

# Current Source Localization Using Deep Prior with Depth Weighting

Rio Yamana

Graduate School of System Informatics  
Kobe University  
Kobe, Japan

Hajime Yano

Graduate School of System Informatics  
Kobe University  
Kobe, Japan

Ryoichi Takashima

Graduate School of System Informatics  
Kobe University  
Kobe, Japan

Tetsuya Takiguchi

Graduate School of System Informatics  
Kobe University  
Kobe, Japan

Seiji Nakagawa

Center for Frontier Medical Engineering  
Chiba University  
Chiba, Japan

**Abstract**—This paper proposes a novel neuronal current source localization method based on Deep Prior that represents a more complicated prior distribution of current source using convolutional networks. Deep Prior has been suggested as a means of an unsupervised learning approach that does not require learning using training data, and randomly-initialized neural networks are used to update a source location using a single observation. In our previous work, a Deep-Prior-based current source localization method in the brain has been proposed but the performance was not almost the same as those of conventional approaches, such as sLORETA. In order to improve the Deep-Prior-based approach, in this paper, a depth weight of the current source is introduced for Deep Prior, where depth weighting amounts to assigning more penalty to the superficial currents. Its effectiveness is confirmed by experiments of current source estimation on simulated MEG data.

**Index Terms**—current source localization in the brain, deep prior, neural networks, unsupervised learning

## I. INTRODUCTION

Magnetoencephalography (MEG) and electroencephalography (EEG) are non-invasive measurements of human brain activities that provide excellent temporal resolution. The estimation of current sources in the brain using MEG and EEG has been helped to elucidate brain function and assist in the diagnosis of brain diseases. However, estimating the current distribution in the brain is inherently difficult because it is an underdetermined problem with a small number of MEG/EEG sensors relative to the number of current source parameters.

Conventional methods for current source estimation, such as Minimum Norm Estimation (MNE) [1] and Standardized Low Resolution Brain Electromagnetic Tomography (sLORETA) [2], solve this problem by explicitly giving the prior distribution of the current source. However, it is difficult to obtain the prior distribution of the actual current sources, and estimation based on an incorrect prior distribution may result in a large error.

In recent years, deep convolutional networks have been shown to play a role in the prior distribution of natural images.

One such unlearned network is called “Deep Image Prior” and has been shown to be effective for inverse problems in the image field [3]. In our previous work [4], we proposed a method for solving the inverse problem of MEG and EEG using an untrained deep network prior with a convolutional structure (Deep Prior), and showed that the convolutional networks can represent the prior distribution of current sources. However, the estimation error of the current source localization using Deep Prior was not almost the same as that of the conventional method, sLORETA, and there was still room for improvement with Deep Prior.

In this paper, we propose a solution that takes into account the depth weight of the current source to improve the current source estimation accuracy using Deep Prior. It is known that the current density values estimated by MNE tend to be higher near the brain surface, and the MNE with depth weighting improves the localization accuracy. Also, as the solution obtained using Deep Prior may have some “bias”, it is expected to be improved by taking the depth weight into consideration. In this paper, we evaluated the localization error of the current source using artificially-generated MEG data assuming a single current source in the brain, and the performance of Deep Prior with depth-weighted regularization is compared to those of conventional methods.

## II. FORMULATION OF CURRENT SOURCE ESTIMATION

### A. MEG Forward Problem

Finding the magnetic field observed by sensors when current sources in the brain is given is called a forward problem. In this work, by discretizing a given region in the brain and fixing the position of the current source on the mesh point, the magnetic field  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^M$  observed by the sensor can be expressed in the form of the product of the lead field matrix  $\mathbf{L}$  and the current vector  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^{3N}$ :

$$\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{q} \quad (1)$$

where  $M$  is the number of sensors and  $N$  is the number of mesh points. The lead field matrix is given by numerical calculation,




Fig. 1. Current source estimation in the brain using the deep prior. This method does not require learning using training data. A randomly-initialized neural network is used to update a source location, and the input is a random tensor. The structure of neural networks is used as a current source prior.

such as the boundary element method, which is based on the position of the sensor, the position of the mesh point, and the conductivity in the brain.

### B. MEG Inverse Problem

The inverse of the forward problem is to find the current source in the brain from the observed magnetic field containing noise. This is commonly referred to as the “inverse problem”. When the brain is discretized, the number of current sources becomes very large compared to the number of sensors. This makes it difficult to uniquely obtain the current source from the observed magnetic field. This is also called an “ill-posed problem”.

