

AIC - Honolulu, July 10

# Development of a harmonized protocol for hippocampal tracing An EADC-ADNI joint effort

M Boccardi, R Ganzola, N Robitaille, S Duchesne, A Redolfi, M Bocchetta, G Bartzokis, R Camicioli, JG Csernansky, MJ de Leon, L deToledo-Morrell, RJ Killiany, S Lehéricy, J Pantel, JC Pruessner, H Soininen, C Watson, C Jack, GB Frisoni



## DISCLOSURES

Funded in part thanks to an unrestricted grant by Lilly and Wyeth

**Bartzokis** Research support – Janssen; Consultant -Lilly, Pfizer, Novartis; **Csernansky** Consultant Eli Lilly; **Duchesne** Research support - Agfa HealthCare Inc.; funding as a partner in the project; **Jack** Contract – Pfizer; consulting – Élan; **Lehericy** Consultant - EISAI, Janssen-Cilag

## **BACKGROUND** Hippocampal volume as a diagnostic marker



## BACKGROUND Hippocampal volume as an outcome measure in trials of disease modifiers

Drug	Study	Effect Segment. method		Ref	
Tramiprosate	Alphase	68% (100 mg) Not mentioned 120% (150 mg)		Gauthier et al., JNHA 2009	
Atorvastatin	ADCLT	"CHV* mm <sup>3</sup> -134±174 vs - 583±354 <i>p</i> > .05"	Manual protocol Insausti et al., 1998 AJNR; Machulda et al., 2001, Neuroimage	Sparks et .a,I CCJM,2008	
	LEADe	"significant at <i>p</i> <.05"	MIDAS (semiautomated)	Jones et al., Alz&Dem 2008 Feldman et al., Neurology 2010	
AN1792		"CHV* % 3.78±2.63 vs 2.86±3.19 p = 0.124"	Manual protocol Watson et al., 1992, Neurology	Fox N et al., Neurology, 2005	
Xaliproden	Sanofi- Aventis Trials	"significant atrophy" §	Not mentioned	From Vellas B et al. (Review), Lancet Neurol.,2008	
Donepezil		"CHV* % -6.14±3.49vs - 4.50±2.28 <i>p</i> = 0.07" ε4 carriers only	Manual protocol Jack et al., 1989;Radiology Jack et al., 2004; Neurology	Jack CR et al., Neurobiol. Aging, 2008	

\* CHV= Change in hippocampal volume; § referenced link not working

## BACKGROUND The effect of segmentation protocols on hippocampal volume

Ref.	Med border	Lat border	Inf border	Norm. hippo vol (cm <sup>3</sup> )	
				Left	Right
Watson et al.	Mesial edge of temporal lobe	Temp horn of lat ventr	Incl subicular complex & uncal cleft w/ border separating subicular complex from parahippo gyrus	4.903	5.264
Zipursky et al.	Regional outline at choroidal fissure	Not mentioned	The interface of hippocampal tissue and parahippocampal gyrus white matter	1.990	2.070

## BACKGROUND Hippocampal volume (manual segmentation) as gold standard for automated segmentation algorithms



Morey et al., NeuroImage 2009



# IMMEDIATE: To operationalize protocols differences in order to quantify their impact on: test-retest variability total hippo volume differences between AD and controls

FINAL: To feed quantitative info to a panel of experts to achieve a consensus for a harmonized protocol with a Delphi procedure

# **OPERATIONALIZATION** Selection of segmentation protocols

From the pool of (original) protocols identified by Geuze 2005 (n=14) and by Konrad 2009 (n=42), we selected 10 protocols based on:

- i) 3D T1 MRI with field strength greater than 1 Tesla
- ii) only and the whole (most) hippocampus
- iii) reliability measures on at least 10 subjects
- iv) slice thickness lower than 3 mm
- v) validated on AD/MCI samples, or most used in the AD literature
- + 2 further (particularly detailed) protocols

