

# Statistical Learning Methods for Neuroimaging Data Analysis with Applications

Hongtu Zhu<sup>1</sup>, Tengfei Li<sup>2</sup>, and Bingxin Zhao<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Departments of Biostatistics, Statistics, Genetics, and Computer Science and Biomedical Research Imaging Center, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

<sup>2</sup>Departments of Radiology and Biomedical Research Imaging Center, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

<sup>3</sup>Department of Statistics and Data Science, University of Pennsylvania

## Abstract

The aim of this paper is to provide a comprehensive review of statistical challenges in neuroimaging data analysis from neuroimaging techniques to large-scale neuroimaging studies to statistical learning methods. We briefly review eight popular neuroimaging techniques and their potential applications in neuroscience research and clinical translation. We delineate the four common themes of neuroimaging data and review major image processing analysis methods for processing neuroimaging data at the individual level. We briefly review four large-scale neuroimaging-related studies and a consortium on imaging genomics and discuss four common themes of neuroimaging data analysis at the population level. We review nine major population-based statistical analysis methods and their associated statistical challenges and present recent progress in statistical methodology to address these challenges.

**Keywords:** causal pathway, heterogeneity, image processing analysis, neuroimaging techniques, population-based statistical analysis, study design.

## 1 Introduction

Neuroimaging refers to the process of producing images of the structure, function, or pharmacology of the central nervous system (CNS). It has been a dynamic and evolving field with (A1) the development of new acquisition techniques, (A2) the collection of various neuroimaging data in clinical settings and medical research, and (A3) the development of statistical learning (SL) methods. For (A1), popular neuroimaging techniques include structural magnetic resonance imaging (sMRI), functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI), diffusion weighted imaging (DWI), computerized tomography (CT), positron emission tomography (PET), electroencephalography (EEG), magnetoencephalography (MEG), and functional near-infrared spectroscopy (fNIRS). These techniques were developed to measure specific tracers in CNS, that are directly and indirectly associated with brain structure and function. For instance, PET delineates how an injected radioactive tracer (e.g., Fluorodeoxyglucose (FDG)) moves and accumulates in the brain, whereas fMRI measures an indirect tracer, called the concentration of deoxyhaemoglobin, in the flow downstream of

the activated neurons caused by brain's activity. The developments of SL methods for individual neuroimaging data raise serious challenges for existing statistical methods due to four common themes consisting of **(CT1)** *complex brain objects*, **(CT2)** *complex spatio-temporal structures*, **(CT3)** *extremely high dimensionality*, and **(CT4)** *heterogeneity within subjects and across groups*.

For (A2), in recent years, huge amounts of neuroimaging data have been collected in health care, biomedical research studies, and clinical trials. First, neuroimaging has the potential to improve clinical care for diagnosis and prognosis in various brain-related diseases, such as dementia, sleep disorders, and schizophrenia. Some typical uses of neuroimaging include identifying the effects of brain-related diseases (e.g., stroke or glioblastoma), locating cysts and tumors, and finding swelling and bleeding, among others. Second, many large-scale biomedical studies have collected/are collecting massive neuroimaging data (e.g., sMRI, DWI, and fMRI) with high spatial and/or temporal resolution as well as other complex information (e.g., genomics and health factors) in order to map the human brain connectome for understanding the pathophysiology of brain-related disorders, the progress of neuropsychiatric and neurodegenerative disorders, the normal brain development, and the diagnosis of brain cancer, among others. In the last two decades, there are at least three pioneering neuroimaging-related studies, including Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) (<http://www.adni-info.org/>) (Weiner et al., 2010), the Human Connectome Project (HCP) (<http://humanconnectome.org/consortia/>) (Van Essen et al., 2013), and the UK Biobank (UKB) study (<https://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/>) (Miller et al., 2016). They represent major advances and innovations in acquisition protocols, analysis pipelines, data management, experimental design, and sample size. The left panel of Figure 1 shows multi-view data across different domains (e.g., imaging, genetics, or environmental factors) in some large-scale biomedical studies. Third, neuroimaging biomarkers have many uses in clinical trials for drug development in neurological and psychiatric disorders (Schwarz, 2021). These uses include a screening tool for selecting trial participants, a tool to establish biodistribution, target engagement and pharmacodynamic activity, a means for monitoring safety, and an evidence measure of disease modification.

The developments of SL methods for clinical translation and large-scale neuroimaging-related studies raise serious challenges to existing statistical methods due to the four additional themes of **(CT5)** *sampling bias*, **(CT6)** *complex missing patterns*, **(CT7)** *complex data objects*, and **(CT8)** *complicated causal pathways in brain disorders*.

For (A3), there is a large literature on the development of SL methods for neuroimaging data analysis (NDA) in order to correlate multi-type data from different domains across multiple studies, eventually establishing a dynamic causal pathway (e.g., the causal genetic-imaging-clinical (CGIC) pathway in the right panel of Figure 1) linking genetics to brain (or neuroimaging) phenotypes to clinical outcomes confounded with health factors. These SL methods can be categorized into two categories including image processing analysis (IPA) at individual level and population-based statistical analysis (PSA) for a sample of subjects. We further group various IPA methods into deconvolution and structure learning (Sotiras et al., 2013; Li et al., 2019; Zhou et al., 2021; Shen et al., 2017; Park et al., 2003; Yi et al., 2019). Deconvolution methods primarily include image reconstruction and image enhancement. Structure learning methods mainly include image segmentation and image registration. Due to (CT1)-(CT4) and the lack of high-quality annotation datasets, it is very challenging to develop ‘good’ IPA pipelines to extract a relatively small number of image phenotypes (IPs) with high repeatability and reproducibility for both individual health care and PSA. We also group various PSA methods into nine main categories, including study design, statistical parametric mapping, object oriented data analysis, dimensional reduction methods, data integration, imputation methods, predictive models, imaging genetics, and causal discovery (Ombao et al., 2016; Nathoo et al., 2019; Shen and Thompson, 2019; Smith and Nichols, 2018; Nichols et al., 2017; Rathore et al., 2017). Due to (CT1)-(CT8), each category has its own statistical challenges, requiring specific statistical methodology to address them. However, the development of scalable PSA methods has fallen seriously behind the technological advances in neuroimaging techniques, causing difficulty in translating research findings to clinical practice.




Figure 1: Left panel: Major data types from different domains in several representative large-scale biomedical studies; Right panel: A dynamic causal model for delineating causal genetic-imaging-clinical (CGIC) pathway confounded with environmental factors and unobserved confounders.

## 2 A Review of Neuroimaging Techniques and Uses

We briefly review eight neuroimaging techniques below and summarize them in supplementary Table 1. For each image modality, we describe its tracer, data dimension, features, main uses, and several key softwares (Smith and Webb, 2010). Figure 2 also presents different neuroimaging modalities and the different types of features they extract.

- *Structural magnetic resonance imaging (sMRI)* measures the fluid characteristics of different tissues (gray and white matter), creating high-resolution (0.5mm-1mm) images with a strong gray/white matter contrast and many anatomical details. It allows us to qualitatively and quantitatively measure the development and change of cortical and subcortical structures in terms of both size and shape in the brain. Some sMRI derived measurements include cortical thickness, cortical folding, sulcal depth, voxel-based morphometry, and regional volumes and shape. sMRI has been widely used for diagnosis, staging, and follow-up of disease in clinics and brain development in research.

- *Diffusion weighted MRI (DWI)* measures the Brownian motion of water molecules within voxels, creating images with a relatively low spatial resolution of 1.25-3 mm and multiple  $b$ -values and tens to a few hundreds of diffusion directions that can reveal microscopic details about tissue architecture and map white matter trajectories in the brain. It allows us to qualitatively and quantitatively measure white matter (WM) trajectories and water diffusivity along these trajectories *in vivo*. Some DWI derived measurements include invariant measures (e.g., fractional anisotropy) along WM trajectories (or in WM regions) and their related weighted and binary network metrics (e.g., the counts of streamlines connecting all WM region pairs). DWI has been used for delineating tumors, suspected acute ischemic brain injury, intracranial infections, masses, trauma, and edema in clinics and mapping structural connectome in research.
- *Functional MRI (fMRI)* primarily measures the blood-oxygen-level-dependent (BOLD) responses in blood flow associated with brain function, creating images with a typical spatial resolution of 3-4 mm, a typical temporal resolution of 1-3 s, and hundreds of time points that can map metabolic function and neuronal activity. It allows us to indirectly and non-invasively measure brain functions under specific tasks, resting state, and naturalistic paradigms. Thus, fMRI consists of task based fMRI (tfMRI) and resting state fMRI (rsfMRI). Some fMRI derived measurements include voxel-wise activation patterns (e.g., beta images), region-based activation and interaction patterns, and weighted and binary network metrics (e.g., the correlation matrix for all region-of-interest pairs). fMRI has been used for brain activity mapping under different tasks, brain abnormalities detection, and pre-operative mapping of brain functions.
- *Positron emission tomography (PET)* measures emissions from radioactive tracers (e.g.,  $^{18}\text{F}$ -FDG), creating images with a spatial resolution of 4-5 mm, and a poor temporal resolution (tens of seconds to several minutes) that can reveal tissue's metabolism (e.g., flow, oxygen, and glucose metabolism). It allows us to qualitatively and quantitatively measure the

physiology and anatomy of brain as well as its biochemical properties. Some PET-derived measurements include voxel-wise activation patterns (e.g., standard uptake ratio (SUR) images) and region-based activation and interaction patterns. PET has been used for mapping brain functions and detecting abnormalities in brain neurophysiology and neurochemistry associated with Alzheimer's Disease, anxiety, and stroke.

- *Computerized tomography (CT)* measures X-ray attenuations by different tissues inside the body, creating images with a high spatial resolution of tens of nanometers that can non-destructively reveal internal details (e.g., soft tissues or bones) of organs. It allows us to qualitatively and quantitatively measure brain tissue and brain structures, such as skull and blood vessels. However, CT as a radiation diagnostic technique can cause adverse effects, including harmful tissue reactions and cancer. Some CT derived measurements include local and regional volumetric and thickness measures. CT has been used for diagnosing a range of conditions, such as abnormal blood vessels, brain atrophy, hemorrhage, swelling, stroke, and tumors.
- *Electroencephalography (EEG)* measures the electrical field produced by neuron electrical activity, creating an electrogram of the electrical activity on the scalp with a high temporal resolution of millisecond or less. It allows us to indirectly and non-invasively measure synchronous dendritic activity of cortical pyramidal neurons. However, EEG has a poor spatial resolution of 5-40 cm<sup>3</sup>, which depends on the number of electrodes ranging from tens to a few hundreds. Some EEG derived measures include event-related potentials (e.g., stimulus onset) linked to an event, connectivity measures, network measures, and the type of neural oscillations in the spectral content of EEG, including delta (1–4 Hz), theta (4–8 Hz), alpha activity (8–12 Hz), beta (13–30 Hz), low gamma (30–70 Hz), and high gamma (70–150 Hz). EEG has been used for diagnosing and treating brain tumors, brain damage, brain dysfunction, sleep disorders, anxiety, epilepsy, inflammation, and stroke.

- *Magnetoencephalography (MEG)* measures the magnetic field produced by neuron electrical activity, creating an electrogram of the electrical activity with a high temporal resolution of millisecond or less and a moderate spatial resolution of a few millimeters. Compared with scalp EEG, MEG uses very sensitive magnetometers to indirectly and non-invasively measuring the tangential components of post-synaptic intracellular currents in the dendrites of neurons. MEG and EEG share similar derived measures. MEG has been used for identifying the functional areas of the brain, including centers of sensory, motor, language, and memory activities, and for mapping the precise location of the source of epileptic seizures.
- *Functional near-infrared spectroscopy (fNIRS)* uses infrared light (650–900 nm) to measure changes in cortical BOLD response associated with brain function, creating an electrogram of BOLD signals with a high temporal resolution of milliseconds and a spatial resolution of millimeters below cortical surface. fNIRS shares similar derived measures with EEG and fMRI. fNIRS has been used for studying normal and pathological brain physiology and investigating behavioral and cognitive development in infants and children.

There is a great interest in developing different integration methods to fuse multimodal neuroimaging together (Tulay et al., 2019), since no single modality is able to completely delineate the complex dynamics of brain physiology and pathology. It allows us to borrow complementary information from different modalities, leading a comprehensive picture of the brain under different clinical conditions, different tasks, resting state, and normal development. Three categories of multimodal neuroimaging include structural–structural combinations, functional–functional combinations, and structural–functional combinations. For instance, the fMRI/EEG integration as a functional-functional combination improves both spatial and temporal resolution, while cross-validating findings across different scales. A simultaneous CT-MRI scanner as a special case of structural-structural combinations is to integrate high contrast resolution of MRI with high spatial resolution of CT. Structural-functional combinations, including EEG/sMRI, PET/CT, and PET/MRI, link anatomical structure with functional dynamics, improving mapping the anatomical



basis of brain functions and simulating brain dynamics. Furthermore, scientists proposed whole-brain models by combining anatomical networks extracted from DWI/sMRI with local dynamics extracted from fMRI/EEG/MEG and metabolism extracted from PET (Deco et al., 2015). Those whole-brain models usually consist of three basic elements, including brain parcellation (e.g., the HCP-MMP in Glasser et al. (2016)), anatomical connectivity matrix for the human connectome, and local dynamics for the activity of each brain region and interaction terms with other regions.

### **3 Image Processing Analysis (IPA) Methods**

We discuss the four common themes of neuroimaging data, review existing major IPA methods for processing neuroimaging data, and delineate major statistical challenges associated with IPA.

#### **3.1 Common Themes (CT1)-(CT4)**

We discuss four common themes of neuroimaging data as follows.

**(CT1) Complex Brain Objects.** All neuroimaging modalities, including those in Section 2, are developed to indirectly (or directly) measure the structure and function of the cerebrum, cerebellum, brain stem, diencephalon (thalamus and hypothalamus), limbic system, reticular activating system, and ventricular system in the human brain. For instance, the cerebrum is part of the fore-brain, consisting of the cerebral cortex of gray matter as the outer layer and white matter in the inner layer. It is responsible for processing language, motor function, memory, vision, personality, and other cognitive functions. The cerebral cortex consists of frontal lobe, temporal lobe, parietal lobe, and occipital lobe, while its surface is made up of gyri and sulci. Moreover, the human brain uses neurons as information messengers to send electrical impulses and chemical signals to different brain regions and body in order to control biological functions and react to environmental changes. Moreover, there are two sets of blood vessels, including the vertebral arteries and the carotid arteries, that supply blood and oxygen to the brain. These objects in the brain are the targets

of different neuroimaging modalities.




Figure 2: Roles of different imaging modalities for extracting various types of features.

**(CT2) Complex Spatiotemporal Structures.** There are three different spatiotemporal structures, including spatial and temporal resolutions, spatio-temporal smoothness, and spatiotemporal correlation. In Section 2, we have discussed different spatial and temporal resolution ranges for the eight neuroimaging techniques. In general, higher spatial (or temporal) resolution leads to better spatial (or temporal) localization, but in some cases (e.g., DWI), higher spatial resolution decreases signal-to-noise ratio. Due to the intrinsic smooth structure of different brain regions discussed in (CT1), neuroimaging data is expected to contain spatially contiguous regions or effect regions with relatively sharp edges, showing locally strong spatio-temporal smoothness and spatiotemporal correlation. Moreover, long-range temporal correlations among different brain regions may be caused

by respiration, cardiac rhythm, and cognitive processes.

**(CT3) Extremely High Dimensionality.** Both raw neuroimaging data and extracted feature data can be extremely high dimensional even for a single subject. For instance, for a single subject, the number of 3-dimensional (3D) DWI images varies from several tens to a few hundreds, and the extracted feature data includes 3-dimensional images of various diffusion-related quantities (e.g., diffusion tensors and fractional anisotropy), a whole-brain tractographic data set (which can contain more than 1,000,000 streamlines), diffusion properties along white matter bundles, and structural connectivity network metrics. For a single subject, the number of 3D fMRIs is about several hundreds and the extracted feature data includes 3D activation patterns, region-based activation and interaction patterns, and weighted and binary network metrics.

**(CT4) Heterogeneity within Individual Subjects and across Centers/Studies** A neuroimaging data may be written as

$$I = f(\text{brain}(\text{age, gene, race, disease, other factors}), \text{device, acquisition parameters, noises}), \quad (1)$$

where noises contain all kinds of noise components (e.g., thermal noise or motion) (Smith and Nichols, 2018) and brain includes both brain structural and functional components. Model (1) emphasizes two important facts that (i) neuroimage data represent a mixture of different components introduced by brain, device, acquisition parameters, and different noises and (ii) brain changes may be caused by age, genes, race, disease, and other factors (e.g., stimulus, life style, or environmental factors). The effect of device, acquisition parameters, and noises in  $I$  can be larger than the effect of brain changes caused by predictors of interest. For a single subject in a short time window, it is expected that structural images are much more stable than functional images even in the same scanner, whereas one may observe visible differences in the same type of structural images acquired in two different scanners. A sensible neuroimaging modality requires that brain changes caused by a specific condition are large relative to the variability caused by noises, acquisition parameters, and device. Figure 3A presents the reproducibility using intraclass correlation

coefficient (ICC) values of imaging phenotypes based on the UKB test-retest dataset. We observe that the brain and heart structural traits have much larger reproducibility than the brain functional traits, suggesting the complexity and variability of brain function.

