Diffusion Tensor Tractography Reveals Disrupted Topological Efficiency in White Matter Structural Networks in Multiple Sclerosis
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Little is currently known about the alterations in the topological organization of the white matter (WM) structural networks in patients with multiple sclerosis (MS). In the present study, we used diffusion tensor imaging and deterministic tractography to map the WM structural networks in 39 MS patients and 39 age- and gender-matched healthy controls. Graph theoretical methods were applied to investigate alterations in the network efficiency in these patients. The MS patients and the controls exhibited efficient small-world properties in their WM structural networks. However, the global and local network efficiencies were significantly decreased in the MS patients compared with the controls, with the most pronounced changes observed in the sensorimotor, visual, default-mode, and language areas. Furthermore, the decreased network efficiencies were significantly correlated with the expanded disability status scale scores, the disease durations, and the total WM lesion loads. Together, the results suggest a disrupted integrity in the large-scale brain systems in MS, thus providing new insights into the understanding of MS connectome. Our data also suggest that a topology-based brain network analysis can provide potential biomarkers for disease diagnosis and for monitoring the progression and treatment effects for patients with MS.
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Introduction

Multiple sclerosis (MS) is an inflammatory, demyelinating disease of the central nervous system that is usually accompanied by impairments in motor, sensory, visual, and cognitive functions. These dysfunctions arise from disrupted neuronal conduction due to white matter (WM) lesions (Rovaris, Gass, et al. 2005; Filippi and Rocca 2008). In the past decade, modern brain imaging techniques, ranging from structural magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) to functional MRI, have been extensively used to assess the regional changes in brain structures and functions in patients with MS (Barkhof et al. 1998; Dalton et al. 2004; Rovaris et al. 2006; Charil et al. 2007; Ceccarelli et al. 2008; Dineen et al. 2009).

Diffusion tensor imaging (DTI) is a powerful noninvasive imaging technique that can be used to investigate WM microstructures. When applied to the brain, this technique has the potential to map the WM integrity and the structural connectivity in vivo (Basser et al. 2000). In recent years, DTI has been increasingly applied to the brain WM studies in MS. For example, researchers have shown that MS patients exhibited reduced WM integrity in the whole brain (Cercignani et al. 2001; Yu et al. 2008) and specific tracts such as the corticospinal tract, the optic radiation, and the corpus callosum (Lin et al. 2007; Ceccarelli et al. 2009; Dineen et al. 2009; Roosendaal et al. 2009). These studies provide a potential mechanism of the structural disconnections in the brain of MS patients.

Despite these advances, very little is known about the alterations in the topological organization of the WM networks in MS patients. Recent studies have suggested that the human WM networks can be mapped using diffusion MRI tractography methods and can be further described using graph theoretical analysis (for reviews, see Bullmore and Sporns 2009; He and Evans 2010). In healthy populations, the WM networks have been mapped using deterministic (Hagmann et al. 2008; Gong, He, et al. 2009; Shu et al. 2009) or probabilistic tractography methods (Iturria-Medina et al. 2008; Gong, Rosa-Neto, et al. 2009; Zalesky and Fornito 2009). The resultant networks exhibit important topological properties such as small-worldness and highly connected hubs regions in the posterior medial cortical regions. These studies have accelerated our understandings of human connectome in health and disease (Sporns et al. 2005). To our knowledge, only one study has examined the topological alterations in the brain networks in patients with MS, which were obtained by calculating cross-correlations in the gray-matter thickness derived from structural MRI (He et al. 2009). Yet, no studies reported MS-related changes in the WM structural networks.

Here, we used DTI tractography and graph theoretical approaches to investigate the topological organization of the WM networks in patients with MS and healthy comparisons. Given widespread disconnections previously reported in MS, we hypothesized that 1) patients with MS would show a decreased topological efficiency in the WM networks and that 2) these decreases would correlate with the clinical characteristics of the disease such as the expanded disability status scale (EDSS) scores, disease durations, and total WM lesion loads (TWMLLs).

Materials and Methods

Participants

This study included 39 MS patients (27 females; mean age 37.1 ± 10.7 years) and 39 age- and gender-matched healthy controls (HCs) (27 females; mean age 34.4 ± 9.9 years). All the patients were diagnosed as clinically definite relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis (RMS) (Lublin and Reingold 1996; Polman et al. 2005). The HCs had normal findings on the neurological examination and had no history of neurological dysfunction. All the participants were assessed clinically by experienced neurologists, who were unaware of the MRI results. None of the patients had been treated with related medications (e.g.,
corticosteroids or immunosuppressants) within the 3 months preceding the MRI scan. Table 1 shows the main demographics and the clinical characteristics of all the participants. Written informed consent was obtained from each participant, and this study was approved by the institutional review board of Xuanwu Hospital.

