

FMRI Clustering and False Positive Rates

A Letter accepted by PNAS

Robert W. Cox^{*a}, Gang Chen^a, Daniel R. Glen^a, Richard C. Reynolds^a, and Paul A. Taylor^a

^aScientific and Statistical Computing Core, National Institute of Mental Health, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services, USA

Recently, Eklund et al. (2016) analyzed clustering methods in standard FMRI packages: AFNI (which we maintain), FSL, and SPM [1]. They claimed: 1) false positive rates (FPRs) in traditional approaches are greatly inflated, questioning the validity of “countless published fMRI studies”; 2) nonparametric methods produce valid, but slightly conservative, FPRs; 3) a common flawed assumption is that the spatial autocorrelation function (ACF) of FMRI noise is Gaussian-shaped; and 4) a 15-year-old bug in AFNI’s 3dClustSim significantly contributed to producing “particularly high” FPRs compared to other software. We repeated simulations from [1] (Beijing-Zang data [2], see [3]), and comment on each point briefly.

AFNI and 3dClustSim

Fig. 1A-D compares results of the “buggy” and “fixed” 3dClustSim. For each simulation, the typical difference was small: $\Delta\text{FPR} \lesssim 3 - 5\%$ at per-voxel $p = 0.01$ and $\lesssim 1 - 2\%$ for $p = 0.001$. The bug had only a minor impact.

Figs. 1-2 of [1] actually show similar FPRs for AFNI, FSL-OLS, and SPM: most tests were in a range of 20 – 40% FPR at $p = 0.01$ and 5 – 15% FPR at $p = 0.001$. (Nor did their famous 70% FPR come from AFNI.) Their Results’ data simply do not support the Discussion’s statement that AFNI had “particularly high” FPRs.

Smoothness

To test the effect of assuming a Gaussian ACF in FMRI noise, an empirical “mixed ACF” allowing for longer tails was computed from residuals [3]. All FPRs (Fig. 1E-F) decreased. Block designs remained $> 5\%$, likely reflecting dependence of the noise’s spatial smoothness on temporal frequency. Heavy-tails in spatial smoothness indeed have significant consequences for clustering.

Nonparametric approach

A spatial model-free, nonparametric randomization approach was added to AFNI’s group-level GLM program, 3dttest++ [3]. All FPRs (Fig. 1G-H) were within the nominal confidence interval. While this approach shows promise (as in [1]), it may not be feasible to generalize nonparametric permutations to complicated covariate structures and models (e.g., complex ANOVA, ANCOVA or LME) [4, 5].

*Corresponding author. E-mail address: robertcox@mail.nih.gov

Inflated FPRs

Several cases showed significant FPR inflation across existing FMRI software within [1]’s testing framework. However, deviations from nominal FPR were not uniformly large and depended strongly on several factors. Fig. 1 here and Fig. 1 of [1] show quite good cluster results for stricter per-voxel p -values (which [6] found to be predominantly used in FMRI analyses) and for event-related stimuli (emphasizing the importance of good experimental design): FPR inflation was often $\lesssim 10\%$ (Beijing) or $\lesssim 5\%$ (Cambridge), affecting only clusters with marginally significant volume.

We strongly disagree with [1]’s summary statement, “Alarming, the parametric methods can give a very high degree of false positives (up to 70%, compared with the nominal 5%).” For comparison, their own nonparametric method’s results actually showed up to 40% FPR. When characterizing results, medians or percentile ranges are generally more informative summary statistics than maxima. Looking backward, the typical ranges show *much* smaller FPR inflation than what had been highlighted, and looking forward, they provide useful suggestions for experimental design and analyses (lower voxelwise p , event-related paradigms, etc.). By concentrating on the highest observed FPRs, the conclusions of Eklund et al. were unnecessarily alarmist.

AFNI and 3dClustSim

The research and writing of the paper were supported by the NIMH and NINDS Intramural Research Programs (ZICMH002888) of the NIH/DHHS, USA. This work utilized the computational resources of the NIH HPC Biowulf cluster (<http://hpc.nih.gov>).

References

- [1] Eklund A, Nichols T, Knutsson H (2016) Cluster failure: Why fMRI inferences for spatial extent have inflated false-positive rates. PNAS 113: 7900-7905.
- [2] Biswal B, et al. (2010) Toward discovery science of human brain function. PNAS 107:4734–4739 (2010).
- [3] Cox RW, Reynolds RC, Taylor PA (2016) AFNI and Clustering: False Positive Rates Redux. bioRxiv 065862; doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/065862>.
- [4] Chen G, Adleman NE, Saad ZS, Leibenluft E, Cox RW (2014) Applications of Multivariate Modeling to Neuroimaging Group Analysis: A Comprehensive Alternative to Univariate General Linear Model. NeuroImage 99: 571-588 (2014).
- [5] Chen G, Saad ZS, Britton JC, Pine DS, Cox RW (2013) Linear mixed-effects modeling approach to FMRI group analysis. NeuroImage 73:176-190.
- [6] Carp, J (2012) The secret lives of experiments: Methods reporting in the fMRI literature. NeuroImage 63 289-300.




Figure 1: False Positive Rates (FPRs) for various software scenarios, with 1000 2-sample 1-sided t -tests (as in [1], more details in [3]) using 20 subjects' data in each sample. For “buggy” (A-B) and “fixed” (C-D), cluster-size thresholds were selected using the Gaussian shape model with the FWHM being the median of the 40 individual subject's values: “buggy” via 3dClustSim before the bug fix, “fixed” via 3dClustSim after the bug fix. For “mixed ACF” (E-F), the cluster-size threshold was selected using a non-Gaussian ACF model allowing for heavy tails [3]. For “nonparam” (G-H), 3dttest++ was used to perform spatial model-free, nonparametric permutation testing [3]; paired, 2-sided, and tests with covariates gave similar results. Two different per-voxel p -value thresholds are shown. The black line shows the nominal 5% FPR (out of 1000 trials), and the gray band shows its binomial 95% confidence interval, 3.65-6.35%. As in [1], different smoothing values were tested (4-10 mm), and four test designs were used: B1 = 10s block; B2 = 30s block; E1 = regular event related; E2 = randomized event related.