OPERATIONALIZATION Authors' check

# For each protocol: features extraction, tracing and author's certification



## **OPERATIONALIZATION** Extraction of similarities and differences

Harmonized language Reduction of redundancy Extraction of (harmonized) differences Definition of segmentation units and subunits



Protocols (first author)	Citations	Cit. AD & hippo* literature	Inclusion	Justification of exclusion/inclusion
Killiany, 1993	241	147	Yes	Satisfying inclusion criteria
Convit, 1997	189	108	Yes	Satisfying inclusion criteria
Soininen, 1994	194	81	Yes	Satisfying inclusion criteria
Watson., 1992	433	70	Yes	<i>The protocol is particularly detailed; among the most cited in the general literature, and the 4<sup>th</sup> most cited in the AD literature</i>
Lehericy, 1994	107	65	Yes	Satisfying inclusion criteria
deToledo-Morrell, 2004	77	44	Yes	Satisfying inclusion criteria
Pruessner, 2000	229	42	Yes	Satisfying inclusion criteria
Sheline, 1996	790	34	No	Author not available
Haller, 1997	125	32	Yes	Satisfying inclusion criteria
Bogerts, 1990	435	20	No	Amygdala included in the tracing
Bigler, 1997	134	20	No	Slice thickness 3 mm
Cook, 1992	337	14	No	Plexus choroideus included
Bremner, 1995	641	13	No	Only hippocampal body included; slice thickness 3mm.
Pantel, 2000	74	12	Yes	Satisfying inclusion criteria
Steffens, 2002	43	12	No	slice thickness 3 mm
Narr, 2004	78	12	No	Intrarater computed on 1 subject, interrater on 6 subjects
Jack, 1994	65	11	Yes	Satisfying inclusion criteria
Shenton, 1992	798	9	No	Amygdala included in the tracing
Bartzokis, 1993	77	7	Yes	Satisfying inclusion criteria
Mervaala, 2000)	166	6	No	slice thickness 3 mm
Honeycutt, 1998	30	6	No	Satisfying inclusion criteria
Barr, 1997	34	5	No	slice thickness 3.1 mm
Zipursky, 1994	162	5	No	excludes the most posterior region of body and tail; slice thickness 3mm
Giedd, 1996	211	4	No	Sample: Ages 4-18 Years
von Gunten, 2000	52	4	No	Satisfying inclusion criteria
Kates, 1997	131	4	No	Satisfying inclusion criteria
Ashtari, 1999	70	3	No	slice thickness 3.1 mm
Lloyd., 2004	38	3	No	Satisfying inclusion criteria
Hastings, 2004	82	3	No	Satisfying inclusion criteria
Neumeister, 2005	77	3	No	slice thickness 6 mm
MacMillan, 2003	47	3	No	Satisfying inclusion criteria
Malykhin, 2007	7	2	Yes	Particularly detailed

Plane of tracing								
Axis of hippocampus [B,C,J,L,S,dTM,W]	AC-PC line [H,K,M,Pa,Pr]							
Most posterior slice								
Where inferior and superior colliculi are jointly visualized [B]	Where crus/crura of fornix/ces is/are visible in full profile [C,dTM,J•,K,L,S,W]	Where gray matter is visible inferomedially to the trigone of the lateral ventricle [H,M•,Pa•,Pr]						
Superior border								
Lower border of alveus/fimbria [B,H,K,Pa,S]	Upper border of alveus/fimbria [C,dTM,J,L,M,Pr,W]							
Separation subiculum/enthorinal cortex								
vertical line from the CA to the WM of the parahippocampal gyrus [C]	Oblique line with same inclination of parahippocampal WM, connecting the inferior part of the subiculum to the quadrigeminal cistern [K,L,M¥,Pr,W]	Orizontal line from the highest medial point of the parahippocampal WM to the cistern [B,dTM,H,J¥]	Line outlining the contour of white matter of parahippocampal gyrus [Pa,S]					