Conventional methods such as MNE and sLORETA assume a multi-dimensional normal distribution for the prior distribution of noise and current sources contained in the observed values, and minimize the sum of the error and the regularization term between the forward problem and the observed value  $\mathbf{b}_{obs}$ . It gives us a new estimation  $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$ :

$$\hat{\mathbf{q}} = \underset{\mathbf{q}}{\operatorname{argmin}} [E_C(\mathbf{L}\mathbf{q}; \mathbf{b}_{obs}) + \lambda \mathbf{q}^T \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{q}] \quad (2)$$

$$= \underset{\mathbf{q}}{\operatorname{argmin}} [(\mathbf{b}_{obs} - \mathbf{L}\mathbf{q})^T \mathbf{C}^{-1} (\mathbf{b}_{obs} - \mathbf{L}\mathbf{q}) + \lambda \mathbf{q}^T \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{q}] \quad (3)$$

$$= \mathbf{S}\mathbf{L}^T (\mathbf{L}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{L}^T + \lambda \mathbf{C})^{-1} \mathbf{b}_{obs} \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathbf{S}$  is the covariance matrix of the parameters of the current source, and  $\mathbf{C}$  is the covariance matrix of the noise in the sensor. However, it is difficult to obtain the probability distribution of the actual current source, and an estimation based on a prior distribution that differs from the actual one may result in a large error.

### III. DEPTH WEIGHTING

Since MNE minimizes the observation error under the L2 norm constraint of the brain currents, the current density values estimated by MNE tend to be higher near the brain surface. In order to compensate for it, a depth-dependent factor is introduced for the covariance matrix  $\mathbf{S}$  of the prior distribution of the currents [5].

$$s_k = (\mathbf{l}_{3k-2}^T \mathbf{l}_{3k-2} + \mathbf{l}_{3k-1}^T \mathbf{l}_{3k-1} + \mathbf{l}_{3k}^T \mathbf{l}_{3k})^{-p} \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathbf{l}_i$  is the  $i$ -th column vector of the lead field matrix  $\mathbf{L}$  and  $p$  is a depth weighting parameter.  $l_{3k-2}$ ,  $l_{3k-1}$ , and  $l_{3k}$  correspond to the lead fields of the  $x$ ,  $y$ , and  $z$  components of the  $k$ -th current source, respectively. Since each component of the lead field matrix is smaller for current sources located farther away from the sensor, i.e., deeper in the brain, the corresponding value of  $s_k$  becomes larger. Therefore, given by  $s_k$ , the variance of the prior distribution of the currents at deeper locations increases, making it easier to estimate the currents at deeper locations. Also, depth weighting amounts to assigning more penalty to the superficial currents [5].

### IV. DEEP PRIOR WITH DEPTH WEIGHTING

When carrying out current source estimation using Deep Prior, the current  $\mathbf{q}$  is generated by neural networks  $\mathbf{f}_\phi(\mathbf{z})$  with the latent variable  $\mathbf{z}$  as input, and the network parameters  $\phi$  is estimated so that the observation error is minimized. In our method,  $\mathbf{q}$  in (2) is replaced by the output  $\mathbf{f}_\phi(\mathbf{z})$  of the neural networks and the covariance matrix  $\mathbf{S}$  of the current is modified using (5) in order to perform depth-weighted estimation. When taking depth weight into consideration using Deep Prior to solve an inverse problem, the solution of the current source estimation is as follows:

$$\hat{\phi} = \underset{\phi}{\operatorname{argmin}} [E_C(\mathbf{L}\mathbf{f}_\phi(\mathbf{z}); \mathbf{b}_{obs}) + \lambda \mathbf{f}_\phi(\mathbf{z})^T \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{f}_\phi(\mathbf{z})] \quad (6)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{q}} = \mathbf{f}_{\hat{\phi}}(\mathbf{z}) \quad (7)$$

where each element of the latent variable  $\mathbf{z}$  is sampled from the standard normal distribution that is independent of each other. The local optimum  $\hat{\phi}$  is obtained by starting from a random initialization of the parameter  $\phi$ . The only information available is the observation vector from MEG sensors.

Fig. 1 shows the overview of the deep prior in this work. The number of the dimensions of the random input  $\mathbf{z}$  was set to 128. The size of the final layer of the network corresponds to the arrangement of mesh points. The number of channels in the final layer was set to three corresponding to the  $x$ ,  $y$ , and  $z$  components of the current source. From the output of the final layer, only the elements corresponding to the mesh points in the brain region were extracted and used as the final output of the network (current sources).




Fig. 2. Relationships between the regularization parameter  $\lambda$  and localization error of the current dipole in the right primary auditory cortex

TABLE I  
LOCALIZATION ERROR OF THE CURRENT DIPOLE IN THE RIGHT PRIMARY AUDITORY CORTEX

Method	Localization Error [mm]
MNE ( $\lambda = 0.44$ )	18.9
sLORETA ( $\lambda = 0.22$ )	2.5
Deep Prior ( $\lambda = 0$ )	13.7
Deep Prior ( $\lambda = 0.88$ )	3.4

## V. EVALUATION EXPERIMENT

Current source estimation was performed on artificially-generated MEG data. A head model of a subject and settings of a MEG system in MNE-Python sample dataset [6] were used as the simulation environment. The MEG measurement system has a total of 306 sensors, consisting of 204 planar gradiometers and 102 magnetometers. A current source with a peak intensity of 50 nAm at 0.1 sec was placed in the center of the primary auditory and primary visual cortex of the right hemisphere in the brain. (Current source estimation was performed at 0.1 sec.) The noise level was equivalent to that after averaging over 80 MEG epochs. The noise covariance matrix was computed from a noise recording in the dataset. The peak signal-to-noise ratio was 21.6 dB.

