Tract-based white matter hyperintensity patterns in patients with Systemic Lupus Erythematosus using an unsupervised machine learning approach.

- 3
- 4 Theodor Rumetshofer^{*1†}, Francesca Inglese^{2†}, Jeroen de Bresser², Peter Mannfolk³, Olof
- 5 Strandberg⁴, Andreas Jönsen⁵, Anders Bengtsson⁵, Markus Nilsson¹, Linda Knutsson^{6,7,8},
- 6 Jimmy Lätt³, Gerda M. Steup-Beekman⁹, Tom W.J. Huizinga⁹, Mark A. van Buchem², Itamar
- 7 Ronen^{10,‡} and Pia C. Sundgren^{1,3,11,‡}
- 8
- 9 ¹Department of Clinical Sciences Lund/Diagnostic Radiology, Lund University, Lund, Sweden
- 10 ²Department of Radiology, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, Netherlands
- ³Department of Medical Imaging and Physiology, Skåne University Hospital, Lund, Sweden
- 12 ⁴Department of Clinical Sciences Malmö/Clinical Memory Research Unit, Lund University,
- 13 Lund, Sweden
- ⁵Department of Clinical Sciences Lund/ Rheumatology, Lund University, Skåne University
- 15 Hospital, Lund, Sweden
- ⁶Department of Medical Radiation Physics, Lund University, Lund, Sweden
- 17 ⁷Russell H. Morgan Department of Radiology and Radiological Science, Johns Hopkins
- 18 University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, US
- 19 ⁸F.M. Kirby Research Center for Functional Brain Imaging, Kennedy Krieger Research
- 20 Institute, Baltimore, MD, US.
- 21 ⁹Department of Rheumatology, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, Netherlands
- 22 ¹⁰Clinical Imaging Science Center, Brighton and Sussex Medical School, University of
- 23 Brighton, UK
- 24 ¹¹Lund University BioImaging Center, Lund University, Lund, Sweden
- 25
- 26 *Correspondence:
- 27 Theodor Rumetshofer
- 28 theodor.rumetshofer@med.lu.se
- 29 ORCID: 0000-0002-0778-0703
- 30
- 31 † T Rumetshofer and F Inglese have contributed equally to this work and share first
- 32 authorship
- 33 ‡ I Ronen and PC Sundgren have contributed equally to this work and share senior
- 34 authorship.
- 35
- 36

37 KEYWORDS

- 38 Magnetic resonance imaging, Cluster analysis, White matter hyperintensities, Systemic lupus
- 39 erythematosus, Rare diseases
- 40
- 41

42 FORMAT

- 43 Article
- 44
- 45

46 ABSTRACT

47

48 Currently, little is known about the spatial distribution of white matter hyperintensities (WMH) 49 in the brain of patients with Systemic Lupus erythematosus (SLE). Previous lesion markers, such as number and volume, ignore the strategic location of WMH. The goal of this work was 50 51 to develop a fully-automated method to identify predominant patterns of WMH across WM 52 tracts based on cluster analysis. A total of 221 SLE patients with and without neuropsychiatric 53 symptoms from two different sites were included in this study. WMH segmentations and lesion 54 locations were acquired automatically. Cluster analysis was performed on the WMH 55 distribution in 20 WM tracts. Our pipeline identified five distinct clusters with predominant 56 involvement of the forceps major, forceps minor, as well as right and left anterior thalamic 57 radiations and the right inferior fronto-occipital fasciculus. The patterns of the affected WM 58 tracts were consistent over the SLE subtypes and sites. Our approach revealed distinct and 59 robust tract-based WMH patterns within SLE patients. This method could provide a basis, to link the location of WMH with clinical symptoms. Furthermore, it could be used for other 60 61 diseases characterized by presence of WMH to investigate both the clinical relevance of WMH 62 and underlying pathomechanism in the brain.

- 63
- 64

65

66 1. INTRODUCTION

White matter hyperintensities (WMH) are lesions in the white matter (WM) appearing 67 68 hyperintense on T₂-weighted MRI images¹. The prevalence of WMH in the general population increases with age¹. WMH are considered as important neuroimaging and clinical markers in 69 many neurological diseases². However, the pathogenesis of WMH is not well understood and 70 71 may have various etiologies. The prevalence of WMH is highly variable within and across different diseases^{2,3}. WMH are one of the main imaging findings observed in the brain in 72 73 systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) patients⁴, even though not all SLE patients manifest 74 WMH^{5,6}. SLE is a rare autoimmune disease affecting mostly women and it is characterized by the production and deposition of several autoantibodies. SLE involves different organs, 75 76 including the central nervous system, in which damage could lead to neuropsychiatric (NP) 77 syndromes⁶. The American Colleague of Rheumatology (ACR) describes 19 NP syndromes that could be present in SLE patients. These ACR criteria also subdivide SLE patients 78 79 experiencing NP events in two subgroups based on the attribution of NP events directly related 80 to the disease (NPLSE) or other causes (non-NPSLE)^{7,8}. In clinical practice, however, the attribution process of the NP events to the disease is difficult as the nature of NP syndromes is 81 82 highly heterogeneous and ranges from mild (e.g. headache and anxiety) to major symptoms 83 (e.g. seizures and psychosis)⁹. In addition, there are large differences in the NP attribution 84 across sites and across studies (between 37% and 95%)⁴, illustrating the difficulty in establishing a rigorous standard for the attribution of NP to SLE¹⁰. We used the term NPSLE 85 to refer to patients with NP manifestations attributed to SLE and the term non-NPSLE to 86 87 patients with NP manifestations not attributed to SLE.

88

89 The origin of WMH in SLE is not fully understood, but could be the result of inflammatory and 90 immunologically mediated small vessel disease (SVD)³. The location of WMH in white matter 91 has been shown to be of major importance in several neurological diseases. In multiple sclerosis 92 (MS) and Alzheimer's disease it has been demonstrated that WMH location is more strongly linked to neuropsychological impairment than WMH volume and count^{11,12,13}. WMH location 93 94 in patients with arterial diseases can provide prognostic survival information¹⁴. WMH in SLE 95 patients has not been shown to be homogeneous across subgroups¹⁵. One study reported that 96 the prevalence of WMH in the splenium of the corpus callosum, in the right superior 97 longitudinal fasciculus and in some small clusters in the right corona radiata was higher in NPSLE patients compared to SLE patients without NP involvement¹⁶. Another study reported 98 99 high WMH burden in the superior longitudinal fasciculus and anterior corona radiata in NPSLE as well as in SLE patients without NP involvement¹⁷. All previous assessments of WMH burden 100 101 on specific white matter tracts in SLE were based on manual WMH segmentation. Although 102 manual segmentation is often considered as gold standard, it inevitably introduces variability that can be reduced by devising an automated WMH segmentation pipeline^{18,19}. The variability 103 104 in results obtained from WMH segmentation algorithms compared to manual segmentation, 105 seems to depend on WMH burden. However, existing WMH segmentation algorithms are robust for a wide range of WMH load^{20,21,22} and a fully automated pipeline could increase the 106 107 level of reproducibility.

108

109 The goal of our retrospective cross-sectional study was to develop a fully automated method to

110 characterize the spatial distribution of WMH across WM tracts in SLE patients. Due to the well-

111 known heterogeneity in diagnosis and difficulties in the attribution of NP manifestations, we

aimed for a highly objective approach by investigating only the spatial distribution of WMH in

113 the brain. We used an unsupervised machine learning method to identify clusters based on WM

114 tract-based abnormalities. We addressed the typical paucity of subjects in SLE studies by

- 115 pooling two cohorts of SLE patients. Further, we investigated if our method is robust across
- 116 SLE subgroups and clinical and radiological differences between the sites.

117

118

119 2. METHODS

2.1 Subject population 120

121 2.1.1 Leiden cohort

122 The Leiden University Medical Center (LUMC) is the national referral center in the 123 Netherlands for SLE patients experiencing NP symptoms. The SLE patients undergo a one-day 124 standardized evaluation that includes multidisciplinary medical assessments and 125 complementary tests, including extensive laboratory tests, neuropsychological testing and a brain MRI scan^{23,24}. All patients are assessed by a rheumatologist, neurologist, psychiatrist, 126 127 vascular internal medicine expert and advanced nurse practitioner. This evaluation is followed 128 by a multidisciplinary consensus meeting in order to decide whether the NP events are 129 attributable to SLE or not. In the final attribution of NP symptoms to SLE or other etiologies, several aspects are taken into account: the time between the onset of NP symptoms and 130 diagnosis of SLE, SLE disease activity, the type of NP symptoms, favoring factors and the 131 presence of alternative diagnoses^{10,25}. NPSLE diagnoses were defined according to the 1999 132 133 ACR nomenclature²⁶. All patients fulfilled the 1997 revised ACR criteria for the classification of SLE²⁷.

134

135 From this cohort, 216 patients scanned between May 2007 and April 2015 were eligible.

136 Information on sex, age, disease duration and age of disease onset was obtained via interview 137 with the patient and retrieved from electronical medical records. SLE activity and damage

138 indices were scored for each patient: the SLE disease activity was determined using the

139 Systemic Lupus Erythematosus Disease Activity Index 2000 (SLEDAI-2K)²⁸; SLE irreversible

140 damage was assessed with the Systemic Lupus International Collaborating Clinics/American

141 College of Rheumatology damage index (SDI)⁸. The Leiden-The Hague-Delft ethics approval

142 committee approved the study (registration number P07.177) and all included patients signed

143 informed consent.

144 All participants were scanned using a Philips Achieva 3T MRI scanner (Philips Healthcare,

Best, The Netherlands) equipped with a body transmit RF coil and an 8-Channel receive head 145 146 coil array. A standardized scanning protocol was used. The sequences included in this study

147 were: a 3D T₁-weighted scan (voxel size = $1.17 \times 1.17 \times 1.2$ mm³; TR/TE = 9.8/4.6 ms) and two 148 versions of a fluid-attenuated inversion recovery (FLAIR) scan. A total of 99 data sets included 149 size = $1.0 \times 1.0 \times 3.6 \text{ mm}^3$: 2D-multislice **FLAIR** sequence (voxel a 150 TR/TE/TI = 10000/120/2800 ms) and 53 data sets included a 3D FLAIR (voxel 151 size = $1.10 \times 1.11 \times 0.56$ mm³; TR/TE/TI = 4800/576/1650 ms) (see Supplementary Table S1 for a summary of the MRI methods). The change from 2D to 3D in the FLAIR protocol occurred

- 152 153 in February 2013.
- 154

155 2.1.2 Lund cohort

156 SLE patients experiencing NP symptoms were recruited by the Department of Rheumatology 157 in Lund, Skåne University Hospital, Sweden. Inclusion criteria were: female sex, age between 158 18 and 55 years and right handedness. Patients with any contraindication to MRI or pregnancy 159 were not asked to participate in this study. All patients fulfilled the SLICC classification criteria 160 for SLE²⁹. Extensive laboratory and neuropsychological testing were performed in the Lund 161 cohort as well. The brain MRI scan was performed on the same day as the clinical visit with few exceptions due to logistical issues (maximum of 2 weeks in difference, e.g. patients 162 requested another time slot). The collected clinical data and the NP symptoms, as defined by 163 the American College of Rheumatology (ACR) case definition for NPSLE²⁶, were evaluated by 164 165 a rheumatologist and a neurologist. In case of split opinions, a consensus meeting followed. 166 In the Lund cohort, 73 subjects, recruited consecutively from January 2013 to January 2016,

167 were eligible for this study. All participants underwent rheumatologic and standardized

168 neurologic clinical assessment. Information about SLE disease activity and organ damage were

recorded according to the SLE disease Activity Index 2000 (SLEDAI-2k)²⁸ and the Systemic
Lupus Erythematosus International Collaborating Clinics / ACR Damage Index (SLICC/ACRDI)⁸. The Regional Ethical Review Board in Lund, Sweden (#2012/4, #2014/748) approved

172 this study and a written informed consent was obtained for all subjects prior to inclusion.

173 All participants underwent a brain scan on a 3T MRI Siemens scanner (Siemens MAGNETON

174 Skyra, Erlangen, Germany). Imaging protocols included in this study were: T₁-weighted

175 magnetization-prepared rapid gradient-echo (MPRAGE) (1 mm isotropic voxels, TR/TE =

176 1900/2.54 ms) and 2D-multislice T_2 -weighted FLAIR (0.7x0.7x3.0 mm, TR/TE/TI = 0000/81/2500 mc) (see Superlaw entry T-11-S1)

- 177 9000/81/2500 ms) (see Supplementary Table S1).
- 178

179 **2.2 Cluster analysis**

180 The preprocessing of image data, prior to cluster analysis is shown in Figure 1. A detailed description of all preprocessing steps can be found in the Supplementary Material (Material 181 182 Section). For the cluster analysis, the WMH burden on each WM tract was L2-normalized (unit 183 norm) to obtain an individual WMH pattern for each subject. All subjects were included in this 184 analysis without giving any information about clinical diagnose, site or NP manifestations. Hierarchical clustering (Ward's method)³⁰ was applied to the L2-normalized WMH load from 185 186 20 WM tracts (based on the JHU WM atlas) and a total of 186 SLE patients, resulting in 186 187 feature vectors with 20 values. SLE patients without detectable WMH (n=35) were not included 188 in the clustering but were included in the statistics. The cluster analysis and the performance 189 evaluation of the clustering procedure was performed with scikit-learn 0.20.3

190 (RRID:SCR 002577)³¹.