Image Acquisition
All participants were scanned with a 1.5T MRI scanner (Sonata, Siemens Medical Systems). T2, T1, and DTI images were acquired using with the following sequences: 1) T2-weighted turbo spin echo imaging (repetition time [TR]/echo time [TE] = 5460/94 ms; number of excitation [NEX] = 3; echo train length = 11; matrix = 224 × 256; field of view [FOV] = 210 × 240 mm; slice = 30; slice thickness = 4 mm; orientation = axial), 2) T1-weighted spin echo imaging (TR/TE = 1900/4 ms; NEX = 1; matrix = 224 × 256; FOV = 220 × 250 mm; slices = 96; slice thickness = 1.7 mm; orientation = sagittal), and 3) spin echo single-shot echo planar imaging (TR/TE = 5000/100 ms; NEX = 10; matrix = 128 × 128; FOV = 240 × 240 mm; slices = 30; slice thickness = 4 mm; orientation = axial; 6 nonlinear diffusion weighting gradient directions with b = 1000 s/mm² and 1 additional image without diffusion weighting [i.e., b = 0 s/mm²]).

Measurement of Total WM Lesion Loads
The WM lesions of each patient were manually delineated on the T2-weighted images by an experienced radiologist, who was blind to the clinical details (Y.L.). The lesions were redelineated on 2 separate occasions (at least 3-months apart) in 10 of the patients, and the intrarater reliability was 94.3%. We then obtained a binary lesion mask of each patient after the removal of the head size effect by the normalization process. To account for the effect of head size, we performed the following steps using the SPM8 package. First, the individual T1-weighted images were coregistered to the T1 template in the Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) space using a nonlinear transformation. Next, the transformed T1 images were normalized to the ICBM152 T1 template in the MNI space using a nonlinear transformation. Last, the transformation information was applied to the lesion masks. This procedure yielded the relative TWMLL for each patient after the removal of the head size effect by the normalization process. To visualize the distribution of the WM lesions, we generated an average lesion map in which the value in a given voxel represented the proportion of the patients with a lesion (Fig. 1).

Network Construction
Nodes and edges are the 2 basic elements of a network. In this study, we defined all the network nodes and edges using the following procedures.

Network Node Definition
The procedure of defining the nodes has been previously described (Gong, He, et al. 2009; Gong, Rosa-Neto, et al. 2009; Shu et al. 2009) and was performed in the present study using the SPM8. Briefly, individual T2-weighted images were coregistered to the b0 images in the DTI space. The transformed T2 images were then nonlinearly transformed to the ICBM152 T1 template in the MNI space. The inverse transformations were used to warp the automated anatomical labeling atlas (Tzourio-Mazoyer et al. 2002) from the MNI space to the DTI native space. Of note, discrete labeling values were preserved by the use of a nearest-neighbor interpolation method. Using this procedure, we obtained 90 cortical and subcortical regions (45 for each hemisphere, see Table 2), each representing a node of the network (Fig. 2).

WM Tractography
To reconstruct the whole brain WM tracts, we performed the following steps. First, the eddy current distortions and the motion artifacts in the DTI data set were corrected by applying an affine alignment of the diffusion-weighted images to the b0 images using FMRIB’s Diffusion Toolbox (FSL, version 4.1; www.fmrib.ox.ac.uk/fsl). After this process, the diffusion tensors were estimated by solving the Stejskal and Tanner equation (Basser et al. 1994; Westin et al. 2002), and the reconstructed tensor matrix was diagonalized to obtain 3 eigen values (λ₁, λ₂, λ₃) and their corresponding eigenvectors. The fractional anisotropy (FA) of each voxel was also calculated. DTI tractography was carried out using DTIstudio (version 3.0) based on the “fiber assignment by continuous tracking” method (Mori et al. 1999). All the tracts in the data set were computed by seeding each voxel with an FA greater than 0.2. The tractography was terminated if it turned an angle greater than 45 degrees or reached a voxel with an FA less than 0.2 (Mori et al. 2002). As a result, all the fiber pathways in the brain were constructed using the deterministic tractography method.

Network Edge Definition
To define the network edges, we selected a threshold value for the fiber bundles. Two regions were considered structurally connected at least 3 fibers with 2 end points were located in these 2 regions (Shu et al. 2009). Such a threshold selection reduced the risk of false-positive connections due to noise or the limitations in the deterministic tractography and simultaneously ensured the size of the largest connected component (i.e., 90) in the networks was observed across all the controls (Shu et al. 2009). In the present study, we also evaluated the effects of different thresholds on the network analysis by setting threshold values of the number of fiber bundles that ranged from 1 to 5. We found that this thresholding procedure did not significantly influence our results (for details, see the Supplementary Materials).

