

Fine Motor Skill Decline after Brain RT – A Multivariate Normal Tissue Complication Probability Study of a Prospective Trial

Multivariate NTCP Analysis of Motor Decline

46 Characters or Fewer Including Spaces

Michael Connor, MD^a

Mia Salans, MD, MAS^a

Roshan Karunamuni, PhD^a

Soumya Unnikrishnan, MD^a

Minh-Phuong Huynh-Le, MD, MAS^b

Michelle Tibbs, MD, MAS^a

Alexander Qian, MD^a

Anny Reyes, PhD^c

Alena Stasenko, PhD^c

Carrie McDonald, PhD^{a,c}

Vitali Moiseenko, PhD^a

Issam El-Naqa, PhD^d

Jona Hattangadi-Gluth, MD^a

^aDepartment of Radiation Medicine and Applied Sciences, University of California San Diego,
San Diego, CA, USA

^bRadiation Oncology, The Brooklyn Cancer Center, Brooklyn, NY, USA

^cDepartment of Psychiatry, University of California San Diego, San Diego, CA, USA

^dDepartment of Radiation Oncology, Moffitt Cancer Center and Research Institute, Tampa, FL,
USA

Corresponding Author:

Jona Hattangadi-Gluth

Department of Radiation Medicine and Applied Sciences

University of California, San Diego

9500 Gilman Dr. Mail Code 0861

La Jolla, CA 92093-0861

Phone: 858-822-6040

Email: jhattangadi@health.ucsd.edu

Twitter: @JHGLab

Author Responsible for Statistical Analysis Name & Email Address:

Michael Connor

Department of Radiation Medicine and Applied Sciences

University of California, San Diego

9500 Gilman Dr. Mail Code 0861

La Jolla, CA 92093-0861

m3connor@health.ucsd.edu

Conflict of Interest Statement for All Authors:

CRM reports research funding from GE Healthcare, unrelated to the current study. There are no other financial or other relationships that might lead to a perceived conflict of interest.

Meeting Presentations: Analyses from this study were previously presented as an oral presentation at the 2021 annual American Society of Radiation Oncology (ASTRO) meeting

Funding Statement:

This work was supported by the Radiological Society of North America (RSNA) (Research Resident Grant to MC), the National Institutes of Health (1TL1TR001443 to MS, MT; F31 NS111883-01 to AR; UL1TR001442 of CTSA funding in support of CTRI; and 1KL2TR001444, UL1TR000100, R01 CA238783-01 to JAH-G); National Cancer Institute and UC San Diego Moores Cancer Center (P30 CA02310029 to JAH-G); and American Cancer Society (RSG-15-229-01-CCE

to CRM). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of any of the funding agencies. Funding agencies had no direct role in designing, conducting, or reporting the study.

Data Availability Statement for this Work

Research data are stored in an institutional repository and will be shared upon request to the corresponding author

Acknowledgements

Special thanks to the patients who enrolled and participated in this study. Many thanks to nurses in radiation oncology, particularly Abby Pennington, RN and Mary Kay Gorman, RN, for their help with this study.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Abstract

Purpose

Brain radiotherapy can impair fine motor skills (FMS). FMS are essential for activities of daily living, enabling hand-eye coordination for manipulative movements. We developed normal tissue complication probability (NTCP) models for decline in FMS after fractionated brain RT.

Methods

On a prospective trial, 44 primary brain tumor patients received fractionated RT, underwent high-resolution volumetric MRI and diffusion tensor imaging, and comprehensive FMS assessments (Delis-Kaplan Executive Function System Trail Making Test Motor Speed [DKEFS-MS], and Grooved Pegboard Dominant/Non-Dominant Hands [PDH/PNDH]) at baseline and 6 months post-RT. Regions of interest subserving motor function (including cortex, superficial white matter, thalamus, basal ganglia, and white matter tracts) were autosegmented using validated methods and manually verified. Dosimetric and clinical variables were included in multivariate NTCP models, using automated bootstrapped logistic regression, least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (LASSO) logistic regression, and random forests with nested cross-validation.

Results

Half of patients showed decline on PNDH, 17 of 42 (40.4%) on PDH, and 11 of 44 (25%) on DKEFS-TM. Automated bootstrapped logistic regression selected a one-term model including maximum dose to dominant postcentral white matter. LASSO selected this term and steroid use. The top five variables in random forest were all dosimetric: mean and maximum dose to dominant corticospinal tract; maximum dose to dominant thalamus; mean dose to dominant caudate; maximum dose to dominant postcentral white matter. This technique performed best with AUC 0.69 (95% CI 0.68 – 0.70) on nested cross-validation.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Conclusion

We present the first NTCP models for FMS impairment after brain RT. Dose to several supratentorial motor-associated ROIs correlated with decline in dominant hand fine motor dexterity in primary brain tumor patients, outperforming clinical variables. These data can guide prospective fine motor-sparing strategies for brain RT.

Introduction

Intracranial radiotherapy (RT) is associated with neurocognitive decline, likely due to injury to eloquent neuroanatomic structures¹. As survival for brain tumor patients improves, the burden of treatment sequelae increases, with many of these patients exhibiting dysfunction that is progressive and disabling². Although affected neurocognitive domains such as learning, memory, processing speed, attention, and executive function often garner the most interest³, fine motor skills (FMS) can also be impaired, with randomized trials demonstrating decline in this domain after RT⁴⁻⁶.

FMS involve precise hand-eye coordination for manipulative movements and are essential for many activities of daily living, including handwriting, typing, eating, and using a phone. In addition, FMS are important for performance on other tests of cognitive function⁷. With increased focus on survivorship and quality of life, strategies to improve or preserve these outcomes may consider FMS as well as higher-order cognitive domains. Novel imaging and image processing techniques allow us to well demarcate eloquent brain regions quickly and reliably over time and understand how radiation dose-related damage may underlie functional impairments^{4,8-11}.

