SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

SUPPLEMENTARY METHODS AND MATERIALS

Neuroimaging

Structural MRI data preprocessing and analyses

Diffusion weighted imaging (DWI) scans were converted from the native DICOM to NIFTI format using the dcm2nii tool developed at the McCauseland Centre for Neuroimaging (http://www.mccauslandcenter.sc.edu/mricro/mricron/dcm2nii.html). Each image was visually checked gradient by gradient and slice by slice. One participant was excluded due to artefacts linked to head motion, and one participant was excluded due to difficulties characterising corpus callosum malformation. DWI data sets were preprocessed for tractography using MRtrix 3 (1). DWI data denoising, eddy current-induced distortion correction, motion correction and bias field correction were performed on the two different shells independently. In order to remove non-brain tissue components and background noise, b0 images for the two shells were extracted using Brain Extraction Tool (BET2) compiled in FSL (2). Images from the two shells were then coregistered using FreeSurfer and merged using FSL. An in-house global normalisation procedure of the two shell DWI data was performed (3). Tractography and connectome reconstruction were done using MRtrix 3 (1, 4, 5). The Tax algorithm was used for single-fibre voxel selection and response function estimation (6). The second order integration over fibre orientation distributions (iFOD2) algorithm was estimated using constrained spherical deconvolution with default parameters (4). Probabilistic tractograms of one million streamlines were generated over the entire brain, with subsequent filtering to 100 thousands streamlines using Spherical Deconvolution Informed Filtering of Tractograms (SIFT) to improve the accuracy of the reconstructed whole-brain connectome(7). For each participant, the structural connectome matrix was generated from the resulting tractography using the registered Brainnetome Atlas (8) . Two 246 \times 246 connectivity matrices were obtained using the following connectivity metrics: a) number of streamlines weighted for sum of the volumes of the connected regions; and b) average fractional anisotropy (FA), a quantitative measure of directionality of the diffusion. The two obtained symmetric matrices will be referred to as structural connectivity (SC). Based on the SC matrices created, the average connectivity value for all inter-hemispheric connections (left-right), as well as for all intra-hemispheric connections (right to right and left to left) were computed for each participant. In addition, a lobe-wise SC analysis was performed, by computing the connectivity (the same two metrics) for left and right frontal lobes to all intra-hemispheric lobes, and to all contralateral lobes. Lobe-wise SC was computed similarly for temporal, parietal and occipital lobes.

Functional MRI data preprocessing and analyses

Resting-state functional MRI (fMRI) data were converted from the native DICOM to NIFTI format using dcm2nii. In each participant, the first 5 (of the 196) volumes were discarded to ensure magnetisation equilibrium, and the remainder underwent spatial realignment and smoothing (5mm FWHM Gaussian kernel) using SPM12 (Wellcome Centre for Human Neuroimaging, University College London, UK, http://www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm/software/spm12). For resting-state fMRI data, the mean framewise displacement for each frame was computed to quantify the extent of head motion from volume to volume for each participant (9, 10). Following Power et al. recommendations (2012; 2014), we implemented volume censoring ('scrubbing') for motion correction using a framewise displacement of 0.5 mm threshold for exclusion. Participants with less than 125 frames remaining after scrubbing were excluded. Using this approach, three AgCC and one TDC participants were removed from further analyses. The following steps were performed on the scrubbed data of all remaining participants. We followed the preprocessing pipeline described by Preti and Van De Ville (2017). Voxelwise timecourses were first detrended (linear and quadratic trends). The 6 motion parameters, as well as the average white matter and cerebrospinal fluid signals obtained from standard white matter and ventricular masks mapped to the subjects' fMRI space and masked with individual segmentation maps, were regressed out using the DPARSF toolbox (11). The timecourses were then band-pass filtered in the range of [0.01 0.15 Hz] to enhance resting-state fluctuations. To restrict the analysis to voxels belonging to grey matter, the segmented grey matter T1 image obtained using SPM12 was resliced and coregistered to each individual's mean functional image, and used as a mask. The Brainnetome Atlas was also resliced and coregistered to each individual's T1 image coregistered to the mean functional image. Quality check of the coregistation of the Atlas to the individual's T1 image coregistered to the mean functional image were carefully done for cortical and subcortical regions. Region-averaged time series were extracted in each participant's individual space. We computed pairwise Pearson correlation coefficients between all pairs of the Brainnetome atlas regions to obtain a symmetric correlation matrix of 246 x 246 for each participant, referred to as functional connectivity (FC) for the remainder of this paper. Similarly to the SC measures, average FC values of all inter-hemispheric connections (leftright), and intra-hemispheric connections (right to right and left to left) were computed for each participant. In addition, lobe-wise FC was computed for left and right frontal lobes to all intrahemispheric lobes, as well as for left and right frontal lobes to all contralateral lobes. Lobewise FC was similarly computed for temporal, parietal and occipital lobes.