After defining the network edges, both the weighted and unweighted network analyses were performed. For the weighted networks, we defined the fiber number (FN) and the mean FA values of the connected fibers between 2 regions as the weights of the network
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Table 2
Cortical and subcortical regions of interest defined in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1,2)</td>
<td>Precentral gyrus</td>
<td>PreCG</td>
<td>(47,48)</td>
<td>Lingual gyrus</td>
<td>LING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,4)</td>
<td>Superior frontal gyrus, dorsolateral</td>
<td>SFGdor</td>
<td>(49,50)</td>
<td>Superior occipital gyrus</td>
<td>SOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5,6)</td>
<td>Superior frontal gyrus, orbital part</td>
<td>ORBsup</td>
<td>(51,52)</td>
<td>Middle occipital gyrus</td>
<td>MOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7,8)</td>
<td>Middle frontal gyrus</td>
<td>MFG</td>
<td>(53,54)</td>
<td>Inferior occipital gyrus</td>
<td>IOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9,10)</td>
<td>Middle frontal gyrus, orbital part</td>
<td>ORBmid</td>
<td>(55,56)</td>
<td>Fusiform gyrus</td>
<td>FG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11,12)</td>
<td>Inferior frontal gyrus, opercular part</td>
<td>IFGop</td>
<td>(57,58)</td>
<td>Postcentral gyrus</td>
<td>PoCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13,14)</td>
<td>Inferior frontal gyrus, triangular part</td>
<td>IFGrang</td>
<td>(59,60)</td>
<td>Superior parietal gyrus</td>
<td>SPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15,16)</td>
<td>Inferior frontal gyrus, orbital part</td>
<td>ORBmed</td>
<td>(61,62)</td>
<td>Inferior parietal, but supramarginal and angular gyr</td>
<td>IRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17,18)</td>
<td>Rolandic operculum</td>
<td>ROL</td>
<td>(63,64)</td>
<td>Supramarginal gyrus</td>
<td>SMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19,20)</td>
<td>Supplementary motor area</td>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>(65,66)</td>
<td>Angular gyrus</td>
<td>ANG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21,22)</td>
<td>Occipital cortex</td>
<td>OLF</td>
<td>(67,68)</td>
<td>Precuneus</td>
<td>PCUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23,24)</td>
<td>Superior frontal gyrus, medial</td>
<td>SFGmed</td>
<td>(69,70)</td>
<td>Paracentral lobule</td>
<td>PCL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25,26)</td>
<td>Superior frontal gyrus, medial orbital</td>
<td>ORBsupmed</td>
<td>(71,72)</td>
<td>Caudate nucleus</td>
<td>CAU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27,28)</td>
<td>Gyrus rectus</td>
<td>REC</td>
<td>(73,74)</td>
<td>Lenticular nucleus, putamen</td>
<td>PUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29,30)</td>
<td>Insula</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>(75,76)</td>
<td>Lenticular nucleus, pallidum</td>
<td>PAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31,32)</td>
<td>Anterior cingulate and paracingulate gyri</td>
<td>ACB</td>
<td>(77,78)</td>
<td>Thalamus</td>
<td>THA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33,34)</td>
<td>Median cingulate and paracingulate gyri</td>
<td>DCS</td>
<td>(79,80)</td>
<td>Heschl gyrus</td>
<td>HES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(35,36)</td>
<td>Posterior cingulate gyrus</td>
<td>PCC</td>
<td>(81,82)</td>
<td>Superior temporal gyrus</td>
<td>STG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(37,38)</td>
<td>Hippocampus</td>
<td>HIP</td>
<td>(83,84)</td>
<td>Temporal pole: superior temporal gyrus</td>
<td>TPOsup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(39,40)</td>
<td>Parahippocampal gyrus</td>
<td>PHG</td>
<td>(85,86)</td>
<td>Middle temporal gyrus</td>
<td>MTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41,42)</td>
<td>Amygdala</td>
<td>AMYG</td>
<td>(87,88)</td>
<td>Temporal pole: middle temporal gyrus</td>
<td>TPOmid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(43,44)</td>
<td>Calcarine fissure and surrounding cortex</td>
<td>CAL</td>
<td>(89,90)</td>
<td>Inferior temporal gyrus</td>
<td>ITG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(45,46)</td>
<td>Cuneus</td>
<td>CUN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The regions are listed in terms of a prior template of an automated anatomical labeling-atlas (Tzourio-Mazoyer et al. 2002).

Network Strength
For a network (graph) G with N nodes and K edges, we calculated the strength of G as:

\[ S_p(G) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} S(i), \]

where \( S(i) \) is the sum of the edge weights \( w_{ij} \) (\( w_{ij} \) are the FN or FA values for the weighted networks and 1 for the binary networks) linking to node \( i \). The strength of a network is the average of the strengths across all the nodes in the network.

Small-World Efficiency
The small-world network parameters (the clustering coefficient and the shortest path length) were originally proposed by Watts and Strogatz (1998). In the present study, we employed a single network efficiency measure (Latora and Marchiori 2001) to quantify the small-world behavior of the WM structural networks. This efficiency metric deals with disconnected graphs and provides a clear physical meaning for the topological characterization of the networks. The global efficiency of G can be computed as (Latora and Marchiori 2001):

\[ E_{glob}(G) = \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{1}{L_{ij}}, \]

where \( L_{ij} \) is the shortest path length between node \( i \) and \( j \) in G. The path length between node \( i \) and node \( j \) is defined as the sum of the edge lengths along this path, where each edge’s length was obtained by computing the reciprocal of the edge weight, \( 1/w_{ij} \). The shortest path length \( L_{ij} \) between node \( i \) and \( j \) is the length of the path with the shortest length between the 2 nodes. The local efficiency of \( G \) is measured as (Latora and Marchiori 2001):

\[ E_{loc}(i) = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{1}{L_{ij}}. \]

The network efficiency \( E_{glob} \) is slightly less than and \( E_{loc} \) is much greater than the matched random networks. Here, random networks were generated using the random rewiring procedure, described by Maslov and Sneppen (2002), that preserves the degree distribution as real networks. In particular, we retained the weight of each edge during the rewiring procedure such that the weight distribution of the network was preserved. For comparison purposes, we generated 50 random networks. Typically, a small-world network should meet the following criteria: \( E_{loc}(G) - E_{loc}((\text{random})) > 1 \), \( E_{glob}(G) - E_{glob}((\text{random})) \approx 1 \).