While neurocognitive decline is a common sequelae of RT for brain tumor patients, there is little in the way of predictive models to guide preservation strategies in radiotherapy patients. We previously reported seminal work on changes in FMS after brain RT, examining *in vivo* imaging biomarkers of white matter integrity and cortical atrophy in motor-associated regions of interest as predictors of longitudinal FMS decline⁴. This study established associations between radiation dose and loss of cortical and white matter integrity, as well as associations between imaging biomarkers of injury and functional FMS impairment. While we

1
2
3
4 successfully demonstrated the associations between RT dose and microstructural damage
5
6 within the motor cortex and superficial white matter, normal tissue complication probability
7
8 (NTCP) analyses would be needed for a more practical, clinical model directly exploring the
9
10 associations between RT dose and functional outcome. These are the very
11
12 dose/volume/structure parameters needed to design fine motor functional-sparing interventions.
13
14 Very few prior reports, mostly pertaining to the hippocampus¹², have described an NTCP dose
15
16 response model for a cognitive or functional outcome after brain RT, and QUANTEC
17
18 (Quantitative Analysis of Normal Tissue Effects in the Clinic) guidelines do not include cognitive
19
20 or motor outcomes. We sought to perform multivariate NTCP analyses to identify predictors of
21
22 FMS decline at 6-months post-RT in primary brain tumor patients undergoing fractionated partial
23
24 brain RT, using data from a prospective clinical trial. Our methodology uses advanced image
25
26 processing and a cognitive/fine motor neuroscience framework. Given the multiple regions
27
28 which subserve motor function, and the multiple clinical variables which can affect function, we
29
30 used multivariate model building techniques. We specifically analyzed baseline to 6-month
31
32 change in FMS as this approximates the shift from subacute to long-term, irreversible RT-
33
34 associated damage^{2,8}.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **Methods**

45 Study Overview

46
47
48
49 We enrolled 52 patients on a single-institution prospective longitudinal IRB-approved clinical trial
50
51
52
53 investigating comprehensive neurocognitive functioning in several domains, including FMS, in
54
55
56 patients receiving fractionated RT for primary brain tumors. Patients underwent high resolution
57
58
59 volumetric MRI and diffusion imaging, as well as comprehensive neurocognitive evaluation, at
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 baseline (pre-RT) and 3-, 6-, and 12 months after RT completion. All subjects provided written
5
6 informed consent. Inclusion criteria included: Karnofsky performance status [KPS] ≥ 70 ;
7
8 diagnosis of primary brain tumor; life expectancy of ≥ 1 year; ability to complete neurocognitive
9
10 assessments in English; and age ≥ 18 years. Patients who received prior radiation were
11
12 excluded. The current analysis includes 44 of these primary brain tumor patients with baseline
13
14 and 6-month FMS outcomes as well as baseline imaging with the specific MRI protocol detailed
15
16
17 below.

23 24 FMS Assessment

25
26
27
28
29 FMS was evaluated using two robust, validated objective measurements. All FMS assessments
30
31 were performed in-person, with direct observation and testing by a trained neuropsychologist.
32
33 Fine motor speed was evaluated with the Delis-Kaplan Executive Functioning System Trail
34
35 Making Test Motor Speed¹³ (DKEFS-MS) and fine motor coordination/dexterity was evaluated
36
37 with the Grooved Pegboard¹⁴ test. In the DKEFS-MS test, participants are instructed to connect
38
39 a series of circles joined by a dashed line as quickly as possible. Scores are defined by the time
40
41 taken to complete the test in seconds. The Grooved Pegboard requires patients to insert metal
42
43 pegs into slots in sequence as quickly as possible. The score is the time in seconds required to
44
45 complete the array with the dominant (PDH) and non-dominant (PNDH) hands, with a higher
46
47 score indicating worse performance.
48
49

50 51 52 53 Reliable Change Indices

54
55
56
57
58 Reliable change indices (RCI), quantifications of whether the change in FMS scores per test is
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 significant for individual patients, were calculated between baseline and 6-month scores using
5
6 the standardized neurocognitive scores (T-scores)¹⁵. To account for repeated testing, reliable
7
8 change indices were adjusted for practice effects (RCI-PEs) using DKEFS-MS T-scores,
9
10 corrected for age, sex, and education when appropriate, and raw PDH and PNDH scores. RCI-
11
12 PEs were calculated for each patient on each neurocognitive test measure between 0 and 6
13
14 months. RCI-PE calculation is based on the test-retest data of a reference group that has
15
16 completed the same assessment multiple times^{16,17}. A negative RCI-PE was scored as decline.
17
18
19
20
21

22 Imaging

23
24
25
26 The imaging acquisition of high-resolution volumetric and diffusion-weighted MRIs for this study
27
28 have been described in detail elsewhere^{18,19}. Briefly, imaging for all patients at each time point
29
30 were acquired on a 3.0T 750 GE system (GE Healthcare, Milwaukee, Wisconsin) equipped with
31
32 an 8-channel head coil. Sequences selected for the protocol included a 3D volumetric T1-
33
34 weighted inversion recovery spoiled gradient echo sequence (echo time [TE]/repetition time
35
36 [TR]=2.8/6.5 ms; inversion time [TI]=450 ms; flip angle=8 degrees; field of view [FOV]=24 cm), a
37
38 3D FLAIR sequence (TE/TR=125/6000 ms, TI=1868 ms, FOV=24cm, matrix=256x256, slice
39
40 thickness=1 mm), and a diffusion weighted imaging (DWI) sequence using a single-shot pulsed-
41
42 field gradient spin EPI sequence (TE/TR=96 ms/17 s; FOV=24 cm, matrix=128x128x48; in-
43
44 plane resolution 1.87x1.875; slice thickness=2.5 mm; 48 slices) with b=0, 500, 1500, and 4000
45
46 s/mm², with 1, 6, 6, and 15 unique gradient directions for each b-value respectively and one
47
48 average for each non-zero b-value. Two additional b=0 volumes were acquired with either
49
50 forward or reverse phase-encode polarity for use in nonlinear B₀ distortion correction²⁰.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 Image Analysis and Segmentation

59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Imaging data was preprocessed using in-house algorithms in MATLAB. T1- and T2-weighted
5
6 images were corrected for distortions attributed to gradient nonlinearities²¹ and imaging non-
7
8 uniformities arising from bias fields²². Diffusion-weighted data was corrected for spatial
9
10 distortions arising from eddy currents, and B0 field inhomogeneities using robust, well-validated
11
12 methods²⁰.
13
14

