

# SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

Longitudinal alterations in brain microstructure surrounding subcortical ischemic stroke lesions detected by free-water imaging

## Methods

### Image Processing

The following description is based on a boilerplate generated by *QSI/Prep* and therefore facilitates standardized reporting and reproducibility.

#### *Anatomical data preprocessing*

We employed the longitudinal anatomical processing stream in order to ensure proper co-registration of individual time points for each participant. All T1w images were corrected for intensity non-uniformity (INU) using `N4BiasFieldCorrection`<sup>1</sup> (ANTs 2.3.1). For each subject, a T1w-reference map was computed after registration of all T1w images/time points (after INU-correction) using `mri_robust_template`<sup>2</sup> (FreeSurfer 6.0.1). The T1w-reference was then skull-stripped using `antsBrainExtraction.sh` (ANTs 2.3.1), using OASIS as target template. Brain surfaces were reconstructed using `recon-all`<sup>3</sup> (FreeSurfer 6.0.1), and the brain mask estimated previously was refined with a custom variation of the method to reconcile ANTs-derived and FreeSurfer-derived segmentations of the cortical gray-matter of *Mindboggle*<sup>4</sup>.

#### *Diffusion data preprocessing*

MP-PCA denoising as implemented in MRtrix3's `dwidenoise`<sup>5</sup> was applied with a 5-voxel window. After MP-PCA, Gibbs unringing was performed using MRtrix3's `mrdegibbs`<sup>6</sup>. Following unringing, B1 field inhomogeneity was corrected using `dwibiascorrect` from MRtrix3 with the N4 algorithm<sup>1</sup>.

*FSL*'s `eddy` (version 6.0.3:b862cdd5) was used for head motion correction and eddy current correction<sup>7</sup>. *Eddy* was configured with a *q*-space smoothing factor of 10,

a total of 5 iterations, and 1000 voxels used to estimate hyperparameters. A linear first level model and a linear second level model were used to characterize eddy current-related spatial distortion.  $q$ -space coordinates were forcefully assigned to shells. Field offset was attempted to be separated from subject movement. Shells were aligned post-eddy. Eddy's outlier replacement was run<sup>8</sup>. Data were grouped by slice, only including values from slices determined to contain at least 250 intracerebral voxels. Groups deviating by more than 4 standard deviations from the prediction had their data replaced with imputed values. Final interpolation was performed using the jac method.

A deformation field to correct for susceptibility distortions was estimated based on *fMRIPrep's*<sup>9</sup> fieldmap-less approach. The deformation field is that resulting from co-registering the b0 reference to the same-subject T1w-reference with its intensity inverted.<sup>10,11</sup> Registration is performed with antsRegistration (ANTs 2.3.1), and the process regularized by constraining deformation to be nonzero only along the phase-encoding direction, and modulated with an average fieldmap template<sup>12</sup>. Based on the estimated susceptibility distortion, an unwarped b=0 reference was calculated for a more accurate co-registration with the anatomical reference. The DWI time-series were resampled to ACPC, generating a preprocessed DWI run in ACPC T1w space with 2 mm isotropic voxels.

Many internal operations of *QSIprep* use *Nilearn* 0.8.0<sup>13</sup> and *Dipy*<sup>14</sup>. For more details of the pipeline, see <https://qsiprep.readthedocs.io/en/latest/workflows.html>).

## Results

**Table S1. Results of the linear mixed effects models investigating differences in free-water and FA<sub>T</sub> between lesion and tissue shells at four different time points**