Regional Nodal Characteristics
To determine the nodal (regional) characteristics of the WM networks, we computed the regional efficiency, \( E_{nodal}(i) \) (Achard and Bullmore 2007):

\[ E_{nodal}(i) = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{1}{L_{ij}}, \]

where \( L_{ij} \) is the shortest path length between node \( i \) and \( j \) in G. \( E_{nodal}(i) \) measures the average shortest path length between a given node \( i \) and all the other nodes in the network. The node \( i \) was considered a brain hub if \( E_{nodal}(i) \) was at least 1 standard deviation (SD) greater than the average nodal efficiency of the network (i.e., \( E_{nodal}(i) > \text{mean} + \text{SD} \)).

Statistical Analysis
To determine whether there were significant differences in the topological organization of the WM networks between the 2 groups, a multiple linear regression analysis was performed on each network metric (\( S_p, E_{glob}, E_{loc}, \text{and } E_{nodal} \)). Age and gender were entered as covariates of no interest in the models. To evaluate the clinical relevance analysis of the nodal properties, we only included the regions with significant between-group differences in their nodal efficiencies.

where \( G_i \) denotes the subgraph composed of the nearest neighbors of node \( i \). Practically, a network can be categorized as a small-world network if \( E_{glob} \) is slightly less than 1 and \( E_{loc} \) is much greater than the matched random networks. Here, random networks were generated using the random rewiring procedure, described by Maslov and Sneppen (2002), that preserves the degree distribution as real networks. In particular, we retained the weight of each edge during the rewiring procedure such that the weight distribution of the network was preserved. For comparison purposes, we generated 500 random networks. Typically, a small-world network should meet the following criteria: \( E_{loc}(G)/E_{loc}((\text{random})) > 1 \), \( E_{glob}(G)/E_{glob}((\text{random})) \approx 1 \).
To further explore whether there were specific correlations between topological changes of WM networks and behavior deficits, we selected a subset of patients (11/39 patients) mainly with visual dysfunction symptom. A multiple linear regression analysis was performed on each network metric (S_p, E_glo, E_loc, and E_nod) to reveal how topological efficiencies of WM networks in this subset of patients differed from those of the controls. Age and gender were entered as covariates of no interest in the models.

Reproducibility
To test the reproducibility of our findings, we used a split-half method. Briefly, we divided the HC group into 2 subgroups according to the distributions of age and gender: HC1: 19 participants, 13 females, age [mean ± SD] 34.1 ± 9.6 years; HC2: 20 participants, 14 females, age [mean ± SD] 34.8 ± 10.5 years. As such, we divided the MS group into 2 subgroups (MS1: 19 participants, 13 females, age [mean ± SD] 37 ± 10.4 years; MS2: 20 participants, 14 females, age [mean ± SD] 37.3 ± 11.3 years). There were no significant differences (all P > 0.1) in the age and the sex between any 2 groups. To determine whether there was a consistent topological organization in the population, we computed Pearson’s correlation coefficients for the nodal efficiency of the WM networks between HC1 and HC2 subgroups and between MS1 and MS2 subgroups. We also compared the topological parameters (S_p, E_glo, and E_loc) between each pair of subgroups using linear regression analyses. The age and gender effects were removed in these analyses.

Results
In the present study, we constructed 3 different kinds of networks for each participant, including FN-weighted, FA-
weighted, and binary networks (Fig. 2). Despite the different connectivity metrics of the networks, we observed compatible results for the group differences and the clinical correlations. In the present study, we focused mainly on the results that were obtained from the analyses of the FN-weighted networks (for the other results of the FA-weighted and binary networks, see the Supplementary Materials).

Small-World Efficiency of the WM Networks

Small-World Efficiency

Using graph theoretical analyses, we showed that the WM structural networks of both the HC and MS groups exhibited a much higher local efficiency and a similar global efficiency compared with the matched random networks [HC group:
\[ \frac{E_{\text{loc}}(G)}{E_{\text{loc}}(G_{\text{random}})} = 4.14, \frac{E_{\text{glob}}(G)}{E_{\text{glob}}(G_{\text{random}})} = 0.87; \text{MS group: } \frac{E_{\text{loc}}(G)}{E_{\text{loc}}(G_{\text{random}})} = 5.05, \frac{E_{\text{glob}}(G)}{E_{\text{glob}}(G_{\text{random}})} = 0.85 \] (Fig. 3). The results suggest that there are small-world characteristics of the WM structural networks in the HC and MS groups.