15
16
17 We specifically investigated brain regions which subserve FMS. As described previously⁴,
18
19 selected FMS regions of interest (ROIs) included the sensorimotor cortex and superficial white
20
21 matter (WM) (precentral, postcentral, and paracentral gyri), the corticospinal tracts, the
22
23 cerebellar cortex and WM, the thalamus, and the basal ganglia (caudate, putamen, and
24
25 pallidum) (Table S1). ROIs were classified as dominant or non-dominant side per subject based
26
27 on handedness. For example, in a right-handed patient, the left corticospinal tract was the
28
29 dominant one. Cortical, superficial WM, cerebellar, thalamic, and basal ganglia ROIs were
30
31 segmented using the automated FreeSurfer processing pipeline (version 5.3;
32
33 <http://surfer.nmr.harvard.edu>), available on the Neuroscience Gateway Portal²³. Superficial WM
34
35 is defined as the volume of WM up to 5 mm below the surface of cortical ROIs defined by
36
37 FreeSurfer's Desikan-Killiany atlas²⁴. The DWI-derived maps and high-resolution volumetric
38
39 MRI were co-registered and atlas-based tractography was used to segment the DWI into WM
40
41 tracts in order to evaluate the corticospinal tracts²⁵. A censoring mask was drawn manually,
42
43 slice by slice, on each image to exclude tissue affected by tumor, surgical cavity, or edema.
44
45 Voxels within the censoring mask were excluded from the final ROI to avoid confounding by
46
47 tumor and edema-related effects²⁶. Planning CT and RT dose maps were co-registered to the
48
49 baseline T1 and DWI volumes to estimate dose distributions for each of the ROIs¹⁹.
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 57 Candidate Variables 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65

1
2
3
4 The mean and maximum doses to all of the above ROIs (Table S1) were calculated and
5
6 included as potential variables. Volumetric dose variables (eg. V10Gy) were included in
7
8 univariate analyses, however they were excluded from multivariate model building due to the
9
10 small volume of most ROIs and high collinearity^{27,28}. Additionally, several clinical and
11
12 demographic variables were included, all binary or continuous: age (years), prescription dose
13
14 (Gy), receipt of adjuvant chemotherapy (yes/no), anti-epileptic drug use (yes/no), diagnosis
15
16 (glioma vs. other), ethnicity (Hispanic vs. non-Hispanic), handedness (L vs. R), Karnofsky
17
18 performance status, KPS (≥ 90 or ≤ 80), laterality (tumor on dominant or non-dominant side),
19
20 progression at 6 months (yes/no), race (white vs. other), radiation modality (photon vs. proton),
21
22 seizures (yes/no), sex (M/F), steroid use (yes/no), any surgery, and GTR (gross total resection)
23
24 at surgery.
25
26
27
28
29

30 31 Statistical Analyses

32
33 Statistical analysis was done using R²⁹ with packages including mlr³⁰, caret³¹, and glmnet³².
34
35

36 37 Univariate Analyses

38
39 Univariate analyses were performed using logistic regression, Spearman's rank correlation (Rs),
40
41 non-parametric tests (Wilcoxon rank test for continuous variables, Fisher's test for categorical
42
43 variables), and decision stumps. A decision stump is a one-level decision tree, with a single root
44
45 node connected immediately to the terminal nodes, and makes a decision based on a single
46
47 input feature.
48
49

50 51 Multivariate Analyses

52
53 Multivariate model building was performed using three commonly used methods in this space³³:
54
55 automated bootstrapped logistic regression with forward selection, LASSO, and random forests.
56
57 First, in order to minimize issues with collinearity, among variables highly correlated with each
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 other (Pearson's correlation coefficient larger than 0.85), those with the lower correlation with
5
6 the outcome were removed.
7
8
9

10 The automated logistic regression technique has been described previously, first introduced by
11 El Naqa and colleagues³⁴. Briefly, the modeling process is done in two steps. First, an optimal
12 model size (or number of variables included) is estimated by automating forward selection over
13 1000 bootstrapped samples. The average predictive performance on each out of bag sample for
14 each model order is calculated, and the peak performance of this statistic (e.g., Spearman rank
15 correlation) as a function of the number of variables in the model is used to select the optimal
16 model size. Second, models of this optimal order are fit across the held-out folds of a repeated
17 cross-validation (5-folds, 200 repeats), and the most-frequently selected variable set is chosen
18 for the final model.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 LASSO, or least absolute shrinkage and selection operator, is a regression technique with a
34 penalty parameter. Specifically, L1 regularization adds a penalty equal to the absolute value of
35 the coefficients, where λ is a tuning parameter controlling the amount of regularization.
36 LASSO therefore performs feature selection, encourages sparsity of model parameters, and is
37 well-suited for multicollinearity.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Random Forests are ensembles of many decision trees; the algorithm utilizes both bagging and
47 random subsets of features to create an uncorrelated "forest" of these trees, reducing
48 overfitting. The tunable hyperparameter was the number of variables considered as candidate
49 splitting variables at each split when building each tree, or $mtry$ in the randomForest R
50 package³⁵. Variables were ranked by mean decrease in the Gini index; the higher the value the
51 higher the importance of the variable in the model³³.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Nested cross validation with a 5-fold inner loop for tuning hyperparameters was done; the outer
5
6 loop also consisting of 5-folds with the held-out data used as a test set for unbiased
7
8 performance estimation²⁷. In each inner loop for the LASSO, an initial feature selection of the
9
10 top 4 variables by AUC using each feature separately for thresholded class prediction³⁶ was
11
12 also implemented to further reduce the feature space and tendency for overfitting, due to poor
13
14 performance noted without this. Outer cross-validation with random stratified reshuffling was
15
16 repeated 200 times. Final models were fit by applying optimal hyperparameters and training on
17
18 the full dataset.
19
20
21
22
23

24 Model performance, discrimination, and calibration were assessed by the area under the ROC
25
26 curve (AUC), balanced accuracy, Brier's score, Nagelke's R2, calibration slopes and intercepts,
27
28 and Hosmer-Lemeshow tests.
29
30
31
32
33