	Free-water		FA <sub>T</sub>	
	Estimate (SE)	P	Estimate (SE)	P
<b>Days 3-5 (N = 26)</b>				
<b>Intercept</b>	0.006 (0.129)	.96	-0.043 (0.030)	.17
<b>Location</b>				
<b>Lesion</b>	0.309 (0.041)	<b>&lt;.001***</b>	-0.325 (0.011)	<b>&lt;.001***</b>
<b>2 mm</b>	0.163 (0.041)	<b>&lt;.001***</b>	-0.058 (0.011)	<b>&lt;.001***</b>
<b>4 mm</b>	0.028 (0.041)	.50	0.002 (0.011)	.88
<b>6 mm</b>	0.010 (0.042)	.82	0.007 (0.011)	.49
<b>8 mm</b>	0.007 (0.043)	.88	0.012 (0.011)	.28
<b>10 mm</b>	-0.022 (0.044)	.62	0.011 (0.011)	.33
<b>12 mm</b>	-0.024 (0.047)	.60	0.005 (0.012)	.66
<b>14 mm</b>	-0.018 (0.054)	.74	-0.004 (0.014)	.78
<b>Lesion volume</b>	0.001 (0.002)	.55	<-0.001 (<0.001)	.73
<b>Days since stroke</b>	0.029 (0.032)	.38	-0.002 (0.007)	.76
<b>1 month (N = 21)</b>				
<b>Intercept</b>	0.263 (0.157)	.11	-0.151 (0.030)	<b>&lt;.001***</b>
<b>Location</b>				
<b>Lesion</b>	1.041 (0.069)	<b>&lt;.001***</b>	-0.318 (0.012)	<b>&lt;.001***</b>
<b>2 mm</b>	0.148 (0.070)	<b>.04*</b>	-0.115 (0.012)	<b>&lt;.001***</b>
<b>4 mm</b>	-.021 (0.071)	.77	-0.029 (0.013)	<b>.02*</b>
<b>6 mm</b>	0.001 (0.072)	.99	-0.010 (0.013)	.45
<b>8 mm</b>	-0.024 (0.073)	.75	-0.002 (0.013)	.88
<b>10 mm</b>	-0.049 (0.076)	.52	-0.002 (0.013)	.87
<b>12 mm</b>	-0.027 (0.080)	.73	-0.004 (0.014)	.79
<b>14 mm</b>	-0.019 (0.093)	.84	-0.011 (0.016)	.49
<b>Lesion volume</b>	0.002 (0.004)	.59	-0.001 (0.001)	.20
<b>Days since stroke</b>	-0.002 (0.003)	.54	0.002 (0.001)	<b>.02*</b>

**Table S1. (continued)**

	Free-water		FA <sub>T</sub>	
	Estimate (SE)	P	Estimate (SE)	P
<b>3 months (N = 19)</b>				
<b>Intercept</b>	0.079 (0.311)	.80	-0.072 (0.056)	.22
<b>Location</b>				
<b>Lesion</b>	1.943 (0.132)	<b>&lt;.001***</b>	-0.208 (0.016)	<b>&lt;.001***</b>
<b>2 mm</b>	0.344 (0.133)	<b>.01*</b>	-0.119 (0.016)	<b>&lt;.001***</b>
<b>4 mm</b>	0.046 (0.135)	.73	-0.052 (0.016)	<b>.001**</b>
<b>6 mm</b>	0.069 (0.137)	.62	-0.031 (0.016)	0.05
<b>8 mm</b>	0.043 (0.139)	.76	-0.013 (0.017)	.42
<b>10 mm</b>	-0.018 (0.144)	.90	<-0.001 (0.017)	.99
<b>12 mm</b>	0.008 (0.153)	.96	0.005 (0.018)	.79
<b>14 mm</b>	-0.028 (0.176)	.88	0.003 (0.021)	.90
<b>Lesion volume</b>	-0.003 (0.010)	.76	-0.006 (0.002)	<b>.005**</b>
<b>Days since stroke</b>	0.003 (0.003)	.37	<0.001 (0.001)	.74
<b>12 months (N = 19)</b>				
<b>Intercept</b>	2.343 (1.720)	.19	-0.024 (0.195)	.90
<b>Location</b>				
<b>Lesion</b>	2.174 (0.133)	<b>&lt;.001***</b>	-0.143 (0.018)	<b>&lt;.001***</b>
<b>2 mm</b>	0.862 (0.134)	<b>&lt;.001***</b>	-0.090 (0.018)	<b>&lt;.001***</b>
<b>4 mm</b>	0.247 (0.136)	.7	-0.030 (0.018)	.11
<b>6 mm</b>	0.169 (0.137)	.22	-0.021 (0.018)	.25
<b>8 mm</b>	0.102 (0.140)	.47	-0.012 (0.019)	.51
<b>10 mm</b>	0.048 (0.145)	.74	-0.004 (0.019)	.83
<b>12 mm</b>	0.060 (0.154)	.70	0.006 (0.019)	.75
<b>14 mm</b>	0.039 (0.177)	.83	<0.001 (0.023)	>.99
<b>Lesion volume</b>	0.011 (0.013)	.41	-0.003 (0.001)	.06
<b>Days since stroke</b>	-0.005 (0.005)	.31	<0.001 (0.001)	.91

**Table S2. Spearman correlations of imaging parameters 3-5 days after stroke with clinical variables and change in lesion size 3 months after stroke**