**Group Differences in Network Efficiency**

For each participant, we calculated the strength, global, and local efficiency of the WM networks. Compared with HCs, the MS patients exhibited significant decreases in the strength \( (t_{74} = -4.22, P = 7 \times 10^{-5}) \), global efficiency \( (t_{74} = -4.41, P = 3.5 \times 10^{-5}) \), and local efficiency \( (t_{74} = -3.80, P = 0.0003) \) of their WM structural networks (Fig. 3).

**Regional Efficiency of the WM Networks**

**Hub Regions**

In the HC group, we identified 14 hub nodes in the WM structural networks, including 8 association cortex regions, 4 primary cortex regions, 1 paralimbic cortex region, and 1 subcortical region (Fig. 4 and Supplementary Table S5). In the MS group, we identified 15 hub regions, including 8 association cortex regions, 4 primary cortex regions, and 3 subcortical regions (Fig. 4 and Supplementary Table S5). Of note, 13 of the hub regions were the same for both groups, including the bilateral precuneus (PCUN), bilateral precentral gyrus (PreCG), bilateral postcentral gyrus (PoCG), bilateral dorsolateral superior frontal gyrus (SFGdor), bilateral middle frontal gyrus (MFG), left medial superior frontal gyrus (SFGmed), left putamen (PUT), and left inferior parietal gyrus (IPL). One brain region, the right median cingulate and paracingulate gyrus (DCG), was identified as a hub in the HC group but not in the MS group. Two brain regions, the right PUT and the right thalamus (THA), were identified as hubs in the MS group but not in the HC group. The results suggest that the hubs that we identified for both groups were predominantly in the regions of the association cortices that receive convergent inputs from multiple cortical regions (Mesulam 1998). These results are consistent with those from previous studies (He et al. 2007; Hagmann et al. 2008; Iturria-Medina et al. 2008; Gong, He, et al. 2009).

**Group Differences in Regional Efficiency**

Compared with the controls, the MS patients exhibited a widespread reduction in the nodal efficiency in many brain regions \( P < 0.05, \text{false discovery rate (FDR)-corrected} \). These regions can be categorized into 4 different functional systems: 1) the sensorimotor system, including the bilateral PreCG, the right PoCG, and the left paracentral lobule (PCL); 2) the visual system, including the bilateral superior occipital gyrus (SOG), the right cuneus (CUN), and the left middle occipital gyrus (MOG); 3) the default-mode system, including the left posterior cingulate gyrus (PCG), the bilateral PCUN, the right anterior cingulate gyrus (ACG), the right DCG, and the right IPL; and 4) the executive control system, including the bilateral dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC), the bilateral anterior cingulate cortex (ACC), and the left middle frontal gyrus (MFG).
4) the language system, including the bilateral opercular parts of the inferior frontal gyrus (IFGoperc), the left rolandic operculum (ROL), the left triangular part of the inferior frontal gyrus (IFGtriang), and the bilateral MFG (Table 3 and Fig. 5).

For the subset of MS patients with visual deficits, we found that the patients showed reduced small-world network efficiency as compared with the controls ($E_{glob}$: $t_{55} = -2.57, P = 0.023$; $E_{loc}$: $t_{55} = -2.26, P = 0.023$). Moreover, the distribution of regions with reduced efficiency ($P < 0.05$, FDR-corrected) was similar with the results derived from the analysis in all patients. Notably, the region with most significantly reduced efficiency was located in the left SOG in the subset of patients (with visual dysfunction) (Supplementary Table S7).

### The Correlation between the Network Efficiency and Clinical Variables

Using multiple linear regression analyses, we found that in MS patients, the global and local efficiencies of the WM structural networks were significantly correlated with their EDSS scores ($E_{glob}$: $t_{55} = -2.57, P = 0.023$; $E_{loc}$: $t_{55} = -2.26, P = 0.023$), disease durations ($E_{glob}$: $t_{55} = -2.76, P = 0.0091$; $E_{loc}$: $t_{55} = -2.42, P = 0.021$), and TWMLL ($E_{glob}$: $t_{55} = -3.90, P = 0.00041$; $E_{loc}$: $t_{55} = -2.71, P = 0.010$) (Fig. 6).

Furthermore, we found that the nodal efficiencies of several brain regions had significant correlations with the EDSS scores (right CUN, bilateral PCUN, left PCL, left PCG, left ROL, left PreCG, right DCG, right MFG, and right SOG), disease durations (bilateral PCUN, left PCG, left ROL, right DCG, left IFGoperc, left IFGtriang, and bilateral MFG). These regions are listed in Table 3 and Fig. 5.

