

Abnormal effective connectivity in migraine with aura under photic stimulation

S. Stramaglia,¹ D. Marinazzo,² M. Pellicoro,¹ and M. de Tommaso³

¹*Dipartimento di Fisica, Università degli Studi di Bari and INFN, via Orabona 4, 70126 Bari, Italy*

²*Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Department of Data Analysis, Ghent University, Henri Dunantlaan 1, B-9000 Gent, Belgium*

³*Dipartimento di Scienze Neurologiche e Psichiatriche, Università degli Studi di Bari, Piazza Giulio Cesare 11, 70124 Bari, Italy*

(ΩDated: January 8, 2019)

Migraine patients with aura show a peculiar pattern of visual reactivity compared with those of migraine patients without aura and healthy subjects: an increased effective connectivity, connected to a reduced synchronization among EEG channels, for frequencies in the beta band. The effective connectivity is evaluated in terms of the Granger causality. This anomalous response to visual stimuli may play a crucial role in the progression of spreading depression and clinical evidences of aura symptoms.

PACS numbers: 87.19.L-, 05.45.Tp, 05.45.Xt, 42.66.Lc

Important information on the structure of complex systems can be obtained by measuring to what extent the individual components exchange information among each other. Transfer entropy [1, 2] and Granger causality [3–6] have emerged in recent years as leading statistical techniques to detect cause-effect relationships between time series; they are equivalent in the case of Gaussian stochastic variables [7]. These approaches provide further insights on the architecture of complex systems, in addition to those from correlation and synchronization analysis [8–10]. In neuroscience, interdependencies estimated by correlation or spectral coherence are referred to as functional connectivity, whilst effective connectivity is a notion related to Granger causality or transfer entropy [11]; the relationship between functional and effective connectivity in the cortex represents a significant challenge to present-day neuroscience [12–14].




FIG. 1: In the case of 21 Hz stimuli, the mean of the synchronization index Γ in the alpha band (measuring how phase synchronization varies, in presence of the stimuli, with respect to basal conditions, see [16]), is depicted for the six electrodes; aura patients (stars), no aura patients (empty circles) and controls (empty squares).

Migraine, an incapacitating disorder of neurovascular origin, consists of attacks of headache, accompanied by autonomic and possibly neurological symptoms [15]. This pathology affects a relevant fraction of the general population and represents a social problem. The study of phase synchronization in EEG rhythms showed a pattern of alpha rhythm (8-12.5 Hz) hyper-synchronization under repetitive flash stimulation in migraine without aura patients, opposite to a de-synchronization trend in non-migraine subjects [16]; this nonlinear EEG pattern was found to be modulated by anti-epileptic drugs [17]. Approximately one-third of people who suffer migraine headaches perceive an aura (visual abnormality lasting 10-30 minutes) as a sign that the migraine will soon occur [18]. There are evidences [19] of relationships between migraine aura and the spreading depression (SD) phenomenon (a wave of electrophysiological hyperactivity followed by a wave of inhibition [20]) but the link between SD and headache is far to be explained in humans [21]. SD in clinically less conspicuous or extended brain regions may be the trigger of migraine attacks ostensibly without a "perceived" aura [22], so it may be plausible that, migraine with and without aura may differ for those neuronal factors favoring the clinical expression of SD phenomenon.

The question we address here is the following: how does the response of aura migraine patients, to external stimuli, differ from those of patients without aura? We show that, in presence of visual stimulations, migraineurs with aura show a pattern of increased effective connectivity between EEG channels in the beta band, and correspondingly a decrease of the synchronization between channels. This variation of connectivity, due to stimuli, is statistically significant for migraine with aura: we remark that in our knowledge neurophysiological patterns separating migraine with and without aura have been rarely detected [23], nor relevant differences in regard to visual reactivity [24].

Our data are as follows. EEG is recorded from 19 patients (7 males, 20-44 age) affected by migraine with




FIG. 2: The nonlinear Granger causality of EEGs filtered in the beta band, averaged over pairs of channels and over subjects in the classes, is depicted for aura patients (stars), no aura patients (empty circles) and controls (empty squares) as a function of the frequency of stimulations and for basal condition. For aura migraine, the variation of nonlinear Granger causality, between basal conditions and in presence of stimuli, is statistically significant ($p < 10^{-3}$) for frequencies 18-21-24-27 Hz (after Bonferroni correction and using the t test to estimate probabilities). For controls, as well as for migraine without aura, no significant change due to stimuli is observed for the nonlinear Granger causality. The ANOVA [27], taking the nonlinear Granger causality as variable, the diagnosis (migraine with aura vs migraine without aura vs controls) and the frequency of stimulation (9-18-21-24-27 Hz) as factors, yields the F values 31.26, 0.26 and 0.84 for diagnosis, frequency and interaction respectively. It turns out that the nonlinear Granger causality depends on the diagnosis ($p < 10^{-8}$), irrespectively of the frequency of stimulation.

aura, 19 (4 males, 21-45 age) patients affected by migraine without aura, and from 11 healthy subjects (control group, 3 males, 20-46 age). All patients are in the interictal state, the time from the end of the last attack being at least 72 h. No patient was under preventive treatment nor had assumed symptomatic drugs in the 72 hours preceding the recording session. During the acquisition, flash stimuli are presented at a rate of 9-18-21-24-27 Hz; also EEG in the absence of stimuli (base) is recorded. Each frequency of stimulation is delivered by a flash with 0.2 J luminance for about 20 sec. EEG data are recorded by six scalp electrodes: two occipital channels (O1 and O2), two parietal ones (P3 and P4), a central electrode (Cz) and a frontal one (Fz); the sampling rate is 256 Hz, and the EEG is digitally filtered off line by a filter with a band-pass 0.3-30 Hz.