Agglomerative hierarchical clustering successively merges groups of subjects (starting with each subject in its own group) based on the Euclidean distance between their WMH feature

vector, until all subjects form a single cluster. The successive merging of subgroups results in

194 a tree structure, or *dendrogram*, shown in Supplementary Figure S1. The iterative calculation

195 of inter-cluster distances was computed using Ward's method, resulting in minimal intra-cluster

196 variance. Each node or branching point of the tree corresponds to the merging of two clusters,

197 for which the corresponding inter-cluster distance is shown on the y-axis. To estimate the 198 optimal number of clusters, the dendrogram has to be cut at a certain distance threshold. The

optimal cluster number was evaluated by a consensus of two different methods: Silhouette
 Coefficient³² and the Calinski-Harabasz index³³.

201 To evaluate the robustness of the method, three sensitivity analyses were performed. In the first

202 one, cluster analysis was performed on each SLE subgroup. The second sensitivity analysis was

- implemented separately on the Lund and Leiden cohorts. The last sensitivity analysis was
- 204 performed by clustering the total SLE patients using as a regressor the site (Lund, Leiden) 205 including: sex, type of FLAIR (2D, 3D), age, disease duration, SDI-score, SLEDAI-2k-score,
- and WMH total volume.
- 207

208 2.3 Statistical analysis

The between-group and cohort differences in demographic and clinical data, were assessed for nominal variables with Chi-square test and for continuous variables based on their non-normal distribution with Mann-Whitney U test. Differences between clusters were estimated for

212 nominal variables with Chi-square test and for continuous variables with non-parametric

213 Kruskal-Wallis test. Post-hoc pairwise comparisons of the clusters were performed with Mann-

- 214 Whitney U-test and using Bonferroni multiple comparison correction. Data are represented as
- 215 number (percentage) or median (10-90 percentile). All statistical analyses as well as tests for
- 216 distribution normality (D'Agostino and Pearson's test) were performed using Python package
- 217 Scipy 1.2.1 (RRID:SCR_008058)³⁴. Covariates correction was performed with a general linear 11×10^{-11} (RRID:SCR_008058)³⁵.
- 218 model (GLM) using Python package statsmodels 0.10.1 (RRID:SCR_016074)³⁵.

219 **3. RESULTS**

220 **3.1 Demographic and clinical data**

- From the Leiden cohort, 216 patients were eligible for this study. Of these, 28 patients were
- excluded because of undefined and mixed subgroups, 8 for misdiagnosis established during a
- follow-up visit, 3 patients for motion artefacts in the MRI scans, 3 patients for co-registration
- failure of the T1 and FLAIR images using the LST-LGA toolbox, 20 patients for the presence
- of brain infarcts over 1.5 cm that hindered accurate brain volume measurements and 2 patients
- were removed due to the presence of other diseases (brain tumor and large arachnoid cyst). This resulted in a total of 152 patients included in the present study, comprising 37 NPSLE and 115
- 228 non-NPSLE patients.
- From the Lund cohort, 73 subjects were eligible for this study. A total of 4 subjects were
- 230 excluded due to misdiagnosis, temporal lobe resection, hypothyroidism and co-registration
- failure of the LST-LGA toolbox. In total, 69 patients were included in the present study, comprising 42 NPSLE and 27 non-NPSLE.
- Table 1 shows clinical and demographic data of the two different cohorts (Leiden/NL and
- 234 Lund/SWE). Statistically significant differences were observed in sex, age, disease duration,
- age of onset, SLE disease scores, ACR criteria, volume and number of WMH (p<0.05).
- An overview of the cerebrovascular risk factors, ongoing pharmacologic treatments as well as antibodies can be found in Supplementary Table S2.
- From both cohorts, a total of 221 data sets were analyzed in this study, of which 79 were NPSLE
- and 142 were non-NPSLE. Supplementary Table S3 includes demographic and clinical data for
- 240 the two subgroups. No significant differences were found between the two groups in
- 241 demographic and clinical variables.
- 242

243 **3.2** Cluster analysis

- The cluster analysis was performed on all patients and yielded in five distinct clusters (Figure 2): cluster 1 (n=52) is mainly assigned to the forceps major and to lesser extent to the left and
- right inferior fronto-occipital fasciculus; cluster 2 (n=57) mainly to the right anterior thalamic
- radiation and to lesser extent to the forceps minor and the right inferior fronto-occipital
- fasciculus; cluster 3 (n=23) to the forceps minor; cluster 4 (n=30) to the left anterior thalamic
- 249 radiation and to lesser extent to the forceps minor and the right anterior thalamic radiation;
- andcluster 5 (n=24) was more heterogeneous in terms of location in WM tracts but it could be
- 251 mainly assigned to the right inferior fronto-occipital fasciculus. A total of 35 patients (8 NPSLE,
- 27 non-NPSLE) with no WMH were excluded from cluster analysis. The lesion frequency maps(Figure 3) show the WMH location probability in each cluster.
- Patient age, volume and number of WMH lesions were statistically significantly different across clusters (p=0.005, p=0.008 and p=0.003 respectively). After correction for multiple testing, patient age was significantly higher (p=0.002) in cluster 5 compared to patients without detectable WMH. WMH volume and number in cluster 4 was significantly higher than in cluster 3 (p<0.001) and number of lesions was significantly higher in cluster 2 compared to cluster 3 (p=0.001) (Supplementary Table S4).
- 260

261 **3.3 Performance evaluation of the cluster analysis**

The cluster analysis was evaluated through a consensus of two different methods. The Silhouette coefficient and Calinski-Harabaz index showed a clear peak using five clusters (Figure 4). Although the Silhouette coefficient seems to increase with higher cluster size (with local maximum for 5 clusters), the Calinski-Harabaz index sharply decreases with increasing number of clusters, therefore n(clusters) = 5 was chosen for best performance.

267

268 **3.4 Sensitivity analysis**

Sensitivity analysis was implemented in three different ways. The first sensitivity analysis was 269 performed separately on each of the two subgroups of SLE patients: NPSLE and non-NPSLE. 270 271 This resulted in an overlap of the number of the same patients included in a certain cluster of 272 83% for the NPSLE group and 85% for the non-NPSLE group, when compared to the main 273 analysis where all SLE patients were included. The cluster analysis on NPSLE patients resulted 274 in 6 clusters. Similarly to the cluster analysis performed on the entire group, clusters 1, 2, 3 and 275 5 were mainly assigned to specific WM tracts: forceps major, right anterior thalamic radiation, 276 forceps minor and left anterior thalamic radiation, respectively. Cluster 4 consisted of two 277 subjects and was attributed to the left inferior fronto-occipital fasciculus. Cluster 6 was more 278 heterogeneous in terms of WM tract location and was comparable to cluster 5 of the main 279 analysis (Figure 5). The corresponding NP manifestations in the NPSLE subgroup showed no 280 correlation with the unveiled clusters (Supplementary Figure S2). The cluster analysis on non-281 NPSLE patients revealed 5 clusters. Clusters 1, 2, 3 and 4 could be mainly assigned to the same 282 specific WM tracts identified in the main cluster analysis: forceps major, forceps minor, right 283 anterior thalamic radiation and left anterior thalamic radiation, respectively. Similar to the 284 NPSLE subgroup clustering, cluster 5 was more heterogeneous in terms of WM tract location 285 and comparable to cluster 5 of the main analysis (Figure 5).

286 The second sensitivity analysis was performed on each site separately (Figure 6). Compared to 287 the main analysis, the overlap of the same patients in the certain clusters resulted in 93% for 288 the Lund cohort and 87% for the Leiden cohort. The four clusters revealed from clustering the 289 Lund cohort separately, can be assigned to the right anterior thalamic radiation, the forceps 290 minor, the forceps major, similar to the main analysis, and a heterogenous cluster in terms of 291 the affected tracts, similar to the cluster 5 in the main analysis. The five clusters revealed from 292 clustering the Leiden cohort separately can be assigned to the forceps major, the forceps minor 293 and the left and right anterior thalamic radiation, similar to the main analysis, and a 294 heterogenous cluster in terms of the affected tracts, similar to cluster 5 in the main analysis.

295 The third and last sensitivity analysis was performed on the entire SLE population using as 296 regressors the site and the significant differences between the cohorts: sex, type of FLAIR, age, 297 disease duration, SDI-score, SLEDAI-2k-score and the WMH total volume using a general 298 linear model (GLM). The resulting clusters showed an overlap of 90% with those obtained by 299 the main analysis (Figure 7). Cluster 1 to 4 could be mainly assigned to specific WM tracts: 300 forceps major, right anterior thalamic radiation, forceps minor and left anterior thalamic 301 radiation, respectively. Cluster 5 was more heterogeneous in terms of WM tract location and 302 was comparable to cluster 5 of the main analysis.

303

304 3.5 Volumetric analysis of the WMH

The distributions of the WMH volumes on each WM tract for each cluster on the total SLE population are given in Supplementary Table S5. With the exception of the right corticospinal tract and the left cingulum cingulate gyrus, statistically significant differences in WMH volumes were found in all WM tracts, across all five clusters. The main WM tract assigned to each cluster shows also the highest volume.

The WMH volume was significantly higher in NPSLE patients compared to non-NPSLE patients in the right anterior thalamic radiation (p=0.024), in the right inferior fronto-occipital fasciculus (p=0.010), in the right inferior longitudinal fasciculus (p=0.041) and in the right uncinate fasciculus (p=0.033) (Supplementary Table S6).

- 314
- 315
- 316

317 4. DISCUSSION

We developed a fully automated method to unveil WMH pattern in SLE patients experiencing 318 319 NP events. We applied this method on a two-center dataset of SLE patients. Our method 320 detected five robust and distinct clusters, characterized by the involvement of the forceps major, 321 forceps minor as well as the left and right anterior thalamic radiation and the right inferior 322 fronto-occipital fasciculus (Figures 2 and 3). Our results are consistent across the two 323 subgroups, NPSLE and non-NPSLE patients (Figure 4). Despite the heterogeneity of the 324 disease, our results are consistent across both sites (Figure 6) and are not affected by the clinical 325 and radiological differences between the two cohorts (Figure 7). Differences in volume and 326 number of WMHs were observed between the clusters and subgroups as presented in the 327 Supplementary Tables S5 and S6.

328 Cluster analysis has been applied successfully to identify distinct clusters based on coarse location of WMH in other brain disorders, such as arterial disease³⁶ and postoperative 329 330 delirium³⁷. So far, unsupervised machine learning approaches based on structural MRI 331 information were not explored in research involving SLE patients^{5,6}. To the best of our knowledge, the work we present here is the first machine learning analysis that focuses on brain 332 features gauged by MRI in SLE. Compared to previous studies^{16,17}, in our developed method 333 334 the WMH were detected and assigned to WM tracts automatically by using a well-established 335 lesion segmentation algorithm and further processed by publicly available software³⁸. Further, 336 the L2-normalization highlighted the underlying WMH pattern for each patient by reducing the 337 impact of the total WMH burden and harmonizing the two-sites dataset. These steps, in 338 combination with a machine learning technique unveiled a consistent spatial pattern of the 339 mainly affected WM tracts. Few studies applied cluster analysis in SLE but those are based on clinical features, such as demographic³⁹, genetic⁴⁰ and autoantibodies⁴¹ data.. In contrast, our 340 developed approach focuses on MRI brain features which could provide a basis to link 341 342 neuroimaging findings to clinical symptoms.

343

Several studies in other diseases, such as Alzheimer's disease and MS showed the importance 344 345 to categorize spatially WMH to the link with neuropsychological impairment^{12,13}. Previous studies in SLE patients showed higher prevalence of WMH on specific WM tracts^{16,17,42,43,44}. 346 347 However, manual segmentation of the WMH and their subsequent ways to assign WMH to 348 specific WM tracts may have influenced the reproducibility of the study and make it difficult 349 to compare them with our approach. Furthermore, these studies included also SLE patients 350 without any NP syndromes, a subgroup which was not included in the present study^{16,17}. Our 351 method identified a set of WM tracts with the highest lesion volume, which seem to be those most significantly involved in our SLE patients experiencing NP manifestations. In healthy 352 353 elderly, WMH on tracts adjacent to the frontal horns of lateral ventricles, such as the left and 354 right anterior thalamic radiation, are associated with worse performance in executive function^{45,46} and planning complex behavior⁴⁶. Indeed, decrease of complex planning behavior 355 performance is shown in SLE patients⁴⁷. Microstructural WM abnormalities in forceps minor 356 are higher in patient with Schizophrenia compared to controls⁴⁸ and are related to depression 357 358 and fatigue in MS⁴⁹. Furthermore, both anterior thalamic radiation and forceps minor are linked 359 to cognitive impairment in patients with SVD⁵⁰. Since the importance of the frontal WM tracts 360 in cognition and psychiatric disorder, future studies are needed to fully understand the role that 361 the tracts we found in this study may play in the performance of NPSLE patients.

All SLE patients, except those without detectable WMH, were included in the cluster analysis without considering the subgroups or the affiliation to cohorts. The attribution process of the NP events is difficult since the nature of NP syndromes is heterogeneous (can vary from headache and seizures to anxiety and psychosis)⁹ and there are large differences in the NP attribution across studies (between 37% and 95%)⁴. It has been demonstrated that

367 misclassification of NP events may occur in clinical practice with an over attribution of NP to the disease (NPSLE)⁵¹. Several challenges are related to the diagnostic procedure of NPSLE. 368 369 First, SLE is categorized as a rare disease (prevalence 1-5/10 000, source www.orpha.net) and many SLE studies suffer from small sample sizes^{5,52}, hampers to draw conclusions regarding 370 the reliability and robustness of results. To overcome this problem, we performed a two site 371 372 study. Second, the absence of biomarkers (radiological or laboratory) reliable enough in the 373 diagnostic process make it difficult to create a link between radiological findings and clinical 374 symptoms (clinic-radiological paradox)⁵.

