NIH fMRI Summer Course What's neuronal and what's not in fMRI

Daniel Handwerker

June 17, 2016

What makes us think this is neural?

What makes us think this is neural?

ICA component from a resting state run

Bright & Murphy, *NeuroImage* 2015

What makes us think this is neural?

Just because it's published doesn't mean it's neural

This is your brain on...love

Yes, it's possible to see that head-over-heels feeling. Anthropologist Helen Fisher, Ph.D., scanned the brains of 17 people who'd been in love for an average of seven months. As they stared at photos of their beloved, certain neural areas lit up on-screen. Says Fisher, "The brain in love reacts in a specific way. It's hard to control." Bottom line: You may think you're following your heart, but it's all in your head. -JO PIAZZA

When you're in love, blood flow increases to a region of the brain[®] that's responsible for motivation. It's illuminated here.

love quickie Is commitmentphobia dead? 75% of single women and men are "serious

Glamour, March 2004

We don't know any fMRI results are neural

… but, for a well designed and reported study, we can be *reasonably* confident

Where does this confidence come from? Confidence for neuroscience as a field Confidence for an individual study

Where does confidence in fMRI come from?

- Confidence for neuroscience as a field (See also Peter Bandettini's 5/31 talk)
	- A plausible mechanism
	- Results match our understanding of brain function
	- Complementary studies with other measures
- Confidence for an individual study
	- Task based fMRI
	- Resting state fMRI
	- A task based case study

in vitro Deoxy Hb is an intrinsic MRI contrast agent

100% oxygenated blood

Oxygenated hemoglobin

Deoxygenated hemoglobin

BOLD Blood Oxygen Level Dependent

20% O

in vivo

Plausibility: The mechanism behind fMRI **i**
ו n
Ex
Ox ge
De
De eh
en
Ers served in the CMR of the $\mathop{\text{in}}$
Ext d
ract F
i N on $\mathbf 1$ on a particular strategy of analysis. stimulation was applied. Muscular activity was not affected determined by electromyography. No alteration in systemic in finger flexors or extensors by this stimulation modality, as blood pressure was induced by stimulus onset or offset.

p. 1
1
1 \sum_{m} and the fingers are finded state measurements (unit defined vibrotactile stimulation of the final vibrotactile stimulation of the final vibrotactile stimulation of the final vibrotactile subsection of the final $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$ Cerebral Cerebral Oxygen
Blood Flow Metabolism Rate Oxygen Extraction **Cerebral**
Blood Flow Fraction $\frac{26}{100}$ and $\mathcal{L} = \{ \mathcal{L} \mid \mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{L} \}$ "Rest" $1/$ (NIN100 \overline{a}

CBF goes up more than CMR_{O2} . This uncoupling produces a highly significant decrease in the local OEF (-19% of mean), indicating that tissue P_{02} rose during stimulation.

Less deoxyhemoglobin in a voxel (volume) results in a larger Blood Oxygen Level Dependent (BOLD) MRI measurement

The fMRI BOLD time course

This shows what happens, not why it happens

What types of neural activity use energy?

We know a lot about neurovascular coupling
It's not directly driven by oxygen or energy needs

Elizabeth Hillman, Annual Review of Neuroscience 2014. 37:161–81

There's still a lot we don't know about neurovascular coupling

Elizabeth Hillman, Annual Review of Neuroscience 2014. 37:161–81

One example of neurovascular coupling complexity Breath Hold Visual Stimulation 80 80 8 CBF CBF,CBV,CBVa change (%) 60 CBV し o ~ ~ e
BOLD signal change (%) BF,CBV,CBVa change (%) 60 8 6 CBVa **BOLD** signal change 40 **BOLD** 40 $\overline{\mathbf{4}}$ 20 20 -20 -20 20 40 60 0 20 40 60 time (second)

time (second)

Figure 1 Average time courses of cerebral blood flow (CBF, square), cerebral blood volume (CBV; circle), arterial CBV (CBVa; dershoot and blood outnation nom commaca oxygen metabolism or vascular changes?
 Is the BOLD undershoot after stimulation from continued oxygen

normalized by their individual maximum change and the shaded poststimulus periods in A and C were then zoomed in and displayed Hua et al "Physiological origin for the BOLD poststimulus undershoot in human brain: vascular compliance versus oxygen metabolism" JCBFM 2011

Why believe fMRI is neural?