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systems</th>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>$T$ values of group differences (uncorrected $P$ values)</th>
<th>$T$ values of clinical correlations ($P$ values)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensorimotor</td>
<td>PCL.L</td>
<td>$-3.77$ ($0.0003$)</td>
<td>$-2.56$ ($0.015$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PreCG.R</td>
<td>$-3.74$ ($0.0004$)</td>
<td>$-2.68$ ($0.011$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PogRL</td>
<td>$-3.70$ ($0.0004$)</td>
<td>$-2.61$ ($0.013$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PreCG.L</td>
<td>$-3.62$ ($0.0005$)</td>
<td>$-2.34$ ($0.025$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>SOG.L</td>
<td>$-4.11$ ($0.0001$)</td>
<td>$-3.19$ ($0.003$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CUN.R</td>
<td>$-3.85$ ($0.0003$)</td>
<td>$-2.85$ ($0.013$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDG.R</td>
<td>$-3.46$ ($0.0009$)</td>
<td>$-2.61$ ($0.013$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOG.L</td>
<td>$-3.32$ ($0.0019$)</td>
<td>$-2.33$ ($0.002$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Default-mode</td>
<td>PCG.L</td>
<td>$-4.45$ ($0.00003$)</td>
<td>$-2.54$ ($0.016$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DCG.R</td>
<td>$-4.21$ ($0.0001$)</td>
<td>$-2.19$ ($0.036$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCUN.R</td>
<td>$-4.13$ ($0.0001$)</td>
<td>$-2.66$ ($0.011$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACG.R</td>
<td>$-3.64$ ($0.0005$)</td>
<td>$-2.58$ ($0.014$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCUN.L</td>
<td>$-3.57$ ($0.0006$)</td>
<td>$-3.12$ ($0.004$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>IFGoperc.R</td>
<td>$-4.54$ ($0.00002$)</td>
<td>$-2.52$ ($0.017$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROL.L</td>
<td>$-3.98$ ($0.0002$)</td>
<td>$-2.46$ ($0.019$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IFGoperc.L</td>
<td>$-3.77$ ($0.0003$)</td>
<td>$-2.28$ ($0.029$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IFGtriang.L</td>
<td>$-3.55$ ($0.0007$)</td>
<td>$-2.10$ ($0.043$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MFG.L</td>
<td>$-3.48$ ($0.0008$)</td>
<td>$-2.30$ ($0.002$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MFG.R</td>
<td>$-3.27$ ($0.0017$)</td>
<td>$-2.13$ ($0.004$)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The regions with significant group differences in the nodal efficiency at $P < 0.05$ (FDR-corrected) can be categorized into 4 functional systems, and they were listed in an ascending order by the $T$ values in each system. For these regions, the nodal efficiencies of several of the regions have significant correlations with the EDSS scores, disease durations, and TWMLL at $P < 0.05$ (uncorrected). $—$, nonsignificant at $P < 0.05$. 

**Figure 5.** The brain regions with a significantly reduced efficiency in patients with MS. These regions can be categorized into 4 functional systems: 1) the nodes in green are within the sensorimotor system, including the bilateral PreCG, right PCL, and left PCL; 2) the nodes in yellow are within the visual system, including the bilateral SOG, right CUN, and left MOG; 3) the nodes in red are within the default-mode system, including the left PCG, bilateral PCUN, right ACG, right DCG, and right IPL; and 4) the nodes in blue are within the language system, including the bilateral IFGoperc, left ROL, left IFGtriang, and bilateral MFG. All brain regions showed reduced regional efficiency at $P < 0.05$ (FDR-corrected). The node sizes indicate the significance of between-group differences in the regional efficiency. The network shown here was constructed by averaging the anatomical connection matrices of all HCs. The nodal regions are located according to their centroid stereotaxic coordinates. The edge widths represent the connection weights between nodes. For the abbreviations of nodes, see Table 2.
Reproducibility of Our Findings

As described above, we classified all the participants into 4 subgroups: 2 HC subgroups (HC1 and HC2) and 2 MS subgroups (MS1 and MS2). We then constructed the WM structural networks for each subgroup (Fig. 8). There were significant differences (all $P < 0.05$) in the global and local efficiencies when the HC and MS subgroups were compared (HC1 vs. MS1; HC1 vs. MS2; HC2 vs. MS1; HC2 vs. MS2) (Fig. 8 and Supplementary Table S6). However, we did not observe any significant differences in the global or local efficiencies between the 2 HC subgroups (HC1 vs. HC2, all $P > 0.1$) or between the 2 MS subgroups (MS1 vs. MS2, all $P > 0.1$) (Fig. 8 and Supplementary Table S6). A significant correlation was
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**Figure 6.** The correlations between the global network parameters and clinical variables in MS patients. (A) Plots showing the significant decreases of the global and local efficiencies of the network with EDSS scores. (B) Plots showing the significant decreases of the strength, global, and local efficiencies of the network with disease durations. (C) Plots showing the significant decreases of the strength, global, and local efficiencies of the network with TWMLL.
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**Figure 7.** The regions with significant correlations between the nodal efficiencies and clinical variables in MS patients. The regions were overlaid on the brain surface at the axial view. The node sizes indicate the significance of the correlations between the nodal efficiencies and clinical variables. (A) Nodes and their plots showing the decreases of the nodal efficiencies with EDSS scores. (B) Nodes and their plots showing the decreases of the nodal efficiencies with disease durations. (C) Nodes and their plots showing the decreases of the nodal efficiencies with TWMLL. For the abbreviations of nodes, see Table 2.
observed in the nodal efficiencies when the 2 HC subgroups were compared ($r = 0.978; P = 1.7 \times 10^{-61}$) and when the 2 MS subgroups were compared ($r = 0.966; P = 2.9 \times 10^{-53}$) (Fig. 8). These results suggest a high reproducibility of our findings.

