	Y	1/4	Motor right arm	- / 10 mA	1 shell (b1200) + RP-B0	AF + CST					
PT021	Y	3/6	Motor left wrist and hand	4 mA	2 shells + RP- B0	CST					
PT022	Y	0/8	None	-	2 shells + RP- B0	AF					

PT = patient, DES = direct electrical stimulation, +ve = positive DES, -ve = negative DES, dMRI = diffusion magnetic resonance imaging, AF = arcuate fasciculus, CST = corticospinal tract, Y = awake surgery, N = general anaesthesia with motor and somatosensory evoked potentials (MEP/SSEP), Ctx = cortical, SubCtx= subcortical, mA = milliampere, RP-B0 = reversed-phase non-diffusion weighted spin-echo EPI volume.

6



shown in green are generated from volume rendered voxel masks with the T1-brain image silhouette shown underneath. The other 4 methods Supplementary figure 1 Arcuate fasciculi (AF) representative images using all methods in lateral projection. The FACT tractogram outputs tractography by second order integration over spherical harmonics, AiFOD2 = anatomically constrained iFOD2 assignment by continuous tracking, TP tensor probabilistic, ATP = anatomically constrained tensor probabilistic, iFOD2 = probabilistic TP, ATP, iFOD2, and AiFOD2 are shown as 3D rendered streamlines with end-point directional color coding. PT = patient, FACT = fiber

Supplementary table 3: Descriptive statistics for distance measures per tractography method											
DES type	Bundle	FT	Mean	StDev	Median	Q1	Q3	IQR	Var	Range	Ν
pDES		FACT	12.37	11.73	8	2.25	21	18.75	137.57	0 - 39	46
		TP	13.14	11.76	8.50	3.75	22	18.25	138.21	0 - 39	44
		ATP	14.78	11.45	10.50	5.25	23	17.75	131.15	0 - 39	46
		iFOD2	5.22	6.75	2	1	6	5	45.51	0 - 34	46
	Сет	AiFOD2	4.89	6.06	3	1	6	5	36.68	0 - 27	46
nDES	631	FACT	27.24	12.47	28	19	37	18	155.42	3 - 57	93
		TP	27.37	12.18	29	19.50	37	17.50	148.40	1 - 54	85
		ATP	30.23	12.16	32	22.50	39	16.50	147.83	3 - 58	93
		iFOD2	15.68	10.79	13	6.50	22	15.50	116.42	0 - 43	93
		AiFOD2	15.78	10.71	13	8	21	13	114.59	0 - 48	93
		FACT	12.80	6.18	13	12	17	5	38.20	3 - 19	5
		TP	9.40	3.85	10	6	12	6	14.80	5 - 14	5
pDES		ATP	8.60	3.58	8	6	10	4	12.80	5 - 14	5
		iFOD2	5.60	5.41	3	2	8	6	29.30	1 - 14	5
	۸E	AiFOD2	5.20	4.82	4	2	8	6	23.20	0 - 12	5
	Аг	FACT	15	10.71	12	6.25	21.75	15.50	114.76	0 - 40	30
		TP	13.90	11.26	13.50	3.50	21	17.50	126.78	0 - 42	30
nDES		ATP	14	11.84	11.50	4.25	20.50	16.25	140.07	0 - 42	30
		iFOD2	9.37	7.79	8.50	2.75	12.75	10	60.66	0 - 33	30
		AiFOD2	9.67	8.25	8	3.50	13.50	10	68.09	0 - 35	30
DES = dire	ct electric	al stimulat	tion, pDE	ES = pos	itive DES	, nDES	S = nega	ative DES	S, FT = fibe	r tractogr	aphy

method, StDev = standard deviation, Q = quartile, IQR = interquartile range, Var = variance, N = number, FACT = fiber assignment by continuous tracking, TP = tensor probabilistic, ATP = anatomically constrained TP, iFOD2 = probabilistic tractography by second-order integration over spherical harmonics, AiFOD2 = anatomically constrained iFOD2