375 In this study we could not find an association between the NP manifestations and the clusters 376 in the NPSLE subgroup. We assume that the reason for this lies in the strong variability of NP 377 manifestations between the two clinical cohorts (Supplementary Figure S2) and in the highly 378 heterogenous nature of NP syndromes. Even though NPSLE patients showed higher WMH 379 volume in some WM tracts compared to non-NPSLE patients, the cluster analysis showed that 380 the WM tracts most affected by WMH are similar in both subgroups. This suggests that location 381 and pattern of WMH have no correlation with NPSLE diagnosis and attribution to the disease. 382 Therefore, location may give a new important information about WMH in SLE. Describing 383 WMH only in terms of volume or number may not give enough information about etiology but 384 in severity. Furthermore, despite the heterogeneity of the NP events within each site and the 385 diagnostic, clinical and radiological variability across sites, our results appeared to be robust 386 and stable. This is the first comprehensive study to examine WMH in SLE that assesses a broad 387 categorization of WMH in terms of load, location and volume using a fully automated method 388 in two site cohort.

389 Our work is not without limitations. Some clusters identified by our method comprise a low 390 number of patients. This is expected, since SLE is a rare disease, and even with our effort to 391 increase the patient population by merging data from two centers, the overall number of patients 392 remains small compared to similar studies performed in more common diseases. A significant 393 limitation of this study is the lack of a subgroup of SLE patients without NP symptoms. The 394 lack of such a group stems from the retrospective nature of this study and the lack of availability 395 of imaging data within our database. Recruiting such a cohort in future studies will undoubtedly 396 strengthen any conclusion regarding the link between spatial distribution of brain abnormalities 397 and NP symptoms in SLE, as it has been repeatedly shown that patients with SLE without NP 398 also exhibit brain abnormalities, albeit to a lesser extent⁵³. Further, the focus on structural MRI 399 information omits the possible impact of clinical features, such as the presence of clinical 400 activity, antiphospholipid antibodies positivity as well as cardiovascular risk factors and other 401 factors that were not included in the present analysis. This is a limitation of this study, and 402 future multicenter studies would benefit from incorporating such data in the analysis. 403 Additionally, patients for which automated detection of WMH yielded no positive results, were 404 not included in our analysis. This study was retrospectively performed in prospective cohorts, 405 therefore differences in MRI protocol, diagnosis definition, and clinical data are present and 406 can contribute to biases between groups and to an increased variance. The MRI sequences, and 407 in particular the FLAIR sequences, were different between sites. However, in all our analyses, subgroups, cohorts and 3D FLAIR scans were not predominant in a specific cluster. Differences 408 409 in NP attribution and diagnosis between the two sites, could have had an effect on the results. 410 However, the sensitivity analysis we performed show that the WMH patterns obtained by our 411 clustering strategy are robust even when SLE subgroups and cohorts are clustered separately, 412 or when corrected for significant clinical and radiological differences.

To conclude, we developed a method based on an unsupervised machine learning approach and identified a WMH pattern which was consistent in a two-site cohort. With our approach, we

415 provided a fully automated standardized method to identify tract-based WMH patterns. The

416 identification of affected WM tracts via the clustering algorithm was robust, despite 417 heterogeneity of the NP events and their association with the disease. Allocation of the WMH 418 burden to the most affected WM tracts could help investigate the link between radiological 419 findings and clinical symptoms in SLE patients with NP manifestations. In a future study an 420 association between pathogenesis, overall phenotypes and even genetics would be interesting 421

- 421 to explore.
- 422
- 423

424 **REFERENCES**

- 425
- Debette, S. & Markus, H. S. The clinical importance of white matter hyperintensities
 on brain magnetic resonance imaging: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ* 341,
 288 (2010).
- 429 2. Wardlaw, J. M. *et al.* Neuroimaging standards for research into small vessel disease
 430 and its contribution to ageing and neurodegeneration. *Lancet Neurol.* 12, 822–838
 431 (2013).
- 432 3. Pantoni, L. Cerebral small vessel disease: from pathogenesis and clinical characteristics
 433 to therapeutic challenges. *The Lancet Neurology* 9, 689–701 (2010).
- 434 4. Govoni, M. *et al.* The diagnosis and clinical management of the neuropsychiatric
 435 manifestations of lupus. *J. Autoimmun.* 74, 41–72 (2016).
- 436 5. Magro-Checa, C., Steup-Beekman, G. M., Huizinga, T. W., van Buchem, M. A. &
 437 Ronen, I. Laboratory and Neuroimaging Biomarkers in Neuropsychiatric Systemic
 438 Lupus Erythematosus: Where Do We Stand, Where To Go? *Front. Med.* 5, (2018).
- Hanly, J. G., Kozora, E., Beyea, S. D. & Birnbaum, J. Review: Nervous System
 Disease in Systemic Lupus Erythematosus: Current Status and Future Directions. *Arthritis Rheumatol.* 71, 33–42 (2019).
- Ainiala, H., Loukkola, J., Peltola, J., Korpela, M. & Hietaharju, A. The prevalence of
 neuropsychiatric syndromes in systemic lupus erythematosus. *Neurology* 57, 496–500
 (2001).
- 445 8. Gladman, D. D. *et al.* The Systemic Lupus International Collaborating
 446 Clinics/American College of Rheumatology (SLICC/ACR) Damage Index for systemic
 447 lupus erythematosus international comparison. *J. Rheumatol.* 27, 373–376 (2000).
- 448 9. Hanly, J. G. Diagnosis and management of neuropsychiatric SLE. *Nat. Rev.*449 *Rheumatol.* 10, 338–347 (2014).
- 450 10. Bortoluzzi, A. *et al.* Development and validation of a new algorithm for attribution of
 451 neuropsychiatric events in systemic lupus erythematosus. *Rheumatol. (United*452 *Kingdom)* 54, 891–898 (2014).
- Preziosa, P. *et al.* Structural MRI correlates of cognitive impairment in patients with
 multiple sclerosis: A Multicenter Study Structural MRI Correlates of Cognitive
 Impairment in Patients With Multiple Sclerosis: A Multicenter Study Cognitive
 Impairment and Brain Damage in . *Hum. Brain Mapp.* 37, 1627–1644 (2016).
- Meijer, K. A., Steenwijk, M. D., Douw, L., Schoonheim, M. M. & Geurts, J. J. G.
 Long-range connections are more severely damaged and relevant for cognition in multiple sclerosis. *Brain* 143, 150–160 (2020).
- Taylor, A. N. W. *et al.* Tract-specific white matter hyperintensities disrupt neural
 network function in Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimer's Dement.* 13, 225–235 (2017).
- 462 14. Ghaznawi, R., Geerlings, M., Jaarsma-Coes, M., Hendrikse, J. & de Bresser, J.
 463 Association of White Matter Hyperintensity Markers on MRI and Long-term Risk of
 464 Mortality and Ischemic Stroke. *Neurology* 10.1212/WNL.000000000011827 (2021).
 465 doi:10.1212/wnl.00000000011827
- 466 15. Inglese, F. *et al.* Different phenotypes of neuropsychiatric systemic lupus
 467 erythematosus are related to a distinct pattern of structural changes on brain MRI. *Eur.*468 *Radiol.* (2021). doi:10.1007/s00330-021-07970-2
- 469 16. Ramirez, G. A. *et al.* Quantitative MRI adds to neuropsychiatric lupus diagnostics.
 470 *Rheumatology* 1–11 (2020). doi:10.1093/rheumatology/keaa779
- 471 17. Shastri, R. K. *et al.* MR Diffusion Tractography to Identify and Characterize
 472 Microstructural White Matter Tract Changes in Systemic Lupus Erythematosus
 473 Patients. *Acad. Radiol.* 23, 1431–1440 (2016).