**Discussion**

We investigated the WM networks of MS patients and HCs using DTI tractography and graph theoretical approaches. Both of groups exhibited efficient small-world properties in their WM networks. However, the topological efficiencies were significantly decreased in the patients compared with controls, with the most pronounced changes in the sensorimotor, visual, default-mode, and language areas. The decreases in the efficiency were significantly correlated with the EDSS scores, disease durations, and TWMLL. Together, our data show disrupted topological organizations of WM networks in patients with MS, which could be responsible for the functional disabilities in patients.

**Disrupted Small-World Efficiencies in the WM Networks in MS**

The human brain is a complex system with an optimal balance between local specialization and global integration. In this study, we identified the small-world properties of the WM networks in MS patients and controls, which were characterized by high global and local efficiencies. This finding is consistent with previous network studies based on different imaging techniques (for reviews, see Bullmore and Sporns 2009; He and Evans 2010).

Although there are small-world properties in the MS networks, the global and local efficiencies were significantly decreased compared with controls. The global efficiency reflects the information transfer between the remote cortical....
regions, and it is mainly associated with long-range connections. The local efficiency is predominantly related to the short-range connections between neighboring regions. Decreases in both global and local efficiencies reflect disrupted topological organizations of the WM networks in patients with MS, which could be due to impaired structural connections. Our results can be supported by many previous studies. Evidence from a quantitative postmortem study showed a significant reduction in axonal density and the total number of axons in MS patients (Evelandou et al. 2000). Many DTI studies provided direct evidence for disrupted structural integrity in various WM tracts in MS patients, such as the corticospinal tract, the optic radiation, and the corpus callosum (Lin et al. 2007; Bodini et al. 2009; Ceccarelli et al. 2009; Reich et al. 2009). Moreover, functional MRI studies have shown abnormal functional integrity in MS (Rocca et al. 2007, 2010; Passamonti et al. 2009). These studies provide rich evidence for the structural and functional disconnectivity in patients with MS. Here, our data further supports the notion of MS as a disconnection syndrome from a network perspective.

**Disrupted Nodal Efficiency in the WM Networks in MS**

We observed reduced nodal efficiency in the MS networks. The involved regions were categorized into 4 distinct systems: sensorimotor, visual, default-mode, and language systems.

**Sensorimotor System**

We observed reduced nodal efficiencies in several regions related to sensorimotor functions (PreCG, PoCG, and PCL). Functional imaging studies observed abnormal neuronal activity in these sensorimotor regions in MS patients (Lowe et al. 2002, 2008; Rocca et al. 2010). Morphological studies also reported decreases of gray-matter volumes in these regions (Sailer et al. 2003; Charil et al. 2007; Ceccarelli et al. 2008). Using DTI analysis, abnormal diffusivity was observed in the sensorimotor pathways (e.g., the corticospinal tracts) (Lin et al. 2007; Reich et al. 2008; Rocca et al. 2010). These findings suggest that structural and functional changes exist in the sensorimotor system in patients with MS, which provides support for our findings.

**Visual System**

Reduced nodal efficiencies were also found in several occipital regions (SOG, MOG, and CUN) that are important for visual processing. The results are supported by the fact that the WM lesions identified in the patients are mainly located in the visual pathways (Fig. 1). In fact, previous DTI studies have revealed abnormal diffusion changes in the optic radiation in MS patients (Kolappan et al. 2009; Roosendaal et al. 2009; Dasenbrock et al. 2010). Additionally, Reich et al. (2009) found that the diffusion measures of the optic radiation were correlated with retinal injury and visual disability in MS patients. Moreover, gray matter atrophy of the optic pathways (Sepulcre et al. 2009), magnetic transfer ratio changes in the optic nerve (Kolappan et al. 2009), and decreased functional activity in the primary visual cortex (Faro et al. 2002) have also been reported in MS. Thus, our results provide further evidence for the disruption of the visual system in patients with MS.

**Default-Mode System**

We observed a decreased nodal efficiency in the MS networks in several default-mode regions (ACG, DCG, PCG, PCUN, and IPL). These regions are core components of the default-mode (DMN) and have been implicated in the processing of episodic memory (Raichle et al. 2001; Greicius et al. 2003). Relating to MS, functional MRI studies revealed that a dysfunction of the DMN was associated with a reduced cognitive performance (Roosendaal et al. 2010; Schoonheim et al. 2010). Using a combined DTI and functional MRI technique, Rocca et al. (2010) showed that the functional changes in the DMN were correlated with structural changes in the cingulum (a major WM structure that links cingulate regions). Thus, our results are in agreement with these previous findings.

**Language System**

Reduced nodal efficiencies were observed in several frontal regions (IFGoperc, IFGtriang, MFG, and ROL) that are key components for language processing. The IFGoperc and IFGtriang, comprising Broca's area, especially in the left hemisphere, are known to be important for language production. The MFG is responsible for writing (Lubrano et al. 2004; Roux et al. 2009), and the ROL is involved in speech (Indefrey et al. 2001). Structural and functional changes in the prefrontal regions in MS patients have been reported in previous neuroimaging studies (Au Duong, Audoin, et al. 2005; Au Duong, Boulanouar, et al. 2005; Dineen et al. 2009; He et al. 2009; Rocca et al. 2010), but the exploration of language-specific regions has not received much attention. In this study, 8/39 MS patients exhibited language deficits (including verbal fluency and naming difficulty), which supports for our findings of the abnormalities in the language areas.

