

#### Introduction

 Functional Near-infrared spectroscopy (fNIRS) is a non-invasive functional brain imaging technique which uses light in the range of 690 to 1000 nm to measure the local changes in the cerebral concentrations of oxygenated hemoglobin and deoxygenated hemoglobin associated with brain activity [1].

 Studies which target localizing the brain regions related to a specific activity (i.e. "detection" studies), generally involve block-design experiments. The recorded signals across blocks under the same condition are then averaged, using the conventional arithmetic averaging technique, and the related activated areas are then identified. As there might be occasions during the experiment, in which the onset of hemodynamic responses are not time-locked across multiple blocks of the same type, (due to subject distraction for example), use of conventional arithmetic technique may result in not correctly identifying the activation regions (e.g. the averaged amplitude is decreased). The inaccuracy of arithmetical averaging is an essential problem and of great concern because it might lead to misunderstanding of the brain functionality.

 In this study, we introduce an averaging method based on dynamical time warping (DTW) algorithm [2] which helps to improve the accuracy of the averaged signal across multiple blocks, and hence, increases the detection power. The technique is applied to real experimental fNIRS data and results are compared with the conventional averaging technique.

### **fNIRS** Technique

a typical functional brain imaging experiment using NIRS technique, an array of detectors and low power NIR light sources are placed on the head. The light entering at a source position and exiting the head at a detector position samples a diffuse volume along this path. Due to the low optical absorption of biological tissue NIR wavelengths, NIR light can at penetrate deep enough to sample the outer 1.5–2 cm of the head through skin the outer skull and reach and approximately 5–10 mm of the brain tissue.

Changes in the concentrations of oxygenated and deoxygenated hemoglobin can be extracted using Modified Beer Lambert law:

 $ln\left(\frac{1}{I_{1\lambda_2}}\right)$ 



Fig. 2: Absorption spectra for Oxy and Deoxy Hemoglobin in the Near-Infrared range [3].

 $-(\epsilon_{HbO_2,\lambda_2}\Delta c_{HbO_2} + \epsilon_{HbR,\lambda_2}\Delta c_{HbR})DPF_{\lambda_2} \cdot x$ 

$$ln\left(\frac{I_{2,\lambda_{1}}}{I_{1,\lambda_{1}}}\right) = -\Delta\mu_{a,\lambda_{1}}DPF \cdot x = -(\epsilon_{HbO_{2},\lambda_{1}}\Delta C_{HbO_{2}} + \epsilon_{HbR,\lambda_{1}}\Delta C_{HbR})DPF_{2}$$

• X

# **Towards Improving the "Detection" Power** of Brain Imaging Experiments Using fNIRS\*

Li Zhu, Maria Peifer, and Laleh Najafizadeh

**Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Rutgers University** 



# **Results and Discussions**

The performance comparison of conventional and DTW averaging is evaluated according to within group sum of squares (WGSS) [2].  $\Xi$ The percentage improvement in WGSS is calculated from: % Improvement in  $WGSS = \frac{WGSS_{arithmetic avg} - WGSS_{DTW avg}}{WGSS} \times 100.$ 

	WGSS <sub>arithmetic</sub> avg	
Dataset	Mean of WGSS Improvement (%)	Variance of WGSS Improvem
$\Delta HbO_2$ 0-back	9.37	0.0026
$\Delta HbO_2$ 1-back	0.64	$3.5480 \times 10^{-9}$
$\Delta HbO_2$ 2-back	14.99	0.0041
$\Delta HbO_2$ 3-back	16.72	0.0055
$\Delta HbR$ 0-back	0.46	$1.5590  imes 10^{-9}$
$\Delta HbR$ 1-back	7.33	$7.4626 \times 10^{-4}$
∆ <i>HbR</i> 2-back	4.99	$2.2267 \times 10^{-4}$
$\Delta HbR$ 3-back	5.12	$4.7479  imes 10^{-4}$

**Table 1**: % WGSS improvement for 8 datasets from one subject.

 duration. **Discussions:** Block averaging of hemodynamic responses is an important step in activity detection studies. Conventional averaging techniques may fail to accurately identify the activation regions due to possible existing misalignment in the recorded hemodynamic response from each block. In this paper, we addressed this problem for fNIRS signals by using DTW averaging technique. The comparison was made for all four experimental conditions and for both  $\Delta HbO_2$  and  $\Delta HbR$  signals. An improvement of up to 16% in accuracy was obtained using the DTW method.

#### References

[1] Amyot, F. et al., "Normative database of judgment of complexity task with functional near infrared spectroscopy—Application for TBI." Neuroimage, 60, pp. 879-883, 2012. [2] F. Petitjean, et. al., "A global averaging method for dynamic time warping, with applications to clustering," Pattern Recognition, Vol. 44.3, pp. 678-693, 2011.

#### \*This study is partly supported by the "ECE Research Excellence Award" from the ECE Department, Rutgers University.

## Method

To illustrating the method, we demonstrate the way to average over three signals from one channel. We denote signal from block 1 as  $b_1$ , block 2 as  $b_2$  and block **3** as  $b_3$ , arithmethic averaged signal of  $b_1$ ,  $b_2$  and  $b_3$  as **c**, - Step 1: find arithmetic average c for  $b_i$  (i=1,2,3). **Step 2:** form distance matrices for the pair of c and  $b_i$  (*i=1,2,3*), respectively. **Step 3:** find the optimal warping path  $w_i$  (*i=1,2,3*). **Step 4:** align c,  $b_i$  from  $w_i$  (*i=1,2,3*), re-assign the value of each point in c as the arithmetic average of its associated points in  $b_i$  (*i=1,2,3*).



Fig. 7: The illustration of the distance matrices and signal alignment. (a) – (c) demonstrate the optimal warping path between c and  $b_i$  (*i=1,2,3*). The contour maps represent the distance landscape, brown color represents large distance and green color represents low distance. The blue lines represent the warping path. Alignment visualization for c and  $b_i$  are plotted in (d) – (f) respectively. The associated point-pairs are connected with segments.





Fig. 8: Performance comparison between DTW and arithmetic averaging over all subjects for  $\Delta HbO_2$  from Channel 8 and 3-back tasks. The shaded area represents the experimental block

In this area, DTW averaging is better than Arithmetical averging In this area, arithmetical averaging is better than DTW averging WGSS by DTW Averaging Fig. 9: WGSS by DTW averaging vs. arithmetical averaging, across all 5 subjects, 52 channels, and 4 experimental conditions.

[3] http://images.scholarpedia.org/w/images/2/2d/NIRS\_absorption\_spectra.png. [4] T. Giorgino, "Computing and visualizing dynamic time warping alignments in R: the dtw package," Journal of statistical Software, vol. 31, no. 7. pp. 1–24, 2009.