Any novel IPA methods for neuroimaging data need to account for some/all of the four themes (CT1)-(CT4) discussed above. We review two categories of IPA methods including deconvolution and structural learning in the existing literature below.




Figure 3: The reproducibility (left panel) and heritability (right panel) of seven different categories of imaging traits based on UKB including brain regional volume, brain diffusivity parameters, heart MRI traits, brain independent component analysis (ICA)-based resting-state fMRI full and partial connectivity, 12 network-based brain rsfMRI full connectivity, and 12 network-based brain tfMRI full connectivity.

### 3.2 IPA: Deconvolution

We use “deconvolution” to represent all computational and statistical methods for reconstructing image data of interest from recorded imaging signals with various noise components. We can further categorize all deconvolution methods into the image reconstruction and enhancement processes (Park et al., 2003; Hansen and Kellman, 2015).

The *image reconstruction process* for neuroimage data aims to reconstruct clinically inter-

pretable images from raw data acquired by neuroimaging devices. For instance, MRI data are acquired in k-space and a specific image reconstruction process is needed to generate MRI images in image space. Several key methods for MRI reconstruction include noise pre-whitening, zero filling in k-space, raw data filtering, Fourier transforms, and phased array coil combination (Hansen and Kellman, 2015). Recently, compressed sensing algorithms and deep learning (DL) methods play a critical role in fast MRI acquisition and reconstruction (Chen et al., 2022; Lustig et al., 2008). Furthermore, most neuroimage data in the image space still need additional reconstruction in order to estimate local features of interest in the human brain. Some examples include diffusion tensors for DWI, cortical surface for sMRI, white matter fiber bundles for DWI, and hemodynamic response functions for fMRI and fNIS (Ombao et al., 2016; Zhu et al., 2007; Yeh et al., 2021; Seghouane and Ferrari, 2019; Liu et al., 2008; Jenkinson et al., 2012).

The *image enhancement process* for neuroimage data is to improve the quality of the generated images for better presentation and analysis. Popular enhancement tasks include denoising, super-resolution, bias field correction, and harmonization. Among them, bias field correction and harmonization were proposed to correct for two major confounders including devices and artifacts in noises described in Model (1). Specifically, bias field in image data refers to the presence of a low frequency intensity nonuniformity, representing a potential confounder in various image analysis tasks, such as tissue segmentation (Song et al., 2017). Various bias correction methods (e.g., nonparametric nonuniform intensity normalization (N3) algorithm) fall into prospective and retrospective approaches according to different sources of bias field and features used in bias correction (Song et al., 2017). Harmonization in imaging data aims to correct significant inter- and intra-site variability even within individual subjects, which may be caused by hardware, reconstruction process, and acquisition parameters. Such variability are much more profound across different subjects in multi-site and multi-study neuroimaging datasets. Therefore, there is a great interest in the development of various harmonization methods, including surrogate variable approach, meta analysis, mega analysis, removal of artificial voxel effect by linear regression, phantome-based

harmonization, DL, or combined association test (Combat), for correcting inter- and intra-site variability in neuroimaging datasets (Yu et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2021). See Section 5.2.5 for further details.

### 3.3 IPA: Structure Learning

We use “structure learning” to include all computational and statistical methods for extracting signals of interest from reconstructed imaging data. We can further categorize structural learning methods into the image segmentation and registration processes (Sotiras et al., 2013; Li et al., 2019; Zhou et al., 2021; Shen et al., 2017; Bharati et al., 2022; Miller and Younes, 2001; Grenander and Miller, 2007; Hesamian et al., 2019; Srivastava and Klassen, 2016).

The *image segmentation process* for neuroimage data aims to label reconstructed neuroimaging data into meaningful subgroups for clinical and scientific tasks, including the quantification of brain development, the localization of pathology, surgical planning, and image-guided interventions. Existing image segmentation methods can be roughly clustered into traditional segmentation techniques (e.g., intensity-based methods or surface-based methods), machine learning approaches, and deep-learning ones, such as fully connected networks (FCNs) and U-nets (Isensee et al., 2021; Hesamian et al., 2019). Major neuroimage segmentation tasks include skull stripping, cortical and subcortical structures segmentation, white matter tract parcellation, functional parcellation, and lesion localization (Kalavathi and Prasath, 2016; Eickhoff et al., 2018; Fischl, 2012; Wasserthal et al., 2018; Havaei et al., 2017; Isensee et al., 2021). Performing these tasks allows us to extract a wealth of important features, including local properties of brain structures; short-, median-, and long-range structural and functional connectivity patterns; and structural and functional markers, while addressing (CT1)-(CT4),

Segmentation tasks have at least three important applications. First, they greatly compress the dimensionality of neuroimaging data as detailed in (CT3), while providing strong biological interpretation. Second, refined brain structural and functional parcellations greatly improve our

understanding of the organizational principles behind the human brain across multiple regions, multiple scales, and multiple tasks. Third, an important clinical application of image segmentation is computer-aided detection and diagnosis for localizing lesions and then classifying them into a specific lesion type (Zhou et al., 2021).

The *image registration process* for neuroimage data aims to transform the spatial coordinates of neuroimage data within individual subjects and/or across different subjects into the same coordinate system of an atlas (Bharati et al., 2022; Miller and Younes, 2001; Grenander and Miller, 2007; Hesamian et al., 2019; Srivastava and Klassen, 2016). Some important applications of registration include the construction of brain atlas, multimodal fusion, the quantification of brain development, population analysis, longitudinal analysis, automated image segmentation, shape analysis, and the localization of pathology. Most image registration algorithms have three major components including (i) the similarity measure, (ii) the transformation model, and (iii) the optimization process. The similarity measures can be either intensity-based (e.g., mutual information or correlation metrics) or feature-based (e.g., distances between image features such as points, lines, and contours). The transformation models can be categorized into rigid (translations and rotations), affine, homographies, and deformations models. Deformation models (Sotiras et al., 2013) can be further grouped into physics-based models based on a physical model, interpolation-based methods, and knowledge-based approaches, leading to ill-posed problems. It requires imposing implicit and explicit regularization constraints, such as hard constraints, topology preservation, volume preservation, and rigidity constraints. Recently, we witness a growing interest in the development of DL-based image registration methods, such as deep iterative registration, deep supervised registration, and deep unsupervised registration (Bharati et al., 2022). These DL-based models hold great promise for using a single forward calculation to complete registration within few seconds, while showing comparable accuracy with conventional methods.

As an example, we consider the construction of imaging-based human brain atlases as one of the most important applications of registration. Cartographic approaches have been widely used

to create anatomical atlases (e.g., Brodmann’s map and Dejerine’s map) based on post-mortem tissues, establishing spatial correspondences between a coordinate and a brain structure. Recently, we witness a tremendous evolution of human brain atlases (e.g., Yeo-Network, AHB, or HCP-MMP) (Glasser et al., 2016; Eickhoff et al., 2018; Toga et al., 2006; Nowinski, 2021) due to the availability of many advanced imaging techniques, brain mapping methods, large-scale neuroimaging datasets, and registration methods, among others. Various criteria have been applied for human brain atlases, including brain architecture, functional activities, anatomical and functional connectivity, abnormality, genetic and protein information, cell type, lifespan, spatio-temporal scales, ethnicity, and multiple modalities, among others. In the near future, modern human brain atlases may provide an integrative and comprehensive description of brain structure and function in large populations, across different scales, age, gender, behavioral tasks, ethnic groups, disease states, and imaging modalities.

### 3.4 A Generic Statistical Model for IPA

We discuss a generic statistical model for IPA, including denoising, super-resolution, reconstruction, segmentation, and registration. First, we consider image reconstruction. Suppose that we observe  $\{(\mathbf{x}_i, I_i) : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ , where  $I_i$  and  $\mathbf{x}_i$  are, respectively, an imaging vector and a predictor vector, which may depend on the imaging device, acquisition parameters, and observable confounders in noise components. It is assumed that  $I_i$  given  $\mathbf{x}_i$  follows a probability distribution  $p(I_i|h(\mathbf{x}_i, \theta), \sigma)$ , where  $\theta$  is a vector of parameters (or functions),  $\sigma$  is a vector of nuisance parameters, and  $h(\cdot, \cdot)$  is a vector of functions. Let’s consider two examples. First, we consider the raw sMRI data in k-space. In this case,  $I_i$  is the complex magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) measurement in k-space,  $\mathbf{x}_i$  includes its  $(k_x, k_y)$  coordinate and other MRI scanner parameters,  $n$  is the total number of observations in k-space, and  $\theta$  is the sMRI in image space. Second, we consider the DWI data. In this case,  $I_i$  is DWI,  $\mathbf{x}_i$  includes  $b$ -values and diffusion directions,  $n$  is the total number of DWI, and  $\theta$  is the image of diffusion tensors.



The primary interest of many deconvolution methods is to estimate  $\theta$  by maximizing

$$L_n(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log p(I_i|h(\mathbf{x}_i, \theta), \sigma) + R_1(h(\mathbf{x}_i, \theta)) + R_2(\theta, \sigma), \quad (2)$$

where  $R_1(\cdot)$  and  $R_2(\cdot)$  are two regularization terms based on prior information, such as sparsity and spatio-temporal structures in (CT1) and (CT2). As an illustration, we discuss how to construct  $\log p(I_i|h(\mathbf{x}_i, \theta), \sigma)$  in equation (2) for image denoising by using weighted loss functions. Many denoising methods solve a weighted loss function by incorporating signals in the neighboring locations of each location. A further refinement is to build a sequence of increasing neighborhood sizes and then sequentially fit the weighted loss function in equation (2) to estimate  $\theta$  as size starts from the smallest size to the largest size, while borrowing information from the previous sizes (Polzehl and Spokoiny, 2000; Li et al., 2011). In this case,  $L_n(\theta)$  may implicitly depend on all observations in the neighboring locations of each location, so it is strongly dependent on both location and neighborhood size. Specifically, we estimate  $\theta$  in equation (2) at the smallest size, denoted as  $\hat{\theta}_{(0)}$ , and then use adaptive smoothing methods to sequentially calculate  $\hat{\theta}_{(s_k)}$  for  $s_0 = 0 < s_1 < \dots < s_K$ , while preserving spatial smoothness and edges (Buades et al., 2005).

Both image segmentation and registration can be also formulated as special cases of equation (2). For image segmentation,  $\mathbf{x}_i$  and  $I_i$  are, respectively, input image data for segmentation and output segmentation results,  $n$  is the number of annotated image data, and  $R_1(\cdot)$  may be a spatio-temporal regularization term. For image registration, we consider registering a pair of images with  $\mathbf{x}_i$  and  $I_i$  being source image and target image, respectively. In this case,  $n = 1$ ,  $h(\mathbf{x}_i, \theta) = \mathbf{x}_i(T_i(s))$  with  $T_i(\cdot)$  being a transformation model,  $\log p(I_i|h(\mathbf{x}_i, \theta), \sigma)$  is a matching criterion chosen to match  $(I_i, \mathbf{x}_i)$ , and  $R_1(\mathbf{x}_i(T_i(s)))$  is imposed on  $T_i(\cdot)$  to induce certain constraints (e.g., diffeomorphism) (Bharati et al., 2022; Miller and Younes, 2001; Grenander and Miller, 2007; Hesamian et al., 2019; Srivastava and Klassen, 2016).

### 3.5 Challenges

We have briefly reviewed four major IPA techniques including reconstruction, enhancement, segmentation, and registration, which are the key building blocks of most neuroimage preprocessing pipelines, but each of them requires substantial efforts on validation, which can be a daunting and difficult task. For instance, most neuroimage segmentation methods suffer from a major data bottleneck (or barrier) for validation, even though DL-based methods have significantly improved segmentation accuracy over traditional methods. Specifically, there are no single, publicly available, high-quality neuroimaging datasets with detailed annotation information that cover a large spectrum of segmentation tasks in neuroimaging research, greatly limiting the translation of segmentation methods to the clinic. In contrast, publicly available datasets and environments (e.g., the ImageNet) played a vital role in the development of DL methods for computer vision problems and the successes of ‘narrow AI’ systems, such as DeepMind’s AlphaGo. Several methodological attempts to partially address the data bottleneck for validation include unsupervised learning, self-supervised learning, weakly supervised learning, data augmentation, patch-wise training, and transfer learning (Zhou et al., 2021; Isensee et al., 2021; Hesamian et al., 2019). However, there is a great need to accomplish several key developments in order to address the data bottleneck including the development of good annotation protocols for major segmentation tasks, the collection of high-quality datasets covering a wide range of settings as discussed in (CT4), the use of active learning and reinforcement learning (Budd et al., 2021; Zhou et al., 2021), and a comprehensive evaluation system for image segmentation and registration. Similar comments are also valid for validating most image registration methods.

As an illustration, we consider a comprehensive DWI preprocessing pipeline consisting of (i) fiber orientation reconstruction, (ii) WM tracking, (iii) WM parcellation, (iv) WM registration, (v) extraction of diffusion properties along WM and structural connectivity metrics, (vi) visualization, and (vii) statistical analysis. Although major technical advancements have been made in Steps (i)-(vii) in the last decade, steps (ii)-(iv) still face major technical barriers. Specifically, multiple

tractography challenges reveal that most state-of-the-art algorithms produce many more false than valid WM bundles (Schilling et al., 2019, 2022), leading to erroneous structural connectivity metrics. Those false WM bundles are mainly caused by the limitation of DWI and the complexity of WM structure as discussed in (CT1). Moreover, a recent open call for segmenting 14 white matter fascicles based on the same sets of streamlines obtained from six subjects (Schilling et al., 2021) reveals that there is a large variability across 57 different state-of-the-art segmentation protocols and techniques for such call. Such variability is mainly caused by the complexity of WM structure as discussed in (CT1) and the lack of good validation data sets in addition to the limitations of existing clustering techniques. The variability in WM tracking and parcellation greatly affects downstream WM structural connectivity metrics extraction and quantification (Schilling et al., 2021). Another technical barrier is that existing WM registration algorithms not only suffer from pinching effects for transforming WM bundles to the WM bundle atlas (Srivastava and Klassen, 2016), but also largely ignore the diffusion property information along fiber tracts (Zhang et al., 2018), causing a local misalignment issue among those diffusion property functions. In contrast, the method of tract-based spatial statistics (TBSS) (Smith et al., 2006), which projects WM diffusion properties onto a whole brain WM skeleton, is a robust approach with high reproducibility (Figure 3), but TBSS does not have individual fiber tract specificity.

## **4 Large-scale Neuroimaging-related Studies**

We witness the exponential increase in the collection of neuroimaging data in many large-scale biomedical studies (e.g., UKB) in the last decade primarily due to huge investment from different funding agencies and private sectors (Miller et al., 2016; Littlejohns et al., 2020). The number of subjects in a neuroimaging study increases from several tens in most neuroimaging-related studies thirty years ago to more than 10,000 in several studies lately. Besides neuroimaging data, those large-scale biomedical studies have collected/are collecting other data types, including genetic data, behavioral data, environmental factors, and clinical outcomes in order to better understand

the progress of neuropsychiatric disorders, neurological disorders, and stroke, and normal brain development, among many others. Recently, several large consortiums have been formed to enhance collaborations on neuroimaging and imaging genomics among researchers across the world. We brief review four large-scale neuroimaging-related studies, whose detailed information is included in Figure 4, and a consortium on imaging genomics, called ENIGMA.

Datasets*	ADNI	HCP-B	HCP-D	HCP-Y	HCP-A	ABCD	UKB
Age range (year)	54~92	0~5	6~21	22~35	36~100	9~10	40~69
Samples (k)	2.3	0.4	0.7	1.2	0.7	11	500
Female %	47%	51%	51%	54%	56%	48%	53%
White %	91%	79%	62%	74%	72%	52%	95%
Brain image							
Genomics		—	—		—		
Lifestyle							
SES							
Clinical							
Else							

\*: Up till 2021.

**Image:** **Genomics:**   
**Lifestyle:**   
**SES:**   
**Clinical:**   
**Else:**

Figure 4: Some summary information for the ADNI, HCP, ABCD and UKB studies.