Outcome variable	Free-water				FA <sub>T</sub>			
	Lesional		Perilesional		Lesional		Perilesional	
	<i>Rho</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Rho</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Rho</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Rho</i>	<i>P</i>
<b>Change in lesion size (N = 18)</b>	0.14	.59	<b>-0.51</b>	<b>.03*</b>	<b>-0.51</b>	<b>.03*</b>	-0.09	.71
<b>NIHSS (N = 18)</b>	-0.29	.24	0.18	.47	-0.15	.55	-0.08	.74
<b>Relative grip strength (N = 17)</b>	0.21	.42	-0.22	.40	-0.04	.89	-0.06	.82
<b>UEFM (N = 18)</b>	0.18	.47	0.05	.85	0.19	.46	-0.15	.56
<b>NHP (N = 13)</b>	0.45	.12	0.49	.09	0.02	.96	-0.22	.47

*Abbreviations:* FA<sub>T</sub> = fractional anisotropy of the tissue, NHP = Nine-Hole-Peg-Test, NIHSS = National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale, SD = standard deviation, UEFM = Fugl-Meyer assessment of the upper extremity

## References

1. Tustison NJ, Avants BB, Cook PA, Zheng Y, Egan A, Yushkevich PA, Gee JC. N4ITK: improved N3 bias correction. *IEEE Trans Med Imaging*. 2010;29:1310–1320.
2. Reuter M, Rosas HD, Fischl B. Highly accurate inverse consistent registration: A robust approach. *NeuroImage*. 2010;53:1181–1196.
3. Dale AM, Fischl B, Sereno MI. Cortical Surface-Based Analysis: I. Segmentation and Surface Reconstruction. *NeuroImage*. 1999;9:179–194.
4. Klein A, Ghosh SS, Bao FS, Giard J, Häme Y, Stavsky E, Lee N, Rossa B, Reuter M, Neto EC, et al. Mindboggling morphometry of human brains. *PLOS Computational Biology*. 2017;13:e1005350.
5. Veraart J, Novikov DS, Christiaens D, Ades-aron B, Sijbers J, Fieremans E. Denoising of diffusion MRI using random matrix theory. *NeuroImage*. 2016;142:394–406.
6. Kellner E, Dhital B, Kiselev VG, Reisert M. Gibbs-ringing artifact removal based on local subvoxel-shifts. *Magn Reson Med*. 2016;76:1574–1581.
7. Andersson JLR, Sotiropoulos SN. An integrated approach to correction for off-resonance effects and subject movement in diffusion MR imaging. *NeuroImage*. 2016;125:1063–1078.
8. Andersson JLR, Graham MS, Zsoldos E, Sotiropoulos SN. Incorporating outlier detection and replacement into a non-parametric framework for movement and distortion correction of diffusion MR images. *Neuroimage*. 2016;141:556–572.

9. Esteban O, Markiewicz CJ, Blair RW, Moodie CA, Isik AI, Erramuzpe A, Kent JD, Goncalves M, DuPre E, Snyder M, et al. fMRIPrep: a robust preprocessing pipeline for functional MRI. *Nat Methods*. 2019;16:111–116.
10. Wang S, Peterson DJ, Gatenby JC, Li W, Grabowski TJ, Madhyastha TM. Evaluation of Field Map and Nonlinear Registration Methods for Correction of Susceptibility Artifacts in Diffusion MRI. *Frontiers in Neuroinformatics* [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2022 May 16];11. Available from: <https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fninf.2017.00017>
11. Huntenburg JM. Evaluating nonlinear coregistration of BOLD EPI and T1w images [Internet]. 2014 [cited 2022 May 16]; Available from: [https://pure.mpg.de/pubman/faces/ViewItemOverviewPage.jsp?itemId=item\\_2327525](https://pure.mpg.de/pubman/faces/ViewItemOverviewPage.jsp?itemId=item_2327525)
12. Treiber JM, White NS, Steed TC, Bartsch H, Holland D, Farid N, McDonald CR, Carter BS, Dale AM, Chen CC. Characterization and Correction of Geometric Distortions in 814 Diffusion Weighted Images. *PLOS ONE*. 2016;11:e0152472.
13. Abraham A, Pedregosa F, Eickenberg M, Gervais P, Mueller A, Kossaifi J, Gramfort A, Thirion B, Varoquaux G. Machine learning for neuroimaging with scikit-learn. *Frontiers in Neuroinformatics* [Internet]. 2014 [cited 2022 Apr 19];8. Available from: <https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fninf.2014.00014>
14. Garyfallidis E, Brett M, Amirbekian B, Rokem A, Van Der Walt S, Descoteaux M, Nimmo-Smith I. Dipy, a library for the analysis of diffusion MRI data. *Frontiers in Neuroinformatics* [Internet]. 2014 [cited 2022 Apr 19];8. Available from: <https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fninf.2014.00008>