Neurobehavioural outcome measures

Associations with brain structural and functional connectivity and variation in neurobehavioural outcomes were examined using measures administered as part of the "Paediatric Agenesis of the Corpus Callsoum Project" assessing five neurobehavioural domains; general cognitive functioning, short-term and working memory, executive and attentional functions, learning and memory, as well as social functions. Three measures were not included because there was a large amount of missing data (i.e., Tower Test from the Delis-Kaplan Executive Function System, D-KEFS (12); California Verbal Learning Test – Children's Version, CVLT-C (13); Dot location subtest from the Children's Memory Scale, CMS (14)). A subset of 33 agestandardised neurobehavioural scores from clinical tests and parent-reported questionnaires were included in the Partial Least Squares Correlation analysis.

Statistical analyses

To evaluate associations between connectivity (i.e., intra- and inter-hemispheric SC and FC) and neurobehavioural measures, we used Partial Least Squares Correlation (PLSC) analyses. PLSC is a multivariate data-driven statistical technique that maximises the covariance between two matrices by deriving latent components, which are optimal linear combinations of the original matrices (15) and described in previous work (16, 17). The neurobehavioural (behaviour) and brain connectivity variables were first z-scored within each group (AgCC and TDC). The upper triangular part of the FC and SC matrices were vectorised, and both structural connectivity vectors (containing FA measures and number of streamlines) were stacked together. A covariance matrix (which is effectively a correlation matrix, since the data is zscored) was then computed between the neurobehavioural and brain connectivity matrices for each group. Singular value decomposition was then applied to this correlation matrix, resulting in components (CorrComps). Each CorrComp is composed of a set of neurobehavioural weights (different for each group) and brain connectivity weights (common to all participants), which indicate how strongly each neurobehavioural and brain connectivity variable contribute to the multivariate brain connectivity- neurobehavioural association. Therefore, each group has its own neurobehavioural pattern associated to a common brain connectivity pattern across both the AgCC and TDC groups. The significance of CorrComps was determined by permutation testing (1000 permutations). Stability of neurobehavioural and brain connectivity weights was estimated using bootstrapping (500 bootstrap samples with replacement). Bootstrap ratio z-scores for each neurobehavioural and brain connectivity variables were obtained by dividing each neurobehavioural and brain connectivity weight by its bootstrapestimated standard deviation, and a p-value was obtained for each bootstrap ratio z-score. The contribution of neurobehavioural and brain connectivity weights for a given CorrComp was considered robust at p<0.01 (i.e., absolute bootstrap ratio z-scores above 3.

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES AND FIGURES

Table S1. Neurobehavioural measures included in the Partial Least Square (PLS) analyses

Fig. S1. Whole brain SC showing number of streamlines and mean FA along streamlines connecting a) left intra-hemispheric regions; b) right intra-hemispheric regions; and c) inter-hemispheric region, in children with AgCC (in blue) and typically developing controls (TDC, in white). Black square shows the median for each group.

Table S2. Whole Brain SC in the AgCC (n=20) and the TDC (n=29) groups

Table S3. Whole Brain SC in children with complete and partial AgCC (complete n=13, partial n=7)

Table S4. Whole Brain SC in children with isolated AgCC (n=7) and complex AgCC (n=13)

	Isolated AgCC (median)	Complex AgCC (median)	Group comparison			
			W			
Number of streamlines						
Left to left intra-hemispheric connectivity	0.1856	0.2002	33	0.3507	-0.2086786	0.4595
Right to right intra-hemispheric connectivity	0.1838	0.2105	26	0.1348	-0.3343869	0.2592
Left to right inter-hemispheric connectivity	0.001080	0.001884	33	0.3507	-0.2086786	0.4595
FA						
Left to left intra-hemispheric connectivity	0.05377	0.04961	-53	0.588	-0.1211266	0.6125
Right to right intra-hemispheric connectivity	0.05504	0.05515	38	0.588	-0.1211266	0.6125
Left to right inter-hemispheric connectivity	0.000785	0.001128	38	0.588	-0.1211266	0.6125

Table S5. SC of the different cortical regions in the AgCC (n=20) and TDC groups (n=29)

Fig. S2. Whole brain FC within: a) right intra-hemispheric regions; b) left intra-hemispheric regions; and c) inter-hemispheric regions, in children with AgCC (in blue) and typically developing controls (TDC, in white). Black square shows the median for each group.