 sclerosis lesion segmentation techniques on magnetic resonance imaging. Comput. Med. Imaging Graph. 70, 83–100 (2018). Caligiuri, M. E. et al. Automatic Detection of White Matter Hyperintensities in Healthy Aging and Pathology Using Magnetic Resonance Imaging: A Review. Neuroinformatics 13, 261–276 (2015). Heinen, R. et al. Performance of five automated white matter hyperintensity segmentation methods in a multicenter dataset. Scientific Reports 9, 1–12 (2019). G Sitter, A. et al. Performance of five automated white matter hyperintensities segmentation methods in a multicenter MS study. Neuroimage 163, 106–114 (2017). Vanderbeeq, O. et al. Comparison and validation of seven white matter hyperintensities segmentation software in elderly patients. NeuroImage Clin. 27, (2020). Zirkzee, E. J. M. et al. Prospective study of clinical phenotypes in neuropsychiatric systemic lupus erythematosus; Multidisciplinary approach to diagnosis and therapy. J. Rheumatol. 39, 2118–2126 (2012). Monahan, R. C. et al. Mortality in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus and neuropsychiatric involvement: A retrospective analysis from a tertiary referral center in the Netherlands. Lupus 29, 1892–1901 (2020). Hanly, J. G. et al. Neuropsychiatric events at the time of diagnosis of systemic lupus erythematosus: An international inception cohort study. Arthritis Rheum. 46, 265–273 (2007). Liang, M. H. et al. The American College of Rheumatology rowineclature and case definitions for neuropsychiatric lupus syndromes. Arthritis Rheum. 40, 1725 (1997). Gladman, D. D., Ibahez, D. & Urowitz, M. B. Systemic lupus erythematosus disease activity index 2000. J. Rheumatol. 29, 288–291 (2002). Petri, M. et al. Derivation and validation of the systemic lupus erythematosus. Arthritis Rheum. 64, 2677–2686 (2012). Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. J. Am. Stat. As	474	18.	Danelakis, A., Theoharis, T. & Verganelakis, D. A. Survey of automated multiple
 Med. Imaging Graph. 70, 83 100 (2018). Caligiuri, M. E. <i>et al.</i> Automatic Detection of White Matter Hyperintensities in Healthy Aging and Pathology Using Magnetic Resonance Imaging: A Review. <i>Neuroinformatics</i> 13, 261–276 (2015). Heinen, R. <i>et al.</i> Performance of five automated white matter hyperintensity segmentation methods in a multi-center MS study. <i>Neuroimage</i> 163, 106–114 (2017). de Sitter, A. <i>et al.</i> Performance of five rescarch-domain automated WM lesion segmentation methods in a multi-center MS study. <i>Neuroimage</i> 163, 106–114 (2017). Vanderbeeq, Q. <i>et al.</i> Comparison and validation of seven white matter hyperintensities segmentation software in elderly patients. <i>NeuroImage Clin.</i> 27, (2020). Zirkzee, E. J. M. <i>et al.</i> Prospective study of clinical phenotypes in neuropsychiatric systemic lupus erythematosus; Multidisciplinary approach to diagnosis and therapy. <i>J.</i> <i>Rheumatol.</i> 39, 2118 2126 (2012). Monahan, R. C. <i>et al.</i> Mortality in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus and neuropsychiatric involvement: A retrospective analysis from a tertiary referral center in the Netherlands. <i>Lapus</i> 29, 1892–1901 (2020). Hanly, J. G. <i>et al.</i> Neuropsychiatric events at the time of diagnosis of systemic lupus erythematosus: An international inception cohort study. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 42, 599–608 (1997). Liang, M. H. <i>et al.</i> The American College of Rheumatology nomenclature and case definitions for neuropsychiatric lupus srythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 40, 1725 (1997). Gladman, D. D., Dañez, D. & Urowltz, M. B. Systemic lupus erythematosus disease activity index 2000. <i>J. Rheumatol.</i> 29, 288–291 (2002). Petri, M. <i>et al.</i> Derivation and validation of the systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 40, 2677–2686 (2012). Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. <i>J. Am. Stat. Assoc.</i> 58, 236–244 (1963). P	475		sclerosis lesion segmentation techniques on magnetic resonance imaging. Comput.
 Caligiuri, M. E. <i>et al.</i> Automatic Detection of White Matter Hyperintensities in Healthy Aging and Pathology Using Magnetic Resonance Imaging: A Review. <i>Neuroinformatics</i> 13, 261–276 (2015). Heinen, R. <i>et al.</i> Performance of five automated white matter hyperintensity segmentation methods in a multicenter dataset. <i>Scientific Reports</i> 9, 1–12 (2019). de Sitter, A. <i>et al.</i> Performance of five research-domain automated WM lesion segmentation methods in a multi-center MS study. <i>Neuroimage</i> 163, 106–114 (2017). Vanderbeeg, Q. <i>et al.</i> Comparison and validation of seven white matter hyperintensities segmentation software in elderly patients. <i>NeuroImage Clin.</i> 27, (2020). Zirkzee, E. J. M. <i>et al.</i> Prospective study of clinical phenotypes in neuropsychiatric systemic lupus crythematosus, Multidisciplinary approach to diagnosis and therapy. <i>J.</i> <i>Rheumatol.</i> 39, 2118–2126 (2012). Monahan, R. C. <i>et al.</i> Mortality in patients with systemic lupus crythematosus and neuropsychiatric involvement: A retrospective analysis from a tertiary referal center in the Netherlands. <i>Lupus</i> 29, 1892–1901 (2020). Hanly, J. G. <i>et al.</i> Neuropsychiatric events at the time of diagnosis of systemic lupus erythematosus: An international inception cohort study. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 42, 599–608 (1999). Liang, M. H. <i>et al.</i> The American College of Rheumatology nomenclature and case definitions for neuropsychiatric lupus srythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 40, 1725 (1997). Gladman, D. D., Ibañez, D. & Urowltz, M. B. Systemic lupus erythematosus disease activity index 2000. <i>J. Rheumatol.</i> 29, 288–291 (2002). Petri, M. <i>et al.</i> Derivation and validation of the systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 64, 2677–2686 (2012). Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. <i>J. Am. Stat.</i> <i>Assoc.</i> 58, 236–244 (0563). Pedregosa, F. <i>et al.</i> Scikit-learn: Machine Learn	476		Med. Imaging Graph. 70, 83–100 (2018).
 Aging and Pathology Using Magnetic Resonance Imaging: A Review. <i>Neuroinformatics</i> 13, 261–276 (2015). Heinen, R. <i>et al.</i> Performance of five reautomated white matter hyperintensity segmentation methods in a multi-center Mds study. <i>Neuroimage</i> 15, 116(2017). de Sitter, A. <i>et al.</i> Performance of five research-domain automated WM lesion segmentation methods in a multi-center MS study. <i>Neuroimage</i> 163, 106–114 (2017). Vanderbeeq, Q. <i>et al.</i> Comparison and validation of seven white matter hyperintensities segmentation software in elderly patients. <i>NeuroImage Clin.</i> 27, (2020). Zirkzee, E. J. M. <i>et al.</i> Prospective study of clinical phenotypes in neuropsychiatric systemic lupus erythematosus; Multidisciplinary approach to diagnosis and therapy. <i>J.</i> <i>Rheumatol.</i> 39, 2118–2126 (2012). Monahan, R. C. <i>et al.</i> Mortality in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus and neuropsychiatric involvement: A retrospective analysis from a tertiary referral center in the Netherlands. <i>Lupus</i> 29, 1182–1100 (2020). Hanly, J. G. <i>et al.</i> Neuropsychiatric events at the time of diagnosis of systemic lupus erythematosus: An international inception eohort study. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 56, 265–273 (2007). Liang, M. H. <i>et al.</i> The American College of Rheumatology rownenclature and case definitions for neuropsychiatric lupus syndromes. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 42, 759–608 (1999). Gladman, D. D., Ibañez, D. & Urowitz, M. B. Systemic lupus erythematosus disease activity index 2000. <i>J. Rheumatol.</i> 29, 288–291 (2002). Petri, M. <i>et al.</i> Derivation and validation of the systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 40, 1725 (1997). Gladman, D. D., Ibañez, D. & Urowitz, M. B. Systemic lupus erythematosus disease activity index 2000. <i>J. Rheumatol.</i> 29, 288–291 (2002). Petric, M. <i>et al.</i> Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. <i>J. Mack. Learn. Res.</i> 12, 2825–2830	477	19.	Caligiuri, M. E. et al. Automatic Detection of White Matter Hyperintensities in Healthy
 Neuroinformatics I3, 261–276 (2015). Heinen, R. et al. Performance of five automated white matter hyperintensity segmentation methods in a multicenter dataset. Scientific Reports 9, 1–12 (2019). de Sitter, A. et al. Performance of five research-domain automated WM lesion segmentation methods in a multi-center MS study. Neuroinage 163, 106–114 (2017). Vanderbeeq, Q. et al. Comparison and validation of seven white matter hyperintensities segmentation software in elderly patients. NeuroImage 1Cin, 27, (2020). Zirkzee, E. J. M. et al. Prospective study of clinical phenotypes in neuropsychiatric systemic lupus crythematosus, Multidisciplinary approach to diagnosis and therapy. J. Rheumatol. 39, 2118–2126 (2012). Monahan, R. C. et al. Mortality in patients with systemic lupus crythematosus and neuropsychiatric involvement: A retrospective analysis from a tertiary referral center in the Netherlands. Lupus 29, 1892–1901 (2020). Hanly, J. G. et al. Neuropsychiatric events at the time of diagnosis of systemic lupus crythematosus: An international inception cohort study. Arthritis Rheum. 56, 265–273 (2007). Liang, M. H. et al. The American College of Rheumatology nomenclature and case definitions for neuropsychiatric lupus syndromes. Arthritis Rheum. 42, 599–608 (1999). Hochberg, M. C. Updating the American College of Rheumatology revised criteria for the classification of systemic lupus crythematosus. Arthritis Rheum. 40, 1725 (1997). Gladman, D. D., Ibañez, D. & Urovitz, M. B. Systemic lupus erythematosus disease activity index 2000. J. Rheumatol. 29, 288–291 (2002). Petri, M. et al. Derivation and validation of the systemic lupus erythematosus. Arthritis Rheum. 64, 2677–2686 (2012). Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. J. Am. Stat. Assoc. 58, 236 244 (1963). Pedergosa, F. et al. SciRit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. J	478		Aging and Pathology Using Magnetic Resonance Imaging: A Review.
 Heinen, R. et al. Performance of five automated white matter hyperintensity segmentation methods in a multicenter dataset. Scientific Reports 9, 1–12 (2019). de Sitter, A. et al. Performance of five research-domain automated WM lesion segmentation methods in a multi-center MS study. Neuroimage 163, 106–114 (2017). Vanderbeeq, Q. et al. Comparison and validation of seven white matter hyperintensities segmentation software in elderly patients. NeuroImage Clin. 72, (2020). Zirkzee, E. J. M. et al. Prospective study of clinical phenotypes in neuropsychiatric systemic lupus crythematosus, Multidisciplinary approach to diagnosis and therapy. J. Rheumatol. 39, 2118–2126 (2012). Monahan, R. C. et al. Mortality in patients with systemic lupus crythematosus and neuropsychiatric involvement: A retrospective analysis from a tertiary referral center in the Netherlands. Lupus 29, 1892–1901 (2020). Hanly, J. G. et al. Neuropsychiatric events at the time of diagnosis of systemic lupus erythematosus: An international inception cohort study. Arthritis Rheum. 56, 265–273 (2007). Liang, M. H. et al. The American College of Rheumatology nomenclature and case definitions for neuropsychiatric lupus syndromes. Arthritis Rheum. 42, 599–608 (1999). Hochberg, M. C. Updating the American College of Rheumatology revised criteria for the classification of systemic lupus erythematosus. Arthritis Rheum. 40, 1725 (1997). Gladman, D. D., Ibaäez, D. & Urowltz, M. B. Systemic lupus erythematosus. Arthritis Rheum. 64, 2677–2686 (2012). Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. J. Am. Stat. Assoc. 58, 236–244 (1963). Pedregosa, F. et al. Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. J. Mach. Learn. Res. 12, 2825–2830 (2012). Kaut, I. M. J. et al. SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. Net. Methods 17, 261–272 (2020). Seabold, S.	479		<i>Neuroinformatics</i> 13 , 261–276 (2015).
 segmentation methods in a multicenter dataset. <i>Scientific Reports</i> 9, 1–12 (2019). dc Sitter, A. <i>et al.</i> Performance of five research-domain automated WM lesion segmentation methods in a multi-center MS study. <i>Neuroimage</i> 163, 106–114 (2017). Vanderbeeq, Q. <i>et al.</i> Comparison and validation of seven white matter hyperintensities segmentation software in clderly patients. <i>NeuroImage</i> Clin. 27, (2020). Zirkzee, E. J. M. <i>et al.</i> Prospective study of clinical phenotypes in neuropsychiatric systemic lupus erythematosus; Multidisciplinary approach to diagnosis and therapy. <i>J. Rheumatol.</i> 39, 2118–2126 (2012). Monahan, R. C. <i>et al.</i> Mortality in patients with systemic lupus crythematosus and neuropsychiatric involvement: A retrospective analysis from a tertiary referral center in the Netherlands. <i>Lupus</i> 29, 1892–1901 (2020). Hanly, J. G. <i>et al.</i> Neuropsychiatric events at the time of diagnosis of systemic lupus crythematosus: An international inception cohort study. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 56, 265–273 (2007). Liang, M. H. <i>et al.</i> The American College of Rheumatology nomenclature and case definitions for neuropsychiatric lupus syndromes. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 42, 599–608 (1999). Hochberg, M. C. Updating the American College of Rheumatology revised criteria for the classification of systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 40, 1725 (1997). Gladman, D. D., Ibañez, D. & Urowltz, M. B. Systemic lupus erythematosus disease activity index 2000. <i>J. Rheumatol.</i> 29, 288–291 (2002). Petri, M. <i>et al.</i> Derivation and validation of the systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 42, 6277–2686 (2012). Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. <i>J. Am. Stat. Assoc.</i> 58, 236–244 (1963). Pedregosa, F. <i>et al.</i> Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. <i>J. Mach. Learn. Res.</i> 12, 2825–2830 (2012).	480	20.	Heinen, R. <i>et al.</i> Performance of five automated white matter hyperintensity
 de Sitter, A. <i>et al.</i> Performance of five research-domain automated WM lesion segmentation methods in a multi-center MS study. <i>Neuroimage</i> 163, 106-114 (2017). Vanderbecq, O. <i>et al.</i> Comparison and validation of seven white matter hyperintensities segmentation software in elderly patients. <i>NeuroImage Clin</i>, 27, (2020). Zirkzee, E. J. M. <i>et al.</i> Prospective study of clinical phenotypes in neuropsychiatric systemic lupus crythematosus; Multidisciplinary approach to diagnosis and therapy. <i>J.</i> <i>Rheumatol.</i> 39, 2118–2126 (2012). Monahan, R. C. <i>et al.</i> Mortality in patients with systemic lupus crythematosus and neuropsychiatric involvement: A retrospective analysis from a tertiary referral center in the Netherlands. <i>Lupus</i> 29, 1892–1901 (2020). Hanly, J. G. <i>et al.</i> Neuropsychiatric events at the time of diagnosis of systemic lupus erythematosus: An international inception cohort study. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 56, 265–273 (2007). Liang, M. H. <i>et al.</i> The American College of Rheumatology nomenelature and case definitions for neuropsychiatric lupus syndromes. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 42, 599 608 (1999). Hochberg, M. C. Updating the American College of Rheumatology revised criteria for the classification of systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 40, 1725 (1997). Gladman, D. D., Ibañez, D. & Urowltz, M. B. Systemic lupus international collaborating clinics classification criteria for systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 64, 2677–2686 (2012). Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. <i>J. Am. Stat. Assoc.</i> 58, 236–244 (1963). Pedregosa, F. <i>et al.</i> Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. <i>J. Mach. Learn. Res.</i> 12, 2825–2830 (2012). Rousseeuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. <i>J. Comput. Appl. Math.</i> 20, 53–65 (1987). Caliński, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method	481		segmentation methods in a multicenter dataset. Scientific Reports 9, 1–12 (2019).
 segmentation methods in a multi-center MS study. <i>Neuroimage</i> 163, 106–114 (2017). Vanderbecq, Q. <i>et al.</i> Comparison and validation of seven white matter hyperintensities segmentation software in elderly patients. <i>NeuroImage Clin.</i> 27, (2020). Zirkzee, E. J. M. <i>et al.</i> Prospective study of clinical phenotypes in neuropsychiatric systemic lupus erythematosus; Multidisciplinary approach to diagnosis and therapy. <i>J. Rheumatol.</i> 39, 2118–2126 (2012). Monahan, R. C. <i>et al.</i> Mortality in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus and neuropsychiatric involvement: A retrospective analysis from a tertiary referral center in the Netherlands. <i>Lupus</i> 29, 1892–1901 (2020). Hanly, J. G. <i>et al.</i> Neuropsychiatric events at the time of diagnosis of systemic lupus erythematosus: An international inception cohort study. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 56, 265–273 (2007). Liang, M. H. <i>et al.</i> The American College of Rheumatology nomenclature and case definitions for neuropsychiatric lupus syndromes. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 42, 599–608 (1999). Hochberg, M. C. Updating the American College of Rheumatology revised criteria for the classification of systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 40, 1725 (1997). Gladman, D. D., Ibañez, D. & Urowltz, M. B. Systemic lupus international collaborating clinics classification criteria for systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 40, 2677–2686 (2012). Petri, M. <i>et al.</i> Derivation and validation of the systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 42, 527–268 (2012). Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. <i>J. Am. Stat.</i> Assoc. 58, 236–244 (1963). Pedregosa, F. <i>et al.</i> Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. <i>J. Mach. Learn. Res.</i> 12, 2825–2830 (2012). Roussecuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. <i>J. Comput. Appl. Math.</i> 20, 53–65 (1987).	482	21	de Sitter A <i>et al</i> Performance of five research-domain automated WM lesion
 Vanderbecq, Q. <i>et al.</i> Comparison and validation of seven white matter hyperintensities segmentation software in elderly patients. <i>NeuroImage Clin.</i> 27, (2020). Zirkzee, E. J. M. <i>et al.</i> Prospective study of clinical phenotypes in neuropsychiatric systemic lupus erythematosus; Multidisciplinary approach to diagnosis and therapy. <i>J. Rheumatol.</i> 39, 2118–2126 (2012). Monahan, R. C. <i>et al.</i> Mortality in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus and neuropsychiatric involvement: A retrospective analysis from a tertiary referral center in the Netherlands. <i>Lupus</i> 29, 1892–1901 (2020). Hanly, J. G. <i>et al.</i> Neuropsychiatric events at the time of diagnosis of systemic lupus erythematosus: An international inception cohort study. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 56, 265–273 (2007). Liang, M. H. <i>et al.</i> The American College of Rheumatology nomenclature and case definitions for neuropsychiatric lupus syndromes. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 42, 599–608 (1999). Hochberg, M. C. Updating the American College of Rheumatology revised criteria for the classification of systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 40, 1725 (1997). Gladman, D. D., Ibañez, D. & Urowltz, M. B. Systemic lupus erythematosus disease activity index 2000. <i>J. Rheumatol.</i> 29, 288–291 (2002). Petri, M. <i>et al.</i> Derivation and validation of the systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 40, 1725 (1997). Russeew, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. <i>J. Comput. Appl. Math.</i> 20, 53–65 (1987). Pedregosa, F. <i>et al.</i> Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. <i>J. Mach. Learn. Res.</i> 12, 2825–2830 (2012). Rousseew, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. <i>J. Comput. Appl. Math.</i> 20, 53–65 (1987). Scabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. in 92–96 (2010). doi:10.2	483	21.	segmentation methods in a multi-center MS study <i>Neuroimage</i> 163 106–114 (2017)
 Segmentation software in elderly patients. <i>Natural Induction Of Section 1</i>, 1979. Instituted segmentation software in elderly patients. <i>NeuroImage Clin</i>, 27, (2020). Zirkzee, E. J. M. <i>et al.</i> Prospective study of clinical phenotypes in neuropsychiatric systemic lupus erythematosus; Multidisciplinary approach to diagnosis and therapy. <i>J. Rheumatol.</i> 39, 2118–2126 (2012). Monahan, R. C. <i>et al.</i> Mortality in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus and neuropsychiatric involvement: A retrospective analysis from a tertiary referral center in the Netherlands. <i>Lupus</i> 29, 1892–1901 (2020). Hanly, J. G. <i>et al.</i> Neuropsychiatric events at the time of diagnosis of systemic lupus erythematosus: An international inception cohort study. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 56, 265–273 (2007). Liang, M. H. <i>et al.</i> The American College of Rheumatology nomenclature and case definitions for neuropsychiatric lupus syndromes. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 42, 599–608 (1999). Hochberg, M. C. Updating the American College of Rheumatology revised criteria for the classification of systemic lupus crythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 40, 1725 (1997). Gladman, D. D., Ibañez, D. & Urowltz, M. B. Systemic lupus erythematosus disease activity index 2000. <i>J. Rheumatol.</i> 29, 288–291 (2002). Petri, M. <i>et al.</i> Derivation and validation of the systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 42, 2677–2686 (2012). Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. <i>J. Am. Stat. Assoc.</i> 58, 236–244 (1963). Pedregosa, F. <i>et al.</i> Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. <i>J. Mach. Learn. Res.</i> 12, 2825–2830 (2012). Rousseeuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. <i>J. Comput. Appl. Math.</i> 20, 33–65 (1987). Calinski, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method For Cluster Analysis. <i>Commun. Stat.</i> 3, 1–27 (1974). Virtanen, P. <i>et al.</i> Sci	484	22	Vanderbeca Ω <i>et al.</i> Comparison and validation of seven white matter hyperintensities