34 35 **Results**

36 37 Patient Characteristics and FMS Outcomes

38
39 Patient characteristics are shown in Table 1. In total, 44 primary brain tumor patients were
40
41 eligible for inclusion in this study with baseline and 6-month FMS outcomes and baseline
42
43 volumetric and diffusion imaging. Of these, all 44 completed baseline and six-month DKEFS-
44
45 TM tests, and 42 completed pegboard tests. The median age was 46.2 years, 57% were male,
46
47 and 89% were right-handed. The cohort was high-functioning with 93% having a KPS \geq 90.
48
49 Most patients (61%) had gliomas, and 13 (29.5%) had benign diagnoses. By RCI-PE, 21 of 42
50
51 patients (50%) experienced decline on the PNDH test at 6 months, 11 of 44 (25%) experienced
52
53 decline on the DKEFS-TM test, and 17 of 42 (40.4%) declined on the PDH.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Univariate Analyses

On univariate analysis for PDH outcome at 6 months, mean or maximum dose to most dominant supratentorial structures, as well as several of their volumetric dose variables (e.g., V30Gy, V40Gy) were correlated with decline (Table 2, Fig 1). Non-dominant structures showed no association. Using decision stumps and in-sample performance, D_{\max} to the precentral cortex, D_{mean} to the caudate, and D_{mean} to the thalamus were the most discriminative dosimetric variables (AUC 0.76-0.77), with cutoff doses of 24.3 Gy, 33.7 Gy, and 27.3 Gy, respectively. Among the clinical variables, laterality (presence of tumor on the dominant side) and steroid use were correlated with decline. There were no significant associations for decline on the non-dominant pegboard test (Table S1), and only increasing age was predictive for decline on the DKEFS-TM (Table S2). Dosimetric variables among dominant motor ROIs showed a high degree of correlation (Fig S1).

Multivariate Analyses

We proceeded with multivariate model building for decline on the PDH at 6 months. Automated bootstrapped logistic regression selected an optimal model order of 1, likely reflecting overfitting with higher order models due to our small sample size. The most frequently selected variable was maximum dose to the dominant postcentral white matter, with the next two most frequent being steroid use, and mean dose to the dominant caudate (Fig 2A). Model performance at nested cross-validation by the AUC as 0.61 (SD 0.005) (Fig 3). The final NTCP model is given by:

$$NTCP = (1 + e^{-S})^{-1}, \text{ where } S = -1.47 + (0.04 \times \text{dom_wm_postcentral_Dmax})$$

LASSO model performance at nested cross validation by AUC was 0.55 (SD 0.005), improved to 0.63 (SD 0.005) by the use of an initial feature selection step based on AUC (Fig 3). The

1
2
3
4 frequency of terms selected over the repeated, nested CVs are shown in Fig 2A. The final
5
6 LASSO NTCP model (without feature selection) is given by:

$$NTCP = (1 + e^{-S})^{-1}, \text{ where } S = -0.81 + (0.013 \times dom_wm_postcentral_Dmax) + \\ (0.31 \times steroid_use[0 = yes; 1 = no])$$

15 The final LASSO NTCP model (with feature selection) is given by:

$$NTCP = (1 + e^{-S})^{-1}, \text{ where } S \\ = -1.44 + (0.025 \times dom_wm_postcentral_Dmax) + (0.94 \times steroid_use[0 \\ = no; 1 = yes])$$

27 Graphical depictions of the logistic NTCP curves are shown in the supplement (Fig S3, S4).

31 The top five important variables in the Random Forest, as ranked by mean decrease in Gini
32 coefficient, were: mean dose to dominant corticospinal tract; maximum dose to the dominant
33 thalamus; mean dose to dominant corticospinal tract; mean dose to the dominant caudate, and
34 maximum dose to the dominant postcentral white matter (Fig 2B). All of these dosimetric
35 variables outperformed clinical variables. Model performance by AUC was 0.69 (95% CI 0.68 –
36 0.70) on nested cross-validation (Fig 3).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44
45
46 All models achieved good calibration by Hosmer-Lemeshow test (p=0.07-0.67). Additional
47 model characteristics are shown in Table 3.
48
49
50

51
52
53 Multivariate analysis was attempted for the other endpoints, though models performed poorly
54 via nested cross validation for predicting decline on the PNDH (AUC 0.31-0.49) and DKEFS-TM
55 (AUC 0.51-0.57) tests.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Discussion

There is a critical need to understand substructure-dose-function relationships in the brain, and to build practical and clinical models for cognitive and functional outcomes, thereby paving the way for more individualized precision brain RT. We present the first evidence-based NTCP modeling analyses of fine motor function decline after brain RT, and the only study, to our knowledge, of a neurocognitive/functional endpoint outside of hippocampal dose and cognition. There are published NTCP studies for the prediction of memory decline based on hippocampal dose³⁷⁻³⁹, however one of these failed an external validation attempt⁴⁰ and none use multivariate methods or take into account clinical variables. Given that the probability of a functional change in outcome is typically influenced by *both dosimetric and clinical factors*, we employed multivariate model building methods³⁴. We also employed a neuroanatomic and motor function framework and advanced image processing to analyze specific brain regions of interest which are associated with fine motor function. We found that dose to several supratentorial motor-associated ROIs correlated with decline on grooved pegboard dominant hand tests at 6 months post-RT in primary brain tumor patients undergoing partial fractionated brain RT. These findings implicate the anatomic-functional pathway of fine motor control: including cortex, superficial white matter, thalamus and basal ganglia, and the corticospinal tract. The results also reinforce neuroanatomic correlation; that dose to brain ROIs on the motor dominant side of the cerebral hemisphere matter most.