Supplementary figure 2 Box and violin plots of distance measures by bundle type, DES response type and tractography method. Results for the CST are shown on the left, for the AF on the right, for pDES on top, and for nDES on the bottom. The highlighted circle at the center of each violin plot indicates the median distance value, the box within each violin indicates the interquartile range, and the central line represents the range. FACT = fiber assignment by continuous tracking, TP tensor probabilistic, ATP = anatomically constrained tensor probabilistic, iFOD2 = probabilistic tractography by second order integration over spherical harmonics, AiFOD2 = anatomically constrained iFOD2



Supplementary figure 3 ROC plots for raw distance measures pooled for all methods (black), DTI (blue), and CSD (red), showing the optimal distance cutoff, and area under the curve (AUC), and comparisons in bottom right panel. FACT = fiber assignment by continuous tracking, TP tensor probabilistic, ATP = anatomically constrained tensor probabilistic, iFOD2 = probabilistic tractography by second order integration over spherical harmonics, AiFOD2 = anatomically constrained iFOD2



Supplementary figure 4: ROC plots for each tractography method using raw distances on the left, and using averaged distances per patient for nDES and pDES separately on the right. Also shown are the optimal distance cutoffs, and area under the curve (AUC), and all methods ROCs compared in bottom right panel. FACT = fiber assignment by continuous tracking, TP tensor probabilistic, ATP = anatomically constrained tensor probabilistic, iFOD2 = probabilistic tractography by second order integration over spherical harmonics, AiFOD2 = anatomically constrained iFOD2

Supplementary table 4: Summarized results of DeLong pairwise tests comparing the ROC curves from averaged distance measures										
Pairwise comparisons	Estimate1	Estimate2	Statistic	p.value	Conf.low	Conf.high				
FACT v TP	67.46	64.15	0.62	0.54	-0.07	0.14				
FACT v ATP	67.46	68.18	-0.22	0.82	-0.07	0.06				
FACT v iFOD2	67.46	77.38	-1.45	0.15	-0.23	0.03				
FACT v AiFOD2	67.46	77.69	-1.55	0.12	-0.23	0.03				
TP v ATP	64.15	68.18	-0.81	0.42	-0.14	0.06				
TP v iFOD2	64.15	77.38	-1.84	0.07	-0.27	0.01				
TP v AiFOD2	64.15	77.69	-1.92	0.05	-0.27	0.00				
ATP v iFOD2	68.18	77.38	-1.37	0.17	-0.22	0.04				
ATP v AiFOD2 68.18 77.69 -1.46 0.15 -0.22 0.0										
iFOD2 v AiFOD2	77.38	77.69	-0.21	0.84	-0.03	0.03				
ROC = receiver operating characteristic, Conf. = confidence interval, DES = direct electrical stimulation, pDES = positive DES, nDES = negative DES, FT = fiber tractography method, StDev = standard deviation, Q = quartile, IQR = interquartile range, Var = variance, N = number, FACT = fiber assignment by continuous tracking, TP = tensor probabilistic, ATP = anatomically constrained TP, iFOD2 = probabilistic tractography by second-order integration over spherical harmonics, AiFOD2 = anatomically constrained iFOD2										

Tractogram similarity analysis results (46 words)

DSC and JI scores were used to evaluate the similarity of tractograms across different FT methods. As expected, we found higher similarity between AiFOD2 and iFOD2 than between TP, ATP and iFOD2 bundles. However, clinical DTI FACT tractograms also showed higher DSC and JI compared to TP and ATP, see **S.table 5** for summarized descriptive statistics of tractogram similarity measures. Tractogram shape similarity analysis using DSC and JI with iFOD2 tractograms as the reference showed the expected pattern of mild to moderate similarity between DTI and iFOD2 tractograms. This also showed that the CSD-based and DTI-based tractograms were not identical among themselves, confirming the differences noted visually.

Supplementary table 5: Summarized descriptive statistics for bundle similarity measures for all methods compared to iFOD2

Tractography methods	FACT		т	Ρ	A	ГР	AiFOD2		
Measures	JI	DSC	JI	DSC	JI	DSC	JI	DSC	
max	0.41	0.59	0.34	0.51	0.42	0.59	0.76	0.86	
min	0.10	0.18	0.13	0.23	0.06	0.11	0.51	0.68	
mean	0.26	0.41	0.24	0.39	0.20	0.32	0.66	0.80	
median	0.25	0.39	0.24	0.39	0.20	0.33	0.69	0.82	
stdev	0.09	0.11	0.06	0.08	0.08	0.11	0.07	0.05	
IQR	0.08	0.10	0.06	0.08	0.04	0.06	0.02	0.02	

iFOD2 = second order integration over fiber orientation distributions, FACT = fiber assignment by continuous tracking, TP = tensor probabilistic, ATP = anatomically constrained TP, AiFOD2= anatomically constrained iFOD2, JI = Jaccard index, DSC = Dice similarity coefficient, stdev = standard deviation, IQR = interquartile range