## 4.1 ADNI

The overall goal of ADNI is to validate potentially useful biomarkers for AD clinical treatment trials (Weiner et al., 2017). ADNI is a multisite, prospective clinical study and actively supports the investigation and development of treatments that may slow or stop the progression of Alzheimer’s

disease (AD) \*. Researchers across 63 sites in the US and Canada have been tracking the progression of AD through clinical, imaging, genetic and biospecimen biomarkers, starting from normal aging, early mild cognitive impairment (EMCI), late mild cognitive impairment (LMCI) to dementia or AD. The recruitment for ADNI was designed to mimic a clinical trial population, where the participants were generally well educated, mostly white, and with a high proportion of *APOE4* carriers among the MCI and AD groups, which is consistent with subjects in MCI and AD clinical trials. The ADNI participants do not represent “typical” subjects across the old population since the proportion of AD cases (23%) is much higher than the prevalence of AD in the US. Up till 2022, the ADNI study has collected 2,723 participants aged above 40 in four phases including ADNI1, ADNI2, ADNIGO, and ADNI3. Genomic biosample and genotyping were collected for all subjects, enabling polygenic risk scores and gene pathway- and network-based metrics for prediction of disease progression. Cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) biomarkers, including the  $A\beta$ , t-tau and p-tau, were provided. For imaging data, ADNI1 focused primarily on sMRI and PET to study brain changes in brain morphology and metabolism with AD. ADNIGO and ADNI2 added a high-resolution coronal T2, perfusion MRI, DWI, and resting-state fMRI (rsfMRI). ADNI3 includes seven sequences (sMRI, FLAIR, T2\*GRE, DWI, rsfMRI, ASL perfusion MRI, and a high resolution coronal T2 fast spin echo) in all subjects. ADNI3 aims to study how tau PET, CSF biomarker, and functional imaging affect treatment, promote the development of new immunoassay platforms and mass spectroscopy techniques to improve the reliability of CSF analysis, and deepen our understanding of the progression and pathophysiology of AD (Weiner et al., 2017). As a multimodal longitudinal AD-targeted study, ADNI has provided a myriad of important insights on various aspects of AD, emphasizing AD pathophysiology and and disease progression.

---

\*ADNI, <https://adni.loni.usc.edu/study-design/>

## 4.2 HCP

The original Human Connectome Project (HCP-Y) gathered data from 1,200 healthy young adults aged 21-35, including young adult sibships of average size 3–4, to build a high-quality data set that can be comparable with other populations. The primary goals of HCP include (i) building a “network map” that will shed light on the anatomical and functional connectivity within the healthy human brain, (ii) promoting the understanding of inter-individual variability of brain circuits to behavior, (iii) facilitating research into brain disorders, such as autism, AD, and schizophrenia, and (iv) making all data freely available to the scientific community (Van Essen et al., 2013; Bookheimer et al., 2019). Now, it has been extended to a number of studies on healthy humans ranging from birth to nonagenarians and beyond<sup>†</sup>, aiming at mapping neural systems to underlying cognition and behavior across the life span. Those studies will include HCP-B (HCP babies: age 0-5; 500 subjects), HCP-D (HCP development: age 5-21; 1,350 subjects), and HCP-A (HCP aging: age 36-100+; 1,200+ subjects). All HCP studies are hybrid cross-sectional and longitudinal cohorts, which recruited participants according to specific inclusion and exclusion criteria, such as the age range, birth weight, no major diagnosed diseases, and informed consent, with longitudinal follow-up observations for subsets of participants. Such recruitment method ensures that the samples reflect the racial/ethnic and socioeconomic diversity of the US Census. The HCP collected various imaging modalities including DWI, rsfMRI, tfMRI, T1- and T2-weighted sMRI, and MEG/EEG. Domains of cognition, emotion, motor function, and sensation were also collected, while different major factors relevant to brain development, aging, cognition and behavior were collected for different age phases. For example, HCP-A collected the vascular burden (e.g., obesity, hypertension, smoking), risk gene status (e.g., *APOE*), hormonal status, and lifestyle factors (e.g., depression, sleep patterns, social/community engagement, and adversity) (Bookheimer et al., 2019). For HCP-Y participants, genotyping data are available across 2 million SNPs from 1142 study participants, while for HCP study participants outside of the HCP-Y cohort, samples

---

<sup>†</sup>HCP lifespan, <https://www.humanconnectome.org/lifespan-studies/>

will be assayed on several SNP regions of interest. Follow-up samples will also be collected for longitudinal assessment. Two major advantages of HCP include maximized resolution of imaging data and overall data quality for multi-modal imaging.

### **4.3 ABCD**

The ABCD study is the largest prospective longitudinal study of brain development and child health in the United States, which has recruited approximately 11,880 children aged 9-10 years old from 21 research sites and is following them for 10 years into early adulthood <sup>‡</sup>. Its initial goal was to examine risk and resiliency factors associated with the development of substance use, and then expanded far beyond, into identifying the underlying biospecimens, neural alterations, and environmental factors, and their contributions to the development of behavior, brain function, and other mental and physical outcomes throughout adolescence (Karcher and Barch, 2021). The ABCD adopted multi-stage probability sampling strategy to recruit eligible children to reflect as best as possible, the sociodemographic variation of the US population. However, more neuroimaging research centers were located in urban areas, leading to a potential under-representation of rural youth. The ABCD study covers personal information, family structure, family socioeconomic status, medical history, mental/behavioral performance, lifestyle (physical activity, sleep, diet), substance use (both self-reported and screening: alcohol, nicotine, cannabis, caffeine, cocaine, and marijuana), exposure (air pollution and lead), neuroimaging data (sMRI, DWI, and rsfMRI and tfMRI), and genotyping data. At baseline and year 1 follow-up sessions, biological breath, saliva, urine, and hair samples were collected from youth and genotyping were performed from saliva and blood DNA sample for 11,601 participants. ABCD provides a comprehensive platform for investigating gene-environmental effects on children brain development.

---

<sup>‡</sup>ABCD, <https://abcdstudy.org/about/>

## 4.4 UKB

UKB is a very large prospective cohort study that have recruited over 500,000 individuals aged 40 and 69 from 22 centers across the United Kingdom. It aims to inspire the imaginations of health researchers around the world to meet the challenge of greater understanding, prevention, and treatment of a range of serious illnesses <sup>§</sup>. Extensive phenotypic and genotypic details about its participants were collected, including data from questionnaires focused on health and lifestyle, physical measures, sample assays, accelerometry, multimodal imaging, genome-wide genotyping and longitudinal follow-up for a wide range of health-related outcomes. The UKB imaging study is by far the largest multi-modal imaging study in the world, with over 50,000 participants having undergone assessments (Littlejohns et al., 2020), including brain sMRI, brain fMRI, brain DWI, body MRI, low-dose X-ray bone and joint scans, and ultrasound of the carotid arteries. The genotype data, whole exome sequencing, and whole genome sequencing data for 500,000, 470,000, and 200,000 participants are available to researchers up till 2022, respectively. Finally, over 19,155 diagnostic terms has been collected including hospitalization episode statistics (HES) and recorded using the International Classification of Diseases, Tenth Revision (ICD-10) codes. There is expected to be 20 years of longitudinal follow-up on the participants, and the identification of disease risk factors should increase over time with emerging clinical outcomes. The UKB data set provides a unique opportunity for uncovering the genetic bases of brain structure and function, aging, and various diseases. For the recruitment procedure, postal invitations were sent to 9,238,453 individuals aged 40–69 years old, who lived within 25 miles from one of 22 assessment centres in the UK. With a response rate of 5.5%, there is significant evidence of selection biases, including the higher socio-economic status, better education and health of the UKB sample compared to the general population, leading to debates on the generalizability of UKB findings. Nevertheless, as reported in Batty et al. (2019), many findings from UKB appear to be generalizable to England and Scotland.

---

<sup>§</sup>UK Biobank, <https://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/>



## 4.5 ENIGMA

The Enhancing NeuroImaging Genetics through Meta-Analysis (ENIGMA) Consortium is a global alliance of over 1,400 scientists across 43 countries in the fields of imaging genomics, neurology, and psychiatry, studying a range of large-scale human brain studies that integrate data based on sMRI, DWI, fMRI, genetic data and many patient populations from over 70 institutions worldwide (Thompson et al., 2020). Launched in December 2009, the initial goal of the ENIGMA was to discover the impact of genetic factors on brain systems by integrating the two big data sources—neuroimaging and genetics. The major goals of ENIGMA include<sup>¶</sup> (i) pushing forward the field of imaging genetics, (ii) ensuring promising and reproducible findings, (iii) sharing data, ideas, methods, algorithms and other information, and (iv) training new investigators. The consortium consists of over 50 working groups (WGs), including diagnosis-based, normal variation-based, and method-based WGs. In 2014, ENIMGA considered nine targeted disorders: schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, major depressive disorder, obsessive-compulsive disorder, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder, autism spectrum disorders, substance use disorders, 22q11.2 deletion syndrome, and the effects of the human immunodeficiency virus on the brain. Following this, additional work groups focusing on specific disorders were established, including anxiety disorders, suicidal thoughts and behavior, sleep and insomnia, eating disorders, irritability, antisocial behavior, and dissociative identity disorder. Besides the diagnosis-based WGs, normal-variation WGs study the brain lifespan development, normal aging, gender difference, sleep patterns, and early onset psychosis, whereas method-based WGs span over developing innovative pipelines on producing DWI measures, anatomical shape measures, and data harmonization. Up till now, ENIGMA has stood out for its great impact in promoting robustness and reproducibility, setting methodological standards, and driving new discoveries in neuroscience research and clinical translation.

---

<sup>¶</sup>ENIGMA, <https://enigma.ini.usc.edu/>

## 5 Population-based Statistical Analysis (PSA) Methods

We discuss four common themes of NDA in those large-scale biomedical studies as discussed in Section 4, review existing major PSA methods for NDA, and discuss major statistical challenges associated with PSA.

### 5.1 Common Themes (CT5)-(CT8)

Although we have discussed the common themes (CT1)-(CT4) of neuroimaging data, four more themes as detailed below arise from the joint analysis of big neuroimage data and other related variables from many large-scale biomedical studies, such as UKB and ENIGMA.

**(CT5) Sampling Bias.** The most important issue in NDA is how to appropriately address potential sampling bias introduced at design and data collection stages. Some common types of sampling bias include undercoverage, observer bias, voluntary response bias, survivorship bias, recall bias, and exclusion bias (Riffenburgh, 2012). A direct consequence of sampling bias is that the sample in a study is not a representative sample of a target population. Sampling bias can have profound effects on downstream data analysis as well as on the generalizability and fairness (e.g., sex, race, or age) of conclusions drawn from statistical models. Although the issue of sampling bias is prevalent in neuroimaging research, it has been largely ignored in the medical imaging literature until recently (Roberts et al., 2021; Batty et al., 2019). Understanding how to appropriately deal with sampling bias requires development of specific strategies in the design and collection stages as well as statistical models to explicitly model the sample selection process (Thompson, 2012).

**(CT6) Complex Missing Patterns.** Missing data frequently encountered in large-scale neuroimaging studies are caused by various reasons, including missing by design, faulty scanning, attrition in longitudinal studies, mis-entry, and non-responses in surveys, among others. For a single variable with missing data, these are three types of missingness, including missing completely at random (MCAR), missing at random (MAR), and missing not at random (MNAR). Simply ignoring missing observations and improperly imputing them may lead to efficiency loss and introduce

spurious correlations. Additional challenges also arise in handling missing data in large-scale neuroimaging related studies. For instance, variables with different missing patterns often occur in the same neuroimaging study, while high-dimensional image data are block-wise missing either within individual studies or across different studies. Little progress has been ever made on how to appropriately integrate information across different domains from multiple heterogeneous studies in the presence of block-wise missing data (Xiang et al., 2014), even though there is a large literature on handling missing entries of low-dimensional clinical outcomes (Little and Rubin, 2002; Ibrahim and Molenberghs, 2009).

**(CT7) Complex Data Objects.** Complex data objects in curved spaces frequently arise in the process of extracting meaningful features with strong biological interpretation from neuroimaging data. Some examples of data objects include planar shapes, symmetric positive definite matrices, matrix Lie groups, tree-structured data, the Grassmann manifolds, deformation fields, connectivity graphs, functional connectivity graphs, diffusivity properties along WM bundles, and the shape representations of cortical and subcortical structures, among others. Most of these complex data objects are inherently nonlinear as well as high-dimensional (or even infinite-dimensional), so many traditional statistical techniques, including semiparametric and nonparametric regression, growth curve models, clustering, classification, correlation, and dimension reduction, are often not be directly applicable to them (Dryden and Mardia, 1998; Marron and Dryden, 2021; Huckemann and Eltzner, 2021; Cornea et al., 2017; Srivastava and Klassen, 2016; Wang et al., 2016; Dubey and Müller, 2020). The undertaking of efficient analysis of complex data objects as well as variables obtained from other domains presents major statistical and computational challenges.

**(CT8) Complicated Causal Pathways in Brain Disorders.** Brain disorders (e.g., AD) are affecting 1 in 6 people worldwide and pose a massive threat to public health, resulting in significant disability, morbidity, and mortality. Most approved therapies for treating brain disorders only treat symptoms. Existing studies suggest that most complex brain disorders are highly heritable with polygenic architecture and are caused by a combination of genetic and health factors Miller

et al. (2016); Alnæs et al. (2019); Van Cauwenberghe et al. (2016); Zhao and Castellanos (2016). Moreover, many brain disorders can be regarded as endpoints of abnormal trajectories of brain changes. Since neuroimaging measures are closer to the underlying biology and can be measured temporally, much effort has been devoted to understanding the temporal CGIC pathophysiological pathway in the continuum of brain disease progression from increasingly large cohorts (e.g., ADNI). It may lead to the identification of possible hundreds of risk genes and health factors that contribute to abnormal developmental trajectories of brain disorders. Once such identification has been accomplished, we may establish a set of complex causal relationships that delineate the CGIC pathways confounded with environmental factors and unobserved confounders as shown in Figure 1. These risk trajectories can be detected early enough to identify urgently needed therapies that target the correction of abnormal developmental trajectories, ultimately preventing the onset of brain disorders and reducing their severity.

## **5.2 PSA Methods**

There is a great interest in developing various SL methods for NDA in order to address (CT1)-(CT4) inherent in neuroimaging data discussed in Section 3 and (CT5)-(CT8) in large-scale neuroimaging studies discussed in Section 4. We briefly review nine categories of PSA methods in the literature, many of which are emerging. Moreover, we cannot cite many important papers in each category due to the maximum number of references set by the publisher.

### **5.2.1 Study Designs**

Popular designs in large-scale observational studies include case-control, cross-sectional, and cohort studies (Thompson, 2012; Riffenburgh, 2012). These designs can be applied to a variety of scientific questions, but they all have certain limitations when it comes to specific clinical and epidemiological applications. Case-control studies are good for studying rare clinical outcomes and latent diseases. Participants in a case-control study are selected based on their outcome status

and are defined as cases and controls. In such studies, matching is often used to ensure that the cases and controls have similar characteristics (such as age and sex), which can increase study efficiency. Wellcome Trust Case Control Consortium, for example, uses a case-control design in order to study multiple major diseases with the careful use of a common control group (The-Wellcome-Trust-Case-Control-Consortium, 2007). The case-control design has been widely combined with meta-analysis approaches to pool summary-level data from different research groups, such as the Psychiatric Genomics Consortium (Watson et al., 2020) and ENIGMA (Thompson et al., 2020). However, the selection and matching steps may be prone to certain biases and confounding effects, such as selection bias and recall bias. Due to potential differences between study samples and the general population, the findings and statistics learned from case-control designs may not have perfect generalizability. As neuroimaging data were frequently collected as secondary traits or endophenotypes in these biomedical studies, the "case-control" nature needs to be taken into account when inferring these imaging traits in statistical analyses.

On the other hand, cohort studies recruit participants without screening for the outcome of interest. Participants are selected based on their characteristics and/or their willingness to volunteer. The outcome of interest is typically monitored over time to assess its occurrence and the relationship between outcome and exposures can be evaluated at baseline (e.g., cross-sectional analyses) or in a longitudinal framework. For example, the UKB is a large, population-based cohort study (Littlejohns et al., 2020; Miller et al., 2016), and many cross-sectional analyses have been conducted based on baseline data from UKB. However, UKB is well known for its "healthy volunteer" selection bias, and may not be a true representation of the general population (Fry et al., 2017). To deal with selection bias, reweighting-based methods could be used from a causal inference perspective (Batty et al., 2019; Bradley and Nichols, 2022). These methods typically assume that volunteer bias can be explained by observed variables, such as socioeconomic status. In addition, missing data is also a known source of confounding in cohort studies, especially when the outcome of interest is not independent of the missing mechanism. Failing to address these biases may lead to

confounding effects, biased statistical results, and misleading findings.

Moreover, when meta- or mega- analyses integrate data from different studies and cohorts, the study designs of these sources may differ. Ignoring such differences may lead to unexpected results in data integration. For example, it may not be straightforward to specify a correct statistical inference framework when pooling data from a case-control and a cohort studies. It is obvious that naive analyses without taking into account of the study design will lead to biased findings. Therefore, it is important to understand sampling mechanisms and to apply them appropriately for the desired objectives when designing and merging population-based studies.