Although there is more focus on higher-order cognitive domains in the literature, impairment in fine motor skills has been consistently reported in clinical trials⁴⁻⁶. Chang et al found that 33-50% of patients undergoing SRS vs. SRS plus whole brain RT experienced significant decline on grooved pegboard tests of fine motor skills, the highest rates of decline outside of the Hopkins Verbal Learning Test (HVLN) in the study⁶. Brown et al, in reporting the results

1
2
3
4 of Alliance N0574, found similar rates of decline on grooved pegboard tests in patients with 1-3
5
6 metastases randomized to SRS with or without whole brain RT, with 29.3-47.7% of patients
7
8 declining on grooved pegboard tests⁵. Moreover, fine motor skills are critical for performance on
9
10 other common neurocognitive instruments used in clinical trials, including tests of processing
11
12 speed and those that require a writing/drawing component . Some investigators have even used
13
14 fine motor skill tests as a “measure of higher-level cognitive processes which influence motor
15
16 and nonmotor skills alike”^{41–43}.
17
18
19
20
21

22 We previously found that increasing age and use of anti-epileptic medications predicted higher
23
24 rates of fine motor skill decline among primary brain tumor patients undergoing fractionated RT⁴.
25
26 We also found imaging biomarkers for FMS decline, showing that diffusion imaging measures of
27
28 white matter microstructure injury in the cerebellar white matter and corticospinal tract were
29
30 predictive of decline, as was volumetric atrophy of the precentral and cerebellar cortices,
31
32 pallidum, and pons⁴. Likewise, in traumatic brain injury, atrophy of the thalamus, putamen, and
33
34 pallidum have been correlated significantly with decline in FMS⁴⁴. Here, we report the results of
35
36 NTCP modeling to directly predict fine motor skill decline from planned/delivered doses and
37
38 clinical variables.
39
40
41
42
43

44 Univariate methods showed that mean or max dose to all supratentorial motor ROIs in our study
45
46 were associated with FMS decline, with a high degree of correlation among variables.
47

48 Multivariate approaches yielded very parsimonious models likely due to our modest sample
49
50 size. Multivariate logistic regression techniques (automated bootstrapped logistic regression and
51
52 LASSO) selected maximum dose to the dominant postcentral white matter and steroid use as
53
54 the top two features for inclusion in the models. The top five most important predictors in the
55
56 Random Forest (Fig 2B) were all dosimetric variables relating to dominant-sided supratentorial
57
58 motor ROIs, all of which *outperformed clinical variables*. These results reinforce the importance
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 of dose to motor-associated functional brain areas, with careful attention to lateralization of brain
5
6 function affecting the dominant hand.
7
8
9

10 One may expect that dose to the precentral, or primary motor, cortex would be most important
11
12 in a model predicting fine motor skill decline, and indeed these variables were ranked as highly
13
14 important in the random forest. Dose variables for the precentral cortex were also significant on
15
16 univariate analysis (Table 2). Additionally, D_{\max} to the precentral cortex was highly predictive as
17
18 a decision stump. However, our logistic models selected maximum dose to the postcentral white
19
20 matter and random forest showed high importance of this region. As an illustrative example, the
21
22 logistic model predicts increased risk of decline on PDH of 5%, 10%, and 20% over baseline
23
24 with doses of 6.9 Gy, 13.1 Gy, and 25 Gy, respectively, to the postcentral white matter (Fig. S3)
25
26 This could represent a nuance of our dataset, as dose to this postcentral area is highly collinear
27
28 with doses to the precentral cortex given they are neuroanatomically adjacent. However, some
29
30 studies have demonstrated the importance of injury to the somatosensory cortex to motor
31
32 function and recovery^{45,46}. Mean dose to caudate on the dominant side, and max dose to
33
34 thalamus were consistently important dosimetric predictors in our study. These findings are
35
36 consistent with previous studies of the basal ganglia and thalamus as critical structures in
37
38 radiosurgery applications. These two areas ranked behind only the pons/midbrain as high-risk
39
40 regions in a clinical study to predict permanent symptomatic post-SRS injury in AVM patients⁴⁷.
41
42 Finally, mean and maximum dose to the dominant corticospinal tract was an important predictor
43
44 of FMS decline in the dominant hand in our study. This key white matter tract represents a
45
46 possible (organ at risk) OAR for sparing.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 Indeed, there is limited precedent in the literature for implemented motor-associated OARs into
57
58 treatment planning. Maruyama et al found that a maximum dose of 23 Gy to the corticospinal
59
60 tract resulted in a 5% complication rate⁴⁸. Koga et al found that limiting the corticospinal tract to
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 20 Gy during single fraction radiosurgery for AVMs reduced motor complications without
5
6 decreasing the obliteration rate⁴⁹. We are currently testing motor-associated OAR avoidance,
7
8 along with avoidance of other eloquent white matter tracts, during SRS on a prospective clinical
9
10 trial in patients with brain metastases⁵⁰. However, in many instances involving brain tumors, a
11
12 certain amount of dose to nearby structures is unavoidable. NTCP models may therefore also
13
14 be used in the future to identify patients at high risk of toxicity, in whom preventative or
15
16 rehabilitative strategies may be undertaken. The rehabilitation of motor skills has been found to
17
18 result in persistent gray matter changes over the short term, suggesting this may counteract the
19
20 atrophy noted in RT and other studies⁵¹. The restoration of motor skill after injury may involve
21
22 enhanced activation of contralateral cortex as well⁵².
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 In terms of clinical variables, patient age emerged as the most important demographic/clinical
30
31 variable. Other studies have confirmed the finding that increasing age may compromise
32
33 performance on the grooved pegboard test^{4,53,54}, as fine motor dexterity declines with normal
34
35 and pathological aging. Steroid use emerged as a predictive factor in several of our models for
36
37 FMS decline. This may be a surrogate marker for tumor volume, edema, mass effect, and/or
38
39 overall functioning. Prolonged steroid use may also cause myopathy in some patients, though
40
41 this is usually associated with large muscle groups and not fine motor control. Use of anti-
42
43 epileptic medications has also been associated with decline in FMS⁵⁵, however, this was not a
44
45 particularly important variable in our analyses.
46
47
48
49
50