 Zinkzec, E. J. M. <i>et al.</i> Prospective study of clinical phenotypes in neuropsychiatric systemic lupus crythematosus; Multidisciplinary approach to diagnosis and therapy. <i>J. Rheumatol.</i> 39, 2118–2126 (2012). Monahan, R. C. <i>et al.</i> Mortality in patients with systemic lupus crythematosus and neuropsychiatric involvement: A retrospective analysis from a tertiary referral center in the Netherlands. <i>Lupus</i> 29, 1892–1901 (2020). Hanly, J. G. <i>et al.</i> Neuropsychiatric events at the time of diagnosis of systemic lupus crythematosus: An international inception cohort study. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 56, 265–273 (2007). Liang, M. H. <i>et al.</i> The American College of Rheumatology nomenclature and case definitions for neuropsychiatric lupus syndromes. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 42, 599–608 (1999). Chochberg, M. C. Updating the American College of Rheumatology revised criteria for the classification of systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 40, 1725 (1997). Gladman, D. D., Ibañez, D. & Urowltz, M. B. Systemic lupus erythematosus disease activity index 2000. <i>J. Rheumatol.</i> 29, 288–291 (2002). Petri, M. <i>et al.</i> Derivation and validation of the systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 43, 267–2686 (2012). Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. <i>J. Am. Stat. Assoc.</i> 58, 236–244 (1963). Pedregosa, F. <i>et al.</i> Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. <i>J. Mach. Learn. Res.</i> 12, 2825–2830 (2012). Roussecuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. <i>J. Comput. Appl. Math.</i> 20, 53–65 (1987). Caliński, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method For Cluster Analysis. <i>Commun. Stat.</i> 3, 1–27 (1974). Virtanen, P. <i>et al.</i> SciPi 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. <i>Nat. Methods</i> 17, 261–272 (2020). Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Ec	485		segmentation software in elderly patients NeuroImage Clin 27 (2020)
 Sintee, E. <i>Numered</i>. Numered is a strain of the system of the system in the object of the system system of the system of the system of the system of the sys	486	23	Zirkzee F I M <i>et al</i> Prospective study of clinical phenotypes in neuropsychiatric
 Systemic Toyson, Systemic Lynnay approach to diagnosis and dictapy. J. Rheumatol. 39, 2118–2126 (2012). Monahan, R. C. et al. Mortality in patients with systemic lupus crythematosus and neuropsychiatric involvement: A retrospective analysis from a tertiary referral center in the Netherlands. Lupus 29, 1892–1901 (2020). Hanly, J. G. et al. Neuropsychiatric events at the time of diagnosis of systemic lupus crythematosus: An international inception cohort study. Arthritis Rheum. 56, 265–273 (2007). Liang, M. H. et al. The American College of Rheumatology nomenclature and case definitions for neuropsychiatric lupus syndromes. Arthritis Rheum. 42, 599–608 (1999). Hochberg, M. C. Updating the American College of Rheumatology revised criteria for the classification of systemic lupus crythematosus. Arthritis Rheum. 40, 1725 (1997). Gladman, D. D., Ibañez, D. & Urowltz, M. B. Systemic lupus erythematosus disease activity index 2000. J. Rheumatol. 29, 288–291 (2002). Petri, M. et al. Derivation and validation of the systemic lupus erythematosus. Arthritis Rheum. 64, 2677–2686 (2012). Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. J. Am. Stat. Assoc. 58, 236–244 (1963). Rousseeuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. J. Comput. Appl. Math. 20, 53–65 (1987). Rousseeuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. J. Comput. Appl. Math. 20, 53–65 (1987). Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. Nat. Methods 17, 261–272 (2020). Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. in 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. et al. MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest	480	23.	systemic lupus erythematosus: Multidisciplinary approach to diagnosis and therapy <i>I</i>
 Monahan, R. C. <i>et al.</i> Mortality in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus and neuropsychiatric involvement: A retrospective analysis from a tertiary referral center in the Netherlands. <i>Lupus</i> 29, 1892–1901 (2020). Hanly, J. G. <i>et al.</i> Neuropsychiatric events at the time of diagnosis of systemic lupus erythematosus: An international inception cohort study. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 56, 265–273 (2007). Liang, M. H. <i>et al.</i> The American College of Rheumatology nomenclature and case definitions for neuropsychiatric lupus syndromes. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 42, 599–608 (1999). Hochberg, M. C. Updating the American College of Rheumatology revised criteria for the classification of systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 40, 1725 (1997). Gladman, D. D., Ibañez, D. & Urowltz, M. B. Systemic lupus international collaborating clinics classification criteria for systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 64, 2677–2686 (2012). Petri, M. <i>et al.</i> Derivation and validation of the systemic lupus international collaborating clinics classification criteria for systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 64, 2677–2686 (2012). Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. <i>J. Am. Stat. Assoc.</i> 58, 236–244 (1963). Pedregosa, F. <i>et al.</i> Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. <i>J. Mach. Learn. Res.</i> 12, 2825–2830 (2012). Rousseeuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. <i>J. Comput. Appl. Math.</i> 20, 53–65 (1987). Califiski, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method For Cluster Analysis. <i>Commun. Stat.</i> 3, 1–27 (1974). Virtanen, P. <i>et al.</i> Sciky 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. <i>Nat. Methods</i> 17, 261–272 (2020). Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. in 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 <li< td=""><td>407</td><td></td><td>Phaumatol 30 2118 2126 (2012)</td></li<>	407		Phaumatol 30 2118 2126 (2012)
 Yonahan, K. C. et al. Motanty in patients why stelline inpussion eryinematosus and neuropsychiatric involvement: A retrospective analysis from a tertiary referral center in the Netherlands. <i>Lupus</i> 29, 1892–1901 (2020). Hanly, J. G. et al. Neuropsychiatric events at the time of diagnosis of systemic lupus erythematosus: An international inception cohort study. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 56, 265–273 (2007). Liang, M. H. et al. The American College of Rheumatology nomenclature and case definitions for neuropsychiatric lupus syndromes. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 42, 599–608 (1999). Hochberg, M. C. Updating the American College of Rheumatology revised criteria for the classification of systemic lupus crythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 40, 1725 (1997). Gladman, D. D., Ibañez, D. & Urowltz, M. B. Systemic lupus crythematosus discase activity index 2000. <i>J. Rheumatol.</i> 29, 288–291 (2002). Petri, M. et al. Derivation and validation of the systemic lupus international collaborating clinics classification criteria for systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 64, 2677–2686 (2012). Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. <i>J. Am. Stat. Assoc.</i> 58, 236–244 (1963). Pedregosa, F. et al. Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. <i>J. Mach. Learn. Res.</i> 12, 2825–2830 (2012). Rousseeuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. <i>J. Comput. Appl. Math.</i> 20, 53–65 (1987). Caliñski, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method For Cluster Analysis. <i>Commun. Stat.</i> 3, 1–27 (1974). Virtanen, P. et al. SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. <i>in</i> 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 Jasrma-Coes, M. G. et al. MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. <i>J. Cereb. Blood Flow </i>	400	24	Monshan P. C. at al. Mortality in nationts with systemic lunus or thematosus and
 Hendopsychiatic Brodyscheiden, Neuropsychiate analysis from a ferhal yfeferfal center in the Netherlands. Lupus 29, 1892–1901 (2020). Hanly, J. G. et al. Neuropsychiatric events at the time of diagnosis of systemic lupus erythematosus: An international inception cohort study. Arthritis Rheum. 56, 265–273 (2007). Liang, M. H. et al. The American College of Rheumatology nomenclature and case definitions for neuropsychiatric lupus syndromes. Arthritis Rheum. 42, 599–608 (1999). Hochberg, M. C. Updating the American College of Rheumatology revised criteria for the classification of systemic lupus crythematosus. Arthritis Rheum. 40, 1725 (1997). Gladman, D. D., Ibañez, D. & Urowltz, M. B. Systemic lupus crythematosus disease activity index 2000. J. Rheumatol. 29, 288–291 (2002). Petri, M. et al. Derivation and validation of the systemic lupus international collaborating clinics classification criteria for systemic lupus erythematosus. Arthritis Rheum. 64, 2677–2686 (2012). Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. J. Am. Stat. Assoc. 58, 236–244 (1963). Pedregosa, F. et al. Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. J. Mach. Learn. Res. 12, 2825–2830 (2012). Rousseeuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. J. Comput. Appl. Math. 20, 53–65 (1987). Califiski, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method For Cluster Analysis. Commun. Stat. 3, 1–27 (1974). Virtanen, P. et al. SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. Nat. Methods 17, 261–272 (2020). Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. in 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 Jarsma-Coes, M. G. et al. MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. J. Cereb. Blood Flow Metab. (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X1881891	409	<i>2</i> 4.	nourongychiatria involvement. A retrognactive analysis from a tertiary referral center in
 Henden Keineriandos. <i>Luptus</i> 29, 1692–1901 (2020). Hanly, J. G. <i>et al.</i> Neuropsychiatric events at the time of diagnosis of systemic lupus erythematosus: An international inception cohort study. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 56, 265–273 (2007). Liang, M. H. <i>et al.</i> The American College of Rheumatology nomenclature and case definitions for neuropsychiatric lupus syndromes. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 42, 599–608 (1999). Hochberg, M. C. Updating the American College of Rheumatology revised criteria for the classification of systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 40, 1725 (1997). Gladman, D. D., Ibañez, D. & Urowltz, M. B. Systemic lupus erythematosus disease activity index 2000. <i>J. Rheumatol.</i> 29, 288–291 (2002). Petri, M. <i>et al.</i> Derivation and validation of the systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 64, 2677–2686 (2012). Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. <i>J. Am. Stat.</i> <i>Assoc.</i> 58, 236–244 (1963). Pedregosa, F. <i>et al.</i> Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. <i>J. Mach. Learn. Res.</i> 12, 2825–2830 (2012). Rousseeuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. <i>J. Comput. Appl. Math.</i> 20, 53–65 (1987). Caliński, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method For Cluster Analysis. <i>Commun. Stat.</i> 3, 1–27 (1974). Virtanen, P. <i>et al.</i> SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. <i>in</i> 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. <i>et al.</i> MRI phenotypes of the brian are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. <i>J. Cereb. Blood Flow Metab.</i> (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18818918 Kant, I. M. J. <i>et al.</i> Properative MRI brian phenotypes are related to postoperative delirium in older individuals. <i>Neurobiol. Aging</i> 101, 247–255 (2021). Schmidt, P. <i>et al.</i> An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white	490		the Notherlands, Lunus 20, 1802, 1001 (2020)
 Frany, J. G. <i>et al.</i> Neuropsychiatric events at the time of diagnosts of systemic tupus erythematosus: An international inception cohort study. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 56, 265–273 (2007). Liang, M. H. <i>et al.</i> The American College of Rheumatology nomenclature and case definitions for neuropsychiatric lupus syndromes. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 42, 599–608 (1999). Hochberg, M. C. Updating the American College of Rheumatology revised criteria for the classification of systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 40, 1725 (1997). Gladman, D. D., Ibañez, D. & Urowltz, M. B. Systemic lupus international collaborating clinics classification criteria for systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 64, 2677–2686 (2012). Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. <i>J. Am. Stat. Assoc.</i> 58, 236–244 (1963). Pedregosa, F. <i>et al.</i> Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. <i>J. Mach. Learn. Res.</i> 12, 2825–2830 (2012). Roussceuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. <i>J. Comput. Appl. Math.</i> 20, 53–65 (1987). Caliñski, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method For Cluster Analysis. <i>Commun. Stat.</i> 3, 1–27 (1974). Virtanen, P. <i>et al.</i> SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. <i>Nat. Methods</i> 17, 261–272 (2020). Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. <i>in</i> 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. <i>et al.</i> MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. <i>J. Cereb. Blood Flow Metab.</i> (2018). doi:10.1	491	25	the Netherlands. Lupus 29, 1892–1901 (2020).
 derythematosus: An international inception conort study. Arthritis Rheum. 50, 205–275 (2007). 26. Liang, M. H. et al. The American College of Rheumatology nomenclature and case definitions for neuropsychiatric lupus syndromes. Arthritis Rheum. 42, 599–608 (1999). 27. Hochberg, M. C. Updating the American College of Rheumatology revised criteria for the classification of systemic lupus erythematosus. Arthritis Rheum. 40, 1725 (1997). 28. Gladman, D. D., Ibañez, D. & Urowltz, M. B. Systemic lupus erythematosus disease activity index 2000. J. Rheumatol. 29, 288–291 (2002). 29. Petri, M. et al. Derivation and validation of the systemic lupus international collaborating clinics classification criteria for systemic lupus erythematosus. Arthritis Rheum. 64, 2677–2686 (2012). 30. Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. J. Am. Stat. Assoc. 58, 236–244 (1963). 31. Pedregosa, F. et al. Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. J. Mach. Learn. Res. 12, 2825–2830 (2012). 32. Rousseeuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. J. Comput. Appl. Math. 20, 53–65 (1987). 33. Caliñski, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method For Cluster Analysis. Commun. Stat. 3, 1–27 (1974). 34. Virtanen, P. et al. SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. Nat. Methods 17, 261–272 (2020). 35. Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. in 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 36. Satarma-Coes, M. G. et al. MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. J. Cereb. Blood Flow Metab. (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18818918 37. Kant, I. M. J. et al. Preoperative MRI brain phenotypes are related to postoperative delirium in older individuals. Neurobiol. Aging 101, 247–255 (2021). 38. Sch	492	23.	Hanly, J. G. <i>et al.</i> Neuropsychiatric events at the time of diagnosis of systemic lupus
 Liang, M. H. <i>et al.</i> The American College of Rheumatology nomenclature and case definitions for neuropsychiatric lupus syndromes. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 42, 599–608 (1999). Hochberg, M. C. Updating the American College of Rheumatology revised criteria for the classification of systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 40, 1725 (1997). Gladman, D. D., Ibañez, D. & Urowltz, M. B. Systemic lupus erythematosus disease activity index 2000. <i>J. Rheumatol.</i> 29, 288–291 (2002). Petri, M. <i>et al.</i> Derivation and validation of the systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 40, 1725 (1997). Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. <i>J. Am. Stat. Assoc.</i> 58, 236–244 (1963). Pedregosa, F. <i>et al.</i> Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. <i>J. Mach. Learn. Res.</i> 12, 2825–2830 (2012). Rousseeuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. <i>J. Comput. Appl. Math.</i> 20, 53–65 (1987). Caliński, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method For Cluster Analysis. <i>Commun. Stat.</i> 3, 1–27 (1974). Virtanen, P. <i>et al.</i> SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. <i>Nat. Methods</i> 17, 261–272 (2020). Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. <i>in</i> 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. <i>et al.</i> MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. <i>J. Cereb. Blood Flow Metab.</i> (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18818918 Kant, I. M. J. <i>et al.</i> Preoperative MRI brain phenotypes are related to postoperative delirium in older individuals. <i>Neurobiol. Aging</i> 10, 247–255 (2021). Schmidt, P. <i>et al.</i> An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. <i>Neuroimage</i> 59, 3774–3783 (2012).	495		(2007)
 Liang, M. H. <i>et al.</i> The American College of Rheumatology nomenciature and case definitions for neuropsychiatric lupus syndromes. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 42, 599–608 (1999). Hochberg, M. C. Updating the American College of Rheumatology revised criteria for the classification of systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 40, 1725 (1997). Gladman, D. D., Ibañez, D. & Urowltz, M. B. Systemic lupus erythematosus disease activity index 2000. <i>J. Rheumatol.</i> 29, 288–291 (2002). Petri, M. <i>et al.</i> Derivation and validation of the systemic lupus international collaborating clinics classification criteria for systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 64, 2677–2686 (2012). Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. <i>J. Am. Stat. Assoc.</i> 58, 236–244 (1963). Pedregosa, F. <i>et al.</i> Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. <i>J. Mach. Learn. Res.</i> 12, 2825–2830 (2012). Rousseeuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. <i>J. Comput. Appl. Math.</i> 20, 53–65 (1987). Caliñski, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method For Cluster Analysis. <i>Commun. Stat.</i> 3, 1–27 (1974). Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. <i>Nat. Methods</i> 17, 261–272 (2020). Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. <i>in</i> 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. <i>et al.</i> MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. <i>J. Cereb. Blood Flow Metab.</i> (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18819818 Kant, I. M. J. <i>et al.</i> Preoperative MRI brain phenotypes are related to postoperative delirimin inder individuals. <i>Neurobiol. Aging</i> 101, 247–255 (2021). Schmidt, P. <i>et al.</i> An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense	494	26	(2007).
 definitions for neuropsychiatric fugus syndromes. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 42, 599–608 (1999). Hochberg, M. C. Updating the American College of Rheumatology revised criteria for the classification of systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 40, 1725 (1997). Gladman, D. D., Ibañez, D. & Urowltz, M. B. Systemic lupus erythematosus disease activity index 2000. <i>J. Rheumatol.</i> 29, 288–291 (2002). Petri, M. <i>et al.</i> Derivation and validation of the systemic lupus international collaborating clinics classification criteria for systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 64, 2677–2686 (2012). Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. <i>J. Am. Stat. Assoc.</i> 58, 236–244 (1963). Pedregosa, F. <i>et al.</i> Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. <i>J. Mach. Learn. Res.</i> 12, 2825–2830 (2012). Rousseeuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. <i>J. Comput. Appl. Math.</i> 20, 53–65 (1987). Caliński, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method For Cluster Analysis. <i>Commun. Stat.</i> 3, 1–27 (1974). Virtanen, P. <i>et al.</i> SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. <i>Nat. Methods</i> 17, 261–272 (2020). Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. in 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. <i>et al.</i> MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. <i>J. Cereb. Blood Flow Metab.</i> (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18819818 Kant, I. M. J. <i>et al.</i> An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. <i>Neuroimage</i> 59, 3774–3783 (2012). 	495	26.	Liang, M. H. <i>et al.</i> The American College of Rheumatology nomenclature and case
 (1999). Hochberg, M. C. Updating the American College of Rheumatology revised criteria for the classification of systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 40, 1725 (1997). Gladman, D. D., Ibañez, D. & Urowltz, M. B. Systemic lupus erythematosus disease activity index 2000. <i>J. Rheumatol.</i> 29, 288–291 (2002). Petri, M. <i>et al.</i> Derivation and validation of the systemic lupus international collaborating clinics classification criteria for systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 64, 2677–2686 (2012). Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. <i>J. Am. Stat.</i> <i>Assoc.</i> 58, 236–244 (1963). Pedregosa, F. <i>et al.</i> Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. <i>J. Mach. Learn. Res.</i> 12, 2825–2830 (2012). Rousseeuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. <i>J. Comput. Appl. Math.</i> 20, 53–65 (1987). Caliński, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method For Cluster Analysis. <i>Commun. Stat.</i> 3, 1–27 (1974). Virtanen, P. <i>et al.</i> SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. <i>Nat. Methods</i> 17, 261–272 (2020). Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. <i>in</i> 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. <i>et al.</i> MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. <i>J. Cereb.</i> <i>Blood Flow Metab.</i> (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18818918 Kant, I. M. J. <i>et al.</i> Preoperative MRI brain phenotypes are related to postoperative delirium in older individuals. <i>Neurobiol. Aging</i> 101, 247–255 (2021). Schmidt, P. <i>et al.</i> An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. <i>Neuroimage</i> 59, 3774–3783 (2012). 	496		definitions for neuropsychiatric lupus syndromes. Arthritis Rheum. 42, 599–608
 Hochberg, M. C. Updating the American College of Rheumatology revised criteria for the classification of systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 40, 1725 (1997). Gladman, D. D., Ibañez, D. & Urowltz, M. B. Systemic lupus erythematosus disease activity index 2000. <i>J. Rheumatol.</i> 29, 288–291 (2002). Petri, M. et al. Derivation and validation of the systemic lupus international collaborating clinics classification criteria for systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 64, 2677–2686 (2012). Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. <i>J. Am. Stat.</i> <i>Assoc.</i> 58, 236–244 (1963). Pedregosa, F. et al. Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. <i>J. Mach. Learn. Res.</i> 12, 2825–2830 (2012). Rousseeuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. <i>J. Comput. Appl. Math.</i> 20, 53–65 (1987). Caliński, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method For Cluster Analysis. <i>Commun. Stat.</i> 3, 1–27 (1974). Virtanen, P. et al. SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. <i>Nat. Methods</i> 17, 261–272 (2020). Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. in 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. et al. MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. <i>J. Cereb.</i> <i>Blood Flow Metab.</i> (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18818918 Kant, I. M. J. et al. An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. <i>Neuroimage</i> 59, 3774–3783 (2012). 	49/	27	(1999).