Supplementary table 6: Results of post hoc tests after two-part linear modeling for the CST at 10.5 mm distance cutoff

Test	Df	Model	Т	Puncorr	PFWE	Model	Т	Puncorr	PFWE
FACT v TP for DES and CST	18	А	-1.07	0.298	0.595	В	-1.28	0.218	0.537
FACT v ATP for DES and CST	18	А	-2.30	0.034	0.102	В	-2.48	0.023	0.070
FACT v iFOD2 DES and CST	18	А	5.01	<0.001	<0.001	В	7.19	<0.001	<0.001
FACT v AiFOD2 DES and CST	18	А	4.98	<0.001	<0.001	В	7.26	<0.001	<0.001
TP v ATP for DES and CST	18	А	-1.26	0.225	0.595	В	-1.14	0.269	0.537
TP v iFOD2 for DES and CST	18	А	5.94	<0.001	<0.001	В	8.24	<0.001	<0.001
TP v AiFOD2 for DES and CST	18	А	5.93	<0.001	<0.001	В	8.33	<0.001	<0.001
ATP v iFOD2 for DES and CST	18	А	6.85	<0.001	<0.001	В	9.44	<0.001	<0.001
ATP v AiFOD2 DES and CST	18	А	6.84	<0.001	<0.001	В	9.54	<0.001	<0.001
IFOD2 v AiFOD2 DES and CST	18	А	-0.06	0.956	0. 956	В	-0.07	0.941	0.941

CST = corticospinal tract, FACT = fiber assignment by continuous tracking, TP = tensor probabilistic, ATP = anatomically constrained TP, iFOD2 = second order integration over fiber orientation distributions, AiFOD2 = anatomically constrained iFOD2, DF = degrees of freedom, T = t-statistic, P_{uncorr} = uncorrected p values, P_{FWE} = Hochberg family-wise error rate corrected p values



Supplementary figure 5: Bar plots for predicted probability of overlap between the CST and DES coordinates (Top) and predicted distances to nonoverlapping DES coordinates (Bottom) at 10.5 mm distance cutoff. CSD methods showed significantly higher probability of overlap, and lower distance if not overlapping compared to DTI methods. Differences between nDES and pDES were comparable between FT methods. CST = corticospinal tract, FACT = fiber assignment by continuous tracking, TP = tensor probabilistic, ATP = anatomically constrained TP, iFOD2 = probabilistic tractography by second order integration over spherical harmonics, AiFOD2 = anatomically constrained iFOD2, four-, five-, and eight-pointed stars denote significant pairwise differences between FT methods.

Bibliography

- 1. Garyfallidis E, Côté M-A, Rheault F, et al (2018) Recognition of white matter bundles using local and global streamline-based registration and clustering. NeuroImage 170:283–295. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2017.07.015
- 2. Bore A, Rheault F, Theaud G, Théberge A (2021) Scilpy. https://github.com/scilus/scilpy. Accessed 3 Aug 2021
- Duffau H, Capelle L, Sichez J, et al (1999) Intra-operative direct electrical stimulations of the central nervous system: the Salpêtrière experience with 60 patients. Acta Neurochir (Wien) 141:1157–1167. https://doi.org/10.1007/s007010050413
- 4. Zangaladze A, Sharan A, Evans J, et al (2008) The effectiveness of low-frequency stimulation for mapping cortical function. Epilepsia 49:481–487. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1528-1167.2007.01307.x
- 5. Brett M, Markiewicz CJ, Hanke M, et al (2022) nipy/nibabel: 3.2.2
- 6. Harris CR, Millman KJ, van der Walt SJ, et al (2020) Array programming with NumPy. Nature 585:357–362. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2649-2
- 7. Virtanen P, Gommers R, Oliphant TE, et al (2020) SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. Nat Methods 17:261–272. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-019-0686-2