Next, we describe our findings. Firstly we investigate the alpha band hyper-synchronization phenomenon [16] in presence of flash stimuli. The pattern of [16] is confirmed for migraineurs without aura, whilst patients with aura do not show alpha band hyper-synchronization in presence of light stimuli: in this range of frequencies,




FIG. 3: For each electrode, the incoming (top) and outgoing (bottom) nonlinear Granger causality in the beta band, corresponding to 21 Hz stimuli and averaged over subjects in classes, is depicted; aura patients (stars), no aura patients (empty circles) and controls (empty squares). We note that the frontal electrode sends more information than how it receives, whilst occipital electrodes receive more than how much they send.

aura patients seem to behave as controls. For example, figure (1) describes the alpha synchronization values in presence of 21 Hz stimulations.




FIG. 4: The linear Granger causality of EEGs filtered in the beta band, averaged over pairs of channels and over subjects in the classes, is depicted for aura patients (stars), no aura patients (empty circles) and controls (empty squares) as a function of the frequency of stimulations and for basal condition. The t test, after Bonferroni correction, recognizes as significant the separation between aura migraine and controls at frequencies 18-21-27 Hz ($p < 10^{-3}$), as well as the separation between aura and no-aura migraine at 9 Hz ($p < 10^{-3}$).

Moving to higher frequencies (beta band, 12.5-30 Hz), we evaluate the effective connectivity by means of the nonlinear Granger causality among the filtered EEG sig-

nals, using the kernel approach described in [6] with a polynomial kernel of degree 2; the order of the regression model is set equal to $m = 6$ [25]. In figure (2) we show the nonlinear Granger causality, averaged over all pairs of channels and over subjects in classes, in basal conditions and in presence of flash stimulations. We find that aura migraine patients exhibit higher values of causality in presence of stimuli, whilst controls and no aura patients show almost the same level of causality as in basal conditions. Our supervised analysis (hypothesis testing) of nonlinear Granger causality, using the t test to evaluate probabilities and the Bonferroni correction for 18 multiple comparisons, confirms that the information flow statistically separates ($p < 10^{-5}$) aura patients from each of the two other classes in presence of light stimulation for all frequencies. No significant separation is observed between no-aura migraineurs and controls under stimulation, as well as in basal conditions among all the three classes.




FIG. 5: The linear correlation of EEGs in the beta band, averaged over pairs of channels and over subjects in the classes, is depicted for aura patients (stars), no aura patients (empty circles) and controls (empty squares) as a function of the frequency of stimulations and for basal condition. For aura migraine, the variation of the linear correlation, between basal conditions and in presence of stimuli, is statistically significant ($p < 0.5 \times 10^{-3}$) for frequencies 18-21-24-27 Hz (after Bonferroni correction and using the t test to estimate probabilities). For controls, as well as for migraine without aura, no significant change due to stimuli is observed for the linear correlation. The ANOVA [27], taking the linear correlation as variable, the diagnosis (migraine with aura vs migraine without aura vs controls) and the frequency of stimulation (9-18-21-24-27 Hz) as factors, yields the F values 71, 0.26 and 0.27 for diagnosis, frequency and interaction respectively. It turns out that the linear correlation depends on the diagnosis ($p < 10^{-9}$), irrespectively of the frequency of stimulation.

A topographic analysis is also performed: for each electrode, we evaluate the total incoming causality (the sum of the causalities from the other electrodes to the electrode under consideration) as well as the total outgoing causality (the sum of the causalities from the electrode




FIG. 6: The average coherence of EEGs in the beta band, averaged over pairs of channels and over subjects in the classes, is depicted for aura patients (stars), no aura patients (empty circles) and controls (empty squares) as a function of the frequency of stimulations and for basal condition. The separation between aura and no-aura patients is significant ($p < 10^{-4}$) for all frequencies of stimulations.




FIG. 7: The phase synchronization of EEGs in the beta band, averaged over pairs of channels and over subjects in the classes, is depicted for aura patients (stars), no aura patients (empty circles) and controls (empty squares) as a function of the frequency of stimulations and for basal condition. The separation between aura and no-aura patients is significant ($p < 10^{-3}$) for all frequencies of stimulations.

under consideration to the other electrodes). In figure (3) we depict these quantities for the three classes at 21 Hz stimulations in the beta band: it shows that the phenomenon is diffuse over the scalp.