MNE and sLORETA were implemented by MNE-Python [6]. The localization error was defined as the Euclidean distance between the actual test source and the estimated location of the maximum amplitude in the estimated current source distribution. The regions in the brain were discretized at 5 mm intervals,

## VI. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Fig. 2 shows the localization error for the dipole source in the right primary auditory cortex when varying the regularization parameter  $\lambda$ . Table I shows the localization error and the value of  $\lambda$  for the smallest error. Also, the localization error of Deep Prior for  $\lambda = 0$  (no depth weight) is shown in Table I. As shown in these results for the right primary auditory cortex, the







Fig. 3. Estimated current source from MEG generated by the current dipole in the right primary auditory cortex

localization error of Deep Prior with depth weighting is almost the same as that of sLORETA when setting an appropriate  $\lambda$ .

The estimated current distribution is shown in Fig. 3, where the actual current source is placed in the right primary auditory cortex. The three images in one box show the current distribution estimated by each method in the  $xz$ ,  $yz$ , and  $xy$  plane at  $y$ ,  $x$ , and  $z =$  “the highest current intensity,” respectively. The blue dot in each image indicates the coordinate of the actual current source. As shown in Fig. 3, when  $\lambda = 0$ , the current distribution estimated by Deep Prior is distributed at shallow locations in the brain. On the other hand, the current distribution estimated by Deep Prior with an appropriate  $\lambda$  is centered on the location of the actual current source.

Fig. 4 shows the localization error of the estimated current source when varying the regularization parameter  $\lambda$ , where the actual current source is placed in the right primary visual cortex. Table II shows the localization error and the value of  $\lambda$  when the smallest localization error was obtained for each method and  $\lambda = 0$  for Deep Prior. As shown in Table II, in that case of the right primary auditory cortex as well, the




Fig. 4. Relationships between the regularization parameter  $\lambda$  and localization error of the current dipole in the right primary visual cortex

TABLE II

LOCALIZATION ERROR OF THE CURRENT DIPOLE IN THE RIGHT PRIMARY VISUAL CORTEX

Method	Localization Error [mm]
MNE ( $\lambda = 4.05$ )	29.7
sLORETA ( $\lambda = 4.05$ )	1.8
Deep Prior ( $\lambda = 0$ )	18.6
Deep Prior ( $\lambda = 4.05$ )	4.2

localization errors of the MNE and the Deep Prior reduced compared to the case when  $\lambda = 0$  by setting an appropriate  $\lambda$ . However, the localization errors of MNE and Deep Prior tended to be larger than that of the right primary auditory cortex. This may be due to the fact that the primary visual cortex is located at a deeper position than the primary auditory cortex, and increasing  $\lambda$  also increases the regularization of the current norm, i.e., the bias toward the surface. Therefore, it is necessary to adjust not only  $\lambda$  but also  $p$  in (5).

## VII. CONCLUSIONS

In this work, in order to improve the performance of current source estimation using Deep Prior, we introduced regularization with depth weight in Deep Prior. In experiments, the MEG data synthesized by assuming a single current source in the right primary auditory cortex and the right primary visual cortex are used, and the results showed that by setting appropriate regularization parameters, the localization error reduced and the current source could be estimated around the true position. Since the estimation is not yet satisfactory for deeper current sources, it is necessary to investigate the effect of other parameters  $p$  and how to select optimal parameters. The evaluation of the proposed method on a wider variety of current sources is also an issue for future work.

## REFERENCES

[1] M. S. Hämäläinen and R. Ilmoniemi, "Interpreting measured magnetic fields of the brain: Estimates of current distributions," Technical Report TKK-F-A559 HUT Finland, vol. 32, 1984.

[2] R. D. Pascual-Marqui, "Standardized low-resolution brain electromagnetic tomography (sLORETA): technical details," *Methods and findings in experimental and clinical pharmacology*, vol. 24 Suppl D, pp. 5–12, 2002.

[3] D. Ulyanov, A. Vedaldi and V. Lempitsky, "Deep image prior," *Int. J. Comput. Vis.* vol. 128, pp. 1867–1888, 2020.

[4] R. Yamana, H. Yano, R. Takashima, T. Takiguchi, and S. Nakagawa, "MEG source localization Using Deep Prior," *IEEE LifeTech*, 2022.

[5] F.-H. Lin, T. Witzel, S. P. Ahlfors, S. M. Stufflebeam, J. W. Belliveau, and M. S. Hämäläinen, "Assessing and improving the spatial accuracy in MEG source localization by depth-weighted minimum-norm estimates," *NeuroImage*, 31, pp. 160–171, 2006.

[6] A. Gramfort, M. Luessi, E. Larson, D. A. Engemann, D. Strohmeier, C. Brodbeck, R. Goj, M. Jas, T. Brooks, L. Parkkonen, and M. S. Hämäläinen, "MEG and EEG data analysis with MNE-Python," *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, vol. 7, no. 267, pp. 1-13, 2013.