As compared to observational studies, there are fewer experimental studies in population-based biomedical research. One of the reasons is that it is typically difficult and expensive to conduct experiments on a large number of subjects. However, experiments play a key role in advancing our understanding in biomedical data science. For example, well-designed task/event-based fMRI experiments can help understand the brain functional changes due to human behavior and interventions. In addition, sequential decision making is also important to better design of the follow-up stages in a large-scale population-based study. In summary, the sampling mechanism needs be taken into consideration when interpreting and generalizing findings from observational studies. It is evident that large-scale experimental designs for NDA are seriously lacking in major publicly available data resources, and this issue will require greater attention in future biomedical data science research.

### **5.2.2 Statistical Parametric Mapping (SPM)**

There is a large literature on the development of various statistical methods, called Statistical Parametric Mapping (SPM), for two major NDA tasks including image reconstruction from image volumes within each subject and group analysis of images obtained from different subjects/groups. In both tasks, images are assumed to be registered to the same space. We will briefly review conventional SPMs and their extensions below.

The SPM refers a statistical technique for detecting changes in brain structure and function recorded during neuroimaging experiments within individual subjects or across groups. Such SPM has been implemented in popular neuroimaging software platforms including statistical parametric mapping (SPM) ([www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm/](http://www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm/)) and FMRIB Software Library (FSL) ([www.fmrib.ox.ac.uk/fsl/](http://www.fmrib.ox.ac.uk/fsl/)). It consists of three key modules: (i) smoothing neuroimaging data spatially and/or temporally, (ii) fitting voxel-wise general linear models, and (iii) correcting for multiple comparisons by using random field theory (RFT), false discovery rate (FDR), and permutation method. Despite the popularity of SPM, there is a great need to extend it in three important directions.

The first direction is to address several major drawbacks of Gaussian smoothing method, which may dramatically increase the numbers of false positives and false negatives (Zhu et al., 2014). Moreover, for twin studies, Li et al. (2012) showed that smoothing raw images can dramatically decrease statistical power in detecting environmental and genetic effects, which is critically important for imaging genetic studies. To address those drawbacks, multiscale adaptive models have been proposed to extend the propagation-separation method to a large class of parametric and semi-parametric models for group analysis (Polzehl et al., 2010; Zhu et al., 2014; Li et al., 2011, 2012). Those multiscale adaptive methods dramatically increase signal-to-noise ratio, while preserving spatial details.

The second direction is to move from general linear models (GLMs) to more advanced statistical models. Such development is primarily motivated by dealing with complex study design, sampling bias, missing data, complex data objects, and complex relationships as discussed in (CT4)-(CT8). Simply applying general linear models to all scenarios in (CT4)-(CT8) can easily lead to false positive and false negative results. In the era of large-scale neuroimaging studies, it is important to integrate and extend many statistical packages in professional statistical softwares including R ([www.r-project.org/](http://www.r-project.org/)), RStudio ([www.rstudio.com](http://www.rstudio.com)), SAS ([www.sas.com](http://www.sas.com)), and python statsmodels ([www.statsmodels.org](http://www.statsmodels.org)), among others. It opens a new world with many parametric, semiparametric, and nonparametric statistical models and their associated statistical inference

tools, even though they may not directly applicable to NDA without some modifications.

There are two ways of applying and extending those statistical models in statistical softwares. The first one is to apply those statistical models to neuroimaging data, generate statistical maps for various statistical results (e.g.,  $p$ -values, parameter estimates, and diagnosis measures) across spatial locations (e.g., voxels, vertexes, or pixels), and then perform multiple comparisons. We will discuss how to correct for multiple comparisons in details below. Minimum effort is required for all necessary technical developments. The second one is to explicitly incorporate the spatio-temporal structure discussed in (CT2) into different statistical models and then correct for multiple comparisons. For instance, some notable developments include multiscale adaptive regression methods for longitudinal neuroimaging data (Yuan et al., 2014), spatial varying coefficient models (Zhu et al., 2012; Li et al., 2021; Zhu et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2020), quantile models (Zhang et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2020), and functional principal component analysis (fPCA) (Chen et al., 2019), among others.

We want to make four remarks on different statistical models for modeling neuroimaging data. First, most statistical models for SPM can be regarded as an approximation to model (1) in order to disentangle the signals of interest, such as age, gender, or diagnosis. Second, most statistical models for SPM can be formulated as an image deconvolution problem according to equation (2). Third, although quantile methods have not been widely used in NDA, they improve our understanding of the conditional distribution of imaging measures on the spatial domain that may have nonlinear relationships with various predictors in model (1). Fourth, it should emphasize that most functional data analysis (FDA) methods in statistics were primarily developed for one-dimensional curves (Silverman and Ramsay, 2005; Wang et al., 2016) and extending these FDA methods to 2 and higher dimensional neuroimaging data faces major statistical and computational challenges.

The third direction is to develop statistical methods, including RFT, resampling methods, and FDR, to correct for multiple comparisons in NDA. Most RFT and resampling methods control for the familywise error rate by accounting for the spatio-temporal structure of raw neuroimaging data



as discussed in (CT2), whereas most FDR methods directly operate on uncorrected  $p$ -values without addressing (CT2). However, recently, several FDR methods have been developed to control for FDR in multiple testing of spatial signals (Sun et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2011). Although FDR is applicable to a larger class of statistical models beyond GLMs, it does depend on the computation of uncorrected  $p$ -values, which is nontrivial in many cases.

Since the beginning of fMRI, RFT dominates the field of NDA primarily due to many fundamental contributions made by Drs. Worsley, Adler, Nichols, Taylor and their collaborators (Worsley et al., 2004; Adler and Taylor, 2007; Nichols and Hayasaka, 2003). RFT has been widely used for voxelwise and cluster size inference in order to test for the intensity of an activation and for the significance of the spatial extent of an activation. Voxelwise RFT uses the expected Euler characteristic heuristic of random fields to approximate the  $p$ -value of the maximum statistic, whereas cluster-size RFT uses the distribution of the maximum of cluster sizes in a zero mean stationary random field. However, current RFT results cannot meet important requisites for many advanced statistical models in NDA due to two primary reasons. First, most RFT results are limited to GLMs and some minor extensions Adler and Taylor (2007). It requires substantial effort on the development of new RFT results for more advanced models. Second, most RFT results require strong assumptions including stationarity and high order smoothness, that are often invalid for fMRI. Specifically, Eklund et al. (2016) had two important observations: (i) some key assumptions of RFT are invalid for fMRI, and (ii) the existing RFT can lead to inflated false positive rates for cluster size inference.

Resampling methods primarily include permutation and bootstrap-based methods, both of which approximate the null distribution of test statistics conditional on the observed data. Although permutation testing has received some attention in NDA, it has not gained much attention in statistics lately due to computational and methodological challenges. Specifically, permutation methods require complete exchangeability under the null hypothesis, which can be problematic even for the simplest two group comparison problem. Bootstrap-based methods, particularly wild

bootstrap, have gained substantial attention in statistics due to their flexibility, theoretical ground, and good empirical performance, even though additional effort may be required for further development and application of good wild bootstrap methods to different models. Theoretically, resampling methods like wild bootstrap are shown to be valid conditional on data (Kosorok, 2003; Chatterjee and Bose, 2005). Practically, wild bootstrap methods have been successfully applied to NDA, including a heteroscedastic linear model for surface analysis (Zhu et al., 2007), regression analysis of asynchronous longitudinal functional and scalar data (Li et al., 2020), functional mixed models for longitudinal neuroimaging data (Yuan et al., 2014), and statistical models for imaging genetics (Huang et al., 2015, 2017).

As an illustration, we consider an interesting study (Botvinik-Nezer et al., 2020), that examined the variability of different SPM analytical pipelines in the analysis of a single neuroimaging dataset by 70 independent teams. Sizeable variations in the final statistical results of hypothesis tests are caused by all three modules of SPM. A surprising observation is that the spatial smoothness of fMRI is the strongest factor in explaining such variation. Another study further evaluated the effect of different fMRI preprocessing pipelines on analytical results (Bowring et al., 2019). Both studies call for additional development of resources and methods for the reduction of variability in preprocessing and analysis pipelines and the effect of the variability on analytical results.

### **5.2.3 Object Oriented Data (OOD) Analysis**

We will briefly review OOD and their extensions below. Object oriented data (OOD) analysis is a comprehensive statistical framework including estimation methods and statistical theory for the analysis of populations of complex objects (Marron and Dryden, 2021; Huckemann and Eltzner, 2021; Srivastava and Klassen, 2016; Wang et al., 2016; Dryden and Mardia, 1998). Some specific examples of complex objects given in (CT7) can be elements of mildly non-Euclidean spaces, such as Riemannian symmetric spaces, or of strongly non-Euclidean spaces, such as spaces of tree-structured objects. A primary application of OOD in NDA is group analysis of complex objects

extracted from neuroimaging data.

Three classes of analytical procedures for OOD include (i) feature analysis, (ii) extrinsic analysis, and (iii) intrinsic analysis. The key ideas of feature analysis include using some feature extraction functions to project random objects to Euclidean-valued variables and then applying the second and third modules of SPM to those Euclidean-valued variables. A key advantage of the feature analysis is its computational efficiency. Moreover, Euclidean-valued variables projected from random objects can be biologically meaningful, if their corresponding extraction functions have strong biological interpretation. We consider two examples of feature analysis as follows. The first one is to treat diffusion tensors, which are  $3 \times 3$  symmetric positive definite (SPD) matrices, as random objects. It is common to calculate several invariant measures of diffusion tensor, such as fractional anisotropy (FA), and then use SPMs to analyze FA images. In neuroscience, FA is an indirect measure of fiber density, axonal diameter, and myelination in white matter. The second one is to treat functional brain network as random objects and use the feature analysis to understand the topological organization of brain networks. Specifically, one may calculate various graph metrics (e.g., nodal centrality, network efficiency, or degree) of functional brain network and then perform the group analysis of these graph metrics (Bullmore and Sporns, 2009; Simpson et al., 2013). For instance, in brain network, network efficiency describes how brain network efficiently exchanges information. However, it is often nontrivial to develop a good feature extraction function with strong neuroscience interpretation besides having the feature vector contain partial information about the original object.

The key ideas of extrinsic analysis are (i) to embed the curved space where the object resides onto some higher-dimensional Euclidean spaces, (ii) to perform statistical inference on random objects in the embedded Euclidean space, and (iii) to pull results back onto the curved space. A key advantage of extrinsic analysis is its computational efficiency. Existing extrinsic analysis methods have been developed for mean, median, local regression, and dimension reduction (Lin et al., 2017). For instance, diffusion tensors can be embedded in a 6 dimensional Euclidean space,

whereas the  $d$ -dimensional sphere  $S^d$  can be embedded in the  $(d + 1)$ -dimensional Euclidean space. The manifolds considered in directional statistics are spheres and projective spaces and the associated statistical tools are primarily extrinsic approaches. However, there are two drawbacks. First, it is nontrivial to propose a good equivariant embedding in most cases, which requires substantially deep thinking. Specifically, in step (i), equivariant embeddings are required to preserve a lot of geometry of the original curved space. Second, in many cases, it is unclear as to how one could pull results back onto the curved space.

The key ideas of intrinsic analysis are (i) to introduce a 'good' metric  $\rho$  for the curved space  $\mathcal{M}$  where the object resides, denoted as  $(\mathcal{M}, \rho)$ , and (ii) to perform statistical inference on random objects in  $(\mathcal{M}, \rho)$ . Some examples of metric spaces with additional structure include Riemannian manifolds, normed vector spaces, length spaces, and graphs. For instance, a Riemannian manifold  $(\mathcal{M}, g)$  is a real, smooth manifold  $\mathcal{M}$  equipped with a Riemannian metric tensor  $g$  defined for all tangent vectors at every point. One can define the geodesic distance between two points on a connected Riemannian manifold. We can further construct quotient metric spaces for  $(\mathcal{M}, \rho)$  based on an equivalence relation on  $\mathcal{M}$ , denoted as  $\sim$  by endowing the quotient set  $\mathcal{M}/\sim$  with a pseudometric  $\rho_P$ .

A fundamental issue in intrinsic analysis is how to appropriately introduce a good metric  $\rho$  for  $(\mathcal{M}, \rho)$  or metric tensor  $g$  for  $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ . The choice of  $\rho$  (or  $g$ ) has fundamental effects on downstream computation and statistical inference. For instance, Dryden et al. (2009) discussed eight different metrics of the space of SPD for estimation of mean diffusion tensor. Recently, Srivastava and Klassen (2016) introduced a general elastic metric, which includes the Fisher-Rao metric as a special case, for the shape analysis of curves, allowing us to separate phase and amplitude components. In general, the choice of  $\rho$  (or  $g$ ) should focus on the signal of interest and data variability in random objects, while considering computational efficiency.

In the last decade, significant progress has been achieved in the development of intrinsic statistical models for manifold-valued data in finite-dimensional Riemannian manifolds. Frechet mean,

median, and variance provide a simple way of characterizing center and variability of random objects in  $\mathcal{M}$  (Arnaudon et al., 2013; Marron and Dryden, 2021; Huckemann and Eltzner, 2021). Principal geodesic analysis (Fletcher et al., 2004) is further developed to reduce the dimensionality of random objects, while increasing interpretability and minimizing information loss. Cornea et al. (2017) developed an intrinsic regression model based on Riemannian logarithm and exponential maps for random objects in a Riemannian symmetric space. Other notable contributions include Riemannian functional data analysis, intrinsic local polynomial regression, Wasserstein regression, a generic measure of dependence, and longitudinal analysis (Yuan et al., 2012; Shao et al., 2022; Chen et al., 2021; Pan et al., 2019), among others. Despite these new developments, computing intrinsic estimators is notoriously difficult, requiring more attention.

Statistical shape modeling and analysis have emerged as important tools for understanding brain structure and function extracted from neuroimaging data. Four key components of shape analysis include (i) shape representation, (ii) shape distance between shapes, (iii) shape registration, and (iv) group analysis of shapes. Shape analysis methods depend on shape representations including landmarks, implicit representations, parametric representations, medial models, and deformation-based descriptors, among others (Marron and Dryden, 2021; Miller and Qiu, 2009; Grenander and Miller, 2007; Srivastava and Klassen, 2016; Dryden and Mardia, 1998; Chung et al., 2007; Fischl, 2012). Most earlier representations focus on either points on the object boundary or parametric descriptors of the object boundary, whereas deformation-based representations use shape information in the entire image. Most shape spaces are quotient metric spaces based on an equivalence relation including translation, rotation, and scaling. Some notable shape analysis methods include the large deformation diffeomorphic metric mapping (LDDMM) technique (Grenander and Miller, 2007), the elastic statistical shape analysis (Srivastava and Klassen, 2016; Zhang et al., 2023), and the Wasserstein shape analysis (Shi and Wang, 2019).

#### 5.2.4 Imputation Methods

Developing good imputation methods for neuroimaging data requires a deep knowledge and understanding of reasons for missing data and their mechanisms in NDA. Table 1 summarizes some common reasons for missing data and their corresponding missing mechanisms in NDA. Reasons for missing data in NDA include missing image modalities due to different acquisition protocols, different study designs, data transfer and storage loss, faulty scanning due to image corruption and susceptibility artifacts, and participant attrition due to allergies to materials, personal belief, and financial costs, among others. There are three missing mechanism categories including MCAR, MAR, and MNAR (Little and Rubin, 2002; Ibrahim and Molenberghs, 2009). Distinguishing between MAR and MNAR depends on whether the missingness is predictable based on either observed covariates or missing variable itself. For example, if dropout rates differ according to observed covariates (e.g., age, sex, or race), then the missing mechanism is traceable and MAR. In contrast, if dropout depends on missing data itself, then it is MNAR and ignoring such missingness may introduce substantial bias. MCAR, as a special case of MAR, assumes that the distribution of the missing data is indistinguishable from the non-missing data. Such assumption is strong and usually difficult to meet in practice. In general, when values are missing systematically, downstream data analysis without correcting for missing data may lead to erroneous conclusions.

There are at least two main strategies for handling missing data including omission and imputation (Nakagawa and Freckleton, 2011; Little and Rubin, 2002; Ibrahim and Molenberghs, 2009). Common omission approaches include listwise/pairwise omission and dropping features. Although omission is simple and easily used, it can lead to serious estimation bias, large efficiency loss, and dramatic reduction of statistical power. There are two types of imputation methods, including single imputation and multiple imputation. Single imputation methods generate one imputation value for each missing observation, which leads to a single complete data, while treating the imputed values as the true values in downstream data analysis. Therefore, downstream analyses based on the single imputed complete dataset do not account for the imputation uncertainty. Two

Missing mechanism	Causes	Details
MCAR	Faulty scanning	Removal of images with corruption or susceptibility artifacts
	Faulty scanning	Random failure of experimental instrument
	Data loss	Data transfer/storage loss
	Data loss	Missing entries
	Attrition/Nonresponse	Unable to participate due to migration/move (irrelevant with the study)
	Study design	Study ended early
	Study design	Modalities were not included in the imaging protocol
MAR	Study design	Exclusion criteria, such as age, sex, race, socioeconomic status, etc.
	Attrition/Nonresponse	Dropout due to side effects, such as allergy
	Attrition/Nonresponse	Dropout rates vary among different age or sex groups
MNAR	Study design	Quit the study due to physical or psychological health conditions
	Attrition/Nonresponse	Dropout due to concerns of financial cost
	Attrition/Nonresponse	Dropout due to concerns of limited available time to visit
	Attrition/Nonresponse	Dropout due to concerns of scanning safety
	Attrition/Nonresponse	Dropout due to concerns of personal data unauthorised disclosure
	Attrition/Nonresponse	Quit the study, following another person's behavior
	Attrition/Nonresponse	Deliberately not willing to respond

Table 1: A summary of scenarios with different missing mechanisms in cognition/behavior-related studies

main strategies of single imputation including imputation by statistical values (e.g., mean, median, or maximum) and imputation by predicted values generated from a statistical model. Multiple imputation methods generate many imputed values for each missing observation, which lead to many complete datasets, while analyzing all of them in downstream data analyses. The use of multiple imputation allows us to explicitly account for imputation uncertainty.