In figure (4) we show the average values of the linear Granger causality of EEGs in the beta band for the three classes of subjects; application of the frequency domain causality [26], another linear approach, provides similar results. The most discriminating measure of causality, among classes, is the nonlinear Granger causality, sug-

gesting that in this application nonlinearities should not be neglected.

Turning to synchronization, we consider the Pearson linear correlation between channels and find that the increased flow of information is connected to weakened correlations between them. In figure (6) we depict the linear correlation between signals filtered in the beta band, averaged over all pairs of channels; in presence of light stimulations correlations become smaller for aura patients. Our supervised analysis states that the linear correlation separates aura patients from controls (at frequencies 18-21-27 Hz with $p < 10^{-3}$) and from no-aura patients at all frequencies of stimulation ($p < 10^{-5}$). No significant separation is observed between no-aura migraineurs and controls under stimulation, as well as in basal conditions among all the three classes.

We find similar results also in terms of the coherence function averaged in the beta band, as well as for the beta band phase synchronization [28], see figures (6-7).

We also quantify the separation among classes in terms of the ROC area [29], which is directly related to the sepa-

ration of two conditional distributions, and measures the discrimination ability of the forecast. Concerning the nonlinear Granger causality and for 21 Hz stimulations, the separation between aura patients and controls is excellent (roc area equal to 0.95), the separation between aura patients and no aura patients is good (roc area 0.87), whilst the separation between no-aura patients and controls is poor (roc area 0.64). Similar results are found using the linear correlation and 21 Hz stimulations (for aura patients vs controls the roc area is 0.91, for aura patients vs no-aura patients 0.86, no-aura patients vs controls 0.57).

Summarizing, we have described for the first time a neurophysiological pattern which seems peculiar of migraine patients perceiving visual aura, where the loss of synchronization between channels induces stronger statistical causal connections among them, diffuse over the scalp. The biological implications of this complex phenomenon in facilitating SD progression and aura symptoms perception is the challenge for a better understanding of migraine pathophysiology.

-
- [1] T. Schreiber, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 461 (2000).
- [2] M. Staniek, K. Lehnertz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 158101 (2008).
- [3] C.W.J. Granger, Econometrica **37**, 424 (1969).
- [4] K. J. Blinowska, R.Kus, and M. Kaminski, Phys. Rev. E **70**, 050902 (2004).
- [5] M. Dhamala, G. Rangarajan, M. Ding, Phys.Rev.Lett. **100**, 18701 (2008).
- [6] D. Marinazzo, M. Pellicoro, S. Stramaglia, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 144103 (2008).
- [7] L. Barnett, A.B. Barrett, A. K. Seth, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 238701 (2009).
- [8] S. Boccaletti, J. Kurths, G. Osipov, D.L. Valladares and C. Zhou, Physics Reports 366, 1 (2002).
- [9] M.G. Rosenblum et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 1804 (1996).
- [10] R. Q. Quiroga, A. Kraskov, T. Kreuz, and P. Grassberger, Phys. Rev. E 65, 041903 (2002).
- [11] K.J. Friston, Human Brain Mapping **2**, 56 (1994).
- [12] O. Sporns, G. Tononi, and R. Kötter, PLoS Computational Biology **1**, 245 (2005).
- [13] D. Marinazzo, W. Liao, H. Chen and S. Stramaglia, *Non-linear connectivity by Granger causality*, in press in Neuroimage, doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.01.099.
- [14] P.A. Valdes-Sosa, J. Daunizeau and K. Friston, *Effective connectivity: Influence, causality and biophysical modeling*, in press in Neuroimage, doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.03.058.
- [15] Headache Classification Committee. The International Classification of Headache Disorders II. Cephalalgia **24**, 24 (2004).
- [16] L. Angelini et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 038103 (2004).
- [17] M. de Tommaso et al., Clin. Neurophysiol. **118**, 2297(2007).
- [18] F.M. Cutrer, K. Huerter, Neurologist. **13**, 118 (2007).
- [19] M. Lauritzen, Brain **117**, 199 (1994).
- [20] A.A.P. Leao, J. Neurophysiol. **7**, 359 (1944).
- [21] X. Zhang et al., *Activation of Meningeal Nociceptor by Cortical Spreading Depression*. Proceedings of the Society for Neuroscience Annual Meeting, Vol. 339.5. Chicago, IL: Society for Neuroscience (2009).
- [22] C. Ayata, Headache **50**, 725 (2010).
- [23] A. Conte et al., PAIN **148**, 43 (2010).
- [24] S. Genco et al., CEPHALALGIA **14**, 41 (1994).
- [25] G.E. Schwarz, Annals of Statistics **6**, 461 (1978).
- [26] A.K. Seth, Journal of Neuroscience Methods **186**, 262 (2010).
- [27] M. Bland, *An introduction to medical statistics*, Oxford Medical Publications, Oxford, 2009.
- [28] P. Tass et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 3291 (1998).
- [29] M. H. Zweig, G. Campbell, Clin. Chem. **39**, 561 (1993).