

Nevena Kraljević^{1,2}, Robert Langner^{1,2}, Federico Raimondo^{1,2}, Kaustubh Patil^{1,2}, Ru Kong^{3,4,5},
Leon Qi Rong Ooi^{3,4,5,6}, B.T. Thomas Yeo^{3,4,5,6,7}, Simon B. Eickhoff^{1,2}, Veronika I. Müller^{1,2}

¹Institute of Systems Neuroscience, Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf, Düsseldorf, Germany; ²Institute of Neuroscience and Medicine (INM-7: Brain and Behaviour), Research Centre Jülich, Jülich, Germany; ³Centre for Sleep and Cognition & Centre for Translational Magnetic Resonance Research, Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore, Singapore; ⁴Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, NUS, Singapore; ⁵N.1 Institute for Health and Institute for Digital Medicine, NUS, Singapore; ⁶Integrative Sciences and Engineering Programme, NUS, Singapore; ⁷Martinos Center for Biomedical Imaging, Massachusetts General Hospital, Charlestown, MA, USA
Contact: n.kraljevic@fz-juelich.de

Introduction

- Brain-behavior **prediction** can **improve understanding of human brain functioning**, but **prediction accuracies** using brain data **are rather low**^{1–3}
 - Possible improvement of prediction through:
 - task-based functional connectivity (FC), rather than resting-state FC¹
 - feature-reduction methods^{1–4}
 - In previous work⁵, we found **limited improvement** of prediction, possibly due to **insufficient capture of individual FC variability**
 - Individualizing**^{4,6,7} parcels for network representation prior to prediction to incorporate individual node-topology could yield improved FC-estimates
- Research question:** Can individualizing parcel networks improve prediction (1) and capture specificity of state (2) or network (3)?


Methods

Sample: 440 subjects from 114 families from Human Connectome Project⁸.

Features: FC from **whole-brain** Schaefer-400 parcels⁹, and selection of **task-related parcels** from task-activation analysis based on n-back (working memory; WM), social cognition (SOCIAL), and emotional face matching task (EMO); both **general** and **individualized networks** with MS-HBM-algorithm⁶. All FC obtained from resting (REST) and 3 task **states**: WM, SOCIAL, and EMO.

Targets: Task performance (z-scored) from the 3 domains (same as task states and task-related parcel networks).

Prediction: Partial least squares prediction, leave-30%-family-out cross-validation scheme, root mean squared error (RMSE) for prediction evaluation.



Results

1. Effect of Individualization




Fig. 1) Average prediction performance of general (solid columns) and individualized (hatched columns) networks.

Fig. 2) Specificity of FC state for A) general and B) individualized parcels.


Fig. 3) Specificity of network for A) general and B) individualized parcels.

Yellow: resting state, green: WM, blue: SOCIAL, red: EMO, white: whole-brain 400 Schaefer parcels.

2. State Specificity



3. Network Specificity



Discussion

- In line with our previous study⁵, **prediction accuracies** were rather **low**
- In contrast to previous results^{4,6,7}, **individualization did not improve prediction performance**
- Prediction was slightly **improved in task fMRI**, though **no state specificity** was observed
- No influence** of selection of task-related parcel **networks** was observed
- Whole-brain** Schaefer parcellation performed slightly **better** than *a priori* task-based feature selection
- No improvement of prediction may be due to rather small sample size^{4,6,7,10}
- Discrepancy** between current results indicating no improvement after individualisation and literature **needs further investigation**
- Predicting complex behaviour based on FC remains a significant challenge**

References: 1. He, T. et al. Deep neural networks and kernel regression achieve comparable accuracies for functional connectivity prediction of behavior and demographics. *NeuroImage* 206, 116276 (2020). 2. McCormick, E. M. et al. Latent functional connectivity underlying multiple brain states. *Netw. Neurosci.* 1–21 (2022) doi:10.1162/netn_a_00234. 3. Dubois, J. et al. Resting-State Functional Brain Connectivity Best Predicts the Personality Dimension of Openness to Experience. *Personal. Neurosci.* 1, (2018). 4. Chen, J. et al. Intrinsic Connectivity Patterns of Task-Defined Brain Networks Allow Individual Prediction of Cognitive Symptom Dimension of Schizophrenia and Are Linked to Molecular Architecture. *Biol. Psychiatry* 89, 308–319 (2021). 5. Kraljević, N. et al. Network and State Specificity in Connectivity-Based Predictions of Individual Behavior. <http://biorxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2023.05.11.540387> (2023) doi:10.1101/2023.05.11.540387. 6. Kong, R. et al. Spatial Topography of Individual-Specific Cortical Networks Predicts Human Cognition, Personality, and Emotion. *Cereb. Cortex* 29, 2533–2551 (2019). 7. Shen, X. et al. Using connectome-based predictive modeling to predict individual behavior from brain connectivity. *Nat. Protoc.* 12, 506–518 (2017). 8. Van Essen, D. C. et al. The WU-Minn Human Connectome Project: An overview. *NeuroImage* 80, 62–79 (2013). 9. Schaefer, A. et al. Local-Global Parcellation of the Human Cerebral Cortex from Intrinsic Functional Connectivity MRI. *Cereb. Cortex* 28, 3095–3114 (2018). 10. Cui, Z. & Gong, G. The effect of machine learning regression algorithms and sample size on individualized behavioral prediction with functional connectivity features. *NeuroImage* 178, 622–637 (2018).

Acknowledgments: The work was supported by: National Institute of Mental Health (R01-MH074457 & P41EB015896); Helmholtz Portfolio Theme "Supercomputing and Modeling for the Human Brain"; European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under Grant Agreement No. 945539 (HBP SGA3) and by a fellowship of the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD).