1 Patient-Specific Connectomic Models Correlate With, But Do Not Predict, Outcomes in Deep

2 Brain Stimulation for Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder

- 3 Alik S. Widge^{1,+}, Fan Zhang², Aishwarya Gosai³, George Papadimitrou³, Peter Wilson-Braun³,
- 4 Magdalini Tsintou³, Senthil Palanivelu³, Angela M. Noecker⁴, Cameron C. McIntyre⁴, Lauren
- 5 O'Donnell², Nicole C.R. McLaughlin⁵, Benjamin D. Greenberg^{5,6}, Nikolaos Makris³, Darin D.
- 6 Dougherty^{3,*}, Yogesh Rathi^{2,3,*}

7

- 8 1: Department of Psychiatry, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN
- 9 2: Department of Radiology, Brigham and Womens Hospital, Boston, MA
- 10 3: Department of Psychiatry, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA
- 11 4: Department of Biomedical Engineering, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH
- 12 5: Department of Psychiatry and Human Behavior, Butler Hospital and Brown University Medical
- 13 School, Providence, RI
- 14 6: Center for Neurorestoration and Neurotechnology, Providence VA Medical Center, Providence, RI
- 15 *: Equal contribution as senior authors
- 16 +: Correspondence to: MTRF 3-208, 2001 6th St SE, Minneapolis, MN 55455 ; <u>awidge@umn.edu</u>
- 17 <u>Running Title:</u> Patient-Specific Models in DBS for OCD
- 18 Keywords: Diffusion magnetic resonance imaging (dMRI); neurostimulation ; machine learning ; internal
- 19 capsule ; electric field modeling

21 Abstract

22	Background: Deep brain stimulation (DBS) of the ventral internal capsule/ventral striatum (VCVS) is an
23	emerging treatment for obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD). Recently, multiple studies using
24	normative connectomes have correlated DBS outcomes to stimulation of specific white matter tracts.
25	Those studies did not test whether these correlations are clinically predictive, and did not apply cross-
26	validation approaches that are necessary for biomarker development. Further, they did not account for
27	the possibility of systematic differences between DBS patients and the non-diagnosed controls used in
28	normative connectomes.
29	
30	Methods: We performed patient-specific diffusion imaging in 8 patients who underwent VCVS DBS for
31	OCD. We delineated tracts connecting thalamus and subthalamic nucleus (STN) to prefrontal cortex via
32	VCVS. We then calculated which tracts were likely activated by individual patients' DBS settings. We fit
33	multiple statistical models to predict both OCD and depression outcomes from tract activation. We
34	further attempted to predict hypomania, a VCVS DBS complication. We assessed all models'
35	performance on held-out test sets.
36	
37	Results: No model predicted OCD response, depression response, or hypomania above chance.
38	Coefficient inspection partly supported prior reports, in that capture of tracts projecting to cingulate
39	cortex was associated with both YBOCS and MADRS response. In contrast to prior reports, however,
40	tracts connected to STN were not reliably correlated with response.
41	
42	Conclusions: Patient-specific imaging and a guideline-adherent analysis were unable to identify a
43	tractographic target with sufficient effect size to drive clinical decision-making or predict individual
44	outcomes. These findings suggest caution in interpreting the results of normative connectome studies.
45	
46	

47 Introduction

48 Deep brain stimulation (DBS) is an emerging approach to treatment-resistant mental disorders (1-3), 49 but response rates in formal clinical trials are mixed (1,4–7). More reliable outcomes might be achieved 50 by improving anatomic targeting. As psychiatric disorders are increasingly understood as network 51 disorders (8,9), psychiatric DBS is moving away from using a single nucleus/structure as the target and 52 towards attempts at affecting networks (1.10–12). There is particular enthusiasm for identifying target 53 networks through diffusion tractography, which may enable DBS electrode placement to be customized 54 to individual patients' anatomy. Although there is controversy over how accurately tractography 55 reconstructs white matter anatomy (13.14), remarkable early results have been reported from DBS 56 placement based on that imaging (10). Further, there are multiple tools available to model the 57 interaction of DBS electric fields and targeted tracts (15–17). These tools could replace trial-and-error 58 DBS programming with a mathematically optimal approach to activating desired pathways while 59 minimizing off-target effects (18). That could overcome the difficulty of correctly programming 60 stimulation, a likely driver of inconsistent clinical outcomes (1,4,19).

61

62 To realize that promise, we need to know which tracts should/should not be stimulated. For DBS of the 63 subcallosal white matter for depression, multiple groups have settled on a specific white matter 64 confluence and are studying it prospectively (with varying clinical outcomes (10,20)). For obsessivecompulsive disorder (OCD), a consensus may also be emerging. A theory linking OCD to dysfunction in 65 66 cortico-striato-thalamic connectivity (21,22) has led to a focus on white matter tracts linking prefrontal 67 cortex (PFC) to striatum, basal ganglia, and thalamus. Retrospective studies from multiple institutions 68 have implicated tracts to/from dorsolateral PFC (23.24), ventrolateral PFC (12.25.26), and anterior 69 cinqulate (12,24) as potentially important in response. Recent analyses of patients implanted at two 70 different targets correlated OCD response with a tract linking the ventral internal capsule/striatum 71 (VCVS) and the subthalamic nucleus (STN) with the medial PFC (12,26–28). One study further 72 suggested that capture of tracts from orbitofrontal cortex (OFC) (23) led to non-response, although a

qualitative synthesis (29) suggests that effective DBS tends to activate OFC-related fibers, and OFC directed circuits can drive compulsive behaviors in animal models (30–32).

75

76 Although promising, these prior tractographic analyses are also limited. Many used standard atlases or 77 connectomes derived from healthy controls, comparing these maps against electric fields from patient-78 specific DBS placements (12,23,27,28). Individual patients, however, show dramatic variation in their 79 white matter topography compared to atlas standards (33). Targeting maps computed using 80 "normative" connectomes differ from those computed from patient-specific DTI images (24). Other 81 studies used simple isotropic field models (25), or distance between electrodes and a target tract (34) 82 which may not accurately capture the DBS-induced electric field (16,35). 83 84 Most importantly, these analyses focused on tracts that correlate with clinical response. A variable may 85 correlate strongly with an outcome but not be able to reliably predict that outcome, e.g. if the means are 86 separate but the tails of two distributions overlap (36-38). Best practices in biomarker research suggest 87 explicitly building predictive models, testing those models on held-out data, and reporting predictive performance in addition to correlation (36,37,39,40). Prediction-oriented analyses might better answer 88

the question of whether a tractographic finding can be used as a programming target, i.e. whether it hasstrong predictive accuracy at the single-patient level (41).

91

Here, we address these limitations through an explicit attempt to predict single-patient response to DBS for OCD at the VCVS target, based on more precise field modeling approaches and using patientspecific tractography. We replicate in part prior studies' findings that cingulate, medial PFC, and lateral PFC tracts are correlated with clinical response, but we show that these correlations do not provide strong clinical predictive power, and in some cases we identify correlations that contradict earlier reports.

98 Methods

99 Study Population and Clinical Treatment

100 Participants were 6 patients who enrolled in a clinical trial (NCT00640133) of VCVS DBS for OCD (42). 101 plus 2 who received VCVS DBS for OCD under a Humanitarian Device Exemption. All patients 102 received Medtronic model 3387 DBS leads, with the most ventral contact targeted to the ventral striatal 103 arev matter. The Institutional Review Boards of Massachusetts General Hospital and Butler Hospital 104 approved the protocols and provided ethical oversight. All participants gave informed consent, explicitly 105 including separate consent for DBS and for neuroimaging. We report here all patients who agreed to 106 undergo imaging. We analyzed both the Yale-Brown Obsessive-Compulsive Scale (YBOCS) and 107 Montgomery-Asberg Depression Rating Scale (MADRS), collected at visits approximately 2-4 weeks 108 apart by a trained rater.

109 *Imaging and Patient-Specific Tractography*

110 Pre-operative MRI data were acquired on a 3T Siemens TimTrio scanner. Diffusion MRI (dMRI) scans 111 had a spatial resolution of 2 mm (isotropic) with 10 non-diffusion weighted volumes and 60 diffusion 112 weighted volumes, with gradient directions spread uniformly on the sphere with a b-value of 700 s/mm². 113 dMRI data were registered to pre-operative T1- and T2-weighted MRI images and post-operative CT 114 scans using a published pipeline (43) available at https://github.com/pnlbwh/. We then performed whole 115 brain tractography from the dMRI data, using a multi-tensor unscented Kalman filter (UKF) (44.45). The 116 UKF fits a mixture model of two tensors to the dMRI data, providing a highly sensitive fiber tracking 117 ability in the presence of crossing fibers (46–49). The UKF method guides each fiber's current tracking 118 estimate by the previous one. This recursive estimation helps stabilize model fitting, making tracking 119 more robust to imaging artifact/noise. Another benefit of UKF is that fiber tracking orientation is 120 controlled by a probabilistic prior about the rate of change of fiber orientation, producing more accurate 121 tracking than the hard limits on curvature used in typical tractography algorithms. We combined the 122 UKF with a fiber clustering algorithm to create an anatomically curated and annotated white matter

atlas (48). The clustering method groups the streamlines from each patient using a spectral embedding
algorithm. Each fiber cluster is matched to a tract from an *a priori* labelled atlas of the white matter
derived from known connections in monkey and human brains. Fiber clustering was performed only on
streamlines longer than 40 mm to annotate medium and long range tracts.

127

128 Tract Activation Modeling

For each clinical DBS setting used in each patient, we calculated the volume of tissue activated (VTA) using a modified version of StimVision (15). Briefly, the VTAs were calculated using artificial neural network predictor functions, which were based on the response of multi-compartment cable models of axons coupled to finite element models of the DBS electric field (50). The VTAs used in this study were designed to estimate the spatial extent of activation for large diameter (5.7 μm) myelinated axons near the DBS electrode (51).

135

136 Based on theories that VCVS DBS acts by modulating circuits that run primarily in the internal capsule 137 (14,22,29), we estimated activation of pathways linking thalamus with anterior cingulate and 138 pericingulate cortex (ACC-PAC), dorsolateral PFC (dIPFC), ventrolateral PFC (vIPFC), dorsomedial 139 PFC (DMPFC), medial orbitofrontal cortex (MOFC) and lateral OFC (LOFC). Pericingulate cortex 140 includes rostral pre-cingulate cortex, but not the dorsal prefrontal cortex (such as the supplementary 141 motor area). The atlas-guided fiber clustering algorithm (48) and a fiber clustering pipeline (52,53) 142 auided manual delineation of fiber bundles connecting these regions to thalamus. All pathway labelings 143 were performed by an expert neuroanatomist (Dr. Makris). Examples of the traced bundles and their 144 intersections with DBS VTAs are shown in Figure 1A. Recent reports found that a tract connecting 145 subthalamic nucleus (STN) to medial prefrontal cortex was strongly associated with clinical response to 146 DBS in OCD (12,26–28). Therefore, we manually segmented the STN in each subject and extracted all 147 fiber tracts connecting the STN with the prefrontal cortex (Figure 1B).

149 [Figure 1 about here]

150

151 Data Analysis - Independent/Predictor Variables

152 It is unclear whether the important "dose" of DBS is activation of a sufficient number of fibers ("total 153 fiber" model), vs. the degree to which a sub-circuit is influenced (i.e., the fraction of the overall 154 streamlines in a tract that are within the VTA, or a "percentage" model). We calculated both and fit them 155 as two separate models for each dependent clinical outcome (see below). We also considered the 156 possibility that DBS response is not determined by any individual tract/pathway, but instead requires 157 capture of multiple pathways simultaneously. We therefore added a "total activation" variable to each 158 prediction model. For total fiber models, this variable represented the total number of streamlines 159 activated for all tracts. For percentage models, it represented the mean percentage activation across all 160 reconstructed tracts. We standardized all input variables to the 0-1 interval to ensure that regression 161 coefficients were comparable between independent variables.

162

All models were fit and evaluated using scikit-learn (0.24.1) in Python (3.8.5). With the exception of a necessary condition analysis described below, variables were coded at the single-visit level. That is, we predicted the clinical outcome at visit T from the DBS settings programmed at visit T-1.

166

167 Data Analysis - OCD Response

White matter pathway activation might relate tightly to the degree of clinical improvement (YBOCS as a continuous variable) or to patients' overall well being (dichotomous responder/non-responder analysis).
We thus modeled each separately. We analyzed continuous YBOCS as percentage decrease from baseline. Distribution fitting via the 'fitdist' package verified that YBOCS values were most compatible with a gamma distribution. We therefore predicted YBOCS improvement via an L1-regularized generalized linear regression (gamma distribution with identity link, Python package 'pyglmnet') and via

174 a random forest regression with 100 trees. The dependent variable was percentage improvement in 175 YBOCS. We compared these two approaches to assess whether conclusions might be sensitive to the 176 model formulation. Regularized regression emphasizes selection of a small number of highly leveraged 177 variables, which may be more helpful in defining clinical decision rules. Random forests can outperform 178 generalized linear regression in at least some cases (54), particularly where there are nonlinearities 179 better captured by thresholding. 180 181 We further analyzed categorical (non)response, defined as a 35% or greater YBOCS decrease from 182 baseline (42). For these, we compared an L1-regularized logistic regression and a random forest

183 classifier with 100 trees. A minority of visits represented clinical response (29 visits out of 165, although

184 5 of 8 patients were in clinical response during at least one visit). To compensate for this imbalance, we

applied the Synthetic Minority Oversampling Technique (SMOTE, (55)) with 3 nearest-neighbor

186 examples. We chose L1 regularization for both regressions because dominant models of OCD argue

187 that dysfunction in specific cortico-striatal loops leads to symptoms (21,22) and/or that a relatively small

number of fiber bundles can explain response (12,26–28). This should be reflected in clinical response
being driven a small subset of tracts.

190

191 Data Analysis - Depression Response

VCVS may have more effects on mood than on compulsivity (56), which would be reflected in better prediction of mood (MADRS) than of YBOCS. We applied the modeling pipeline used for categorical YBOCS response to categorical MADRS response, defined as a 50% or greater MADRS decrease from pre-surgical baseline. 7 out of the 165 visits met MADRS response criteria, although this again represented 5 of 8 patients.

197

We further assessed tractographic models' prediction of hypomania, a known and voltage-dependent
complication of VCVS DBS (57,68); details are in the Supplement.

200

201 Data Analysis - Model Evaluation

202 All categorical data sets were unbalanced, and the outcome of clinical interest was always the minority 203 class. We therefore report balanced accuracy and recall (performance for the minority class) for the 204 categorical dependent variables. Further, we report the area under the receiver operator curve (AUC). 205 which is suggested to be the best summary of a categorical biomarker's performance (36,39). For 206 continuous YBOCS prediction, we report the fraction of variance explained and the coefficient of 207 determination (R^2). We emphasize that R^2 here is not the square of a correlation coefficient (36). 208 209 All metrics were calculated on a held-out test set (36,37,39,40). For each model, we held out 2 random 210 patients from the dataset (effectively 4-fold cross-validation with resampling). This improves over leave-

one-out approaches, which can overstate predictive performance (58). We left out 25% of patients,

rather than visits, because data were highly autocorrelated visit-to-visit, which also falsely inflates

213 performance (36). We then fit the predictive model on the remaining 6 patients, and we report the

214 performance on the visit-level data from the held out patients. To prevent data leakage, the SMOTE

upsampling was performed on the training set only, after the split. We obtained confidence intervals for
all metrics by repeating this process over all 28 possible leave-two-out combinations, then calculating

the range of performance falling within 2 standard deviations of the median performance.

218

We fit 16 models (4 outcomes x 2 types of model x 2 ways of expressing activation), cross-validating within each model. We interpreted the outcomes using an uncorrected 95% confidence interval to maximize power.

223 Data Analysis - Predictor Importance

To detect potentially relevant tracts, we performed importance scoring on all models, regardless of whether they correctly predicted the clinical outcomes. For regression models, we computed the median and standard deviation of the regression coefficient for each tract, across all the train-test splits.
For random forests, we applied permutation importance as implemented in scikit-learn. We permuted each independent variable 5 times for each of the train-test splits.

- 229
- 230 Data Analysis Alternative Univariate Approach

Recent papers (12,26–28) used a different approach, based on comparison of VTAs to population-

scale tractography. As an additional analysis (not pre planned), we attempted a similar approach on

this dataset. We calculated all linear correlations between YBOCS improvement (continuous variable)

and the activation of each individual tract (either as a total fiber or percentage activation). These

correlations were performed on the training set after holding out 2 random patients, consistent with

236 (12). To test whether this approach produced more generalizable predictors of DBS response, we used

the same data to fit a univariate linear regression for each independent variable, then evaluated the

model performance (coefficient of determination, R^2) on the 2 held out patients.

239

In a further exploratory analysis (see Supplement), we considered whether DBS outcomes depended
not on the tracts activated, but the integrity of those tracts.

242 Results

243 Clinical Outcomes - YBOCS

The mean YBOCS improvement (considering each patient's best time point) was 46.6%, and 5 of the 8
patients (62.5%) were clinical responders (≥35% YBOCS drop) for at least one visit.

No tract reliably predicted continuous YBOCS improvement. By all metrics, model performance was worse than chance on the held-out test set (Table 1), for both total-activation and percentage-activation models. Consistent with this, no coefficients in the regression models were above zero (i.e., the dataset mean was more reliable than any tractographic predictor). In the random forest models, the highest importance was percentage activation of fibers connecting thalamus to left OFC, but this was at chance level (change in R² across models: mean 0.09, SD 0.24).

253

[Table 1 about here]

255

256 Similarly, no model exceeded chance for response/nonresponse prediction (Table 2). In the logistic 257 regression, highly weighted features across models were the number (but not percentage) of activated 258 streamlines connecting thalamus to left cingulate, lateral OFC, medial OFC, and vIPFC. Cingulate and 259 lateral OFC streamline activation were positively associated with response, whereas medial OFC and 260 vIPFC activation were negatively associated (Figure 2). For all of these tracts, the confidence interval 261 for the coefficient estimated across all train-test splits included 0. These findings were sensitive to the 262 modeling approach; the same tracts did not show median importance scores different from 0 in the 263 random forest models. The ACC-PAC findings were corroborated by a Necessary Condition Analysis 264 on white matter integrity (Supplementary Results).

265

266 [Table 2 and Figure 2 about here]

267

The alternate mass-univariate approach also did not reliably predict response on the held-out test sets (Table 3). It was concordant with the categorical response analysis in that it identified streamlines connecting the left cingulate to thalamus as correlated with response, and similarly streamlines from bilateral vIPFC as correlated with non-response. There was more discordance than similarity, however. The medial OFC tracts identified by regression were not selected in the mass univariate approach, and conversely, the mass univariate approach predicted nonresponse if tracts projecting to dIPFC were

within the VTA. Further, the mass univariate approach emphasized percentage capture, while the

275 logistic regression emphasized total fibers within a VTA. We note that tracts from STN to PFC were

276 negatively correlated with clinical outcomes, whereas prior reports identify them as positively correlated277 (12,27,28).

278

279 Clinical Outcomes - MADRS

The mean MADRS improvement (considering each patient's best time point) was 55.69%, and 5 of the
8 (62.5%) were responders (≥50% MADRS drop) at some point. Mood and OCD response were not
linked (r=0.13 for correlation between response status on YBOCS and MADRS). Consistent with other
reports (56), there were more observations of MADRS response without YBOCS than of YBOCS
response without MADRS (22 vs. 4).

285

No model reliably predicted MADRS response above chance (Table 4). For comparison with the YBOCS analysis, we further examined the non-zero coefficients of the total-fiber regression. Capture of streamlines between right cingulate and thalamus was correlated with MADRS response, and the confidence interval for this coefficient excluded zero (Figure 3). This was not true of any other tract. Left vIPFC was associated with non-response (as it was in the categorical YBOCS analysis), but the distribution of coefficients across analyses included zero. Random forest importance scores were centered around zero.

293

294 [Table 4 and Figure 3 about here]

295

296 Discussion

Our results are both concordant and discordant with prior efforts to predict clinical OCD DBS response
 from tractographic modeling of cortico-striatal and cortico-basal circuits. Critically, we implemented

299 multiple analytic steps beyond prior studies: individualized, patient-specific tracts registered to 300 individual lead placements, activation volume calculation beyond simple electric field assumptions, 301 consideration of multiple clinical timepoints for each patient, and formal evaluation of predictive power 302 (as compared to measurement of correlations between activation and response or group mean 303 differences). With this more guideline-adherent approach, we found that no tract could reliably predict 304 clinical response or complications, whether those were considered in a continuous or categorical 305 approach. This is likely not a surprise - we and others have highlighted that group-level significant 306 correlations/separations often do not have clinical predictive power (36–39). In this sense, our results 307 support calls for caution regarding the clinical role of tractography (16,41). We also showed that 308 outcomes can be sensitive to the analytic approach - our random forest and regularized regression 309 approaches produced very different results, even though both are commonly used approaches to 310 prediction and variable selection.

311

312 Model inspection may offer some insight into variables for further investigation, even if pathway 313 activation modeling approaches are not yet able to strongly predict response. Numerically, predictive 314 power was greater (more non-zero regression coefficients after regularization) when predicting 315 categorical rather than continuous outcomes. This may be because categorical outcomes effectively 316 smooth out small fluctuations in continuous rating scales, fluctuations that may be primarily due to inter-317 rater variability or disease-unrelated variables rather than to DBS settings. The YBOCS in particular 318 shows non-linear behavior at high scores that may exacerbate this (59). We obtained non-zero 319 regression coefficients for models using activated fiber counts, but not for percentage-activated models, 320 implying that it is more important to get at least a portion of a key tract within the VTA. These results 321 also make sense in the context of our finding that the integrity (traceability) of these tracts varies greatly 322 between patients with OCD -- a tract where response depends on tract integrity will have a large 323 coefficient in a total-fibers model, but not in a percentage-activation model.

325 Our results in part support and in part diverge from a series of recent papers implicating pathways 326 between PFC and basal ganglia as critical for OCD DBS (12,26–28). Consistent with that work, the 327 ACC/PAC to thalamus tracts were implicated in both YBOCS and MADRS response, and were the 328 most positively weighted in our mass-univariate approach. Our white matter integrity analysis identified 329 the same tracts as having the largest effect size (necessity). Also similar to that prior work, we found 330 that activation of connections to medial OFC produced numerically worse outcomes. Inconsistent with 331 the prior work (12,26–28), we found negative correlations (in the mass univariate analysis) or null 332 effects (in the predictive models) specifically for tracts connecting PFC to STN or vIPFC to thalamus. 333 This again may reflect the importance of patient-specific imaging. Given that we have previously shown 334 these tracts to have substantial inter-individual variability in their position within the internal capsule 335 (33), and that here we note them to have similar variability in their overall integrity, a normative 336 connectomic analysis may not reflect the actual fibers being successfully modulated in DBS cases. 337 Alternatively, our results may highlight programming and surgical differences. These patients were 338 implanted and programmed following the approach in (60), which emphasizes an initial search for a 339 positive affective response. Other centers have reported very different programming algorithms (61). 340 based more on standard anatomic positions. If response correlates with, e.g., the quality of concomitant 341 therapy (26,62) or general clinical expertise (63), those factors will likely be strongly correlated with the 342 programming clinician, and thus will spuriously load onto the tracts and implant locations that clinician 343 happens to prefer. Most importantly, our results highlight the importance of applying analyses designed 344 specifically to identify clinical predictors (36). Interestingly, we found that OFC engagement predicted 345 worse OCD clinical response. OFC-originating components of cortico-striato-thalamic circuits are 346 heavily emphasized in theoretical (21,22,29) and animal (30,32,64) models of OCD, and these findings 347 may contribute to an ongoing debate over those models.

348

These results are tempered by three limitations. First, our sample size is small, consistent with the rarity of these patients (65). Second, imaging was not performed on a connectome-optimized scanner, and scanning at 7 Tesla (as has now become more common (66)) might identify more tracts. Third, we used

352 relatively simple models of DBS activation. All of these add noise, reducing our ability to detect subtle 353 correlations, particularly given DTI's susceptibility to false positives (14). Practically, however, these 354 limitations may not affect the clinical importance of our findings. We mitigated the lower resolution of 355 these scans by use of an algorithm that is specifically designed to perform well in the presence of noise 356 (45) and ensuring that our extracted tracts matched known, anatomically verified fiber bundles (48). 357 Further, small sample sizes tend to inflate effect sizes and bias towards positive conclusions (67), not 358 the negative result we report. Most importantly, for a tractographic result to be sufficiently reliable to 359 inform clinical targeting/programming, it would need to have a large and clear influence on outcomes, 360 with robustness to minor variations in analytic or clinical technique. Such a large effect would be clearly 361 detectable and consistent across studies even at small sample sizes, like the clinical effect of VCVS 362 DBS, which shows consistent 60-70% response rates across many small to medium cohorts (56,68-363 71). In that context, failure to identify a significant predictor in this small sample is relevant to both 364 clinical practice and future study design.

365

Overall, our results support a growing argument that circuits linking ACC to thalamus and basal ganglia are important to VCVS DBS response. They dovetail with other work linking modulation of those circuits to increased cognitive control (72,73), a construct that is thought to be deficient in OCD (74,75). At the same time, they highlight that the current level of tractographic understanding does not have strong clinical predictive power, and that multiple confounds remain to be controlled/addressed. With multiple technologies emerging to better verify target engagement and address patient heterogeneity (1,16), that understanding will likely grow in coming years.

373

374 Data/Code Availability

375 De-identified data tables and analysis code used to produce all exhibits in this manuscript will be
376 available at the time of publication at https://github.com/tne-lab.

378 Acknowledgements

This work was supported by NIH grants R03MH111320 (ASW, CCM, DDD), UH3NS100548 (ASW,
DDD), R01MH111917 (ASW, DDD, NMM, YR), U01U01MH076179 (BDG), P20GM130452 (NCM,
BDG), K23MH100607 (NCM), and P50MH106435 (NCM, BDG). ASW further acknowledges support
from the MnDRIVE Brain Conditions and Minnesota Medical Discovery Team – Addictions initiatives.
All opinions and conclusions herein are those of the authors. They do not represent the views or official
policy of any public or private funding body.

385

386 Disclosures

387 ASW and DDD have received research funding, device donations, and honoraria from Medtronic, which

388 manufactured the DBS devices used in patients' clinical care. Medtronic had no financial or technical

role in this study. ASW and CCM have multiple patents and patent filings in the area of deep brain

390 stimulation, including methods for optimizing/customizing stimulation parameters. CCM is a paid

391 consultant for Boston Scientific Neuromodulation, receives royalties from Hologram Consultants,

392 Neuros Medical, Qr8 Health, and is a shareholder in the following companies: Hologram Consultants,

393 Surgical Information Sciences, CereGate, Autonomic Technologies, Cardionomic, and Enspire DBS. All

394 other authors affirm no related financial interests.

395

396 **References**

Sullivan CRP, Olsen S, Widge AS (2021): Deep brain stimulation for psychiatric disorders: From
 focal brain targets to cognitive networks. *NeuroImage* 225: 117515.

2. Bari AA, Mikell CB, Abosch A, Ben-Haim S, Buchanan RJ, Burton AW, *et al.* (2018): Charting the

400 road forward in psychiatric neurosurgery: proceedings of the 2016 American Society for

401 Stereotactic and Functional Neurosurgery workshop on neuromodulation for psychiatric

402 disorders. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* jnnp-2017-317082.

403	3. Ramirez-Zamora A, Giordano J, Gunduz A, Alcantara J, Cagle JN, Cernera S, et al. (2020):
404	Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Deep Brain Stimulation Think Tank: Advances in
405	Neurophysiology, Adaptive DBS, Virtual Reality, Neuroethics and Technology. Front Hum

406 *Neurosci* 14: 54.

- 407 4. Widge AS, Malone DAJ, Dougherty DD (2018): Closing the loop on deep brain stimulation for
 408 treatment-resistant depression. *Front Neurosci* 12: 175.
- 5. Luyten L, Hendrickx S, Raymaekers S, Gabriëls L, Nuttin B (2016): Electrical stimulation in the bed
 nucleus of the stria terminalis alleviates severe obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Mol Psychiatry*21: 1272–1280.
- 412 6. Holtzheimer PE, Husain MM, Lisanby SH, Taylor SF, Whitworth LA, McClintock S, et al. (2017):

Subcallosal cingulate deep brain stimulation for treatment-resistant depression: a multisite,
randomised, sham-controlled trial. *Lancet Psychiatry* 4: 839–849.

415 7. Dougherty DD, Rezai AR, Carpenter LL, Howland RH, Bhati MT, O'Reardon JP, et al. (2015): A

416 randomized sham-controlled trial of deep brain stimulation of the ventral capsule/ventral

417 striatum for chronic treatment-resistant depression. *Biol Psychiatry* 78: 240–248.

- 418 8. Williams LM (2016): Defining biotypes for depression and anxiety based on large-scale circuit
- 419 dysfunction: a theoretical review of the evidence and future directions for clinical translation.
 420 Depress Anxiety 34: 9–24.
- 421 9. Avena-Koenigsberger A, Misic B, Sporns O (2018): Communication dynamics in complex brain
 422 networks. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 19: 17.

423 10. Riva-Posse P, Choi KS, Holtzheimer PE, Crowell AL, Garlow SJ, Rajendra JK, et al. (2018): A

- 424 connectomic approach for subcallosal cingulate deep brain stimulation surgery: prospective
 425 targeting in treatment-resistant depression. *Mol Psychiatry* 23: 843–849.
- 426 11. Karas PJ, Lee S, Jimenez-Shahed J, Goodman WK, Viswanathan A, Sheth SA (2019): Deep brain
 427 stimulation for obsessive compulsive disorder: evolution of surgical stimulation target parallels
 428 changing model of dysfunctional brain circuits. *Front Neurosci* 12: 998.

- 429 12. Li N, Baldermann JC, Kibleur A, Treu S, Akram H, Elias GJB, et al. (2020): A unified connectomic
- 430 target for deep brain stimulation in obsessive-compulsive disorder [no. 1]. *Nat Commun* 11:431 3364.
- 432 13. Maier-Hein KH, Neher PF, Houde J-C, Côté M-A, Garyfallidis E, Zhong J, et al. (2017): The
- 433 challenge of mapping the human connectome based on diffusion tractography [no. 1]. *Nat*434 *Commun* 8: 1349.
- 435 14. Haber SN, Tang W, Choi EY, Yendiki A, Liu H, Jbabdi S, *et al.* (2020): Circuits, networks, and
 436 neuropsychiatric disease: transitioning from anatomy to imaging. *Biol Psychiatry* 87: 318–327.
- 437 15. Noecker AM, Choi KS, Riva-Posse P, Gross RE, Mayberg HS, McIntyre CC (2018): StimVision
- 438 software: examples and applications in subcallosal cingulate deep brain stimulation for
- 439 depression. *Neuromodulation Technol Neural Interface* 21: 191–196.
- 440 16. Noecker AM, Frankemolle-Gilbert AM, Howell B, Petersen MV, Beylergil SB, Shaikh AG, McIntyre
- 441 CC (2021): StimVision v2: examples and applications in subthalamic deep brain stimulation for 442 parkinson's disease. *Neuromodulation Technol Neural Interface* 24: 248–258.
- 443 17. Horn A, Kühn AA (2015): Lead-DBS: A toolbox for deep brain stimulation electrode localizations
 444 and visualizations. *NeuroImage* 107: 127–135.
- 445 18. Peña E, Zhang S, Patriat R, Aman JE, Vitek JL, Harel N, Johnson MD (2018): Multi-objective
- particle swarm optimization for postoperative deep brain stimulation targeting of subthalamic
 nucleus pathways. *J Neural Eng* 15: 066020.
- 448 19. Provenza NR, Matteson ER, Allawala AB, Barrios-Anderson A, Sheth SA, Viswanathan A, et al.
- 449 (2019): The case for adaptive neuromodulation to treat severe intractable mental disorders.
- 450 *Front Neurosci* 13. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2019.00152
- 451 20. Ramasubbu R, Clark DL, Golding S, Dobson KS, Mackie A, Haffenden A, Kiss ZH (2020): Long
- versus short pulse width subcallosal cingulate stimulation for treatment-resistant depression: a
 randomised, double-blind, crossover trial. *Lancet Psychiatry* 7: 29–40.
- 454 21. Robbins TW, Vaghi MM, Banca P (2019): Obsessive-compulsive disorder: puzzles and prospects.
 455 *Neuron* 102: 27–47.

- 456 22. Dougherty DD, Brennan B, Stewart SE, Wilhelm S, Widge AS, Rauch SL (2018): Neuroscientifically
- 457 informed formulation and treatment planning for patients with obsessive-compulsive disorder: a
 458 review. *JAMA Psychiatry* 75: 1081–1087.
- 459 23. Hartmann CJ, Lujan JL, Chaturvedi A, Goodman WK, Okun MS, McIntyre CC, Haq IU (2016):
- 460 Tractography activation patterns in dorsolateral prefrontal cortex suggest better clinical
- 461 responses in OCD DBS. *Neuroprosthetics* 519.
- 462 24. Baldermann JC, Melzer C, Zapf A, Kohl S, Timmermann L, Tittgemeyer M, et al. (2019):
- 463 Connectivity profile predictive of effective deep brain stimulation in obsessive-compulsive
 464 disorder. *Biol Psychiatry* 85: 735–743.
- 465 25. Barcia JA, Avecillas-Chasín JM, Nombela C, Arza R, Albea JG-, Pineda J-Á, *et al.* (2018):
- 466 Personalized striatal targets for deep brain stimulation in obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Brain*467 *Stimulat.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2018.12.226
- 468 26. Mosley PE, Windels F, Morris J, Coyne T, Marsh R, Giorni A, et al. (2021): A randomised, double-
- blind, sham-controlled trial of deep brain stimulation of the bed nucleus of the stria terminalis for
- treatment-resistant obsessive-compulsive disorder [no. 1]. *Transl Psychiatry* 11: 1–17.
- 471 27. Smith AH, Choi KS, Waters AC, Aloysi A, Mayberg HS, Kopell BH, Figee M (2021): Replicable
- 472 effects of deep brain stimulation for obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Brain Stimulat* 14: 1–3.
- 473 28. Bouwens van der Vlis TAM, Ackermans L, Mulders AEP, Vrij CA, Schruers K, Temel Y, et al. (n.d.):
- 474 Ventral capsule/ventral striatum stimulation in obsessive-compulsive disorder: toward a unified
- 475 connectomic target for deep brain stimulation? *Neuromodulation Technol Neural Interface* n/a.
- 476 https://doi.org/10.1111/ner.13339
- 477 29. Haber SN, Yendiki A, Jbabdi S (2020): Four deep brain stimulation targets for obsessive478 compulsive disorder: Are they different? *Biol Psychiatry* S000632232031773X.
- 479 30. Wood J, Ahmari SE (2015): A framework for understanding the emerging role of corticolimbic480 ventral striatal networks in OCD-associated repetitive behaviors. *Front Syst Neurosci* 171.
- 481 31. Burguière E, Monteiro P, Feng G, Graybiel AM (2013): Optogenetic stimulation of lateral
- 482 orbitofronto-striatal pathway suppresses compulsive behaviors. *Science* 340: 1243–1246.

483 32. Heilbronner SR, Rodriguez-Romaguera J, Quirk GJ, Groenewegen HJ, Haber SN (2016): Circuit

484 based cortico-striatal homologies between rat and primate. *Biol Psychiatry* 80: 509–521.

- 485 33. Makris N, Rathi Y, Mouradian P, Bonmassar G, Papadimitriou G, Ing WI, et al. (2016): Variability
- 486 and anatomical specificity of the orbitofrontothalamic fibers of passage in the ventral
- 487 capsule/ventral striatum (VC/VS): precision care for patient-specific tractography-guided
- 488 targeting of deep brain stimulation (DBS) in obsessive compulsive disorder (OCD). Brain
- 489 *Imaging Behav* 10: 1054–1067.
- 490 34. Liebrand LC, Caan MWA, Schuurman PR, van den Munckhof P, Figee M, Denys D, van Wingen

491 GA (2018): Individual white matter bundle trajectories are associated with deep brain stimulation

492 response in obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Brain Stimulat*.

- 493 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2018.11.014
- 494 35. Howell B, McIntyre CC (2016): Analyzing the tradeoff between electrical complexity and accuracy in
 495 patient-specific computational models of deep brain stimulation. *J Neural Eng* 13: 036023.
- 496 36. Poldrack RA, Huckins G, Varoquaux G (2020): Establishment of best practices for evidence for
 497 prediction: a review. *JAMA Psychiatry* 77: 534–540.
- 498 37. Grzenda A, Kraguljac NV, McDonald WM, Nemeroff CB, Torous J, Alpert JE, et al. (Accepted):
- Evaluating the machine learning literature: a primer and user's guide for psychiatrists. *Am J Psychiatry*.
- 38. Lo A, Chernoff H, Zheng T, Lo S-H (2015): Why significant variables aren't automatically good
 predictors. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 112: 13892–13897.
- 503 39. Widge AS, Bilge MT, Montana R, Chang W, Rodriguez CI, Deckersbach T, et al. (2019):
- 504 Electroencephalographic biomarkers for treatment response prediction in major depressive 505 illness: a meta-analysis. *Am J Psychiatry* 176: 44–56.
- 40. Woo C-W, Chang LJ, Lindquist MA, Wager TD (2017): Building better biomarkers: brain models in
 translational neuroimaging. *Nat Neurosci* 20: 365–377.

- 508 41. Coenen VA, Schlaepfer TE, Varkuti B, Schuurman PR, Reinacher PC, Voges J, et al. (2019):
- 509 Surgical decision making for deep brain stimulation should not be based on aggregated
- 510 normative data mining. *Brain Stimul Basic Transl Clin Res Neuromodulation* 12: 1345–1348.
- 42. McLaughlin N, Dougherty DD, Eskandar EN, Ward HE, Foote KD, Malone Jr. DA, et al. (n.d.):
- 512 Double blind randomized controlled trial of deep brain stimulation for obsessive-compulsive
- 513 disorder: clinical trial design. *Contemp Clin Trials*.
- 43. reckbo, Tashrif Billah, Isaiah Norton (2019): *Pnlbwh/Pnlpipe: Easy Install and Multiprocessing*.
 Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3270927
- 44. Malcolm JG, Shenton ME, Rathi Y (2010): Filtered multitensor tractography [no. 9]. *IEEE Trans Med Imaging* 29: 1664–1675.
- 45. Reddy CP, Rathi Y (2016): Joint Multi-Fiber NODDI Parameter Estimation and Tractography Using
 the Unscented Information Filter. *Front Neurosci* 10. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2016.00166
- 46. Gong S, Zhang F, Norton I, Essayed WI, Unadkat P, Rigolo L, *et al.* (2018): Free water modeling of
- 521 peritumoral edema using multi-fiber tractography: Application to tracking the arcuate fasciculus
- for neurosurgical planning [no. 5]. *PLoS ONE* 13. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0197056
- 47. Liao R, Ning L, Chen Z, Rigolo L, Gong S, Pasternak O, *et al.* (2017): Performance of unscented
 Kalman filter tractography in edema: Analysis of the two-tensor model. *NeuroImage Clin* 15:
 819–831.
- 48. Zhang F, Wu Y, Norton I, Rigolo L, Rathi Y, Makris N, O'Donnell LJ (2018): An anatomically curated
 fiber clustering white matter atlas for consistent white matter tract parcellation across the
 lifespan. *NeuroImage* 179: 429–447.
- 49. Chen Z, Tie Y, Olubiyi O, Rigolo L, Mehrtash A, Norton I, *et al.* (2015): Reconstruction of the
 arcuate fasciculus for surgical planning in the setting of peritumoral edema using two-tensor
 unscented Kalman filter tractography. *NeuroImage Clin* 7: 815–822.
- 532 50. Chaturvedi A, Luján JL, McIntyre CC (2013): Artificial neural network based characterization of the 533 volume of tissue activated during deep brain stimulation. *J Neural Eng* 10: 056023.

- 534 51. Butson CR, McIntyre CC (2006): Role of electrode design on the volume of tissue activated during
 535 deep brain stimulation. *J Neural Eng* 3: 1–8.
- 536 52. O'Donnell LJ, Westin C-F (2007): Automatic tractography segmentation using a high-dimensional 537 white matter atlas [no. 11]. *IEEE Trans Med Imaging* 26: 1562–1575.
- 53. O'Donnell LJ, Wells WM, Golby AJ, Westin C-F (2012): Unbiased groupwise registration of white
- 539 matter tractography. In: Ayache N, Delingette H, Golland P, Mori K, editors. *Medical Image*
- 540 *Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention MICCAI 2012*, vol. 7512. Berlin, Heidelberg:
- 541 Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp 123–130.
- 542 54. Couronné R, Probst P, Boulesteix A-L (2018): Random forest versus logistic regression: a large-543 scale benchmark experiment. *BMC Bioinformatics* 19: 270.
- 54. 55. Chawla NV, Bowyer KW, Hall LO, Kegelmeyer WP (2002): SMOTE: Synthetic Minority Over-545 sampling Technique. *J Artif Intell Res* 16: 321–357.
- 546 56. Tyagi H, Apergis-Schoute AM, Akram H, Foltynie T, Limousin P, Drummond LM, et al. (2019): A
- 547 randomised trial directly comparing ventral capsule and anteromedial subthalamic nucleus
- stimulation in obsessive compulsive disorder: clinical and imaging evidence for dissociable
 effects. *Biol Psychiatry* 85: 726–734.
- 550 57. Widge AS, Licon E, Zorowitz S, Corse A, Arulpragasam AR, Camprodon JA, et al. (2015):
- 551 Predictors of hypomania during ventral capsule/ventral striatum deep brain stimulation. J
 552 Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci 28: 38–44.
- 553 58. Smith GCS, Seaman SR, Wood AM, Royston P, White IR (2014): Correcting for optimistic
 554 prediction in small data sets. *Am J Epidemiol* 180: 318–324.
- 555 59. Storch EA, Rasmussen SA, Price LH, Larson MJ, Murphy TK, Goodman WK (2010): Development
 and psychometric evaluation of the Yale–Brown Obsessive-Compulsive Scale—Second Edition.
 557 *Psychol Assess* 22: 223.
- 60. Widge AS, Dougherty DD (2015): Managing patients with psychiatric disorders with deep brain
 stimulation. In: Marks Jr. WJ, editor. *Deep Brain Stimulation Management*, 2nd ed. Cambridge :
 New York: Cambridge University Press.