51 Our study does have potential limitations. Performance on nested cross-validation was
52
53 considerably lower than the final models fit to all data, suggesting an unavoidable degree of
54
55 optimism or overfitting given our modest sample size. Nevertheless, our best models attained
56
57 acceptable discrimination ability (Random Forest, AUC 0.69) on validation, and the models were
58
59 well-calibrated. The inclusion of several ROIs and several dosimetric quantities with high
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 collinearity necessitates variable selection for parsimonious, interpretable models with optimal
5
6 bias-variance trade-off. Motor ROIs were segmented using robust methods for parcellation of
7
8 white matter tracts and cortical and subcortical structures; these methods are well-validated^{4,8-11}
9
10 in the neuroimaging literature, including in brain tumor patients. To minimize any confounding
11
12 by tumor, segmentations for each patient were inspected slice by slice, manually censoring
13
14 tumor, surgical cavities, and edema. The endpoint of decline on fine motor skill tests may be
15
16 influenced by other biomedical or psychological factors beyond the variables we considered⁴¹.
17
18 Our sample size was modest, though we employed a nested cross-validation approach in order
19
20 to avoid overfitting as much as possible. The current study sample size is similar or larger than
21
22 other studies on hippocampal dose-response models^{12,39,56}. We enrolled a heterogeneous group
23
24 of brain tumor patients, and tumor type or receipt of chemotherapy were not important variables
25
26 in our models, though our sample size likely limits these findings. With our heterogeneous
27
28 group and validation however, our findings are more generalizable to all primary brain tumor
29
30 patients undergoing intracranial RT. Our models do not exhibit excellent discriminatory power,
31
32 but perform on par with other recently developed multivariate NTCP models predicting
33
34 xerostomia⁵⁷, esophagitis⁵⁸, rectal and bladder morbidity⁵⁹, or radiation pneumonitis⁶⁰, for
35
36 example. Outcomes were prospectively gathered, and objectively measured by a
37
38 neuropsychologist. Our models rely on a pure structure-function paradigm, which the
39
40 complexities of the human brain may certainly defy. Network connectivity is a growing area of
41
42 research utilizing graph theory, borrowed from computer science, where the brain is
43
44 represented as network of nodes (anatomical areas under consideration) and edges (the
45
46 interconnections between these areas). Diminished connectivity in motor networks among
47
48 patients with brain tumors and weakness has been documented⁶¹, and future studies may
49
50 consider these more complex networks models to predict motor performance.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

In conclusion, we present the first NTCP models for a neurologic functional endpoint outside of hippocampal dose and cognition. Specifically, we found that the dose to several supratentorial motor-associated ROIs correlated with decline on pegboard dominant hand tests at 6 months post-RT in primary brain tumor patients undergoing partial fractionated brain RT. Future studies may externally validate these models and employ prospective strategies to minimize loss of fine motor function after RT.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure Captions

Fig 1. Heatmap for univariate logistic regression coefficient p-values for decline on PDH

Fig 2. A) Frequency of variable selection over the cross-validation folds for the logistic methods.

B) Variable importance in the random forest model by mean decrease in Gini score.

Fig 3. Boxplots of area under the curve (AUC) performance over the repeated outer cross-validation held-out folds.

- 1
2
3
4 1. Greene-Schloesser D, Robbins ME, Peiffer AM, Shaw EG, Wheeler KT, Chan MD.
5
6 Radiation-induced brain injury: A review. *Front Oncol.* 2012;2(July):1-18.
7
- 8 2. Makale MT, McDonald CR, Hattangadi-Gluth JA, Kesari S. Mechanisms of radiotherapy-
9 associated cognitive disability in patients with brain tumours. *Nat Rev Neurol.*
10 2017;13(1):52-64.
11
- 12 3. Meyers CA, Brown PD. Role and relevance of neurocognitive assessment in clinical trials
13 of patients with CNS tumors. *J Clin Oncol.* 2006;24(8):1305-1309.
14
- 15 4. XXXX
16
- 17 5. Brown PD, Jaeckle K, Ballman K V, et al. Effect of Radiosurgery Alone vs Radiosurgery
18 With Whole Brain Radiation Therapy on Cognitive Function in Patients With 1 to 3 Brain
19 Metastases: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA.* 2016;316(4):401-409.
20
- 21 6. Chang EL, Wefel JS, Hess KR, et al. Neurocognition in patients with brain metastases
22 treated with radiosurgery or radiosurgery plus whole-brain irradiation: a randomised
23 controlled trial. *Lancet Oncol.* 2009;10(11):1037-1044.
24
- 25 7. Bezdicek O, Nikolai T, Hoskovcová M, et al. Grooved Pegboard Predicates More of
26 Cognitive Than Motor Involvement in Parkinson's Disease. *Assessment.* 2014;21(6):723-
27 730.
28
- 29 8. Huynh-Le MP, Tibbs MD, Karunamuni R, et al. Microstructural Injury to Corpus Callosum
30 and Intrahemispheric White Matter Tracts Correlate With Attention and Processing Speed
31 Decline After Brain Radiation. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2021;110(2):337-347.
32
- 33 9. Tibbs MD, Huynh-Le MP, Karunamuni R, et al. Microstructural Injury to Left-Sided
34 Perisylvian White Matter Predicts Language Decline After Brain Radiation Therapy. *Int J*
35 *Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2020.
36
- 37 10. Tringale KR, Nguyen TT, Karunamuni R, et al. Quantitative Imaging Biomarkers of
38 Damage to Critical Memory Regions Are Associated With Post-Radiation Therapy
39 Memory Performance in Brain Tumor Patients. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.*
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 2019;105(4):773-783.
11. Tringale KR, Nguyen T, Bahrami N, et al. Identifying early diffusion imaging biomarkers of regional white matter injury as indicators of executive function decline following brain radiotherapy: A prospective clinical trial in primary brain tumor patients. *Radiother Oncol*. 2019;132:27-33.
12. Gondi V, Hermann BP, Mehta MP, Tome WA. Hippocampal dosimetry predicts neurocognitive function impairment after fractionated stereotactic radiotherapy for benign or low-grade adult brain tumors. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2012;83(4):e487-93.
13. Delis D, Kaplan E, Kramer J. Delis-Kaplan Executive Function System (D-KEFS). 2001.
14. Lafayette Instrument. Grooved Pegboard Test. 2015.
15. Jacobson NS, Truax P. Clinical Significance: A Statistical Approach to Defining Meaningful Change in Psychotherapy Research. *J Consult Chmcal Psychol*. 1945;59(1):12-19.
16. Strauss E, Sherman EMS, Spreen O. *A Compendium of Neuropsychological Tests: Administration, Norms, and Commentary*. 3rd ed. Oxford University Press
17. Chelune GJ, Naugle RI, Lüders H, Sedlak J, Awad IA. Individual change after epilepsy surgery: Practice effects and base-rate information. *Neuropsychology*. 1993;7(1):41-52.
18. XXXX
19. XXXX
20. Holland D, Kuperman JM, Dale AM. Efficient correction of inhomogeneous static magnetic field-induced distortion in Echo Planar Imaging. *Neuroimage*. 2010;50(1):175-183.
21. Jovicich J, Czanner S, Greve D, et al. Reliability in multi-site structural MRI studies: Effects of gradient non-linearity correction on phantom and human data. *Neuroimage*. 2006;30(2):436-443.
22. Sled JG, Zijdenbos AP, Evans AC. A nonparametric method for automatic correction of