fMRI results match our understanding of brain function

fMRI can show retinotopy in primary
visual cortex

DeYoe, E.A., et al., 1994. Functional magnetic resonance imaging (FMRI) of the human brain. Journal of Neuroscience Methods 54, 171–187.

fMRI can have very predictable retinotopic mapping

Polimeni, et al 2010. Laminar analysis of 7T BOLD using an imposed spatial activation pattern in human V1. NeuroImage \mathbf{p} stimulus calculated from two 2.5 min acquisitions (i.e., \mathbf{p}

BOLD magnitude scales with auditory stimulus rate using PET. The positive, monotonic response to the positive, monotonic response to the positive, monotonic res
Petrolic response to the positive response to the positive response to the positive response to the positive r

Average responses of 5 subjects' voxels in Heschl's Gyrus

Binder et al 1994 Cognitive Brain Research

Language dominance compared to the WADA test

Desmond, et al 1995. Functional MRI measurement of language lateralization in Wada-tested patients. Brain

Agenesis of the corpus callosum

Activation from a text listening task Right and left auditory seeds in resting data Connectivity map

from a healthy volunteer

Quigley et al AJNR 2003

An acallosal patient was first presented by Lowe et al Neuroimage 9:S422 1999

Vasculature is still symmetric, but bilateral neurons are not connected

$\frac{320}{100}$ $\frac{320}{100}$ $\frac{1}{100}$ $\frac{1}{100}$ $\frac{1}{100}$ Why believe fMRI is neural? Complimentary modalities V and V and V in V in V in V in V in V in V)2%U#;'#&)%-6 4/&,-%(&7 1#21#)#&-%&< + &#/1(&X) %&)-+&-+&#(/) D1%&<

Per cent modulation Logothetis also showed that the LFP time courses have a slightly better linear fit than multi-unit spiking activity

Logothetis et al. (2001) "Neurophysiological investigation of the basis of the fMRI signal" Nature, 412, 150-157

Optical measures \blacksquare arteries. Venous fow in HbO and a decrease 'al ma and in die constrict below baseline). Parenchymal hyperemia

Elizabeth Hillman, Annual Review of Neuroscience 2014. 37:161–81

fMRI relationship to EEG

Laufs et al PNAS 2003 Activation and deactivation maps of EEG signals convolved with a hemodynamic response

The EEG/fMRI rest relationship isn't simple H. Yuan et al. / NeuroImage 79 (2013) 81–93 85

(C). (B, D) Scalp topology of alpha EEG power in 9–11 Hz at all electrodes from recordings inside (B) and outside scanner (D). Note that the alpha power at the visual/posterior

Yuan, Zotev, Phillips, Bodurka Neuroimage, 2013

Relationships similar to resting state in electrical recordings

Leopold et al Cerebral Cortex 2003 Leopold et al Cerebral Cortex 2003

Why believe that a specific fMRI study represents neural activity?

Where does confidence in fMRI come from?

- Confidence for neuroscience as a field (See also Peter Bandettini's 5/31 talk)
	- A plausible mechanism
	- Results match our understanding of brain function
	- Complementary studies with other measures
- Confidence for an individual study
	- Task based fMRI
	- Resting state fMRI
	- A task based case study

How do we know this is neural?

Howkig we kalow ithi's iseneural?

5 cycles of a block design **breath holding** task BOLD changes primarily because of a global blood flow change

How do we know that this is neural?

ICA component from a resting state run

Bright & Murphy, *NeuroImage* 2015

The map is from the motion-correlated noise

Bright & Murphy, *NeuroImage* 2015

Physiologic regressors End-tidal CO₂ conv. with HRF Heart rate conv. with CRF

or 24 (and their quadratic terms) Independent components

Detrending (linear and quadratic)

Isolating the neural signal

Challenges

- Non-neural partially BOLD fluctuations: Respiration, Cardiac pulsation
- Head Motion
- Bad Task Design
- Understanding the effects of data collection choices
- Understanding the effects of data processing choices

Respiration can bias fMRI task results ^r **T**he **I**nterplay **B**etween **C**ognition, **R**espiration, and f**MRI S**ignal ^r

Connectivity differences based on head motion individual differences with a population. The contraction of the contraction of the population of the populatio has systematic effects on functional connectivity estimates that could s based on head motion