Functional Connectivity

Table S6. Whole Brain FC in the AgCC (n=16) and TDC (n=28) groups

Table S7. Whole Brain FC in the complete AgCC (n=10) and partial (n=6) groups

	Complete AgCC	Partial AgCC (median)	Group Comparison			
	(median)		W			
Left to left intra-hemispheric FC	0.3619	0.2909	39	0.3676	-0.2252293	0.4595
Right to right intra-hemispheric FC	0.3258	0.2402	39	0.3676	-0.2252293	0.4595
Left to right inter-hemispheric FC	0.3520	0.2289	-37	0.4923	-0.1716806	0.5511

Note: Group differences were examined using the Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks test. All p-values that survived false discovery rate (FDR) correction (q < 0.05) are indicated in bold.

	Isolated AgCC (median)	Complex AgCC	Group Comparison			
		(median)	W			
Left to left intra-hemispheric FC	0.3857	0.3193	38	0.4278	-0.198231	0.5093
Right to right intra-hemispheric FC	0.3651	0.2650	-40	0.3132	-0.2521394	0.4458
Left to right inter-hemispheric FC	0.3549	0.2679	-39	0.3676	-0.2252293	0.4595

Table S8. Whole Brain FC in the isolated (n=6) and complex (n=10) AgCC groups

Note: Group differences were examined using the Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks test. All p-values that survived false discovery rate (FDR) correction (q < 0.05) are indicated in bold.

	AgCC (median)	TD (median)			Group Comparison			
			W	p		q		
FRONTAL REGION								
Left to left intra-hemispheric FC	0.2999	0.4419	177	0.2598	-0.1698923	0.4043		
Right to right intra-hemispheric FC	0.25315	0.3926	208	0.7084	0.05638768	0.7278		
Left to right inter-hemispheric FC	0.3101	0.4002	176	0.2496	-0.1735829	0.4043		
Right to left inter-hemispheric FC	0.3009	0.38743	193	0.461	-0.1111264	0.5319		
PARIETAL REGION								
Left to left intra-hemispheric FC	0.35496	0.43660	192	0.4464	-0.1147857	0.5231		
Right to right intra-hemispheric FC	0.3015	0.41264	197	0.5221	0.09650343	0.5758		
Left to right inter-hemispheric FC	0.31822	0.4275	187	0.3773	-0.1331069	0.4639		
Right to left inter-hemispheric FC	0.3495	0.42228	198	0.538	0.09285106	0.5848		
TEMPORAL REGION								
Left to left intra-hemispheric FC	0.3626	0.4237	172	0.2115	-0.1883704	0.3777		
Right to right intra-hemispheric FC	0.3134	0.3729	183	0.3269	-0.1477962	0.4540		
Left to right inter-hemispheric FC	0.3136	0.3660	177	0.2598	-0.1698923	0.4043		
Right to left inter-hemispheric FC	0.2874	0.3703	178	0.2703	-0.166204	0.4043		
OCCIPITAL REGION								
Left to left intra-hemispheric FC	0.3609	0.41263	175	0.2396	-0.177276	0.4043		
Right to right intra-hemispheric FC	0.3468	0.3704	177	0.2598	-0.1698923	0.4043		
Left to right inter-hemispheric FC	0.34826	0.3679	178	0.2703	-0.166204	0.4043		
Right to left inter-hemispheric FC	0.3580	0.3792	163	0.1412	-0.221804	0.2648		

Table S9. FC of the different cortical regions in the AgCC (n=16) and the TDC (n=28) groups

Note: Group differences were examined using the Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks test. All p-values that survived false discovery rate (FDR) correction (q < 0.05) are indicated in bold.

Table S10. Group scores of AgCC (n=16) and TDC (n=28) on all neurobehavioural measures included in the PLS analysis. Median values and group comparisons are shown.