- 1
2
3
4 intensity nonuniformity in MRI data. *IEEE Trans Med Imaging*. 1998;17(1):87-97.
5
6
7 23. Carnevale T, Majumdar A, Sivagnanam S, et al. The neuroscience gateway portal: high
8 performance computing made easy. *BMC Neurosci*. 2014;15(S1):1-1.
9
10
11 24. Sivagnanam S, Majumdar A, Yoshimoto K, et al. Introducing the neuroscience gateway.
12 *CEUR Workshop Proc*. 2013;993.
13
14
15 25. Hagler Jr. DJ, Ahmadi ME, Kuperman J, et al. Automated White-Matter Tractography
16 Using a Probabilistic Diffusion Tensor Atlas : Application to Temporal Lobe Epilepsy.
17
18 2009;1547(February 2008):1535-1547.
19
20
21
22 26. Connor M, Karunamuni R, McDonald C, et al. Regional susceptibility to dose-dependent
23 white matter damage after brain radiotherapy. *Radiother Oncol*. 2017;123(2):209-217.
24
25
26 27. Xu CJ, Van Der Schaaf A, Van'T Veld AA, Langendijk JA, Schilstra C. Statistical
27 validation of normal tissue complication probability models. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*.
28
29 2012;84(1):e123-e129.
30
31
32
33 28. Cella L, Liuzzi R, Conson M, D'Avino V, Salvatore M, Pacelli R. Multivariate normal tissue
34 complication probability modeling of heart valve dysfunction in hodgkin lymphoma
35 survivors. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2013;87(2):304-310.
36
37
38
39 29. R Core Team (2015). R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing, Vienna,
40 Australia. <https://www.r-project.org>.
41
42
43
44 30. Lang M, Binder M, Richter J, et al. mlr3: A modern object-oriented machine learning
45 framework in R. *J Open Source Softw*. 2019;4(44):1903.
46
47
48
49 31. Kuhn M. Building predictive models in R using the caret package. *J Stat Softw*.
50
51 2008;28(5):1-26.
52
53
54 32. Friedman J, Hastie T, Tibshirani R. Regularization Paths for Generalized Linear Models
55 via Coordinate Descent. *J Stat Softw*. 2010;33(1):1-22.
56
57
58 33. Naqa I El. *A Guide To Outcome Modeling In Radiotherapy and Oncology*. Boca Raton,
59 FL: CRC Press, Taylor and Francis Group; 2018.
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 34. El Naqa I, Bradley J, Blanco AI, et al. Multivariable modeling of radiotherapy outcomes,
5 including dose–volume and clinical factors. *Int J Radiat Oncol*. 2006;64(4):1275-1286.
6
7
- 8 35. Liaw A, Wiener M. Classification and Regression by randomForest. *R News*.
9 2002;2(3):18-22.
10
- 11 36. Bommert A, Sun X, Bischl B, Rahnenführer J, Lang M. Benchmark for filter methods for
12 feature selection in high-dimensional classification data. *Comput Stat Data Anal*.
13 2020;143:106839.
14
15
- 16 37. Gondi V, Hermann BP, Mehta MP, Tome WA. Hippocampal dosimetry predicts
17 neurocognitive function impairment after fractionated stereotactic radiotherapy for benign
18 or low-grade adult brain tumors. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2013;85(2):348-354.
19
20
- 21 38. Ma TM, Grimm J, McIntyre R, et al. A prospective evaluation of hippocampal radiation
22 dose volume effects and memory deficits following cranial irradiation. *Radiother Oncol*.
23 2017;125(2):234-240.
24
25
- 26 39. Acharya S, Wu S, Ashford JM, et al. Association between hippocampal dose and memory
27 in survivors of childhood or adolescent low-grade glioma: A 10-year neurocognitive
28 longitudinal study. *Neuro Oncol*. 2019;21(9):1175-1183.
29
30
- 31 40. Jaspers J, Mèndez Romero A, Hoogeman MS, et al. Evaluation of the Hippocampal
32 Normal Tissue Complication Model in a Prospective Cohort of Low Grade Glioma
33 Patients—An Analysis Within the EORTC 22033 Clinical Trial. *Front Oncol*.
34 2019;9(October):1-9.
35
36
- 37 41. Goldstein G, Nussbaum PD, Beers SR. *Neuropsychology*. 1st ed. New York: Springer
38 Science+Business Media, LLC; 1997.
39
40
- 41 42. Diamond A. Close interrelation of motor development and cognitive development and of
42 the cerebellum and prefrontal cortex. *Child Dev*. 2000;71(1):44-56.
43
44
- 45 43. Tolle KA, Rahman-Filipiak AM, Hale AC, Kitchen Andren KA, Spencer RJ. Grooved
46 Pegboard Test as a measure of executive functioning. *Appl Neuropsychol*.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 2020;27(5):414-420.
5
6
7 44. Gooijers J, Chalavi S, Beeckmans K, et al. Subcortical Volume Loss in the Thalamus,
8 Putamen, and Pallidum, Induced by Traumatic Brain Injury, Is Associated with Motor
9 Performance Deficits. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2016;30(7):603-614.
10
11
12
13 45. Abela E, Missimer J, Wiest R, et al. Lesions to primary sensory and posterior parietal
14 cortices impair recovery from hand paresis after stroke. *PLoS One*. 2012;7(2).
15
16
17 46. Kato H, Izumiyama M. Impaired motor control due to proprioceptive sensory loss in a
18 patient with cerebral infarction localized to the postcentral gyrus. *J Rehabil Med*.
19
20 2015;47(2):187-190.
21
22
23
24 47. Flickinger JC, Kondziolka D, Dade Lunsford † L, et al. Development of a Model To
25 Predict Permanent Symptomatic Postradiosurgery Injury For Arteriovenous Malformation
26 Patients. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2000;46(5):1143-1148.
27
28
29
30
31 48. Maruyama K, Kamada K, Ota T, et al. Tolerance of Pyramidal Tract to Gamma Knife
32 Radiosurgery Based on Diffusion-Tensor Tractography. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*.
33 2008;70(5):1330-1335.
34
35
36
37 49. Koga T, Shin M, Maruyama K, et al. Integration of corticospinal tractography reduces
38 motor complications after radiosurgery. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2012;83(1):129-133.
39
40
41
42 50. XXXX
43
44
45 51. Filippi M, Ceccarelli A, Pagani E, et al. Motor learning in healthy humans is associated to
46 gray matter changes: A tensor-based morphometry study. *PLoS One*. 2010;5(4).
47
48
49 52. Schaechter JD, Perdue KL. Enhanced cortical activation in the contralesional hemisphere
50 of chronic stroke patients in response to motor skill challenge. *Cereb Cortex*.
51 2008;18(3):638-647.
52
53
54
55 53. Yao ZF, Yang MH, Hsieh S. Brain Structural-Behavioral Correlates Underlying Grooved
56 Pegboard Test Performance Across Lifespan. *J Mot Behav*. 2020;0(0):1-12.
57
58
59
60 54. Nyquist PA, Yanek LR, Bilgel M, et al. Effect of white matter lesions on manual dexterity
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 in healthy middle-aged persons. *Neurology*. 2015;84(19):1920-1926.
5
6
7 55. Mula M, Trimble MR. Antiepileptic Drug-Induced Cognitive Adverse Effects. *CNS Drugs*.
8
9 2009;23(2):121-137.
10
11 56. Okoukoni C, McTyre ER, Ayala Peacock DN, et al. Hippocampal dose volume histogram
12
13 predicts Hopkins Verbal Learning Test scores after brain irradiation. *Adv Radiat Oncol*.
14
15 2017;2(4):624-629.
16
17 57. Teng F, Fan W, Luo Y, et al. A Risk Prediction Model by LASSO for Radiation-Induced
18
19 Xerostomia in Patients With Nasopharyngeal Carcinoma Treated With Comprehensive
20
21 Salivary Gland–Sparing Helical Tomotherapy Technique. *Front Oncol*.
22
23 2021;11(February):1-9.
24
25
26 58. Luna JM, Chao HH, Shinohara RT, et al. Machine learning highlights the deficiency of
27
28 conventional dosimetric constraints for prevention of high-grade radiation esophagitis in
29
30 non-small cell lung cancer treated with chemoradiation. *Clin Transl Radiat Oncol*.
31
32 2020;22:69-75.
33
34
35 59. Pedersen J, Liang X, Casares-Magaz O, et al. Multivariate normal tissue complication
36
37 probability models for rectal and bladder morbidity in prostate cancer patients treated with
38
39 proton therapy. *Radiother Oncol*. 2020;153:279-288.
40
41
42 60. Luna JM, Chao HH, Diffenderfer ES, et al. Predicting radiation pneumonitis in locally
43
44 advanced stage II–III non-small cell lung cancer using machine learning. *Radiother*
45
46 *Oncol*. 2019;133:106-112.
47
48
49 61. Otten ML, Mikell CB, Youngerman BE, et al. Motor deficits correlate with resting state
50
51 motor network connectivity in patients with brain tumours. *Brain*. 2012;135(4):1017-1026.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 1. Patient Characteristics