 F_{α} gh group is 100 functional motion function F_{α} Each group is 100 Subjects the functional connectivity difference for one group of 100 subjects with lesser motion as compared to a second group with lesser motion as compared to a second group with lesser motion as compar

Group 1 had the least motion and group 10 had the most motion Group 1 had the least motion and group 10 had the most motion

 \mathbf{S} Van Dijk et al, Neuroimage 2012

Data collection matters Spatial resolution

Stelzer, J., et al, Front Hum Neurosci, 2014

Data processing matters:

A common preprocessing step will always result in anti-correlated networks

Murphy et al Neuroimage 2009

Removing the global signal was supposed to remove non-neural fluctuations, but it also induces anti-correlations **Removing uncharacterized signals can cause uncharacterized population differences**

Modeling response shape can matter $F = \text{N}$ ladaling regions with N across regions. The canonical HRF is included in all plots for comparison. All HRFs in this figure are normalized to start at 0 and have a peak magnitude

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\frac{1$ Handwerker et al, Neuroimage 2014

Modeling the order of neural events with fMRI is dicey Simulated IVIK.

An example using

Population differences can occur from non-neural variation

Figure 2. Response magnitudes in several brain regions vary during a cognitive $t = \frac{1}{2}$ cap **capanical task** and a primarily vas lar broath bolding took task and a primarily vascular breath holding task.

Handwerker et al, Human Brain Mapping 2007 ROIs. Collapsed across ROIs, a significant decrease in mag-

Using multi-echo fMRI to increase confidence that responses are BOLD functional signal changes as no explicit knowledge about extract under dennown signal changes for values of values α above, the signal evolution during increasing *TE* might be MRI to increase with to the case. $r_{\rm e}$ ponses are BOLD. Fu

Average across active voxels in a figure tapping task at 3T

TE

A case study we generated parameters at different k levels up to a maximum A levels up to a maximum A $\mathsf{\Lambda}$ cases, ca a single contiguous agglomeration of voxels but as distributed sets but as $\mathsf{A}\mathsf{C}\mathsf{d}\mathsf{S}\mathsf{C}$ and are not are not artificially imposed by the clustering algorithm. The clustering algorithm is a group \mathcal{A} $T_{\rm tot}$ $w = w + w + w + w$ \overline{f}

Fig. 4. Conzalez-Castillo, PNAS 2012 and Gonzalez-Castillo, PNAS 2012

- Luck
- Specific Analysis Decisions
- Head motion
- Voxel size (Partial voluming)
- Global blood flow dynamics (blood steal)

Luck & specific analysis decisions

- Replication
	- Same results in 3 volunteers
	- Follow-up study showed same results in 3 more volunteers
- Several variants of the analyses (i.e. different models and different clustering methods) were done & either didn't affect the results or altered them in predicted ways

- Head motion
	- There was minimal head motion across these data and the head motion causes some predictable activation artifacts that we didn't see
- Global blood flow dynamics (blood steal)
	- The spatial variation of response shapes doesn't match what we'd expect blood steal to look like
	- A follow-up study showed widespread activation with the response shapes changing depending on task

What non-neural things can explain these findings? Voxel-size (partial voluming) Global blood flow dynamics (blood steal) Activation extent for pFDR < 0.05 in GM compartment for all 3 models when: 1) only 1 run enters the analysis; and 2) 100 runs enter the analysis \mathbf{C} 3T fFOV + Task 20.5 ± 8.0% 21.0 ± 8.2% 11.0 ± 5.9% 87.5 ± 1.5% 96.4 ± 0.5% 98.2 ± 0.3% $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{F}}$ for $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{F}}$ for $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{F}}$ a.1.6 $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{F}}$ a.1.4 $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{F}}$ a.1.4 $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{F}}$ hFOV Only 2.2 ± 0.4% 1.8 ± 0.4% 1.1 ± 0.2% 43.7% 43.9% 35.8%

Figure 3. Maps of Gonzalez-Castillo, Cerebral Cortex 2014

- Luck: No
- Specific Analysis Decisions: Very unlikely
- Head motion: Very unlikely
- Voxel size (Partial voluming): Probably not
- Global blood flow dynamics (blood steal): Might be a factor that does affect the specific results, but probably doesn't explain the bigpicture finding

Summary

- fMRI helps us understand the brain!
- Even though we measure an indirect signal, it can be quite specific
- There are many ways to confuse artifacts with neural signals if you're not careful
- Think about choices from data collection through analysis
- Look carefully at your data