- 561 61. van Westen M, Rietveld E, Bergfeld IO, Koning P de, Vullink N, Ooms P, et al. (2021): Optimizing
- deep brain stimulation parameters in obsessive–compulsive disorder. *Neuromodulation Technol Neural Interface* 24: 307–315.
- 56462. Mantione M, Nieman DH, Figee M, Denys D (2014): Cognitive-behavioural therapy augments the565effects of deep brain stimulation in obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Psychol Med* 44: 3515-
- 566 3522.
- 567 63. van Westen M, Rietveld E, Denys D (2019): Effective deep brain stimulation for obsessive568 compulsive disorder requires clinical expertise. *Front Psychol* 10: 2294.
- 64. Burguière E, Monteiro P, Mallet L, Feng G, Graybiel AM (2015): Striatal circuits, habits, and
 implications for obsessive–compulsive disorder. *Curr Opin Neurobiol* 30: 59–65.
- 65. Garnaat SL, Greenberg BD, Sibrava NJ, Goodman WK, Mancebo MC, Eisen JL, Rasmussen SA
 (2014): Who qualifies for deep brain stimulation for OCD? Data from a naturalistic clinical
- 573 sample. *J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci* 26: 81–86.
- 66. Duchin Y, Shamir RR, Patriat R, Kim J, Vitek JL, Sapiro G, Harel N (2018): Patient-specific
- 575 anatomical model for deep brain stimulation based on 7 Tesla MRI. *PloS One* 13: e0201469.
- 576 67. Button KS, Ioannidis JPA, Mokrysz C, Nosek BA, Flint J, Robinson ESJ, Munafò MR (2013): Power
- 577 failure: why small sample size undermines the reliability of neuroscience. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 14:
 578 365–376.
- 68. Denys D, Graat I, Mocking R, de Koning P, Vulink N, Figee M, *et al.* (2020): Efficacy of deep brain
 stimulation of the ventral anterior limb of the internal capsule for refractory obsessive-

581 compulsive disorder: a clinical cohort of 70 patients. *Am J Psychiatry* appi.ajp.2019.19060656.

- 582 69. Menchón JM, Real E, Alonso P, Aparicio MA, Segalas C, Plans G, et al. (2021): A prospective
- international multi-center study on safety and efficacy of deep brain stimulation for resistant
 obsessive-compulsive disorder [no. 4]. *Mol Psychiatry* 26: 1234–1247.
- 585 70. Greenberg B, Gabriels L, Malone D, Rezai A, Friehs G, Okun M, *et al.* (2010): Deep brain
 586 stimulation of the ventral internal capsule/ventral striatum for obsessive-compulsive disorder:
- 587 worldwide experience. *Mol Psychiatry* 15: 64–79.

- 588 71. Nuttin B, Cosyns P, Demeulemeester H, Gybels J, Meyerson B (1999): Electrical stimulation in
- anterior limbs of internal capsules in patients with obsessive-compulsive disorder. *The Lancet*354: 1526.
- 591 72. Basu I, Yousefi A, Crocker B, Zelmann R, Paulk AC, Peled N, et al. (Accepted in principle): Closed
- 592 loop enhancement and neural decoding of human cognitive control. *Nat Biomed Eng.*
- 593 https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.24.059964
- 594 73. Widge AS, Zorowitz S, Basu I, Paulk AC, Cash SS, Eskandar EN, et al. (2019): Deep brain
- stimulation of the internal capsule enhances human cognitive control and prefrontal cortex
 function. *Nat Commun* 10: 1536.
- 597 74. Gruner P, Pittenger C (2017): Cognitive inflexibility in Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder.
- 598 *Neuroscience* 345: 243–255.
- 599 75. Abramovitch A, Abramowitz JS, Mittelman A (2013): The neuropsychology of adult obsessive–
 600 compulsive disorder: A meta-analysis. *Clin Psychol Rev* 33: 1163–1171.
- 601 76. Brennan BP, Jacoby RJ, Widge AS (2018): A case of severe intractable contamination-based
 602 obsessive-compulsive disorder. *JAMA Psychiatry* 75: 1088–1089.
- 603 77. Smith SM (2002): Fast robust automated brain extraction [no. 3]. *Hum Brain Mapp* 17: 143–155.
- 604 78. Jenkinson M, Pechaud M, Smith S (2005): BET2 MR-Based Estimation of Brain, Skull and Scalp
- 605 Surfaces. presented at the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the Organization for Human Brain
- 606 Mapping. Retrieved from http://mickaelpechaud.free.fr/these/HBM05.pdf
- 607 79. Advanced Normalization Tools (ANTs) (2021): Advanced Normalization Tools Ecosystem.

608 Retrieved April 1, 2021, from https://github.com/ANTsX/ANTs

- 80. Howell B, Choi KS, Gunalan K, Rajendra J, Mayberg HS, McIntyre CC (2019): Quantifying the
- axonal pathways directly stimulated in therapeutic subcallosal cingulate deep brain stimulation. *Hum Brain Mapp* 40: 889–903.
- 81. Dul J (2016): Necessary Condition Analysis (NCA): logic and methodology of "necessary but not
- 613 sufficient" causality. *Organ Res Methods* 19: 10–52.

- 614 82. Dul J (2021): NCA: Necessary Condition Analysis, version 3.1.0. Retrieved April 1, 2021, from
- 615 https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=NCA
- 616
- 617 2. Bari AA, Mikell CB, Abosch A, Ben-Haim S, Buchanan RJ, Burton AW, et al. (2018): Charting the
- 618 road forward in psychiatric neurosurgery: proceedings of the 2016 American Society for
- 619 Stereotactic and Functional Neurosurgery workshop on neuromodulation for psychiatric
- 620 disorders. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* jnnp-2017-317082.
- 3. Ramirez-Zamora A, Giordano J, Gunduz A, Alcantara J, Cagle JN, Cernera S, et al. (2020):
- 622 Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Deep Brain Stimulation Think Tank: Advances in
- 623 Neurophysiology, Adaptive DBS, Virtual Reality, Neuroethics and Technology. *Front Hum*
- 624 *Neurosci* 14: 54.
- 4. Widge AS, Malone DAJ, Dougherty DD (2018): Closing the loop on deep brain stimulation for
 treatment-resistant depression. *Front Neurosci* 12: 175.
- 5. reckbo, Tashrif Billah, Isaiah Norton (2019): *Pnlbwh/Pnlpipe: Easy Install and Multiprocessing*.
 Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3270927
- 6. Luyten L, Hendrickx S, Raymaekers S, Gabriëls L, Nuttin B (2016): Electrical stimulation in the bed
 nucleus of the stria terminalis alleviates severe obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Mol Psychiatry*21: 1272–1280.
- 7. Widge AS, Licon E, Zorowitz S, Corse A, Arulpragasam AR, Camprodon JA, *et al.* (2015): Predictors
 of hypomania during ventral capsule/ventral striatum deep brain stimulation. *J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci* 28: 38–44.
- 8. Holtzheimer PE, Husain MM, Lisanby SH, Taylor SF, Whitworth LA, McClintock S, et al. (2017):
- Subcallosal cingulate deep brain stimulation for treatment-resistant depression: a multisite,
 randomised, sham-controlled trial. *Lancet Psychiatry* 4: 839–849.
- 9. Denys D, Graat I, Mocking R, de Koning P, Vulink N, Figee M, *et al.* (2020): Efficacy of deep brain
- 639 stimulation of the ventral anterior limb of the internal capsule for refractory obsessive-
- 640 compulsive disorder: a clinical cohort of 70 patients. *Am J Psychiatry* appi.ajp.2019.19060656.

- 10. Dougherty DD, Rezai AR, Carpenter LL, Howland RH, Bhati MT, O'Reardon JP, et al. (2015): A
- randomized sham-controlled trial of deep brain stimulation of the ventral capsule/ventral
 striatum for chronic treatment-resistant depression. *Biol Psychiatry* 78: 240–248.
- 11. Williams LM (2016): Defining biotypes for depression and anxiety based on large-scale circuit
- 645 dysfunction: a theoretical review of the evidence and future directions for clinical translation.
- 646 *Depress Anxiety* 34: 9–24.
- 647 12. Avena-Koenigsberger A, Misic B, Sporns O (2018): Communication dynamics in complex brain
 648 networks. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 19: 17.
- 13. Riva-Posse P, Choi KS, Holtzheimer PE, Crowell AL, Garlow SJ, Rajendra JK, et al. (2018): A

connectomic approach for subcallosal cingulate deep brain stimulation surgery: prospective
targeting in treatment-resistant depression. *Mol Psychiatry* 23: 843–849.

- 14. Karas PJ, Lee S, Jimenez-Shahed J, Goodman WK, Viswanathan A, Sheth SA (2019): Deep brain
 stimulation for obsessive compulsive disorder: evolution of surgical stimulation target parallels
 changing model of dysfunctional brain circuits. *Front Neurosci* 12: 998.
- 15. Li N, Baldermann JC, Kibleur A, Treu S, Akram H, Elias GJB, *et al.* (2020): A unified connectomic
 target for deep brain stimulation in obsessive-compulsive disorder [no. 1]. *Nat Commun* 11:
 3364.
- 16. Maier-Hein KH, Neher PF, Houde J-C, Côté M-A, Garyfallidis E, Zhong J, *et al.* (2017): The
 challenge of mapping the human connectome based on diffusion tractography [no. 1]. *Nat Commun* 8: 1349.

17. Haber SN, Tang W, Choi EY, Yendiki A, Liu H, Jbabdi S, *et al.* (2020): Circuits, networks, and
 neuropsychiatric disease: transitioning from anatomy to imaging. *Biol Psychiatry* 87: 318–327.

- 18. Noecker AM, Choi KS, Riva-Posse P, Gross RE, Mayberg HS, McIntyre CC (2018): StimVision
- 664 software: examples and applications in subcallosal cingulate deep brain stimulation for
- depression. *Neuromodulation Technol Neural Interface* 21: 191–196.

- 666 19. Noecker AM, Frankemolle-Gilbert AM, Howell B, Petersen MV, Beylergil SB, Shaikh AG, McIntyre
- 667 CC (2021): StimVision v2: examples and applications in subthalamic deep brain stimulation for 668 parkinson's disease. *Neuromodulation Technol Neural Interface* 24: 248–258.
- 669 20. Horn A, Kühn AA (2015): Lead-DBS: A toolbox for deep brain stimulation electrode localizations
- and visualizations. *NeuroImage* 107: 127–135.
- 21. Peña E, Zhang S, Patriat R, Aman JE, Vitek JL, Harel N, Johnson MD (2018): Multi-objective
- 672 particle swarm optimization for postoperative deep brain stimulation targeting of subthalamic
 673 nucleus pathways. *J Neural Eng* 15: 066020.
- 674 22. Provenza NR, Matteson ER, Allawala AB, Barrios-Anderson A, Sheth SA, Viswanathan A, et al.
- 675 (2019): The case for adaptive neuromodulation to treat severe intractable mental disorders.
- 676 *Front Neurosci* 13. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2019.00152
- 23. Ramasubbu R, Clark DL, Golding S, Dobson KS, Mackie A, Haffenden A, Kiss ZH (2020): Long
- versus short pulse width subcallosal cingulate stimulation for treatment-resistant depression: a
 randomised, double-blind, crossover trial. *Lancet Psychiatry* 7: 29–40.
- 24. Robbins TW, Vaghi MM, Banca P (2019): Obsessive-compulsive disorder: puzzles and prospects. *Neuron* 102: 27–47.
- 25. Dougherty DD, Brennan B, Stewart SE, Wilhelm S, Widge AS, Rauch SL (2018): Neuroscientifically
 informed formulation and treatment planning for patients with obsessive-compulsive disorder: a
 review. JAMA Psychiatry 75: 1081–1087.
- 26. Hartmann CJ, Lujan JL, Chaturvedi A, Goodman WK, Okun MS, McIntyre CC, Haq IU (2016):
 Tractography activation patterns in dorsolateral prefrontal cortex suggest better clinical
 responses in OCD DBS. *Neuroprosthetics* 519.
- 688 27. Baldermann JC, Melzer C, Zapf A, Kohl S, Timmermann L, Tittgemeyer M, et al. (2019):
- 689 Connectivity profile predictive of effective deep brain stimulation in obsessive-compulsive
- disorder. *Biol Psychiatry* 85: 735–743.

- 691 28. Barcia JA, Avecillas-Chasín JM, Nombela C, Arza R, Albea JG-, Pineda J-Á, *et al.* (2018):
- 692 Personalized striatal targets for deep brain stimulation in obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Brain*693 *Stimulat.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2018.12.226
- 29. Mosley PE, Windels F, Morris J, Coyne T, Marsh R, Giorni A, et al. (2021): A randomised, double-
- blind, sham-controlled trial of deep brain stimulation of the bed nucleus of the stria terminalis for
- treatment-resistant obsessive-compulsive disorder [no. 1]. *Transl Psychiatry* 11: 1–17.
- 30. Smith AH, Choi KS, Waters AC, Aloysi A, Mayberg HS, Kopell BH, Figee M (2021): Replicable
- 698 effects of deep brain stimulation for obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Brain Stimulat* 14: 1–3.
- 31. Bouwens van der Vlis TAM, Ackermans L, Mulders AEP, Vrij CA, Schruers K, Temel Y, et al. (n.d.):
- 700 Ventral capsule/ventral striatum stimulation in obsessive-compulsive disorder: toward a unified
- connectomic target for deep brain stimulation? *Neuromodulation Technol Neural Interface* n/a.
- 702 https://doi.org/10.1111/ner.13339
- 32. Haber SN, Yendiki A, Jbabdi S (2020): Four deep brain stimulation targets for obsessive-
- compulsive disorder: Are they different? *Biol Psychiatry* S000632232031773X.
- 33. Wood J, Ahmari SE (2015): A framework for understanding the emerging role of corticolimbic-
- ventral striatal networks in OCD-associated repetitive behaviors. *Front Syst Neurosci* 171.
- 34. Burguière E, Monteiro P, Feng G, Graybiel AM (2013): Optogenetic stimulation of lateral
- orbitofronto-striatal pathway suppresses compulsive behaviors. *Science* 340: 1243–1246.
- 35. Heilbronner SR, Rodriguez-Romaguera J, Quirk GJ, Groenewegen HJ, Haber SN (2016): Circuit
- based cortico-striatal homologies between rat and primate. *Biol Psychiatry* 80: 509–521.
- 36. Makris N, Rathi Y, Mouradian P, Bonmassar G, Papadimitriou G, Ing WI, et al. (2016): Variability
- and anatomical specificity of the orbitofrontothalamic fibers of passage in the ventral
- 713 capsule/ventral striatum (VC/VS): precision care for patient-specific tractography-guided
- targeting of deep brain stimulation (DBS) in obsessive compulsive disorder (OCD). Brain
- 715 *Imaging Behav* 10: 1054–1067.
- 716 37. Liebrand LC, Caan MWA, Schuurman PR, van den Munckhof P, Figee M, Denys D, van Wingen
- 717 GA (2018): Individual white matter bundle trajectories are associated with deep brain stimulation

- 718 response in obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Brain Stimulat*.
- 719 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2018.11.014
- 38. Howell B, McIntyre CC (2016): Analyzing the tradeoff between electrical complexity and accuracy in
- patient-specific computational models of deep brain stimulation. *J Neural Eng* 13: 036023.
- 39. Poldrack RA, Huckins G, Varoquaux G (2020): Establishment of best practices for evidence for
 prediction: a review. *JAMA Psychiatry* 77: 534–540.
- 40. Grzenda A, Kraguljac NV, McDonald WM, Nemeroff CB, Torous J, Alpert JE, et al. (Accepted):
- Evaluating the machine learning literature: a primer and user's guide for psychiatrists. *Am J Psychiatry*.
- 41. Lo A, Chernoff H, Zheng T, Lo S-H (2015): Why significant variables aren't automatically good
 predictors. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 112: 13892–13897.
- 42. Widge AS, Bilge MT, Montana R, Chang W, Rodriguez CI, Deckersbach T, et al. (2019):
- Electroencephalographic biomarkers for treatment response prediction in major depressive
 illness: a meta-analysis. *Am J Psychiatry* 176: 44–56.
- 43. Woo C-W, Chang LJ, Lindquist MA, Wager TD (2017): Building better biomarkers: brain models in
 translational neuroimaging. *Nat Neurosci* 20: 365–377.
- 44. Coenen VA, Schlaepfer TE, Varkuti B, Schuurman PR, Reinacher PC, Voges J, et al. (2019):
- 735 Surgical decision making for deep brain stimulation should not be based on aggregated
- normative data mining. *Brain Stimul Basic Transl Clin Res Neuromodulation* 12: 1345–1348.
- 45. McLaughlin N, Dougherty DD, Eskandar EN, Ward HE, Foote KD, Malone Jr. DA, et al. (n.d.):
- Double blind randomized controlled trial of deep brain stimulation for obsessive-compulsive
 disorder: clinical trial design. *Contemp Clin Trials*.
- 46. Malcolm JG, Shenton ME, Rathi Y (2010): Filtered multitensor tractography [no. 9]. *IEEE Trans Med Imaging* 29: 1664–1675.
- 742 47. Reddy CP, Rathi Y (2016): Joint Multi-Fiber NODDI Parameter Estimation and Tractography Using
- the Unscented Information Filter. *Front Neurosci* 10. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2016.00166

744	48. Gong S, Zhang F, Norton I, Essayed WI, Unadkat P, Rigolo L, et al. (2018): Free water modeling of
745	peritumoral edema using multi-fiber tractography: Application to tracking the arcuate fasciculus
746	for neurosurgical planning [no. 5]. PLoS ONE 13. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0197056
747	49. Liao R, Ning L, Chen Z, Rigolo L, Gong S, Pasternak O, et al. (2017): Performance of unscented
748	Kalman filter tractography in edema: Analysis of the two-tensor model. Neurolmage Clin 15:
749	819–831.
750	50. Zhang F, Wu Y, Norton I, Rigolo L, Rathi Y, Makris N, O'Donnell LJ (2018): An anatomically curated
751	fiber clustering white matter atlas for consistent white matter tract parcellation across the
752	lifespan. <i>NeuroImage</i> 179: 429–447.
753	51. Chen Z, Tie Y, Olubiyi O, Rigolo L, Mehrtash A, Norton I, et al. (2015): Reconstruction of the
754	arcuate fasciculus for surgical planning in the setting of peritumoral edema using two-tensor
755	unscented Kalman filter tractography. NeuroImage Clin 7: 815–822.
756	52. Chaturvedi A, Luján JL, McIntyre CC (2013): Artificial neural network based characterization of the
757	volume of tissue activated during deep brain stimulation. J Neural Eng 10: 056023.
758	53. Butson CR, McIntyre CC (2006): Role of electrode design on the volume of tissue activated during
759	deep brain stimulation. <i>J Neural Eng</i> 3: 1–8.
760	54. O'Donnell LJ, Westin C-F (2007): Automatic tractography segmentation using a high-dimensional
761	white matter atlas [no. 11]. IEEE Trans Med Imaging 26: 1562–1575.
762	55. O'Donnell LJ, Wells WM, Golby AJ, Westin C-F (2012): Unbiased groupwise registration of white
763	matter tractography. In: Ayache N, Delingette H, Golland P, Mori K, editors. Medical Image
764	Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention – MICCAI 2012, vol. 7512. Berlin, Heidelberg:
765	Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp 123–130.
766	56. Couronné R, Probst P, Boulesteix A-L (2018): Random forest versus logistic regression: a large-
767	scale benchmark experiment. BMC Bioinformatics 19: 270.
768	57. Chawla NV, Bowyer KW, Hall LO, Kegelmeyer WP (2002): SMOTE: Synthetic Minority Over-

sampling Technique. *J Artif Intell Res* 16: 321–357.

- 58. Tyagi H, Apergis-Schoute AM, Akram H, Foltynie T, Limousin P, Drummond LM, et al. (2019): A
- randomised trial directly comparing ventral capsule and anteromedial subthalamic nucleus
- stimulation in obsessive compulsive disorder: clinical and imaging evidence for dissociable
- effects. *Biol Psychiatry* 85: 726–734.
- 59. Smith GCS, Seaman SR, Wood AM, Royston P, White IR (2014): Correcting for optimistic
 prediction in small data sets. *Am J Epidemiol* 180: 318–324.
- 60. Widge AS, Dougherty DD (2015): Managing patients with psychiatric disorders with deep brain
- stimulation. In: Marks Jr. WJ, editor. *Deep Brain Stimulation Management*, 2nd ed. Cambridge :
 New York: Cambridge University Press.
- 61. van Westen M, Rietveld E, Bergfeld IO, Koning P de, Vullink N, Ooms P, et al. (2021): Optimizing
- deep brain stimulation parameters in obsessive–compulsive disorder. *Neuromodulation Technol Neural Interface* 24: 307–315.
- 62. Mantione M, Nieman DH, Figee M, Denys D (2014): Cognitive-behavioural therapy augments the
 effects of deep brain stimulation in obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Psychol Med* 44: 3515–
 3522.
- 63. van Westen M, Rietveld E, Denys D (2019): Effective deep brain stimulation for obsessivecompulsive disorder requires clinical expertise. *Front Psychol* 10: 2294.
- 64. Burguière E, Monteiro P, Mallet L, Feng G, Graybiel AM (2015): Striatal circuits, habits, and
 implications for obsessive–compulsive disorder. *Curr Opin Neurobiol* 30: 59–65.
- 789 65. Garnaat SL, Greenberg BD, Sibrava NJ, Goodman WK, Mancebo MC, Eisen JL, Rasmussen SA
- (2014): Who qualifies for deep brain stimulation for OCD? Data from a naturalistic clinical
 sample. *J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci* 26: 81–86.
- 66. Duchin Y, Shamir RR, Patriat R, Kim J, Vitek JL, Sapiro G, Harel N (2018): Patient-specific
- anatomical model for deep brain stimulation based on 7 Tesla MRI. *PloS One* 13: e0201469.
- 67. Button KS, Ioannidis JPA, Mokrysz C, Nosek BA, Flint J, Robinson ESJ, Munafò MR (2013): Power
- failure: why small sample size undermines the reliability of neuroscience. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 14:
- 796 365–376.

- 68. Menchón JM, Real E, Alonso P, Aparicio MA, Segalas C, Plans G, et al. (2021): A prospective
- international multi-center study on safety and efficacy of deep brain stimulation for resistant
 obsessive-compulsive disorder [no. 4]. *Mol Psychiatry* 26: 1234–1247.
- 800 69. Greenberg B, Gabriels L, Malone D, Rezai A, Friehs G, Okun M, *et al.* (2010): Deep brain
- stimulation of the ventral internal capsule/ventral striatum for obsessive-compulsive disorder:
 worldwide experience. *Mol Psychiatry* 15: 64–79.
- 803 70. Nuttin B, Cosyns P, Demeulemeester H, Gybels J, Meyerson B (1999): Electrical stimulation in
- 804 anterior limbs of internal capsules in patients with obsessive-compulsive disorder. *The Lancet* 805 354: 1526.
- 806 71. Basu I, Yousefi A, Crocker B, Zelmann R, Paulk AC, Peled N, et al. (Accepted in principle): Closed
- 807 loop enhancement and neural decoding of human cognitive control. *Nat Biomed Eng.*808 https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.24.059964
- 809 72. Widge AS, Zorowitz S, Basu I, Paulk AC, Cash SS, Eskandar EN, et al. (2019): Deep brain
- 810 stimulation of the internal capsule enhances human cognitive control and prefrontal cortex
- 811 function. *Nat Commun* 10: 1536.
- 812 73. Gruner P, Pittenger C (2017): Cognitive inflexibility in Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder.
- 813 *Neuroscience* 345: 243–255.
- 74. Abramovitch A, Abramowitz JS, Mittelman A (2013): The neuropsychology of adult obsessive–
 compulsive disorder: A meta-analysis. *Clin Psychol Rev* 33: 1163–1171.
- 816
- 817





- tracts as in (12) connecting STN to ACC and medial PFC. Very few of these intersect the VTA in this
- patient, despite the good clinical response (YBOCS drop of 61% from baseline). To emphasize that
- 828 point, this panel shows all fibers traced from the STN seed in this patient, regardless of VTA
- 829 intersection.





Figure 2: Non-zero regression coefficients across exhaustive leave-two-out cross-validation of
regularized logistic regression to predict YBOCS response. All confidence intervals include 0, with left
medial OFC (non-response) and left ACC (response) coming closest to significance. All reported results
are for total fiber capture; percentage capture did not have non-zero coefficients in this analysis. Data
are coded such that positive regression coefficients represent clinical improvement.

836





Figure 3: Non-zero regression coefficients across exhaustive leave-two-out cross-validation of
regularized logistic regression to predict MADRS response. All confidence intervals include 0, except
for the right cingulate cortex. All reported results are for total fiber capture; percentage capture did not
have non-zero coefficients in this analysis.

			R ²		Explai	ned Variance		
	Median	CI Lower Bound	CI Upper Bound	Median	CI Lower C Median Bound			
L1 Regression (Percentage)	-0.194	-1.743	1.355	0	0	0		
L1 Regression (Total Fibers)	-0.196	-1.747	1.356	0	0	0		
Random Forest (Percentage)	-0.792	-3.794	2.21	-0.023	-0.902	0.857		
Random Forest (Total Fibers)	-1.389	-4.934	2.156	-0.222	-1.249	0.805		

844

- **Table 1:** Modeling outcomes for YBOCS improvement as a continuous variable. All confidence
- 846 intervals include 0. Negative coefficients of determination (R²) imply a model that performs worse than
- 847 chance.

848

- 849
- 850

		Balanced	Accuracy			Recall	AUC			
	Median	CI Lower CI Upp edian Bound Bou		Median	CI Lower Bound	CI Upper Bound	Median	CI Lower Bound	CI Upper Bound	
L1 Logistic (Percentage)	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	0	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	
L1 Logistic (Total Fibers)	0.5	0.093	0.907	0.571	-0.24	1.383	0.572	0.281	0.864	
Random Forest (Percentage)	0.46	0.192	0.728	0	-0.582	0.582	0.58	0.368	0.793	
Random Forest (Total Fibers)	0.421	0.193	0.65	0	-0.527	0.527	0.588	0.374	0.802	

851

- 852 **Table 2:** Modeling outcomes for YBOCS improvement as a categorical response. All confidence
- 853 intervals include chance (0.5 for Balanced Accuracy and AUC, 0 for Recall of the minority class).

		Trai	ning Set R		т	est Set R ²
Tract	Median	CI Lower Bound	CI Upper Bound	Median	CI Lower Bound	CI Upper Bound
L dIPFC (Percentage)	-0.405	-0.607	-0.203	-0.139	-1.842	1.564
L vIPFC (Total Fibers)	-0.389	-0.591	-0.187	-0.268	-2.813	2.277
R vIPFC (Percentage)	-0.384	-0.504	-0.263	-0.162	-1.622	1.297
L STN (Percentage)	-0.373	-0.62	-0.125	-0.301	-3.189	2.587
L vIPFC (Percentage)	-0.366	-0.603	-0.129	-0.411	-27.119	26.297
R dmPFC (Percentage)	-0.359	-0.481	-0.237	-0.275	-2.182	1.633
R dIPFC (Percentage)	-0.356	-0.542	-0.17	-0.14	-1.706	1.426
All Regions (Percentage)	-0.347	-0.555	-0.138	-0.35	-1.598	0.897
L dIPFC (Total Fibers)	-0.332	-0.594	-0.07	-0.275	-2.149	1.6
R STN (Percentage)	-0.321	-0.525	-0.118	-0.315	-2.149	1.519
L dmPFC (Percentage)	-0.315	-0.567	-0.063	-0.434	-22.196	21.329
All Regions (Total Fibers)	-0.311	-0.553	-0.069	-0.421	-1.868	1.026
R dmPFC (Total Fibers)	-0.266	-0.471	-0.062	-0.35	-1.832	1.132
R vIPFC (Total Fibers)	-0.266	-0.461	-0.071	-0.182	-2.991	2.626
L ACC-PAC (Total Fibers)	0.268	0.067	0.469	-0.33	-1.959	1.298
R OFC-Lateral (Percentage)	0.319	0.07	0.567	-0.315	-1.771	1.141

856

Table 3: Correlations between individual fiber tracts and YBOCS response, in the style of (12), filtered to tracts whose confidence interval excludes 0 on the training sets. No such tract has clinical predictive power on held-out test sets (all \mathbb{R}^2 values less than 0).

860

862

		Balanced	Accuracy			Recall	AUC			
	Median	CI Lower Bound	wer Cl Upper und Bound Median Cl Lower Cl Upper Bound Bound				Median	CI Lower Bound	CI Upper Bound	
L1 Logistic (Percentage)	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	0	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	
L1 Logistic (Total Fibers)	0.5	0.093	0.907	0.571	0	1	0.572	0.281	0.864	
Random Forest (Percentage)	0.46	0.192	0.728	0	0	0.582	0.58	0.368	0.793	
Random Forest (Total Fibers)	0.421	0.193	0.65	0	0	0.527	0.588	0.374	0.802	

863

- **Table 4:** Leave-two-out prediction outcomes for categorical depression response (MADRS). No model
- 865 exceeded chance accuracy on the test set (all confidence intervals include a balanced accuracy/AUC of

866 0.5 or recall of 0).

868 Patient-Specific Connectomic Models Correlate With, But Do Not Predict, Outcomes in

869 Deep Brain Stimulation for Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder

870 Supplemental Methods

871 Study Population and Clinical Treatment

In all cases, DBS implantation and programming followed the protocols described in (60). 2 patients
were implanted and followed at Butler Hospital/Brown University Medical School; the other 6 were
implanted and followed at Massachusetts General Hospital. All patients received Medtronic model 3387
DBS leads, with the most ventral contact targeted to the ventral striatal grey matter. All participants
gave informed consent after multiple meetings with the site study teams, which explicitly included
separate consent for neuroimaging.

878

One patient, reported in (76), declined rating visits with the study team after her first several months of treatment, due to being substantially improved and not desiring further programming. She had a series of telephone notes captured in the electronic medical record over the course of a year documenting that she was doing well with no DBS setting changes from her last programming visit. We carried her YBOCS and MADRS forward from the last available rating, despite suggestions in the clinical record that she was doing better than these scores reflect.