Some additional statistical challenges arise from handling missing neuroimage data due to (CT1)-(CT4), even though both omission and imputation methods are useful methods for NDA. Specifically, as discussed in Section 4 and Figure 4, image data are largely block-wise missing, while there are a large number of features across different domains (e.g., genetics/genomics) in various biomedical studies. In this case, it requires building image imputation models to impute

missing high-dimensional images conditional on all other observed features, which may include other imaging modalities, genetic/genomics, and demographic variables. A promising research topic is to develop deep generative models, which have been used to achieve impressive results in image generation and image-to-image translation for image imputation models. In particular, image-to-image translation is designed to learn the mapping between an input image and an output image, while preserving the content representation (Alotaibi, 2020). This task can be further classified into paired and unpaired imputation according to whether both input and output images are available on the same subjects in the training data. For instance, conditional generative adversarial network (CGAN) methods, such as the Pix2pix (Isola et al., 2017) method, perform pixel-to-pixel image synthesis using paired image data, whereas CycleGAN (Zhu et al., 2017) was developed to model image translation based on unpaired data. Although there has been development of many image-to-image translation models for specific neuroimaging pairs, these models require substantial effort in validation requiring the use of synthetic and real data sets for downstream tasks, such as prediction. Furthermore, it is interesting to incorporate additional information (e.g., genetics, diagnosis status, and sex) to impute missing image data, while imposing their dynamic causal relationships in Figure 1. However, little has been ever done on the development of CGAN-based imputation models for neuroimaging data along this direction. In addition, since image data may be missing under MNAR as detailed in Table 1, it is important to develop CGAN imputation models under MNAR.

### **5.2.5 Data Integration (DI)**

We witness the exponential increase in the collection and availability of multi-view data, including electronic health records, imaging, genetic, sensor data, and text, from different studies and clinics as discussed in Section 4. Data integration (DI) is the process of integrating multi-view data from different sources into a unified view of information for better data management and downstream tasks. A good DI system consists of (i) a feature engineering pipeline for generating more complete



'high-quality' data and their associated features, (ii) SL methods for data integration associated with different NDA tasks, and (iii) a feedback loop to improve data collection and feature extraction for major NDA tasks. The feature engineering pipeline consists of data ingestion, data processing, data annotation, transformation, and storage. Missing data imputation prevails in all these tasks, but we defer its related methods to Subsection 5.2.4. However, although much progress has been achieved in the last decade, it remains challenging to develop a good DI system for NDA due to the fact that they are complex, heterogeneous, temporally dependent, irregular, poorly annotated, and generally unstructured as discussed in (CT2)-(CT8).

We review SL methods for data integration within individual studies and across studies associated with four major NDA tasks including (T1) multimodel neuroimaging fusion, (T2) the genetic architecture of neuroimaging measures, (T3) gene–environment interaction on neuroimaging measures, and (T4) the GIC pathways. We defer most SL methods for (T2) and (T3) to Subsection 5.2.7 and those for (T4) to Subsection 5.2.8. Popular building blocks in SL methods for data integration include feature concatenation, Bayesian models, tree-based ensemble methods, multiple kernel learning, matrix/tensor factorizations, and DL (Li et al., 2018; Zhao et al., 2017). For instance, Bayesian methods can easily incorporate prior information from different views, whereas tree-based methods can use ensemble methods to integrate trees learned from each view.

As an illustration, we consider matrix factorizations and DL for data integration in a single study. First, we consider a generic model for using matrix factorizations for multi-view integration in a single study. Suppose that we observe a  $p_k \times n$  row-mean centered data matrix, denoted as  $I_k$ , for the  $k$ -th view of  $K$  views on  $n$  subjects, where  $p_k$  is the number of variables and  $n$  is the number of subjects. A generic model for matrix/tensor factorizations is given by

$$I_k = C_k + D_k + E_k \quad \text{for } k = 1, \dots, K, \quad (3)$$

where  $C_k$  is a low-rank common-source matrix representing latent factors common across all views,  $D_k$  is a low-rank distinctive-source matrix representing distinctive latent factors of the cor-

responding view, and  $E_k$  is the noise matrix. Some state-of-the-art matrix factorization methods based on model (3) include common orthogonal basis extraction (Zhou et al., 2015), joint and individual variation explained (Lock et al., 2013), and decomposition-based generalized canonical correlation analysis (Shu et al., 2022). They differ from each other in how to reconstruct the common- and distinctive-source matrices. Second, we consider the hierarchical architecture of DL for multi-view integration as another powerful method. Its hierarchical structure consists of (i) the construction of sub-networks  $s_k = \mathcal{N}_k(I_k)$  (e.g., Variational Autoencoder (VAE) and Generative Adversarial Network (GAN) for neuroimaging data) for  $k = 1, \dots, K$  and (ii) the integration of all individual sub-networks into a model  $Y = f(s_1, \dots, s_K; \theta) + \epsilon$ , where  $f(\cdot)$  is a link function,  $\theta$  is a vector of parameters, and  $\epsilon$  is an error term. We can use an objective function similar to equation (2) to tune  $\theta$  and  $\{\mathcal{N}_k\}$ . Miotto et al. (2018) discussed different architectures of sub-networks for individual views. These sub-networks can be first adopted from some pretrained models from other fields, such as computer vision, and then be tuned in the whole model at the integration stage.

We consider two major methods for data integration across multiple studies or centers including *the merged learner* and *the ensemble learner*. The *merged learner* proceeds with merging and processing data from all studies and then training a single learner based on the merged data. It is common to use fixed- or random-effect models to train the learner (Zugman et al., 2022). The *ensemble learner* proceeds with training a learner based on the data obtained from each study and then using a weighted average of all learners. It includes ensemble machine learning (Patil and Parmigiani, 2018), meta-analysis (DerSimonian and Laird, 2015), fusion learning (Cai et al., 2020), and federation learning (Li et al., 2020), among others. ENIGMA has been using the ensemble learner in most of their imaging genetic studies, but it starts to use the merged learner (or mega analysis) (Zugman et al., 2022). Since data pooling can dramatically increase sample size and ensure consistent data processing and quality control, the merged learner will be taken in more and more international neuroimaging efforts.

We discuss two major issues in mega analysis including heterogeneity discussed in (CT4) and

sampling bias in (CT5). First, there is a great interest in developing data harmonization methods to explicitly correct additive site and scanner effects, covariance batch effects, hidden factors, as well as some structural priors in neuroimaging data (Yu et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2021; Huang and Zhu, 2022). These methods partially remove the effects of those confounding variables of not interest, but they require extensive validations by using walking phantoms, synthetic datasets, and annotated data sets. Second, although it is tempting to pool multi-view data from studies with different study designs, simple statistical methods based on fixed and random effect models (Burke et al., 2017; Simmonds et al., 2015) cannot appropriately handle such issue. We discuss several key problems. First, in many imaging related studies (e.g., ADNI and UKB), neuroimaging data are only the secondary phenotypic variables, so it can be very problematic not to adjust sampling bias even in a single study Kim et al. (2015); Zhu et al. (2017). Second, many neuroimaging-related studies have different study designs and may have minimum overlap in some key confounding variables (e.g., age) of interest. For instance, besides their age differences, there are many twins in HCP, whereas ADNI has many longitudinal observations. It raises many serious issues on the target population for the merged sample, the type of scientific questions to be answered, and the choices of different statistical models (e.g., prospective and retrospective likelihood). In conclusion, one cannot simply perform the merged learner for many NDA tasks without appropriately addressing sampling bias in (CT5).

### **5.2.6 Dimensional Reduction (DR) Methods**

The goal of DR is to transform data from a high-dimensional space to a relatively low-dimensional space, while retaining important information of the original data. There is a large literature on the development of various statistical methods for dimension reduction (DR) due to (CT3). We can cluster DR methods into feature selection and feature extraction. Feature selection aims to find a subset of the original features for a specific task, whereas feature extraction aims to construct new features from the original features. Originally, the aforementioned DR methods were developed to

solve the *small-n-large-p* problem, where the number of subjects is much smaller than the number of imaging variables. However, with the availability of many large-scale neuroimaging studies as discussed in Section 4, we have to deal with the *large-n-large-p* problem, in which both the number of subjects and the number of variables are both extremely large. This *large-n-large-p* problem requires further development in DR methods.

The feature selection methods can be further grouped into the filter strategy, the wrapper strategy, and the embedded strategy based on how the selection algorithm and the model building are combined (Li et al., 2017). Filter methods use a selection measure, such as correlation and distance correlation, to select a feature subset. Wrapper methods, such as stepwise regression, use a search algorithm based on a predictive model to score feature subsets. Embedded methods, such as decision tree and LASSO, select features as part of the model construction process. In practice, feature selection is essential to eliminate a large number of noisy variables before running downstream data analysis.

The feature extraction methods can be categorized into knowledge-based and data-driven approaches. In NDA, the knowledge-based feature extraction is to use specific human brain atlases to perform feature extraction within individual regions and across region pairs. The use of several tens to several hundreds of homogeneous regions of interest (ROIs) in brain atlases dramatically reduces the complexity of multiple neuroimaging data. It improves neuroanatomical precision for studying the structural and functional organization of the human brain. The data-driven feature extraction methods can be grouped into unsupervised, supervised and semi-supervised approaches for both traditional approaches and modern DL, respectively (Anowar et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2021). Some notable examples of unsupervised feature extraction methods include principal component analysis (PCA), kernel PCA (KPCA), functional PCA (FPCA), single value decomposition (SVD), tensor decomposition, multidimensional scaling (MDS), and independent component analysis (ICA). See Anowar et al. (2021) and references therein for a systematic review and empirical comparisons of various unsupervised DR approaches. Some notable examples of supervised DR

methods include linear discriminant analysis (LDA), partial least squares regression (PLSR), and canonical correlation analysis (CCA). Feature extraction and feature selection methods have been integrated together to solve the small- $n$ -large- $p$  problem, while accounting for complex spatio-temporal structures in (CT2) (Lin et al., 2014; Zhu et al., 3262). However, while most existing feature extraction methods are infeasible for the large- $n$ -large- $p$  problem due to limited computing speed and computer memory, several hierarchical feature extraction methods have been developed to address related challenges (Crainiceanu et al., 2011; Gong et al., 2021).

Most unsupervised DL approaches (or the self-supervised learning (SSL)) to extract image embeddings includes three classes: the generative, contrastive, and adversarial approaches (Liu et al., 2021). These SSL approaches train the encode-decoder networks by encoding input images into a low-dimensional representation, to contrasting semantically similar and dissimilar pairs of embeddings, and generating fake samples that a discriminator can hardly distinguish from real samples. Recently, semi-supervised SSL (SS-SSL) have been developed by incorporating downstream tasks, such as classification or prediction, to original pretext tasks (construction and contrasting) (Jaiswal et al., 2020). Comparing with traditional DR approaches, DL-based DR approaches usually extract more informative representations by taking advantage of great computing power and more flexible frameworks.

### **5.2.7 Imaging Genetics**

The genetic architectures of human brain structures and functions are of great interest. Using imaging traits as phenotypes, the extent to which genetics can affect the structure and function of the human brain (or, heritability) has been quantified in previous family or population-based studies (Blokland et al., 2012; Zhao et al., 2019). Several consortiums, such as the the ENIGMA (Thompson et al., 2020), the CHARGE (Fornage et al., 2011), and the IMAGEN (Mascarell Maričić et al., 2020), were established to discover the genetic loci associated with human brain structure. In recent years, large-scale MRI datasets, such as UKB and ABCD, have provided fur-

ther insights into the genetic determinants of the human brain. For example, Elliott et al. (2018) and Smith et al. (2021) screened more than 3,000 brain functional and structural imaging phenotypes from the UKB study. The genetic architecture of commonly used imaging traits, such as the regional grey matter volumes from sMRI (Zhao et al., 2019), WM microstructure from DWI (Zhao et al., 2021), and functional connectivity from fMRI (Zhao et al., 2022) have been discovered. From these studies, hundreds of brain-related genetic loci have been identified and substantial genetic overlaps with major brain disorders were observed, such as AD and schizophrenia. Several open resource knowledge portals have been developed in imaging genetics, including the Oxford BIG40 (<https://open.win.ox.ac.uk/ukbiobank/big40/>) and BIG-KP (<https://bigkp.org/>). While they extract imaging features using distinct pipelines, they provide similar findings regarding the genetic control of the human brain. Figure 3B presents the heritability values of various imaging phenotypes based on UKB.

A typical imaging genome-wide association study (GWAS) contains the following steps. First, we develop and/or apply imaging data analysis pipelines to extract imaging features from raw neuroimaging data. For example, in the WM GWAS (Zhao et al., 2021), we applied the ENIGMA-DTI pipeline to extract WM microstructure measures from over 40,000 subjects (Jahanshad et al., 2013). Although voxel-wise or vertex-wise feature maps are available, aggregate measures at the brain region-level imaging traits (such as ROI and WM tracts) are typically used in subsequent genetic discoveries. In addition to improving the signal-to-noise ratio, these region-level traits may reduce the burden of multiple testing, while increasing the statistical power in genetic analysis. Second, variant-level and gene-level association analysis are performed to detect significant genetic variants or genes in a large-scale discovery cohort. An independent holdout cohort, which is typically smaller than the discovery one, will be used to examine if the significant trait-variant/gene associations can be replicated. Further replications and generalizability can be explored using racially diverse cohorts. Additionally, polygenic risk scores can also provide evidence of validation by evaluating the proportion of variance of imaging traits that can be predicted by genetic

variants.

A few tools have been developed to estimate the heritability using individual-level (e.g., GCTA-GREML (Yang et al., 2011)) or summary-level data (e.g., univariate LDSC (Bulik-Sullivan et al., 2015)). Furthermore, partitioned LDSC can be used to estimate the enrichment of heritability related to specific brain tissue or cell types, such as glia and neurons. FUMA (Watanabe et al., 2017) is a useful platform for functional gene mappings based on summary-level data. Coloc, bivariate LDSC, and Mendelian randomization methods (Sanderson et al., 2022) can quantify the genetic relationships between imaging traits and other complex traits or diseases from different perspectives. See Sun and Zhao (2020) for a recent review of GWAS methods.

Despite recent significant advancements in imaging genetics, it remains challenging to map the causal biological pathways linking genetics and brain abnormalities to neuropsychiatric disorders (Le and Stein, 2019; Shen and Thompson, 2019). See Figure 1 for a hypothetical causal pathway. To understand the causal pathway, by which genetic variation impacts risk for brain diseases, neuroimaging can serve as important endophenotypes. The identified genetic loci in large-scale imaging genetic cohorts need to be integrated with multiple layers of biomedical data, such as RNA, proteins, brain cells, and brain tissues (Zhao and Castellanos, 2016). It is necessary to make greater efforts to collect and integrate multiple types of biomedical data and develop better statistical models for causal analysis (Yu et al., 2022). Clinical applications can also benefit from recent imaging genetic discoveries. For example, the combination of genetic polygenic risk scores and MRI could better predict the risk of brain diseases (Kauppi et al., 2018).

### **5.2.8 Causality Research**

Causality research has received a lot of attention in neuroscience research (Friston, 2009; Ramsey et al., 2010; Lindquist, 2012; Yu et al., 2022; Sobel and Lindquist, 2020; Yu et al., 2022; Taschler et al., 2022; Knutson et al., 2020; Zhao et al., 2021; Le and Stein, 2019; Zhao and Castellanos, 2016; Li et al., 2021). Some important scientific questions in neuroscience include how experi-

mental stimuli affect brain function, how different brain regions are causally linked for a specific task, how brain structure and function are causally linked with each other, how brain structure mediates the relationship between genetics and clinical variables, how brain mediates the relationship between therapies/drugs and a clinical variable for brain-related diseases, and what are the causal relationships between genetics, brain, health factors, and brain disorders. Addressing these questions raises serious challenges in experimental design, data collection and integration, unobserved confounders, SL methods for causal research, and causality validation, among others. For instance, although randomised controlled trials (RCTs) have been widely regarded as the gold standard for causal discovery, it might be inappropriate to run RCTs in many neuroscience scenarios due to ethical or practical reasons. Therefore, one may have to draw causal conclusions from existing observational data under a series of ‘strict’ assumptions.