 the classification of systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis Rheum.</i> 40, 1725 (1997). Gladman, D. D., Ibañez, D. & Urowltz, M. B. Systemic lupus erythematosus disease activity index 2000. <i>J. Rheumatol.</i> 29, 288–291 (2002). Petri, M. <i>et al.</i> Derivation and validation of the systemic lupus international collaborating clinics classification criteria for systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis</i> <i>Rheum.</i> 64, 2677–2686 (2012). Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. <i>J. Am. Stat.</i> <i>Assoc.</i> 58, 236–244 (1963). Pedregosa, F. <i>et al.</i> Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. <i>J. Mach. Learn. Res.</i> 12, 2825–2830 (2012). Rousseeuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. <i>J. Comput. Appl. Math.</i> 20, 53–65 (1987). Caliñski, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method For Cluster Analysis. <i>Commun. Stat.</i> 3, 1–27 (1974). Virtanen, P. <i>et al.</i> SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. <i>Nat. Methods</i> 17, 261–272 (2020). Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. in 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. <i>et al.</i> MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. <i>J. Cereb.</i> <i>Blood Flow Metab.</i> (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18818918 Kant, I. M. J. <i>et al.</i> An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. <i>Neuroimage</i> 59, 3774–3783 (2012). 	498	27.	Hochberg, M. C. Updating the American College of Rheumatology revised criteria for
 Gradman, D. D., Ibanez, D. & Orowitz, M. B. Systemic lupus erythematosus disease activity index 2000. J. Rheumatol. 29, 288–291 (2002). Petri, M. et al. Derivation and validation of the systemic lupus international collaborating clinics classification criteria for systemic lupus erythematosus. Arthritis Rheum. 64, 2677–2686 (2012). Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. J. Am. Stat. Assoc. 58, 236–244 (1963). Pedregosa, F. et al. Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. J. Mach. Learn. Res. 12, 2825–2830 (2012). Rousseeuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. J. Comput. Appl. Math. 20, 53–65 (1987). Caliñski, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method For Cluster Analysis. Commun. Stat. 3, 1–27 (1974). Virtanen, P. et al. SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. Nat. Methods 17, 261–272 (2020). Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. in 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. et al. MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. J. Cereb. Blood Flow Metab. (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18818918 Kant, I. M. J. et al. Preoperative MRI brain phenotypes are related to postoperative delirium in older individuals. Neurobiol. Aging 101, 247–255 (2021). Schmidt, P. et al. An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. Neuroimage 59, 3774–3783 (2012). 	499	20	the classification of systemic lupus erythematosus. Arthritis Rheum. 40, 1/25 (1997).
 activity index 2000. J. Rheumatol. 29, 288–291 (2002). Petri, M. et al. Derivation and validation of the systemic lupus international collaborating clinics classification criteria for systemic lupus erythematosus. Arthritis Rheum. 64, 2677–2686 (2012). Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. J. Am. Stat. Assoc. 58, 236–244 (1963). Pedregosa, F. et al. Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. J. Mach. Learn. Res. 12, 2825–2830 (2012). Rousseeuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. J. Comput. Appl. Math. 20, 53–65 (1987). Caliński, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method For Cluster Analysis. Commun. Stat. 3, 1–27 (1974). Virtanen, P. et al. SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. Nat. Methods 17, 261–272 (2020). Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. in 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. et al. MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. J. Cereb. Blood Flow Metab. (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18818918 Kant, I. M. J. et al. Preoperative MRI brain phenotypes are related to postoperative delirium in older individuals. Neurobiol. Aging 101, 247–255 (2021). Schmidt, P. et al. An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. Neuroimage 59, 3774–3783 (2012). 	500	28.	Gladman, D. D., Ibanez, D. & Urowitz, M. B. Systemic lupus erythematosus disease
 29. Petri, M. <i>et al.</i> Derivation and validation of the systemic lupus international collaborating clinics classification criteria for systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis</i> <i>Rheum.</i> 64, 2677–2686 (2012). 30. Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. <i>J. Am. Stat.</i> <i>Assoc.</i> 58, 236–244 (1963). 31. Pedregosa, F. <i>et al.</i> Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. <i>J. Mach. Learn. Res.</i> 12, 2825–2830 (2012). 32. Rousseeuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. <i>J. Comput. Appl. Math.</i> 20, 53–65 (1987). 33. Caliñski, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method For Cluster Analysis. <i>Commun. Stat.</i> 3, 1–27 (1974). 34. Virtanen, P. <i>et al.</i> SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. <i>Nat. Methods</i> 17, 261–272 (2020). 35. Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. in 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 36. Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. <i>et al.</i> MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. <i>J. Cereb.</i> <i>Blood Flow Metab.</i> (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18818918 37. Kant, I. M. J. <i>et al.</i> Preoperative MRI brain phenotypes are related to postoperative delirium in older individuals. <i>Neurobiol. Aging</i> 101, 247–255 (2021). 38. Schmidt, P. <i>et al.</i> An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. <i>Neuroimage</i> 59, 3774–3783 (2012). 	501	20	activity index 2000. J. Rheumatol. 29, 288–291 (2002).
 collaborating clinics classification criteria for systemic lupus erythematosus. <i>Arthritis</i> <i>Rheum.</i> 64, 2677–2686 (2012). 30. Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. <i>J. Am. Stat.</i> <i>Assoc.</i> 58, 236–244 (1963). 31. Pedregosa, F. <i>et al.</i> Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. <i>J. Mach. Learn. Res.</i> 12, 2825–2830 (2012). 32. Rousseeuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. <i>J. Comput. Appl. Math.</i> 20, 53–65 (1987). 33. Caliñski, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method For Cluster Analysis. <i>Commun. Stat.</i> 3, 1–27 (1974). 34. Virtanen, P. <i>et al.</i> SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. <i>Nat. Methods</i> 17, 261–272 (2020). 35. Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. in 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 36. Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. <i>et al.</i> MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. <i>J. Cereb.</i> <i>Blood Flow Metab.</i> (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18818918 37. Kant, I. M. J. <i>et al.</i> Preoperative MRI brain phenotypes are related to postoperative delirium in older individuals. <i>Neurobiol. Aging</i> 101, 247–255 (2021). 38. Schmidt, P. <i>et al.</i> An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. <i>Neuroimage</i> 59, 3774–3783 (2012). 	502	29.	Petri, M. <i>et al.</i> Derivation and validation of the systemic lupus international
 <i>Rheum.</i> 64, 2677–2686 (2012). Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. <i>J. Am. Stat.</i> <i>Assoc.</i> 58, 236–244 (1963). Pedregosa, F. <i>et al.</i> Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. <i>J. Mach. Learn. Res.</i> 12, 2825–2830 (2012). Rousseeuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. <i>J. Comput. Appl. Math.</i> 20, 53–65 (1987). Caliński, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method For Cluster Analysis. <i>Commun. Stat.</i> 3, 1–27 (1974). Yirtanen, P. <i>et al.</i> SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. <i>Nat. Methods</i> 17, 261–272 (2020). Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. in 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. <i>et al.</i> MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. <i>J. Cereb. Blood Flow Metab.</i> (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18818918 Kant, I. M. J. <i>et al.</i> Preoperative MRI brain phenotypes are related to postoperative delirium in older individuals. <i>Neurobiol. Aging</i> 101, 247–255 (2021). Schmidt, P. <i>et al.</i> An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. <i>Neuroimage</i> 59, 3774–3783 (2012). 	503		collaborating clinics classification criteria for systemic lupus erythematosus. Arthritis
 Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. J. Am. Stat. Assoc. 58, 236–244 (1963). Pedregosa, F. et al. Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. J. Mach. Learn. Res. 12, 2825–2830 (2012). Rousseeuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. J. Comput. Appl. Math. 20, 53–65 (1987). Caliñski, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method For Cluster Analysis. Commun. Stat. 3, 1–27 (1974). Virtanen, P. et al. SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. Nat. Methods 17, 261–272 (2020). Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. in 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. et al. MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. J. Cereb. Blood Flow Metab. (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18818918 Kant, I. M. J. et al. Preoperative MRI brain phenotypes are related to postoperative delirium in older individuals. Neurobiol. Aging 101, 247–255 (2021). Schmidt, P. et al. An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. Neuroimage 59, 3774–3783 (2012). 	504	20	<i>Rheum.</i> 64 , $2677-2686$ (2012).
 <i>Assoc.</i> 58, 256–244 (1965). 931. Pedregosa, F. <i>et al.</i> Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. <i>J. Mach. Learn. Res.</i> 12, 2825–2830 (2012). 932. Rousseeuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. <i>J. Comput. Appl. Math.</i> 20, 53–65 (1987). 933. Caliñski, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method For Cluster Analysis. <i>Commun. Stat.</i> 3, 1–27 (1974). 944. Virtanen, P. <i>et al.</i> SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. <i>Nat. Methods</i> 17, 261–272 (2020). 955. Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. in 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 96. Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. <i>et al.</i> MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. <i>J. Cereb. Blood Flow Metab.</i> (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18818918 97. Kant, I. M. J. <i>et al.</i> Preoperative MRI brain phenotypes are related to postoperative delirium in older individuals. <i>Neurobiol. Aging</i> 101, 247–255 (2021). 98. Schmidt, P. <i>et al.</i> An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. <i>Neuroimage</i> 59, 3774–3783 (2012). 	505	30.	Ward, J. H. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. J. Am. Stat.
 Solver St. Pedregosa, F. et al. Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. J. Mach. Learn. Res. 12, 2825–2830 (2012). Rousseeuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. J. Comput. Appl. Math. 20, 53–65 (1987). Caliñski, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method For Cluster Analysis. Commun. Stat. 3, 1–27 (1974). Virtanen, P. et al. SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. Nat. Methods 17, 261–272 (2020). Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. in 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. et al. MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with marifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. J. Cereb. Blood Flow Metab. (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18818918 Kant, I. M. J. et al. Preoperative MRI brain phenotypes are related to postoperative delirium in older individuals. Neurobiol. Aging 101, 247–255 (2021). Schmidt, P. et al. An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. Neuroimage 59, 3774–3783 (2012). 	506	2.1	Assoc. 58 , 236–244 (1963).
 2825–2830 (2012). 32. Rousseeuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. <i>J. Comput. Appl. Math.</i> 20, 53–65 (1987). 33. Caliñski, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method For Cluster Analysis. <i>Commun. Stat.</i> 3, 1–27 (1974). 34. Virtanen, P. <i>et al.</i> SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. <i>Nat. Methods</i> 17, 261–272 (2020). 35. Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. in 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 36. Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. <i>et al.</i> MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. <i>J. Cereb. Blood Flow Metab.</i> (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18818918 37. Kant, I. M. J. <i>et al.</i> Preoperative MRI brain phenotypes are related to postoperative delirium in older individuals. <i>Neurobiol. Aging</i> 101, 247–255 (2021). 38. Schmidt, P. <i>et al.</i> An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. <i>Neuroimage</i> 59, 3774–3783 (2012). 	507	31.	Pedregosa, F. <i>et al.</i> Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. J. Mach. Learn. Res. 12,
 Rousseeuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. J. Comput. Appl. Math. 20, 53–65 (1987). Caliñski, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method For Cluster Analysis. Commun. Stat. 3, 1–27 (1974). Virtanen, P. et al. SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. Nat. Methods 17, 261–272 (2020). Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. in 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. et al. MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. J. Cereb. Blood Flow Metab. (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18818918 Kant, I. M. J. et al. Preoperative MRI brain phenotypes are related to postoperative delirium in older individuals. Neurobiol. Aging 101, 247–255 (2021). Schmidt, P. et al. An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. Neuroimage 59, 3774–3783 (2012). 	508	~ ~	2825–2830 (2012).
 cluster analysis. J. Comput. Appl. Math. 20, 53–65 (1987). 33. Caliñski, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method For Cluster Analysis. Commun. Stat. 3, 1–27 (1974). 34. Virtanen, P. et al. SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. Nat. Methods 17, 261–272 (2020). 35. Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. in 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 36. Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. et al. MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. J. Cereb. Blood Flow Metab. (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18818918 37. Kant, I. M. J. et al. Preoperative MRI brain phenotypes are related to postoperative delirium in older individuals. Neurobiol. Aging 101, 247–255 (2021). 38. Schmidt, P. et al. An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. Neuroimage 59, 3774–3783 (2012). 	509	32.	Rousseeuw, P. J. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of
 33. Caliński, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method For Cluster Analysis. Commun. Stat. 3, 1–27 (1974). 34. Virtanen, P. et al. SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. Nat. Methods 17, 261–272 (2020). 35. Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. in 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 36. Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. et al. MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. J. Cereb. Blood Flow Metab. (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18818918 37. Kant, I. M. J. et al. Preoperative MRI brain phenotypes are related to postoperative delirium in older individuals. Neurobiol. Aging 101, 247–255 (2021). 38. Schmidt, P. et al. An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. Neuroimage 59, 3774–3783 (2012). 	510		cluster analysis. J. Comput. Appl. Math. 20, 53–65 (1987).
 512 1–27 (1974). 513 34. Virtanen, P. <i>et al.</i> SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. <i>Nat. Methods</i> 17, 261–272 (2020). 515 35. Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. in 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 517 36. Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. <i>et al.</i> MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. <i>J. Cereb.</i> <i>Blood Flow Metab.</i> (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18818918 520 37. Kant, I. M. J. <i>et al.</i> Preoperative MRI brain phenotypes are related to postoperative delirium in older individuals. <i>Neurobiol. Aging</i> 101, 247–255 (2021). 522 38. Schmidt, P. <i>et al.</i> An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. <i>Neuroimage</i> 59, 3774–3783 (2012). 	511	33.	Caliñski, T. & Harabasz, J. A Dendrite Method For Cluster Analysis. Commun. Stat. 3,
 34. Virtanen, P. <i>et al.</i> SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. <i>Nat. Methods</i> 17, 261–272 (2020). 35. Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. in 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 36. Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. <i>et al.</i> MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. <i>J. Cereb.</i> <i>Blood Flow Metab.</i> (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18818918 37. Kant, I. M. J. <i>et al.</i> Preoperative MRI brain phenotypes are related to postoperative delirium in older individuals. <i>Neurobiol. Aging</i> 101, 247–255 (2021). 38. Schmidt, P. <i>et al.</i> An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. <i>Neuroimage</i> 59, 3774–3783 (2012). 	512		1–27 (1974).
 Python. <i>Nat. Methods</i> 17, 261–272 (2020). Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. in 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. <i>et al.</i> MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. <i>J. Cereb.</i> <i>Blood Flow Metab.</i> (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18818918 Kant, I. M. J. <i>et al.</i> Preoperative MRI brain phenotypes are related to postoperative delirium in older individuals. <i>Neurobiol. Aging</i> 101, 247–255 (2021). Schmidt, P. <i>et al.</i> An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. <i>Neuroimage</i> 59, 3774–3783 (2012). 	513	34.	Virtanen, P. et al. SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in
 515 35. Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with Python. in 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 517 36. Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. <i>et al.</i> MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. <i>J. Cereb.</i> <i>Blood Flow Metab.</i> (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18818918 520 37. Kant, I. M. J. <i>et al.</i> Preoperative MRI brain phenotypes are related to postoperative delirium in older individuals. <i>Neurobiol. Aging</i> 101, 247–255 (2021). 522 38. Schmidt, P. <i>et al.</i> An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. <i>Neuroimage</i> 59, 3774–3783 (2012). 	514		Python. <i>Nat. Methods</i> 17 , 261–272 (2020).
 516 Python. in 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011 517 36. Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. <i>et al.</i> MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and 518 mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. <i>J. Cereb.</i> 519 <i>Blood Flow Metab.</i> (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18818918 520 37. Kant, I. M. J. <i>et al.</i> Preoperative MRI brain phenotypes are related to postoperative 521 delirium in older individuals. <i>Neurobiol. Aging</i> 101, 247–255 (2021). 522 38. Schmidt, P. <i>et al.</i> An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter 523 lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. <i>Neuroimage</i> 59, 3774–3783 (2012). 	515	35.	Seabold, S. & Perktold, J. Statsmodels: Econometric and Statistical Modeling with
 517 36. Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. <i>et al.</i> MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. <i>J. Cereb.</i> <i>Blood Flow Metab.</i> (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18818918 520 37. Kant, I. M. J. <i>et al.</i> Preoperative MRI brain phenotypes are related to postoperative delirium in older individuals. <i>Neurobiol. Aging</i> 101, 247–255 (2021). 522 38. Schmidt, P. <i>et al.</i> An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. <i>Neuroimage</i> 59, 3774–3783 (2012). 	516		Python. in 92–96 (2010). doi:10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-011
 mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. J. Cereb. <i>Blood Flow Metab.</i> (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18818918 37. Kant, I. M. J. <i>et al.</i> Preoperative MRI brain phenotypes are related to postoperative delirium in older individuals. <i>Neurobiol. Aging</i> 101, 247–255 (2021). 38. Schmidt, P. <i>et al.</i> An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. <i>Neuroimage</i> 59, 3774–3783 (2012). 	517	36.	Jaarsma-Coes, M. G. et al. MRI phenotypes of the brain are related to future stroke and
 <i>Blood Flow Metab.</i> (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18818918 Kant, I. M. J. <i>et al.</i> Preoperative MRI brain phenotypes are related to postoperative delirium in older individuals. <i>Neurobiol. Aging</i> 101, 247–255 (2021). Schmidt, P. <i>et al.</i> An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. <i>Neuroimage</i> 59, 3774–3783 (2012). 	518		mortality in patients with manifest arterial disease: The SMART-MR study. J. Cereb.
 520 37. Kant, I. M. J. <i>et al.</i> Preoperative MRI brain phenotypes are related to postoperative delirium in older individuals. <i>Neurobiol. Aging</i> 101, 247–255 (2021). 522 38. Schmidt, P. <i>et al.</i> An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. <i>Neuroimage</i> 59, 3774–3783 (2012). 	519		Blood Flow Metab. (2018). doi:10.1177/0271678X18818918
 delirium in older individuals. <i>Neurobiol. Aging</i> 101, 247–255 (2021). 38. Schmidt, P. <i>et al.</i> An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. <i>Neuroimage</i> 59, 3774–3783 (2012). 	520	37.	Kant, I. M. J. et al. Preoperative MRI brain phenotypes are related to postoperative
52238.Schmidt, P. <i>et al.</i> An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter523lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. <i>Neuroimage</i> 59 , 3774–3783 (2012).	521		delirium in older individuals. Neurobiol. Aging 101, 247–255 (2021).
523 lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. <i>Neuroimage</i> 59 , 3774–3783 (2012).	522	38.	Schmidt, P. et al. An automated tool for detection of FLAIR-hyperintense white-matter
	523		lesions in Multiple Sclerosis. Neuroimage 59, 3774–3783 (2012).