Table S11. PLS results for SC in the AgCC and TDC groups, corresponding to Figure 3. The table shows original neurobehavioural saliences (bootstrap estimate standard deviation) and bootstrap ratio Z-scores; as well as structural brain connectivity saliences (bootstrap estimate standard deviation) and bootstrap ratio Z-scores.

Table S12. PLS results for FC in the AgCC and TDC groups, corresponding to Figure 4. The table shows original neurobehavioural saliences (bootstrap estimate standard deviation) and bootstrap ratio Z-scores; as well as functional brain connectivity saliences (bootstrap estimate standard deviation) and bootstrap ratio Z-scores.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION REFERENCES

- 1. Tournier JD (2010) MRtrix package. (Brain Research Institute, Melbourne, Australia).
- 2. Smith SM (2002) Fast robust automated brain extraction. *Human brain mapping* 17(3):143-155.
- 3. Obertino S*, et al.* (2017) Exploiting Machine Learning Principles for Assessing the Fingerprinting Potential of Connectivity Features. in *Computational Diffusion MRI Workshop (CDMRI) of International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention (MICCAI)*, ed Springer C, pp 175-188.
- 4. Tournier JD*, et al.* (2008) Resolving crossing fibres using constrained spherical deconvolution: Validation using diffusion-weighted imaging phantom data. *Neuroimage* 42(2):617-625.
- 5. Tournier JD, Calamante F, & Connelly A (2007) Robust determination of the fibre orientation distribution in diffusion MRI: non-negativity constrained super-resolved spherical deconvolution. *NeuroImage* 35(4):1459-1472.
- 6. Tax CM, Jeurissen B, Vos SB, Viergever MA, & Leemans A (2014) Recursive calibration of the fiber response function for spherical deconvolution of diffusion MRI data. *NeuroImage* 86:67-80.
- 7. Smith RE, Tournier JD, Calamante F, & Connelly A (2013) SIFT: Spherical-deconvolution informed filtering of tractograms. *NeuroImage* 67:298-312.
- 8. Fan L*, et al.* (2016) The Human Brainnetome Atlas: A New Brain Atlas Based on Connectional Architecture. *Cerebral Cortex* 26(8):3508- 3526.
- 9. Power JD*, et al.* (2014) Methods to detect, characterize, and remove motion artifact in resting state fMRI. *NeuroImage* 84:320-341.
- 10. Power JD, Barnes KA, Snyder AZ, Schlaggar BL, & Petersen SE (2012) Spurious but systematic correlations in functional connectivity MRI networks arise from subject motion. *NeuroImage* 59(3):2142-2154.
- 11. Leonardi N*, et al.* (2013) Principal components of functional connectivity: a new approach to study dynamic brain connectivity during rest. *NeuroImage* 83:937-950.
- 12. Delis D, Kaplan E, & Kramer J (2001) *Delis-Kaplan Executive Function System (DKEFS)* (The Psychological Corporation, San Antonio, TX).
- 13. Delis DC, Kramer JH, Kaplan E, & Ober BA (1994) *The California verbal learning test-Children's version* (The Psychological Corporation, San Antonio, TX).
- 14. Cohen MJ (1997) *Examiner's manual: Children's Memory Scale* (Brace and Compagny, San Antonio: Harcourt).
- 15. McIntosh AR & Lobaugh NJ (2004) Partial least squares analysis of neuroimaging data: applications and advances. *NeuroImage* 23 Suppl 1:S250-263.
- 16. Kebets V*, et al.* (2019) Somatosensory-Motor Dysconnectivity Spans Multiple Transdiagnostic Dimensions of Psychopathology. *Biol Psychiat* 0(0).
- 17. Zoller D*, et al.* (2019) Large-Scale Brain Network Dynamics Provide a Measure of Psychosis and Anxiety in 22q11.2 Deletion Syndrome. *Biol Psychiat*.
- 18. Wechsler D (1999) *Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence (WASI)* (Psychological Corporation, San Antonio, TX).
- 19. Wechsler D (2003) *Manual for the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-IV* (Psychological Corporation, New York).
- 20. Manly T, Robertson I, Anderson V, & Nimmo-Smith I (1999) *Test of everyday attention for children* (Thames Valley Test Company, Cambridge, UK).
- 21. Greenham M, Spencer-Smith MM, Anderson PJ, Coleman L, & Anderson VA (2010) Social functioning in children with brain insult. *Front Hum Neurosci* 4:22.