Causality research can be roughly divided into causal discovery for determining causal relationships among a set of variables and causal inference for estimating causal effects deriving from a change of a certain variable over an outcome of interest in a large system (Imbens and Rubin, 2015; Pearl, 2009; Greenland et al., 1999; Upadhyaya et al., 2021; Imbens, 2020). Causality research proceeds with the development of the causal models (e.g., the CGIC pathway in Figure 1) for a set of variables with possibly unobserved confounders. Three main causal models include the Bayesian network (BN) model based on a directed acyclic graph (DAG), the structural causal model (SCM) given a DAG, and the Rubin causal model (RCM). These causal models complement with each other and have their own pros and cons. Under some conditions, SCM is a causal BN model, while RCM is logically equivalent to SCM (Pearl, 2009). The SCM and BN are more popular in computer science and epidemiology since they offer a graphical representation with reasonable interpretability and explainability. In contrast, RCM is very popular in statistics, economics, and social sciences, since it is well connected with experimental design and estimating causal effects.

The causal discovery methods for causal BN (CBN) can be categorized into discrete space



algorithms and continuous space algorithms (Upadhyaya et al., 2021). Traditional discrete space algorithms, including constraint-based and score-based methods, search for the optimal graph from a discrete space of candidate graphs by using either statistical tests or scores (e.g., Bayesian information criterion) to estimate the causal structure of DAG. In contrast, continuous space algorithms find an optimal graph from the continuous space of weighted DAGs based on machine learning algorithms. Computationally, the complexity of traditional discrete space algorithms grows with the number of nodes in DAG, whereas continuous space algorithms are more scalable. Moreover, causal discovery methods are designed to three types of data under analysis, including cross-sectional, time series, and longitudinal data. Distinguishing cross-sectional and time-series data is that there is a time component in time-series data so that events in the present cannot cause events in the past. The Granger causality method is one of the well-known methods for performing causal discovery for time-series data.

As an illustration, we consider different causal discovery methods for using functional neuroimaging data (e.g., fMRI) to infer effective connectivity, which is a causal model of the interactions between different ROIs. Different discrete space algorithms and their extensions have been used for effective connectivity (Smith et al., 2011). Other statistical methods for effective connectivity include Granger causality, dynamic causal models, structural equation models, state-space models, RCMs, directed graphical models, and dynamic Bayesian network models, among others (Friston, 2009; Ramsey et al., 2010; Lindquist, 2012; Sobel and Lindquist, 2020). However, most existing network methods suffer from large estimation errors for connection directionality (Li et al., 2021).

We estimate the causal effect of a specific treatment ( $X$ ) over a certain outcome of interest ( $Y$ ) in two steps, including (i): the study of identification questions for  $X \rightarrow Y$  and (ii): estimation and inference methods for the causal effect  $X \rightarrow Y$ . Specific identification strategies for Step (i) include experimental design, adjustment/unconfoundedness, instrumental variables, difference-in-differences, regression discontinuity designs, synthetic control methods, and causal mediation

analysis, among others. For instance, it is common to use the frontdoor and backdoor criteria to identify valid adjustment sets (Pearl, 2009; Upadhyaya et al., 2021; Imbens, 2020). Causal inference algorithms only work when all common causes of  $X$  and  $Y$  have been included in observational data, called *causal sufficiency*, so controlling unobserved confounding requires a series of strong assumptions Burgess et al. (2017); Zhu (2020). In Step (ii), SCM explicitly specifies all mediators, whereas RCM does not handle unspecified mediators in the outcome-generating model.

As an illustration, we consider the integration of multi-view data in ADNI to infer a hypothetical causal model for biomarker dynamics in AD pathogenesis presented in (Jack Jr et al., 2010). It starts from AD risk genes to the abnormal deposition of  $\beta$  amyloid ( $A\beta$ ) fibrils, to increased levels of CSF tau protein, to hippocampal atrophy, to declined cognitive symptoms and impairment, to AD. Existing SL methods focus on associations between different views, but there is a growing interest in delineating the *temporal causal relations* in Jack’s causal model, say *the causal effect of hippocampal atrophy ( $X$ ) on behavioral deficits ( $Y$ )* Yu et al. (2022). Our CGIC pathway is an approximation to Jack’s causal model. We need to check the causal sufficiency of  $X$  and  $Y$ , which is most likely invalid in practice. Although there are several popular identification strategies, including instrumental variables and the frontdoor criterion, for handling the issue of unobserved confounding, each of them has to make some strict assumptions. For instance, Mendelian randomization is an instrumental variable method, which selects a set of genetic variants ( $G$ ) as instruments to estimate the causal effect of  $X \rightarrow Y$  (Sanderson et al., 2022). It requires three key assumptions including relevance, independence, and no horizontal pleiotropy. It can be implemented using individual-level data in a single sample or summary data from two samples. Several popular instrumental variable estimation methods include the ratio method, two-stage methods, likelihood-based methods, and semi-parametric methods (Burgess et al., 2017; Zhu, 2020). Furthermore, it is of great interest to build SCMs to link all variables in ADNI together and infer their time-varying causal relationships by extending causal mediation methods (VanderWeele, 2015). This is motivated by delineating how most brain-related disorders progress and change adjusting

for temporal confounding by various health factors (Zhao and Castellanos, 2016).

### 5.2.9 Predictive Models (PM)

There is a large literature on the development of SL methods for building various predictive models in neuroscience research and clinical translation (Kohoutová et al., 2020; Davatzikos, 2019; Hastie et al., 2001; Zhou et al., 2021). The goal of predictive models is to use a set of current and historical features in  $x$  to predict future events in  $Y$ . Such development is motivated by identifying biomarkers (e.g., neuroimaging) that could potentially aid detection, diagnosis, prognosis, prediction, and monitoring of disease status, among many others. As shown in Figure 1, the feature vector  $x$  in NDA may include neuroimaging, genetic, environmental and demographic variables and  $Y$  is a low-dimensional vector consisting of cognitive scores, diagnosis, and survival time, among others. Despite how much progress has been established in academic settings recently, most predictive models have not been transferred to clinical practice in NDA.

A good predictive system in NDA for clinical translation includes (i) a feature engineering pipeline to generate cost-effective and reliable biomarkers (e.g., blood) and perform high-quality data annotation, (ii) SL methods for training predictive models with high predictive capacity, robustness, and clarity for main NDA tasks, and (iii) a feedback loop to improve (i) and (ii). Developing a good predictive system requires appropriately handling (CT1)-(CT8), among which (CT4) needs more close attention. Model (1) emphasizes that neuroimage data contain external heterogeneity caused by exogenous factors (e.g., device, acquisition parameters) and internal heterogeneity associated with downstream tasks for  $Y$  (Liu and Zhu, 2021). Specifically, "internal heterogeneity" refers to how diseased regions may significantly vary across subjects and/or time in terms of their number, size, degree, and location. A good predictive system has to appropriately handle both external heterogeneity and internal heterogeneity in neuroimage data through further developments in (i) and (ii), among which (i) is the biggest bottleneck.

We discuss the pros and cons of existing SL methods for predictive models in NDA. First,

most existing supervised learning and variable selection methods (Hastie et al., 2001) are sub-optimal for predictive models in NDA due to the non-sparse effect of image biomarkers on  $Y$  and (CT4) in neuroimaging data. Second, DL methods (Goodfellow et al., 2016) have achieved very promising results for handling pattern recognition problems, which include the issue of internal heterogeneity in neuroimaging data discussed above. Training good predictive models requires large-scale representative datasets with high-quality data annotation. Third, it is interesting to develop SL methods for causal predictive models, which use causal thinking to improve prediction modelling, in NDA (Imbens and Rubin, 2015; Pearl, 2009). Specifically, we may test and validate the dynamic causal relationships in Figure 1 based on observational data and then incorporate such causal findings to enable risk estimation under hypothetical interventions.

### **5.3 Challenges**

We have briefly reviewed the nine important PSA techniques above, but most of them are emerging fields and pose many statistical challenges. First, the complexity of those large-scale neuroimaging-related data sets is too high for most research teams in both academia and industry. It requires a close multidisciplinary collaboration among experts with strong skills in statistics, biostatistics, epidemiology, genetics/genomics, engineering, applied mathematics, machine learning, neuroscience, brain disorders, imaging physics, and imaging analysis. Second, it is very difficult to appropriately process data across different domains with high quality, while controlling for potential bias introduced during the preprocessing stage. It requires the whole scientific community to work closely to test all major preprocessing tools by using well-designed synthetic and real datasets in terms of reproducibility, generalizability, and reliability. Third, it remains uncertain as to how to appropriately integrate data across different domains obtained from different studies and cohorts with possible different study designs for unbiased data integration. Although one might attempt to integrate as many variables and studies as possible in a project, it would likely lead to serious biases in downstream data analyses and conclusions. Fourth, it remains unclear how to appropriately

and efficiently analyze neuroimaging related data sets with multiple Vs (e.g., Volume, Velocity, Variety and Veracity), while ensuring algorithmic fairness. Many existing statistical and machine learning models were developed before the era of big data, so they might make some strong assumptions that are inappropriate for neuroimaging related data sets as discussed in Sections 2 and 4. We expect that there will be many novel SL methods for NDA in the next decade.

## **6 Supplementary Material**

A supplementary file document was included.

## **7 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

This research was partially supported by U.S. NIH grants MH086633 and MH116527. We acknowledge Prof. Tianming Liu and Miss Wylina Guan for many insightful comments.

## **8 DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

The authors are not aware of any affiliations, memberships, funding, or financial holdings that might be perceived as affecting the objectivity of this review.

## **References**

Adler, R. J. and J. E. Taylor (2007). *Random fields and geometry*, Volume 80. Springer.

Alnæs, D., T. Kaufmann, D. van der Meer, A. Córdova-Palomera, J. Rokicki, T. Moberget, F. Bettella, I. Agartz, D. M. Barch, A. Bertolino, et al. (2019). Brain heterogeneity in schizophrenia and its association with polygenic risk. *JAMA Psychiatry* 76(7), 739–748.

- Alotaibi, A. (2020). Deep generative adversarial networks for image-to-image translation: A review. *Symmetry* 12(10), 1705.
- Anowar, F., S. Sadaoui, and B. Selim (2021). Conceptual and empirical comparison of dimensionality reduction algorithms (pca, kpca, lda, mds, svd, lle, isomap, le, ica, t-sne). *Computer Science Review* 40, 100378.
- Arnaudon, M., F. Barbaresco, and L. Yang (2013). Medians and means in riemannian geometry: existence, uniqueness and computation. In *Matrix Information Geometry*, pp. 169–197. Springer.
- Batty, G. D., C. R. Gale, M. Kivimäki, I. J. Deary, and S. Bell (2019). Generalisability of results from uk biobank: Comparison with a pooling of 18 cohort studies. *MedRxiv*, 19004705.
- Bharati, S., M. Mondal, P. Podder, and V. Prasath (2022). Deep learning for medical image registration: A comprehensive review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.11341*.
- Blokland, G. A., G. I. de Zubicaray, K. L. McMahon, and M. J. Wright (2012). Genetic and environmental influences on neuroimaging phenotypes: a meta-analytical perspective on twin imaging studies. *Twin Research and Human Genetics* 15(3), 351–371.
- Bookheimer, S. Y., D. H. Salat, M. Terpstra, B. M. Ances, D. M. Barch, R. L. Buckner, G. C. Burgess, S. W. Curtiss, M. Diaz-Santos, J. S. Elam, et al. (2019). The lifespan human connectome project in aging: an overview. *NeuroImage* 185, 335–348.
- Botvinik-Nezer, R., F. Holzmeister, C. F. Camerer, A. Dreber, J. Huber, M. Johannesson, M. Kirchler, R. Iwanir, J. A. Mumford, R. A. Adcock, et al. (2020). Variability in the analysis of a single neuroimaging dataset by many teams. *Nature* 582(7810), 84–88.
- Bowring, A., C. Maumet, and T. E. Nichols (2019). Exploring the impact of analysis software on task fmri results. *Human brain mapping* 40(11), 3362–3384.

- Bradley, V. C. and T. E. Nichols (2022). Addressing selection bias in the uk biobank neurological imaging cohort. *medRxiv*.
- Buades, A., B. Coll, and J.-M. Morel (2005). A review of image denoising algorithms, with a new one. *Multiscale modeling and simulation* 4(2), 490–530.
- Budd, S., E. C. Robinson, and B. Kainz (2021). A survey on active learning and human-in-the-loop deep learning for medical image analysis. *Medical Image Analysis* 71, 102062.
- Bulik-Sullivan, B. K., P.-R. Loh, H. K. Finucane, S. Ripke, J. Yang, N. Patterson, M. J. Daly, A. L. Price, B. M. Neale, S. W. G. of the Psychiatric Genomics Consortium, et al. (2015). Ld score regression distinguishes confounding from polygenicity in genome-wide association studies. *Nature Genetics* 47(3), 291–295.
- Bullmore, E. and O. Sporns (2009). Complex brain networks: graph theoretical analysis of structural and functional systems. *Nature reviews neuroscience* 10(3), 186–198.
- Burgess, S., D. S. Small, and S. G. Thompson (2017). A review of instrumental variable estimators for mendelian randomization. *Statistical methods in medical research* 26(5), 2333–2355.
- Burke, D. L., J. Ensor, and R. D. Riley (2017). Meta-analysis using individual participant data: one-stage and two-stage approaches, and why they may differ. *Statistics in medicine* 36(5), 855–875.
- Cai, C., R. Chen, and M.-g. Xie (2020). Individualized inference through fusion learning. *WIREs Computational Statistics* 12(5), e1498.
- Chatterjee, S. and A. Bose (2005). Generalized bootstrap for estimating equations. *The Annals of Statistics* 33(1), 414–436.
- Chen, A. A., C. Luo, Y. Chen, R. T. Shinohara, and H. Shou (2021). Privacy-preserving harmonization via distributed combat. *NeuroImage*, 118822.

- Chen, Y., J. Goldsmith, and R. T. Ogden (2019). Functional data analysis of dynamic pet data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 114(526), 595–609.
- Chen, Y., Z. Lin, and H.-G. Müller (2021). Wasserstein regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 1–14.
- Chen, Y., C.-B. Schönlieb, P. Liò, T. Leiner, P. L. Dragotti, G. Wang, D. Rueckert, D. Firmin, and G. Yang (2022). Ai-based reconstruction for fast mri—a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Proceedings of the IEEE* 110(2), 224–245.
- Chung, M. K., K. M. Dalton, L. Shen, A. C. Evans, and R. J. Davidson (2007). Weighted fourier series representation and its application to quantifying the amount of gray matter. *IEEE transactions on medical imaging* 26(4), 566–581.
- Cornea, E., H. Zhu, P. Kim, J. G. Ibrahim, and A. D. N. Initiative (2017). Regression models on riemannian symmetric spaces. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 79(2), 463–482.
- Crainiceanu, C. M., B. S. Caffo, S. Luo, V. M. Zipunnikov, and N. M. Punjabi (2011). Population value decomposition, a framework for the analysis of image populations. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 106(495), 775–790.
- Davatzikos, C. (2019). Machine learning in neuroimaging: Progress and challenges. *NeuroImage* 197, 652.
- Deco, G., G. Tononi, M. Boly, and M. L. Kringelbach (2015). Rethinking segregation and integration: contributions of whole-brain modelling. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 16(7), 430–439.
- DerSimonian, R. and N. Laird (2015). Meta-analysis in clinical trials revisited. *Contemporary Clinical Trials* 45(Pt A), 139–145.
- Dryden, I. and K. Mardia (1998). Statistical shape analysis. *New York: John Wiley and Sons*.