524	39.	Pego-Reigosa, J. M. et al. Relationship between damage clustering and mortality in
525		systemic lupus erythematosus in early and late stages of the disease: Cluster analyses in
526		a large cohort from the Spanish Society of Rheumatology Lupus Registry. Rheumatol.
527		(United Kingdom) 55 , 1243–1250 (2016).
528	40.	Zollars, E. et al. Clinical application of a modular genomics technique in systemic
529		lupus erythematosus: Progress towards precision medicine. Int. J. Genomics 2016,
530		(2016).
531	41.	To, C. H. & Petri, M. Is antibody clustering predictive of clinical subsets and damage

- 532 in systemic lupus erythematosus? *Arthritis Rheum*. **52**, 4003–4010 (2005).
- 533 42. Nystedt, J. *et al.* Altered white matter microstructure in lupus patients: A diffusion
 534 tensor imaging study. *Arthritis Res. Ther.* 20, 1–11 (2018).
- 535 43. Costallat, B. L. *et al.* Brain diffusion tensor MRI in systematic lupus erythematosus: A systematic review. *Autoimmun. Rev.* 17, 36–43 (2018).
- 537 44. Jung, R. E. *et al.* White matter correlates of neuropsychological dysfunction in
 538 systemic Lupus Erythematosus. *PLoS One* 7, 1–6 (2012).
- 539 45. Lampe, L. *et al.* Lesion location matters: The relationships between white matter
 540 hyperintensities on cognition in the healthy elderly. *J. Cereb. Blood Flow Metab.* 39,
 541 36–43 (2017).
- 542 46. Niida, R. *et al.* Aberrant Anterior Thalamic Radiation Structure in Bipolar Disorder: A
 543 Diffusion Tensor Tractography Study. *Front. Psychiatry* 9, 522 (2018).
- 544 47. Calderón, J. *et al.* Impact of cognitive impairment, depression, disease activity, and
 545 disease damage on quality of life in women with systemic lupus erythematosus. *Scand.*546 *J. Rheumatol.* 46, 273–280 (2017).
- 54748.KA, C. *et al.* Mean diffusivity and fractional anisotropy as indicators of disease and548genetic liability to schizophrenia. J. Psychiatr. Res. 45, 980–988 (2011).
- 549 49. C, G. *et al.* Forceps minor damage and co-occurrence of depression and fatigue in multiple sclerosis. *Mult. Scler.* 20, 1633–1640 (2014).
- 50. M, D. *et al.* Strategic role of frontal white matter tracts in vascular cognitive
 impairment: a voxel-based lesion-symptom mapping study in CADASIL. *Brain* 134,
 2366–2375 (2011).
- 554 51. Magro-Checa, C. *et al.* Value of multidisciplinary reassessment in attribution of
 555 neuropsychiatric events to systemic lupus erythematosus: Prospective data from the
 556 Leiden NPSLE cohort. *Rheumatol. (United Kingdom)* 56, 1676–1683 (2017).
- 557 52. Postal, M., Lapa, A. T., Reis, F., Rittner, L. & Appenzeller, S. Magnetic resonance
 558 imaging in neuropsychiatric systemic lupus erythematosus: Current state of the art and
 559 novel approaches. *Lupus* 26, 517–521 (2017).
- 560 53. Ercan, E. *et al.* A multimodal MRI approach to identify and characterize 561 microstructural brain changes in neuropsychiatric systemic lupus erythematosus.
- 562 *NeuroImage Clin.* **8**, 337–344 (2015).
- 563 564