Interestingly, we found in the subset of patients mainly with visual dysfunction, the left SOG, one of regions for visual processing, showed most significantly reduced efficiency in the WM networks. However, when analyzing all the patients, the SOG was not the most affected region (Table 3). This additional analysis suggests that the topological changes of the WM networks could be associated with specific behavior deficits in the MS patients.

**Clinical Relevance of Network Alterations in MS**

We found that the global and local efficiencies of the WM networks were significantly correlated with the EDSS scores in MS patients. Using an region of interest-based analysis, Ciccarelli et al. (2001) reported a significant correlation between the EDSS scores and the FA values throughout the WM in MS patients. Here, we are the first to show the association between the motor disability and the structural organization in MS patients from a network perspective. Moreover, the disease durations were also correlated with the network efficiency, suggesting a longer duration of disease induced a more severe disruption in network topology. This finding is also supported by findings from previous DTI studies, which have shown a correlation between WM integrity and the disease duration in MS patients (Rovaris, Ballo, et al. 2005; Fink et al. 2010). We also observed that the network efficiencies were significantly correlated with the TWMLL in MS patients, suggesting that a disruption in network organization occurred as the lesion volume increased. The periventricular WM lesions cause damages to the myelin and axons connecting multiple cortical regions and further have an impact on the information transfer efficiency between distributed brain regions. This finding is consistent with our recent study using gray-matter transfer ratio changes in the optic radiation (Roosendaal et al. 2010). Using a combined DTI and functional MRI technique, Rocca et al. (2010) showed that the functional changes in the DMN were correlated with structural changes in the cingulum (a major WM structure that links cingulate regions). Thus, our results are in agreement with these previous findings.
thickness network analyses (He et al. 2009). Moreover, this result is also compatible with the findings from DTI studies in which lesion volumes are significantly correlated with the FA values in the WM in patients with MS (Ciccarelli et al. 2003; Giorgio et al. 2010; Vishwas et al. 2010). Importantly, the efficiencies of several brain regions, such as the PCUN, PCG, PreCG, and ROL, are significantly correlated with all the clinical variables (the EDSS scores, disease durations, and TWMLL), implying that these regions play a key role in the clinical symptoms in MS patients. Together, our data suggests that the network efficiency metrics provide potential biomarkers for disease diagnosis for monitoring the progression and treatment effects for patients with MS.

**Methodological Issues**

Several issues need to be addressed. First, the present study used a suboptimal DTI sequence with 6 diffusion-encoding gradient directions and nonisotropic voxel size. Using a split-half analysis, we found that the results showed a high reproducibility across subjects. It suggests that our findings are reliable, although some suboptimal scanning parameters were used here. Using similar scanning sequences, a recent study also reported a high reproducibility of the WM network properties (Gong, He, et al. 2009). Nonetheless, the analysis should be performed on the new data sets derived from optimal scanning parameters to further evaluate the reproducibility of our results. Second, we employed deterministic tractography to define the edges of the WM networks. This method has been used in previous DTI studies (Gong, He, et al. 2009; Shu et al. 2009). However, the tracking procedure always stops when it reaches regions with fiber crossings and low FA values because of the “fiber crossing” problem ( Mori and van Zijl 2002), which might result in a loss of existing fibers. Other studies have proposed the use of probabilistic tractography to define the network edges (Iturria-Medina et al. 2008; Gong, Rosa-Neto, et al. 2009), which could be helpful to address the issues. Third, we utilized DTI tractography to construct the WM networks. Brain networks can also be studied using structural and functional MRI data (Achard et al. 2006; He et al. 2007). The combination of these multimodal MRI techniques would yield a more comprehensive understanding of how structural disruptions in brain networks are associated with functional deficits in patients with MS. Forth, the distributions of the WM lesions were around the cerebral ventricle for all the patients, therefore we could not category the patients according to their lesion locations. Further studies would be important to explore whether and how topology alterations of WM networks are related to the spatial distribution of WM lesions in MS. Finally, it remains unclear whether the topological changes observed in RRMS can be generalized to other clinical phenotypes.

**Conclusions**

In the present study, we used diffusion tensor tractography and graph theoretical analyses to investigate MS-related changes in the topological efficiency in WM structural networks. We found that, compared with controls, patients with MS had a reduced network efficiency in their brain networks, with the most pronounced reduction observed in the sensorimotor, visual, default-mode, and language systems. Specifically, this reduction was correlated with the clinical characteristics of the patients. Thus, our results suggest a disrupted integrity in the large-scale brain systems in MS and provide structural insights into the MS connectome. Our data also suggest that a topology-based brain network analysis can provide potential biomarkers for disease diagnosis and the monitoring of the progression of the disease and the treatment effects for patients with MS.
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