- Dryden, I. L., A. Koloydenko, and D. Zhou (2009). Non-euclidean statistics for covariance matrices, with applications to diffusion tensor imaging. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* 3(3), 1102–1123.
- Dubey, P. and H.-G. Müller (2020). Functional models for time-varying random objects. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 82(2), 275–327.
- Eickhoff, S. B., B. Yeo, and S. Genon (2018). Imaging-based parcellations of the human brain. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 19(11), 672–686.
- Eklund, A., T. E. Nichols, and H. Knutsson (2016). Cluster failure: Why fmri inferences for spatial extent have inflated false-positive rates. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences* 113(28), 7900–7905.
- Elliott, L. T., K. Sharp, F. Alfaro-Almagro, S. Shi, K. L. Miller, G. Douaud, J. Marchini, and S. M. Smith (2018). Genome-wide association studies of brain imaging phenotypes in uk biobank. *Nature* 562(7726), 210–216.
- Fischl, B. (2012). Freesurfer. *NeuroImage* 62(2), 774–781.
- Fletcher, P. T., C. Lu, S. M. Pizer, and S. Joshi (2004). Principal geodesic analysis for the study of nonlinear statistics of shape. *IEEE transactions on medical imaging* 23(8), 995–1005.
- Fornage, M., S. Debette, J. C. Bis, H. Schmidt, M. A. Ikram, C. Dufouil, S. Sigurdsson, T. Lumley, A. L. DeStefano, F. Fazekas, et al. (2011). Genome-wide association studies of cerebral white matter lesion burden: the charge consortium. *Annals of neurology* 69(6), 928–939.
- Friston, K. (2009). Causal modelling and brain connectivity in functional magnetic resonance imaging. *PLoS biology* 7(2), e1000033.
- Fry, A., T. J. Littlejohns, C. Sudlow, N. Doherty, L. Adamska, T. Sprosen, R. Collins, and N. E. Allen (2017). Comparison of sociodemographic and health-related characteristics of uk biobank

- participants with those of the general population. *American journal of epidemiology* 186(9), 1026–1034.
- Glasser, M. F., T. S. Coalson, E. C. Robinson, C. D. Hacker, J. Harwell, E. Yacoub, K. Ugurbil, J. Andersson, C. F. Beckmann, M. Jenkinson, et al. (2016). A multi-modal parcellation of human cerebral cortex. *Nature* 536(7615), 171–178.
- Gong, W., C. F. Beckmann, and S. M. Smith (2021). Phenotype discovery from population brain imaging. *Medical image analysis* 71, 102050.
- Goodfellow, I., Y. Bengio, and A. Courville (2016). *Deep learning*. MIT press.
- Greenland, S., J. M. Robins, and J. Pearl (1999). Confounding and collapsibility in causal inference. *Statistical Science* 14(1), 29–46.
- Grenander, U. and M. I. Miller (2007). *Pattern Theory From Representation to Inference*. Oxford University Press.
- Hansen, M. S. and P. Kellman (2015). Image reconstruction: an overview for clinicians. *Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging* 41(3), 573–585.
- Hastie, T., R. Tibshirani, and J. Friedman (2001). *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction*. Springer-Verlag: New York.
- Havaei, M., A. Davy, D. Warde-Farley, A. Biard, A. Courville, Y. Bengio, C. Pal, P.-M. Jodoin, and H. Larochelle (2017). Brain tumor segmentation with deep neural networks. *Medical image analysis* 35, 18–31.
- Hesamian, M. H., W. Jia, X. He, and P. Kennedy (2019). Deep learning techniques for medical image segmentation: achievements and challenges. *Journal of digital imaging* 32(4), 582–596.

- Huang, C., P. Thompson, Y. Wang, Y. Yu, J. Zhang, D. Kong, R. R. Colen, R. C. Knickmeyer, H. Zhu, A. D. N. Initiative, et al. (2017). Fgwas: Functional genome wide association analysis. *NeuroImage* 159, 107–121.
- Huang, C. and H. Zhu (2022). Functional hybrid factor regression models for handling heterogeneity in imaging studies. *Biometrika* 107.
- Huang, M., T. Nichols, C. Huang, Y. Yang, Z. Lu, R. C. Knickmeyer, Q. Feng, and H. T. Zhu (2015). FVGWAS: fast voxelwise genome wide association analysis of large-scale imaging genetic data. *NeuroImage* 118, 613–627.
- Huckemann, S. F. and B. Eltzner (2021). Data analysis on nonstandard spaces. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Statistics* 13(3), e1526.
- Ibrahim, J. G. and G. Molenberghs (2009). Missing data methods in longitudinal studies: a review. *Test* 18(1), 1–43.
- Imbens, G. W. (2020). Potential outcome and directed acyclic graph approaches to causality: Relevance for empirical practice in economics. *Journal of Economic Literature* 58(4), 1129–79.
- Imbens, G. W. and D. B. Rubin (2015). *Causal inference in statistics, social, and biomedical sciences*. Cambridge University Press.
- Isensee, F., P. F. Jaeger, S. A. Kohl, J. Petersen, and K. H. Maier-Hein (2021). nnu-net: a self-configuring method for deep learning-based biomedical image segmentation. *Nature methods* 18(2), 203–211.
- Isola, P., J.-Y. Zhu, T. Zhou, and A. A. Efros (2017). Image-to-image translation with conditional adversarial networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 1125–1134.

- Jack Jr, C. R., D. S. Knopman, W. J. Jagust, L. M. Shaw, P. S. Aisen, M. W. Weiner, R. C. Petersen, and J. Q. Trojanowski (2010). Hypothetical model of dynamic biomarkers of the Alzheimer's pathological cascade. *The Lancet Neurology* 9(1), 119–128.
- Jahanshad, N., P. V. Kochunov, E. Sprooten, R. C. Mandl, T. E. Nichols, L. Almasy, J. Blangero, R. M. Brouwer, J. E. Curran, G. I. de Zubicaray, et al. (2013). Multi-site genetic analysis of diffusion images and voxelwise heritability analysis: A pilot project of the enigma-dti working group. *NeuroImage* 81, 455–469.
- Jaiswal, A., A. R. Babu, M. Z. Zadeh, D. Banerjee, and F. Makedon (2020). A survey on contrastive self-supervised learning. *Technologies* 9(1), 2.
- Jenkinson, M., C. F. Beckmann, T. E. Behrens, M. W. Woolrich, and S. M. Smith (2012). Fsl. *NeuroImage* 62(2), 782–790.
- Kalavathi, P. and V. Prasath (2016). Methods on skull stripping of mri head scan images—a review. *Journal of digital imaging* 29(3), 365–379.
- Karcher, N. R. and D. M. Barch (2021). The abcd study: understanding the development of risk for mental and physical health outcomes. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 46(1), 131–142.
- Kauppi, K., C. C. Fan, L. K. McEvoy, D. Holland, C. H. Tan, C.-H. Chen, O. A. Andreassen, R. S. Desikan, A. M. Dale, and A. D. N. Initiative (2018). Combining polygenic hazard score with volumetric mri and cognitive measures improves prediction of progression from mild cognitive impairment to alzheimer's disease. *Frontiers in neuroscience* 12, 260.
- Kim, J., W. Pan, A. D. N. Initiative, et al. (2015). A cautionary note on using secondary phenotypes in neuroimaging genetic studies. *NeuroImage* 121, 136–145.
- Knutson, K. A., Y. Deng, and W. Pan (2020). Implicating causal brain imaging endophenotypes in alzheimer's disease using multivariable iwas and gwas summary data. *NeuroImage* 223, 117347.

- Kohoutová, L., J. Heo, S. Cha, S. Lee, T. Moon, T. D. Wager, and C.-W. Woo (2020). Toward a unified framework for interpreting machine-learning models in neuroimaging. *Nature protocols* 15(4), 1399–1435.
- Kosorok, M. R. (2003). Bootstraps of sums of independent but not identically distributed stochastic processes. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 84(2), 299–318.
- Le, B. D. and J. L. Stein (2019). Mapping causal pathways from genetics to neuropsychiatric disorders using genome-wide imaging genetics: Current status and future directions. *Psychiatry and clinical neurosciences* 73(7), 357–369.
- Li, G., L. Wang, P.-T. Yap, F. Wang, Z. Wu, Y. Meng, P. Dong, J. Kim, F. Shi, I. Rekik, et al. (2019). Computational neuroanatomy of baby brains: A review. *NeuroImage* 185, 906–925.
- Li, H., Y. Wang, G. Yan, Y. Sun, S. Tanabe, C.-C. Liu, M. S. Quigg, and T. Zhang (2021). A bayesian state-space approach to mapping directional brain networks. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 116(536), 1637–1647.
- Li, J., K. Cheng, S. Wang, F. Morstatter, R. P. Trevino, J. Tang, and H. Liu (2017). Feature selection: A data perspective. *ACM computing surveys (CSUR)* 50(6), 1–45.
- Li, T., T. Li, Z. Zhu, and H. Zhu (2020). Regression analysis of asynchronous longitudinal functional and scalar data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 1–15.
- Li, T., A. K. Sahu, A. Talwalkar, and V. Smith (2020). Federated learning: Challenges, methods, and future directions. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine* 37(3), 50–60.
- Li, X., L. Wang, H. J. Wang, and A. D. N. Initiative (2021). Sparse learning and structure identification for ultrahigh-dimensional image-on-scalar regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 116(536), 1994–2008.

- Li, Y., J. H. Gilmore, J. Wang, M. Styner, W. Lin, and H. Zhu (2012). Twinmarm: two-stage multiscale adaptive regression methods for twin neuroimaging data. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging* 31(5), 1100–1112.
- Li, Y., F.-X. Wu, and A. Ngom (2018). A review on machine learning principles for multi-view biological data integration. *Briefings in bioinformatics* 19(2), 325–340.
- Li, Y., H. Zhu, D. Shen, W. Lin, J. H. Gilmore, and J. G. Ibrahim (2011). Multiscale adaptive regression models for neuroimaging data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B* 73(4), 559–578.
- Lin, D., V. D. Calhoun, and Y.-P. Wang (2014). Correspondence between fmri and snp data by group sparse canonical correlation analysis. *Medical image analysis* 18(6), 891–902.
- Lin, L., B. St. Thomas, H. Zhu, and D. B. Dunson (2017). Extrinsic local regression on manifold-valued data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 112(519), 1261–1273.
- Lindquist, M. A. (2012). Functional causal mediation analysis with an application to brain connectivity. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 107(500), 1297–1309.
- Little, R. J. A. and D. B. Rubin (2002). *Statistical Analysis With Missing Data*. New York: Wiley.
- Littlejohns, T. J., J. Holliday, L. M. Gibson, S. Garratt, N. Oesingmann, F. Alfaro-Almagro, J. D. Bell, C. Boulton, R. Collins, M. C. Conroy, et al. (2020). The uk biobank imaging enhancement of 100,000 participants: rationale, data collection, management and future directions. *Nature Communications* 11(1), 1–12.
- Liu, R. and H. Zhu (2021). Statistical disease mapping for heterogeneous neuroimaging studies (with discussions). *Canadian Journal of Statistics* 49(1), 10–34.
- Liu, T., J. Nie, A. Tarokh, L. Guo, and S. T. Wong (2008). Reconstruction of central cortical surface from brain mri images: method and application. *NeuroImage* 40(3), 991–1002.

- Liu, X., F. Zhang, Z. Hou, L. Mian, Z. Wang, J. Zhang, and J. Tang (2021). Self-supervised learning: Generative or contrastive. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*.
- Lock, E. F., K. A. Hoadley, J. S. Marron, and A. B. Nobel (2013). Joint and individual variation explained (jive) for integrated analysis of multiple data types. *The annals of applied statistics* 7(1), 523.
- Lustig, M., D. L. Donoho, J. M. Santos, and J. M. Pauly (2008). Compressed sensing mri. *IEEE signal processing magazine* 25(2), 72–82.
- Marron, J. S. and I. L. Dryden (2021). *Object Oriented Data Analysis*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Mascarell Maričić, L., H. Walter, A. Rosenthal, S. Ripke, E. B. Quinlan, T. Banaschewski, G. J. Barker, A. L. Bokde, U. Bromberg, C. Büchel, et al. (2020). The imagen study: a decade of imaging genetics in adolescents. *Molecular Psychiatry* 25(11), 2648–2671.
- Miller, K. L., F. Alfaro-Almagro, N. K. Bangerter, D. L. Thomas, E. Yacoub, J. Xu, A. J. Bartsch, S. Jbabdi, S. N. Sotiropoulos, J. L. Andersson, et al. (2016). Multimodal population brain imaging in the uk biobank prospective epidemiological study. *Nature Neuroscience* 19(11), 1523–1536.
- Miller, M. I. and A. Qiu (2009). The emerging discipline of computational functional anatomy. *NeuroImage* 45, S16–S39.
- Miller, M. I. and L. Younes (2001). Group actions, homeomorphisms, and matching: A general framework. *International Journal of Computer Vision* 41(1-2), 61–84.
- Miotto, R., F. Wang, S. Wang, X. Jiang, and J. T. Dudley (2018). Deep learning for healthcare: review, opportunities and challenges. *Briefings in bioinformatics* 19(6), 1236–1246.
- Nakagawa, S. and R. P. Freckleton (2011). Model averaging, missing data and multiple imputation: a case study for behavioural ecology. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 65(1), 103–116.

- Nathoo, F., L. Kong, and H. Zhu (2019). A review of statistical methods in imaging genetics. *The Canadian Journal of Statistics* 47, 108–131.
- Nichols, T. and S. Hayasaka (2003). Controlling the familywise error rate in functional neuroimaging: a comparative review. *Statistical methods in medical research* 12(5), 419–446.
- Nichols, T. E., S. Das, S. B. Eickhoff, A. C. Evans, T. Glatard, M. Hanke, N. Kriegeskorte, M. P. Milham, R. A. Poldrack, J.-B. Poline, et al. (2017). Best practices in data analysis and sharing in neuroimaging using mri. *Nature neuroscience* 20(3), 299–303.
- Nowinski, W. L. (2021). Evolution of human brain atlases in terms of content, applications, functionality, and availability. *Neuroinformatics* 19(1), 1–22.
- Ombao, H., M. Lindquist, W. Thompson, and J. Aston (2016). *Handbook of Neuroimaging Data Analysis*. CRC Press.
- Pan, W., X. Wang, H. Zhang, H. Zhu, and J. Zhu (2019). Ball covariance: A generic measure of dependence in banach space. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*.
- Park, S. C., M. K. Park, and M. G. Kang (2003). Super-resolution image reconstruction: a technical overview. *IEEE signal processing magazine* 20(3), 21–36.
- Patil, P. and G. Parmigiani (2018). Training replicable predictors in multiple studies. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115, 2578–2583.
- Pearl, J. (2009). *Causality*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Polzehl, J. and V. Spokoiny (2000). Adaptive weights smoothing with applications to image restoration. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B* 62(2), 335–354.
- Polzehl, J., H. U. Voss, and K. Tabelow (2010). Structural adaptive segmentation for statistical parametric mapping. *NeuroImage* 52(2), 515–523.



- Ramsey, J. D., S. J. Hanson, C. Hanson, Y. O. Halchenko, R. A. Poldrack, and C. Glymour (2010). Six problems for causal inference from fmri. *NeuroImage* 49(2), 1545–1558.
- Rathore, S., M. Habes, M. A. Iftikhar, A. Shacklett, and C. Davatzikos (2017). A review on neuroimaging-based classification studies and associated feature extraction methods for alzheimer’s disease and its prodromal stages. *NeuroImage* 155, 530–548.
- Riffenburgh, R. H. (2012). *Statistics in medicine*. Academic press.
- Roberts, M., D. Driggs, M. Thorpe, J. Gilbey, M. Yeung, S. Ursprung, A. I. Aviles-Rivero, C. Etmann, C. McCague, L. Beer, et al. (2021). Common pitfalls and recommendations for using machine learning to detect and prognosticate for covid-19 using chest radiographs and ct scans. *Nature Machine Intelligence* 3(3), 199–217.
- Sanderson, E., M. M. Glymour, M. V. Holmes, H. Kang, J. Morrison, M. R. Munafò, T. Palmer, C. M. Schooling, C. Wallace, Q. Zhao, et al. (2022). Mendelian randomization. *Nature Reviews Methods Primers* 2(1), 1–21.
- Schilling, K. G., V. Nath, C. Hansen, P. Parvathaneni, J. Blaber, Y. Gao, P. Neher, D. B. Aydogan, Y. Shi, M. Ocampo-Pineda, et al. (2019). Limits to anatomical accuracy of diffusion tractography using modern approaches. *NeuroImage* 185, 1–11.
- Schilling, K. G., F. Rheault, L. Petit, C. B. Hansen, V. Nath, F.-C. Yeh, G. Girard, M. Barakovic, J. Rafael-Patino, T. Yu, et al. (2021). Tractography dissection variability: what happens when 42 groups dissect 14 white matter bundles on the same dataset? *NeuroImage* 243, 118502.
- Schilling, K. G., C. M. Tax, F. Rheault, B. A. Landman, A. W. Anderson, M. Descoteaux, and L. Petit (2022). Prevalence of white matter pathways coming into a single white matter voxel orientation: The bottleneck issue in tractography. *Human brain mapping* 43(4), 1196–1213.
- Schwarz, A. J. (2021). The use, standardization, and interpretation of brain imaging data in clinical trials of neurodegenerative disorders. *Neurotherapeutics* 18(2), 686–708.

- Seghouane, A.-K. and D. Ferrari (2019). Robust hemodynamic response function estimation from fnirs signals. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* 67(7), 1838–1848.
- Shao, L., Z. Lin, and F. Yao (2022). Intrinsic riemannian functional data analysis for sparse longitudinal observations. *The Annals of Statistics* 50(3), 1696–1721.
- Shen, D., G. Wu, and H.-I. Suk (2017). Deep learning in medical image analysis. *Annual review of biomedical engineering* 19, 221–248.
- Shen, L. and P. M. Thompson (2019). Brain imaging genomics: integrated analysis and machine learning. *Proceedings of the IEEE* 108(1), 125–162.
- Shi, J. and Y. Wang (2019). Hyperbolic wasserstein distance for shape indexing. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 42(6), 1362–1376.
- Shu, H., Z. Qu, and H. Zhu (2022). D-gcca: Decomposition-based generalized canonical correlation analysis for multi-view high-dimensional data. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 23(169), 1–64.
- Silverman, B. and J. Ramsay (2005). *Functional Data Analysis*. Springer.
- Simmonds, M., G. Stewart, and L. Stewart (2015). A decade of individual participant data meta-analyses: A review of current practice. *Contemporary clinical trials* 45, 76–83.
- Simpson, S. L., F. D. Bowman, and P. J. Laurienti (2013). Analyzing complex functional brain networks: fusing statistics and network science to understand the brain. *Statistics Surveys* 7, 1.
- Smith, N. B. and A. Webb (2010). *Introduction to medical imaging: physics, engineering and clinical applications*. Cambridge university press.
- Smith, S. M., G. Douaud, W. Chen, T. Hanayik, F. Alfaro-Almagro, K. Sharp, and L. T. Elliott (2021). An expanded set of genome-wide association studies of brain imaging phenotypes in uk biobank. *Nature neuroscience* 24(5), 737–745.