565 AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

TR: Software, Data curation, Formal analysis, Visualization, Roles/Writing – original draft. 566 567 FI: Data curation, Visualization, Formal analysis, Roles/Writing – original draft. JdB: 568 Roles/Writing - original draft, Validation. PM: Data curation, Software, Writing - review and 569 editing. AJ: Resources, Validation, Writing - review and editing. AB: Resources, Validation, 570 Writing - review and editing. MN: Conceptualization, Validation, Writing - review and 571 editing. LK: Conceptualization, Validation, Writing - review and editing. JL: Data curation, 572 Software, Writing – review and editing. GMSB: Resources, Validation, Writing – review and 573 editing. TWJH: Resources, Validation, Writing - review and editing. MAvB: Validation, 574 Writing – review and editing, **OS:** Conceptualization, Software, Writing – review and editing. 575 **IR:** Funding acquisition, Supervision, Project administration, Roles/Writing – original draft. 576 PCS: Funding acquisition, Supervision, Project administration, Roles/Writing – original draft. 577

578 DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

- 579 Under General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) restrictions, the MRI and other patient data 580 cannot be made publicly available. Each of the two sites involved in this study (Lund
- 581 University, Leiden University Medical Center) can share anonymized data with individual sites
- 582 following an appropriate data transfer agreement (DTA). Under such agreement, each site
- 583 (Lund, Leiden) will share only their own data with the signing site. Requests for DTA should
- be sent to Pia Sundgren (Lund University, <u>pia.sundgren@med.lu.se</u>) or Itamar Ronen (Leiden
- 585 University Medical Center, <u>i.ronen@lumc.nl</u>).
- 586 The code used for data preprocessing and cluster analysis can be found in the following GitHub 587 repository: <u>https://github.com/TheoRum/manuscript_WMH_SLE</u>
- 588

589 CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

- 590 The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or
- 591 financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.
- 592

593 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The study was supported by funding by Regional Research founds (RegSkane 625631), SUS Foundation and Donation funds (PCS), Alfred Österlund foundation (PCS), Swedish Rheumatism Association R-56371 (PCS), King Gustaf V's 80-year foundation (FAI-2017-0341 and FAI-2019-0559) (PCS).

- 598 The funding sources had no involvement in the study design, in the collection, analysis and
- interpretation of data, in the writing of the report and in the decision to submit the article for
- 600 publication.601

602 ETHICS STATEMENT

- 603 All patients included in this study signed informed consent and it was approved by the Leiden-604 The Hague-Delft, The Netherlands, ethics approval committee (registration number P07.177)
- and the Regional Ethical Review Board in Lund, Sweden (#2012/4, #2014/748).
- 606
- 607
- 608

609 **TABLE**

610

611 **Table 1. Demographic and clinical data across the two site cohorts.** Data are represented as 612 number (percentage) or median (10-90 percentile). Differences between Leiden and Lund 613 cohort are expressed in p-value and calculated for nominal variables with Chi-square tests (sex) 614 and for continuous variables, based on their not-normally distribution, with Mann-Whitney U 615 tests.

- NPSLE= neuropsychiatric systemic lupus erythematosus; SDI= systemic lupus international
 collaborating clinics damage index; SLEDAI-2K= systemic lupus erythematosus disease
 activity index 2000; ACR= American College of Rheumatology.
- 619

621

620 *= p value<0.05

	Leiden	Lund	Leiden vs Lund p-value
No. of subjects	152	69	
Non-NPSLE	115	27	
NPSLE	37	42	
FLAIR 3D	53 (34%)	0 (0%)	
sex female	138 (90%)	69 (100%)	0.021*
age	42 (25-58)	37.5 (24-47)	0.002*
disease duration (years) non-NPSLE NPSLE	6.6 (0.4-17.4) 2.5 (0.1-17.5)	9.5 (1.0-20.0) 10.0 (1.0-22.6)	0.087 0.001 *
age of disease onset non-NPSLE NPSLE	33.1 (18.6-52.8) 31.5 (20.3-51.1)	24.5 (15.5-37.0) 24.0 (15.0-37.8)	0.000* 0.006*
SDI score non-NPSLE NPSLE	0 (0-2) 1 (0-2)	0 (0-2) 0 (0-2)	0.044* 0.045*
SLEDAI2k score non-NPSLE NPSLE	4 (0-10) 6 (0-20)	2 (0-4) 2 (0-4)	0.006* 0.000*
ACR criteria non-NPSLE NPSLE	5 (3.4-7.0) 5 (4.0-6.4)	6 (4.6-8.0) 5 (4.0-7-0)	0.003 * 0.094
WMH volume in ml non-NPSLE NPSLE	0.102 (0.0-2.3) 0.353 (0.0-6.2)	0.018 (0.0-0.3) 0.057 (0.0-0.3)	0.031* 0.000*
WMH number non-NPSLE NPSLE	2 (0.0-12.8) 4 (0.0-16.8)	1 (0.0-6.0) 2 (0.0-6.8)	0.073 0.000 *

622

623

624 FIGURES625



626

Figure 1. Preprocessing workflow. Workflow of the fully automated approach. 3D-FLAIR 627 images are reoriented and co-registered to the T_1 -weighted (T_1 w) before WMH segmentation. 628 White matter hyperintensities (WMH) segmentation is performed with the Lesion 629 630 Segmentation Toolbox-Lesion Growth Algorithm (LST-LGA) using T1w and FLAIR images. 631 The volume and number of WMH are extracted from the WMH maps in T1-space. The WMH 632 probability maps are transformed to Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) space by applying the transformation from the T1w images. Those maps are masked by the Johns Hopkins 633 634 University (JHU) white matter (WM) probability atlas to obtain the tract specific WMH 635 volumes. To quantitatively assign WMH to specific WM tracts the probability values of 636 superimposed voxels on the lesion map and the WM tract are multiplied and the resulting product is summed over the entire tract. 637

- FLAIR= fluid-attenuated inversion recovery; FSL= FMRIB Software Library; FLIRT= Linear
 Image Registration Tool; BET= Brain Extraction Tool; ANTs= Advanced Normalization Tools
- 641



642

Figure 2. Cluster analysis on the entire SLE cohort. Heatmaps showing the 5 different MRI subtypes after the hierarchical clustering with the L2-normalization was performed. Subjects are shown on the x-axis and the Johns Hopkins University (JHU) white matter probability atlas tracts on the y-axis. The horizontal bars at the top show additional information: Leiden cohort (brown) complemented by the Lund cohort, 3D-FLAIR (pink) complemented by 2D-FLAIR, non-NPSLE (blue), NPSLE (red).

- 649 FLAIR= fluid-attenuated inversion recovery; NPSLE= neuropsychiatric systemic lupus
- erythematosus.
- 651
- 652



653

Figure 3. Lesion frequency map for each cluster in MNI-space. WMH in cluster 1 can be mainly assigned to Forceps Major, cluster 2 to right Anterior Thalamic Radiation, cluster 3 to Forceps Minor and 4 to the left Anterior Thalamic Radiation. Cluster 5 shows a high WMH burden and can be assigned to the right inferior fronto-occipital fasciculus. Clusters are shown as lesion probabilities from 0.0 to 0.5 (color scale on the right). The main WMH corresponding to specific WM tracts (copper color) are emphasized with red arrows.

- 660
- 661



662

Figure 4. Clustering performance evaluation. To determine the optimal number of clusters in the hierarchical cluster analysis a consensus of two different methods were used. The mean Silhouette Coefficient (on the left) is calculated over mean intra-cluster distance divided by the minimal inter-cluster distance to the nearest cluster. Positive values indicate a dense clustering whereas negative an incorrect clustering. The Calinski-Harabaz index (on the right) is the ratio of the sum of distances squared between and within the clusters. A high index indicated a dense and well separated cluster. Both methods indicate an optimal number of clusters of 5.

671



⁶⁷² subjects
⁶⁷³ Figure 5. Sensitivity analysis on NPSLE and non-NPSLE patients. Cluster analysis on
⁶⁷⁴ NPSLE patients (top) and on non-NPSLE patients (bottom). The horizontal bars at the top show
⁶⁷⁵ additional information: Leiden cohort (brown) complemented by the Lund cohort, 3D-FLAIR
⁶⁷⁶ (pink) complemented by 2D-FLAIR, non-NPSLE (blue), NPSLE (red).

677 FLAIR= fluid-attenuated inversion recovery; NPSLE= neuropsychiatric systemic lupus 678 erythematosus.

- 679
- 680





681

682 Figure 6. Sensitivity analysis on each cohort separately. Cluster analysis on Lund (top) and

683 Leiden cohort (bottom). The horizontal bars at the top show additional information: Leiden

684 cohort (brown) complemented by the Lund cohort, 3D-FLAIR (pink) complemented by 2D 685 FLAIR, non-NPSLE (blue), NPSLE (red).

686 FLAIR= fluid-attenuated inversion recovery; NPSLE= neuropsychiatric systemic lupus
 687 erythematosus

- 688
- 689



690

Figure 7. Sensitivity Analysis using GLM. Cluster analysis on the entire SLE cohort performed after L2 normalization and GLM model to correct for cohort, type of FLAIR, sex, age, disease duration. SDI-score, SLEDAI-2k-score and WMH total volume. The horizontal bars at the top show additional information: Leiden cohort (brown) complemented by the Lund cohort, 3D-FLAIR (pink) complemented by 2D-FLAIR, non-NPSLE (blue), NPSLE (red).

- 696 GLM= General linear model; FLAIR= fluid-attenuated inversion recovery; NPSLE= 697 neuropsychiatric systemic lupus erythematosus; SDI= systemic lupus international 698 collaborating clinics damage index; SLEDAI-2K = systemic lupus erythematosus disease 699 activity index 2000.
- 700