# PROTOCOLS FEATURES EXTRACTION Plane of tracing

#### **Axis of hippocampus**

- B. Bartzokis et al 1998
- C. Convit et al 1997
- dTM. deToledo-Morrell et al 2004
- J. Jack 1994
- L. Lehéricy et al 1994
- S. Soininen et al 1994
- W. Watson et al 1992



#### AC-PC

- H. Haller-Csernansky et al 1997
- K. Killiany et al 1993
- M. Malykhin et al **2007**
- Pa. Pantel et al 2000
- Pr. Pruessner et al 2000



# Sagittal



Coronal











A. Level where the inferior (1) and superior (2) colliculi are jointly visualized [B]

B. Slice where the crus/crura of fornix/ces are visible in full profile (4,5) [C,dTM,J,K,L,S,W]

C. Slice where an ovoid mass of gray matter (6) appears inferomedially to the trigone of the lateral ventricle (posterior to anterior) [H, M, Pa, Pr]

# PROTOCOLS FEATURES EXTRACTION Upper border



# PROTOCOLS FEATURES EXTRACTION Medial border



Vertical line [C]





**Arbitrary lines** 



Horizontal line [B, dTM, H, J]

Morphological details

[Pa, S]



## **3D RENDERING & COMPUTATIONS**

Rendering by **Simon Duchesne** and **Nicolas Robitaille** Université Laval and Centre de Recherche Université Laval – Robert Giffard Québec City, Canada





# **MODELING & COMPUTATIONS**



# **Measurements in samples**

	Ctrl (n=8)	MCI (n=9)	AD (n=3)	P (K-W;	AD/MCI	P (M-W;
				Fisher's)	(n=12)	Fisher's)
Age	75 (4)	77 (6)	77 (5)	0.4	78 (6)	0.2
Sex (F)	2 (25%)	2 (22%)	2 (67%)	0.45	4 (33%)	1.0
Education	16 (1)	17 (2)	15 (2)	0.3	16 (2)	0.5
Scheltens	0.5 (0.5)	2.8 (0.8)	3.7 (0.6)	0.001	3 (1)	< 0.0005
Wahlund	1.4	1.7	2.3	0.2	1.8 (1)	0.2

## **Quantification of segmentation units features**

	Controls	% of	MCI/AD	% of	% diff	Р	Intra-
	(n=8)	total	(n=12)	total	MCI/AD-	(MCI/AD	rater
		hippo		hippo	СТ	VS	
						Controls)	
MinHB	1763 (283)	64 (5)	1188 (357)	64 (6)	-33%	0.004	0.993
Alveus/fimbria	227 (56)	8 (1)	147 (51)	8 (2)	-35%	0.009	0.872
Subiculum	240 (79)	9 (3)	224 (103)	12 (4)	-7%	0.6	
Oblique line	164 (43)	6 (2)	184 (87)	10 (4)	+12%	0.7	0.965
Morphology	256 (78)	10 (3)	233 (104)	13 (4)	-9%	0.3	0.980
Horizontal line	240 (79)	9 (3)	224 (103)	12 (4)	-7%	0.6	0.981
Tail	508 (151)	19 (6)	276 (125)	16 (7)	-46%	0.005	
Crus/crura	187 (106)	7 (4)	104 (37)	6 (2)	-44%	0.025	0.998
Most caudal	321 (77)	12 (2)	172 (104)	10 (6)	-46%	0.009	0.935
MaxHV	2739 (334)	100	1836 (613)	100	-33%	0.001	



- The operationalization of the protocols differences gave 4 segmentation units + subunits
- Heterogeneous contribution of units to total hippo volume and to differences between patients and controls
- Lowest reliability for alveus/fimbria and most caudal slices
- Available online material www.hippocampal-protocol.net/site/sops-project-outlines.html

### **TOWARDS A HARMONIZED PROTOCOL**

Maximum hippo = sum of all segmentation units in their most inclusive definition



#### HARMONIZED PROTOCOL = ?+?+?...



HARMONIZED PROTOCOL Validation & implementation

- Validation with neuropathological data
- **Comparison with currently used protocols**
- **Public tracings and probability maps**

Standard environment for tracing, learning, and certification