- Smith, S. M., J. M., H. Johansen-Berg, D. Rueckert, T. E. Nichols, C. E. Mackay, K. E. Watkins, O. Ciccarelli, M. Cader, P. Matthews, and T. E. Behrens (2006). Tract-based spatial statistics: voxelwise analysis of multi-subject diffusion data. *NeuroImage* 31, 1487–1505.
- Smith, S. M., K. L. Miller, G. Salimi-Khorshidi, M. Webster, C. F. Beckmann, T. E. Nichols, J. D. Ramsey, and M. W. Woolrich (2011). Network modelling methods for fmri. *NeuroImage* 54(2), 875–891.
- Smith, S. M. and T. E. Nichols (2018). Statistical challenges in “big data” human neuroimaging. *Neuron* 97(2), 263–268.
- Sobel, M. E. and M. A. Lindquist (2020). Estimating causal effects in studies of human brain function: New models, methods and estimands. *The annals of applied statistics* 14(1), 452.
- Song, S., Y. Zheng, and Y. He (2017). A review of methods for bias correction in medical images. *Biomedical Engineering Review* 1(1).
- Sotiras, A., C. Davatzikos, and N. Paragios (2013). Deformable medical image registration: A survey. *IEEE transactions on medical imaging* 32(7), 1153–1190.
- Srivastava, A. and E. P. Klassen (2016). *Functional and shape data analysis*, Volume 1. Springer.
- Sun, N. and H. Zhao (2020). Statistical methods in genome-wide association studies. *Annual Review of Biomedical Data Science* 3(1).
- Sun, W., B. J. Reich, T. Tony Cai, M. Guindani, and A. Schwartzman (2015). False discovery control in large-scale spatial multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 77(1), 59–83.
- Taschler, B., S. M. Smith, and T. E. Nichols (2022). Causal inference on neuroimaging data with mendelian randomisation. *NeuroImage*, 119385.

- The-Wellcome-Trust-Case-Control-Consortium (2007). Genome-wide association study of 14,000 cases of seven common diseases and 3,000 shared controls. *Nature* 447(7145), 661–678.
- Thompson, P. M., N. Jahanshad, C. R. Ching, L. E. Salminen, S. I. Thomopoulos, J. Bright, B. T. Baune, S. Bertolín, J. Bralten, W. B. Bruin, et al. (2020). Enigma and global neuroscience: A decade of large-scale studies of the brain in health and disease across more than 40 countries. *Translational psychiatry* 10(1), 1–28.
- Thompson, S. K. (2012). *Sampling*, Volume 755. John Wiley & Sons.
- Toga, A. W., P. M. Thompson, S. Mori, K. Amunts, and K. Zilles (2006). Towards multimodal atlases of the human brain. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 7(12), 952–966.
- Tulay, E. E., B. Metin, N. Tarhan, and M. K. Arıkan (2019). Multimodal neuroimaging: basic concepts and classification of neuropsychiatric diseases. *Clinical EEG and neuroscience* 50(1), 20–33.
- Upadhyaya, P., K. Zhang, C. Li, X. Jiang, and Y. Kim (2021). Scalable causal structure learning: New opportunities in biomedicine. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.07785*.
- Van Cauwenberghe, C., C. Van Broeckhoven, and K. Sleegers (2016). The genetic landscape of alzheimer disease: clinical implications and perspectives. *Genetics in Medicine* 18(5), 421–430.
- Van Essen, D. C., S. M. Smith, D. M. Barch, T. E. Behrens, E. Yacoub, K. Ugurbil, W.-M. H. Consortium, et al. (2013). The WU-Minn human connectome project: an overview. *NeuroImage* 80, 62–79.
- VanderWeele, T. (2015). *Explanation in causal inference: methods for mediation and interaction*. Oxford University Press.
- Wang, J.-L., J.-M. Chiou, and H.-G. Müller (2016). Functional data analysis. *Annual Review of Statistics and its application* 3, 257–295.

- Wasserthal, J., P. Neher, and K. H. Maier-Hein (2018). Tractseg-fast and accurate white matter tract segmentation. *NeuroImage* 183, 239–253.
- Watanabe, K., E. Taskesen, A. Van Bochoven, and D. Posthuma (2017). Functional mapping and annotation of genetic associations with fuma. *Nature communications* 8(1), 1–11.
- Watson, H. J., Z. Yilmaz, and P. F. Sullivan (2020). The psychiatric genomics consortium: history, development, and the future. In *Personalized psychiatry*, pp. 91–101. Elsevier.
- Weiner, M. W., P. S. Aisen, C. R. Jack Jr, W. J. Jagust, J. Q. Trojanowski, L. Shaw, A. J. Saykin, J. C. Morris, N. Cairns, L. A. Beckett, et al. (2010). The Alzheimer’s disease neuroimaging initiative: progress report and future plans. *Alzheimer’s & Dementia* 6(3), 202–211.
- Weiner, M. W., D. P. Veitch, P. S. Aisen, L. A. Beckett, N. J. Cairns, R. C. Green, D. Harvey, C. R. Jack Jr, W. Jagust, J. C. Morris, et al. (2017). The alzheimer’s disease neuroimaging initiative 3: Continued innovation for clinical trial improvement. *Alzheimer’s & Dementia* 13(5), 561–571.
- Worsley, K. J., J. E. Taylor, F. Tomaiuolo, and J. Lerch (2004). Unified univariate and multivariate random field theory. *NeuroImage* 23, S189–S195.
- Xiang, S., L. Yuan, W. Fan, Y. Wang, P. M. Thompson, J. Ye, A. D. N. Initiative, et al. (2014). Bi-level multi-source learning for heterogeneous block-wise missing data. *NeuroImage* 102, 192–206.
- Yang, H., V. Baladandayuthapani, A. U. Rao, and J. S. Morris (2020). Quantile function on scalar regression analysis for distributional data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 115(529), 90–106.
- Yang, J., S. H. Lee, M. E. Goddard, and P. M. Visscher (2011). Gcta: a tool for genome-wide complex trait analysis. *The American Journal of Human Genetics* 88(1), 76–82.

- Yeh, C.-H., D. K. Jones, X. Liang, M. Descoteaux, and A. Connelly (2021). Mapping structural connectivity using diffusion mri: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging* 53(6), 1666–1682.
- Yi, X., E. Walia, and P. Babyn (2019). Generative adversarial network in medical imaging: A review. *Medical image analysis* 58, 101552.
- Yu, D., L. Wang, D. Kong, and H. Zhu (2022). Mapping the genetic-imaging-clinical pathway with applications to alzheimer’s disease. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* (just-accepted), 1–30.
- Yu, M., K. A. Linn, P. A. Cook, M. L. Phillips, M. McInnis, M. Fava, M. H. Trivedi, M. M. Weissman, R. T. Shinohara, and Y. I. Sheline (2018). Statistical harmonization corrects site effects in functional connectivity measurements from multi-site fmri data. *Human brain mapping* 39(11), 4213–4227.
- Yuan, Y., J. H. Gilmore, X. Geng, S. Martin, K. Chen, J.-l. Wang, and H. Zhu (2014). Fmem: Functional mixed effects modeling for the analysis of longitudinal white matter tract data. *NeuroImage* 84, 753–764.
- Yuan, Y., H. Zhu, W. Lin, and J. S. Marron (2012). Local polynomial regression for symmetric positive definite matrices. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 74(4), 697–719.
- Zhang, C., J. Fan, and T. Yu (2011). Multiple testing via fdrl for large scale imaging data. *Annals of statistics* 39(1), 613.
- Zhang, D., L. Li, C. Sripada, and J. Kang (2020). Image-on-scalar regression via deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.09911*.
- Zhang, Z., M. Descoteaux, J. Zhang, G. Girard, M. Chamberland, D. Dunson, A. Srivastava, and H. Zhu (2018). Mapping population-based structural connectomes. *NeuroImage* 172, 130–145.

- Zhang, Z., X. Wang, L. Kong, and H. Zhu (2021). High-dimensional spatial quantile function-on-scalar regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 1–16.
- Zhang, Z., Y. Wu, D. Xiong, J. G. Ibrahim, A. Srivastava, and H. Zhu (2023). Lesa: Longitudinal elastic shape analysis of brain subcortical structures (with discussions). *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 118, in press.
- Zhao, B., J. G. Ibrahim, Y. Li, T. Li, Y. Wang, Y. Shan, Z. Zhu, F. Zhou, J. Zhang, C. Huang, et al. (2019). Heritability of regional brain volumes in large-scale neuroimaging and genetic studies. *Cerebral Cortex* 29(7), 2904–2914.
- Zhao, B., T. Li, S. M. Smith, D. Xiong, X. Wang, Y. Yang, T. Luo, Z. Zhu, Y. Shan, N. Matoba, et al. (2022). Common variants contribute to intrinsic human brain functional networks. *Nature Genetics*, in press.
- Zhao, B., T. Li, Y. Yang, X. Wang, T. Luo, Y. Shan, Z. Zhu, D. Xiong, M. Hauberg, J. Bendl, J. Fullard, P. Roussos, Y. Li, J. Stein, and H. Zhu (2021). Common genetic variation influencing human white matter microstructure. *Science* 372(6548), eabf3736.
- Zhao, B., T. Luo, T. Li, Y. Li, J. Zhang, Y. Shan, X. Wang, L. Yang, F. Zhou, Z. Zhu, et al. (2019). Genome-wide association analysis of 19,629 individuals identifies variants influencing regional brain volumes and refines their genetic co-architecture with cognitive and mental health traits. *Nature Genetics* 51, 1637–1644.
- Zhao, J., X. Xie, X. Xu, and S. Sun (2017). Multi-view learning overview: Recent progress and new challenges. *Information Fusion* 38, 43–54.
- Zhao, Y. and F. X. Castellanos (2016). Annual research review: discovery science strategies in studies of the pathophysiology of child and adolescent psychiatric disorders-promises and limitations. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 57(3), 421–439.

- Zhao, Y., L. Li, and B. S. Caffo (2021). Multimodal neuroimaging data integration and pathway analysis. *Biometrics* 77(3), 879–889.
- Zhou, G., A. Cichocki, Y. Zhang, and D. P. Mandic (2015). Group component analysis for multi-block data: Common and individual feature extraction. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems* 27(11), 2426–2439.
- Zhou, S. K., H. Greenspan, C. Davatzikos, J. S. Duncan, B. Van Ginneken, A. Madabhushi, J. L. Prince, D. Rueckert, and R. M. Summers (2021). A review of deep learning in medical imaging: Imaging traits, technology trends, case studies with progress highlights, and future promises. *Proceedings of the IEEE*.
- Zhou, S. K., H. N. Le, K. Luu, H. V. Nguyen, and N. Ayache (2021). Deep reinforcement learning in medical imaging: A literature review. *Medical image analysis* 73, 102193.
- Zhu, H., J. Fan, and L. Kong (2014). Spatially varying coefficient model for neuroimaging data with jump discontinuities. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 109(507), 1084–1098.
- Zhu, H., R. Li, and L. Kong (2012). Multivariate varying coefficient model for functional responses. *Annals of Statistics* 40(5), 2634–2666.
- Zhu, H., D. Shen, X. Peng, L. Y. Liu, and Alzheimer’s Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (2017 (PMC5693262)). Mwpcr: Multiscale weighted principal component regression for high-dimensional prediction. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 112, 1009–1021.
- Zhu, H., H. Zhang, J. G. Ibrahim, and B. S. Peterson (2007). Statistical analysis of diffusion tensors in diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging data (with discussion). *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 102(480), 1085–1102.
- Zhu, H. T., J. G. Ibrahim, N. Tang, D. Rowe, X. Hao, R. Bansal, and B. S. Peterson (2007). A



statistical analysis of brain morphology using wild bootstrapping. *IEEE Trans Med Imaging* 26, 954–966.

Zhu, J.-Y., T. Park, P. Isola, and A. A. Efros (2017). Unpaired image-to-image translation using cycle-consistent adversarial networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pp. 2223–2232.

Zhu, W., Y. Yuan, J. Zhang, F. Zhou, R. C. Knickmeyer, H. Zhu, A. D. N. Initiative, et al. (2017). Genome-wide association analysis of secondary imaging phenotypes from the alzheimer’s disease neuroimaging initiative study. *NeuroImage* 146, 983–1002.

Zhu, X. (2020). Mendelian randomization and pleiotropy analysis. *Quantitative Biology*, 1–11.

Zugman, A., A. Harrewijn, E. M. Cardinale, H. Zwiebel, G. F. Freitag, K. E. Werwath, J. M. Bas-Hoogendam, N. A. Groenewold, M. Aghajani, K. Hilbert, et al. (2022). Mega-analysis methods in enigma: The experience of the generalized anxiety disorder working group. *Human Brain Mapping* 43(1), 255–277.

# Supplementary Material for “Statistical Learning Methods for Neuroimaging Data Analysis with Applications”

Hongtu Zhu<sup>1</sup>, Tengfei Li<sup>2</sup>, and Bingxin Zhao<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Departments of Biostatistics, Statistics, Genetics, and Computer Science and Biomedical Research Imaging Center, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

<sup>2</sup>Departments of Radiology and Biomedical Research Imaging Center, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

<sup>3</sup>Department of Statistics and Data Science, University of Pennsylvania

The supplementary file include:

- Supplementary table S1.

Table 2: Summary of key information for eight neuroimaging modalities

Modality	Tracer	Resolution	Feature	Use	Software
sMRI (T1, T2)	Fluid characteristics of different tissues	0.5-1 mm	Cortical thickness, cortical folding, sulcal depth, voxel-based morphometry, regional volumes and shape	Measure brain cortical/subcortical structural changes for diagnosis/staging/follow-up of disease/brain development.	Freesurfer, ANTs, FSL, SPM, AFNI, Hammer, BRAINVisa, BrainSuite
DWI	Brownian motion of water molecules within voxels	1.25-3 mm	Fractional anisotropy, axial/radial/mean diffusivity, DKI/NODDI parameters, structural connectivity	Delineate tumors, suspected acute ischemic brain injury, intracranial infections, masses, trauma, and edema; map structural connectome in research.	FSL, Mrtrix, AFNI, TrackVis, Camino, TORTOISE, slicerDMRI, Dipy, CAMINO, DSISudio
fMRI	Blood-oxygen-level-dependent (BOLD) response in blood flow associated with brain function	3-4 mm (spatial); 1-3 s (temporal)	Beta image, functional connectivity, weighted and binary network metrics	Brain activity mapping under tasks, brain abnormalities detection, pre-operative brain functional mapping.	SPM, FSL, AFNI, CPAC, FuNP
PET	Emissions from radioactive tracers	4-5 mm	Standard uptake ratio	Reveal metabolic/biochemical functions of tissues/organs and abnormalities in brain neurophysiology/neurochemistry	NiftyPET, SPM, Metavol, NEUROSTAT, APPIAN, kinfitr, LIFEx, Pypes, SPAMALIZE
CT	X-ray attenuations by different tissues inside the body	Tens of nanometres-5 mm	Local and regional volumetric/thickness measures, tumor features	Diagnosing a range of conditions: abnormal blood vessels, brain atrophy, hemorrhage, swelling, stroke, tumors	ITK, SPM, PACS, Velocity, scenium, LIFEx
EEG	Electrical field produced by neuron electrical activity	7-10 mm	Event-related potentials, connectivity/network measures, spectral content	Diagnosis and treatment of brain tumors, damage, dysfunction and disorders	EEGLAB, MNE, ELAN, Field-Trip, NUTMEG, BrainVoyager, SPM
MEG	Magnetic field produced by neuron electrical activity, including tangential components of postsynaptic intracellular currents	2-3 mm	Similar derived measures with EEG	Identification of brain functional areas (centers of sensory, motor, language and memory activities), precise location mapping of the source of epileptic seizures	EEGLAB, MNE, ELAN, Field-Trip, NUTMEG, BrainVoyager, SPM
fNIRS	Changes in cortical BOLD response associated with brain function	650-900 nm (spatial); milliseconds (temporal)	Similar derived measures with EEG and fMRI	Study normal and pathological brain physiology in infants/children	Homer2, Homer3, FNIRSOFT, OPENFNIRS, ICNNA, nirsLAB