885

886 Imaging Details

Pre-operative MRI data were acquired on a 3T Siemens TimTrio scanner. T1-weighted and T2weighted images were acquired with a 1.2 mm isotropic voxel size; diffusion MRI (dMRI) scans had a spatial resolution of 2 mm (isotropic) with 10 non-diffusion weighted volumes and 60 diffusion weighted volumes, with gradient directions spread uniformly on the sphere with a b-value of 700 s/mm². After

BBS implantation, a postoperative CT scan was acquired at a spatial resolution of $0.43 \times 0.43 \times 0.63$ mm³.

893

894 All MRI data was processed using a published pipeline (43) available at https://github.com/pnlbwh/. We 895 applied axis alignment to the T1-weighted and T2-weighted images, and performed eddy current and 896 motion correction for the dMRI images. T1-weighted images were skull-stripped using the Brain 897 Extraction Toolkit (BET) (77,78). These masks were then manually checked and edited to ensure 898 accurate brain extraction. In a similar manner, the CT scans were also masked to only retain the brain. 899 The ANTS registration software (79) was then used to coregister the CT images to the T1-weighted images as well as the dMRI scans. Further, Freesurfer (v6.1) was run on the T1-weighted images to 900 901 parcellate the brain (both cortex and subcortical structures) using the Desikan-Killiany atlas. Next, we 902 registered the Freesurfer segmentation to the diffusion weighted images using pipeline scripts. All 903 registrations (CT to T1-weighted, CT to dMRI, Freesurfer) were manually checked for accuracy.

904

During the tract tracing and annotation, fibers terminating in ACC vs. PAC could not be reliably
distinguished across all subjects. We thus treated these adjacent regions as a single terminus.

907

We defined the STN-PFC tracts as all streamlines connecting the STN with the following Freesurfer segmented regions: caudal anterior cingulate, caudal middle frontal, lateral orbitofrontal, medial orbitofrontal, parsopercularis, parsorbitalis, rostral anterior cingulate, rostral middle frontal, superior frontal, and frontal pole. To ensure that we captured the relevant bundles, we dilated the STN by 1 voxel (~ 2mm) in all directions (from our hand drawn segmentations) to include more tracts that might be close to the STN. These streamlines were analyzed identically to the cortico-thalamic tracts.

915 Data Analysis - Hypomania

916 We considered the possibility that pathway modeling might be more useful for minimizing off-target 917 effects than for determining response (23,80). The most common complication of VCVS DBS is a 918 hypomanic-impulsive syndrome that may affect up to 50% of patients (57,68). (We refer to this as 919 "hypomania" for conciseness, but acknowledge the substantial debate (61) over the naming and nature 920 of this complication.) We ascertained hypomania by chart review of visit notes and case report forms. 3 921 patients experienced at least one hypomanic episode, over 50 total visits. We again compared L1-922 regularized logistic regression and random forest classification on this restricted dataset. It was not 923 possible to perform this analysis on the full dataset, because the rarity of the complication meant that 924 cross-validation strategies would produce training/test sets without sufficient examples. Further, it 925 would likely be possible to achieve above-chance classification by identifying which patient contributed 926 a given data point, which would be subtly reflected in the overall pattern of activation (i.e., there is a 927 strong potential for data leakage).

928

929 Data Analysis - Model Evaluation

We altered the cross-validation process for the hypomania model, because restricting the dataset to the 3 patients who experienced at least one hypomanic event made leave-2-out infeasible. We therefore cross-validated at the level of individual visits. We split the dataset with 80% of the data points as training and 20% as test set data, stratifying the split so that hypomanic events occurred in each dataset. We repeated this splitting process 1,000 times to obtain confidence intervals, and again performed all oversampling after the split.

936 Data Analysis - Overall White Matter Integrity

In a further exploration, we noted that some tracts had very few streamlines in non-responders. We
considered that white matter integrity might affect our results, such that patients could only respond if a
given tract were sufficiently intact. For every tract in the previous analyses, we defined its integrity as

940 the total number of streamlines traced, divided by the overall intracranial volume (to ensure that we did 941 not simply trace more fibers in larger brains). Following the total/percentage fiber analyses above, we 942 also created a predictor from the mean integrity across all tracked bundles. We could not correlate 943 integrity against response at the visit level, since tract integrity does not change with DBS settings. 944 Instead, we classified patients as overall responders if a plurality (40% or more) of their clinical visits 945 had YBOCS scores below the 35% response threshold; 3 of the 8 met this criterion. We did not 946 consider the first three months of the clinical course in determining this response, in order to emphasize 947 response from DBS as opposed to lesion effect. We did not SMOTE this analysis, as the dataset was 948 too small. 949 950 To test for a "threshold" level of integrity for DBS efficacy, we performed a Necessary Condition 951 Analysis (NCA, (81)), as implemented in R package "NCA" (82), using the free disposal hull (CE-FDH) 952 ceiling calculation. We separately tested the necessity of each tract and of overall (mean) integrity. We

953 assessed significance of the resulting NCA effect sizes by 1000-fold permutation (shuffling

954 responder/non-responder labels), with Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate correction.

955

957 Supplemental Results

958 Hypomania

959 3 patients (37.5%) experienced hypomania (6 total episodes) in this dataset. This is somewhat below

960 the rate we reported from a different VCVS dataset (57), but consistent with the largest published

961 cohort of this target in OCD (68).

962

963 No model was able to predict hypomania with better than chance performance (Table S5). Further, all 964 fitted models had 0 median recall, i.e. predictive power was generally achieved by always predicting the 965 majority (non-hypomanic) outcome. The percentage-capture regression model assigned all coefficients 966 to 0, whereas the total-fiber model had some nonzero coefficients (Figure S4). Specifically, the left-967 sided PFC-STN connection was protective against hypomania. The left DLFPC-thalamus fibers had a 968 similar but non-significant effect. Activation of right lateral OFC and STN fibers, on the other hand, 969 predisposed towards hypomania, consistent with a prior analysis that found an association between 970 right-sided monopolar stimulation and hypomania (57). The random forest model had no importance 971 scores that systematically differed from zero.

- 972
- 973

		Balanced	Accuracy			Recall	AUC			
	Median	CI Lower Bound	CI Upper Bound	Median	CI Lower Bound	CI Upper Bound	Median	CI Lower Bound	CI Upper Bound	
L1 Logistic (Percentage)	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	0	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	
L1 Logistic (Total Fibers)	0.4	0	0.84	0	0	0.899	0.7	0.486	0.914	
Random Forest (Percentage)	0.5	0.043	0.957	0	0	0.912	0.55	0.152	0.948	
Random Forest (Total Fibers)	0.5	0.003	0.997	0	0	0.988	0.55	0.109	0.991	

974

975 **Table S5:** Prediction outcomes for hypomania, on a test set composed of 20% of visits from the 3

976 patients who had hypomanic episodes. No model consistently achieves recall > 0 or better than chance

977 accuracy/AUC.



979

Figure S4: Non-zero regression coefficients for regularized logistic regression to predict hypomania.
 The only tract whose confidence interval excludes 0 connected left PFC to STN, and was protective
 against hypomania. All reported results are for total fiber capture; percentage capture did not have non zero coefficients in this analysis. Here, positive coefficients signify greater risk of hypomania.

984

985 White Matter Integrity

There was substantial variability in white matter integrity among individual patients and tracts (Table S2). Overall (mean) white matter integrity had a moderate effect size in the NCA (0.62). Consistent with the regression analyses, the left and right cingulo-thalamic tracts had the highest effect size of any individual tract. None of these effects reached significance even at the uncorrected level (Table S3).

C hi		L	L	L OFC-	L OFC-	L	L	R	R	R	R OFC-	R OFC-	R	R	Mean	Deenender
Subj	ALC-PAC	aiPFC	ampre	Lateral	weatai	VIPEC	31N	ALC-PAL	aiPFC	ampro	Lateral	wediai	VIPEC	31N	Integrity	Responder
А	0.064	0.280	0.306	0.017	0.029	0.414	0.220	0.155	0.331	1.083	0.016	0.010	0.691	0.115	0.278	N
В	0.187	0.506	1.076	0.012	0.055	0.279	0.025	0.160	0.319	1.718	0.013	0.033	0.713	0.025	0.392	Y
С	0.003	0.063	0.117	0.000	0.002	0.075	0.005	0.002	0.167	0.239	0.000	0.000	0.041	0.005	0.055	N
D	0.280	0.364	0.669	0.081	0.080	0.473	0.093	0.210	0.342	0.588	0.057	0.023	0.169	0.102	0.264	Y
Е	0.148	0.470	0.834	0.043	0.089	0.057	0.105	0.296	1.079	0.993	0.008	0.011	0.418	0.104	0.350	N
F	0.194	0.398	0.871	0.038	0.092	0.226	0.054	0.263	0.302	1.206	0.051	0.126	0.688	0.074	0.347	N
G	0.311	0.655	1.327	0.018	0.042	0.145	0.567	0.156	0.413	0.589	0.016	0.056	0.149	0.166	0.342	Y
н	0.098	0.309	0.806	0.100	0.308	0.084	0.103	0.128	0.257	1.283	0.043	0.116	0.198	0.176	0.295	N

Table S6: White matter integrity. Each cell represents the number of traced streamlines within a given tract, divided by each subject's

993 intracranial volume. Responder/nonresponder status is determined by the fraction of clinical visits where the YBOCS had improved 35% or

more from baseline.

998 999

Name	Effect Size	р	p(FDR)
Mean Integrity	0.620	0.635	0.635
L ACC-PAC	0.595	0.077	0.475
R ACC-PAC	0.526	0.190	0.475
L dIPFC	0.509	0.190	0.475
L dmPFC	0.456	0.373	0.622
R dmPFC	0.236	0.635	0.635
R OFC-Lateral	0.225	0.335	0.622
L vIPFC	0.211	0.170	0.475
R OFC-Medial	0.182	0.178	0.475
R dIPFC	0.167	0.187	0.475
R vIPFC	0.160	0.635	0.635
L OFC-Medial	0.130	0.373	0.622
L OFC-Lateral	0.123	0.635	0.635
R STN	0.113	0.635	0.635
L STN	0.036	0.635	0.635

000

001 **Table S3:** Necessary Condition Analysis for white matter integrity predicting YBOCS response, with p-

values from 1000-fold bootstrap resampling, both raw and False Discovery Rate corrected. No variable

003 reaches corrected or uncorrected significance.