| Characteristic | Pegboard N = 42¹ | DKEFS-TM N = 44¹ |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| Age (yrs) | 45.4 (20.0-75.0) | 46.2 (20.0-75.0) |
| Sex | | |
| Male | 25 (60%) | 25 (57%) |
| Female | 17 (40%) | 19 (43%) |
| Race | | |
| White | 39 (92.9%) | 41 (93.2%) |
| Asian | 1 (2.4%) | 1 (2.3%) |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 1 (2.4%) | 1 (2.3%) |
| Black | 1 (2.4%) | 1 (2.3%) |
| Ethnicity | | |
| Hispanic | 3 (7.1%) | 3 (6.8%) |
| Non-Hispanic | 39 (93%) | 41 (93%) |
| Handedness | | |
| Right | 37 (88%) | 39 (89%) |
| Left | 5 (12%) | 5 (11%) |
| KPS | | |
| 90-100 | 39 (93%) | 41 (93%) |
| <=80 | 3 (7.1%) | 3 (6.8%) |
| Radiation Modality | | |
| IMRT/VMAT | 28 (67%) | 30 (68%) |
| Proton | 14 (33%) | 14 (32%) |
| Radiation Dose (Gy) | 57.0 (50.4-70.0) | 57.0 (50.4-70.0) |
| Location | | |
| Frontal | 12 (29%) | 13 (30%) |
| Temporal | 12 (29%) | 11 (25%) |
| Suprasellar | 7 (17%) | 7 (16%) |
| Parietal | 4 (9.5%) | 5 (11%) |
| Cerebellar | 2 (4.8%) | 3 (6.8%) |
| Base of Skull | 2 (4.8%) | 2 (4.5%) |
| Cavernous Sinus | 2 (4.8%) | 2 (4.5%) |
| Sphenoid Wing | 1 (2.4%) | 1 (2.3%) |
| Laterality | | |
| Left | 22 (52%) | 21 (48%) |

Table 1. Patient Characteristics

| Characteristic | Pegboard N = 42¹ | DKEFS-TM N = 44¹ |
|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Right | 16 (38%) | 19 (43%) |
| Central | 4 (9.5%) | 4 (9.1%) |
| Diagnosis | | |
| Glioma: High Grade | 17 (40%) | 18 (41%) |
| Glioma: Low Grade | 9 (21%) | 9 (20%) |
| Meningioma | 9 (21%) | 10 (23%) |
| Pituitary Adenoma | 3 (7.1%) | 3 (6.8%) |
| Craniopharyngioma | 2 (4.8%) | 2 (4.5%) |
| Chondrosarcoma | 1 (2.4%) | 1 (2.3%) |
| Schwannoma | 1 (2.4%) | 1 (2.3%) |
| Surgery | | |
| GTR | 9 (21%) | 10 (23%) |
| STR | 27 (64%) | 27 (61%) |
| Biopsy | 2 (4.8%) | 3 (6.8%) |
| None | 4 (9.5%) | 4 (9.1%) |
| Steroid Use | 17 (40%) | 17 (39%) |
| Seizures | 17 (40%) | 18 (41%) |
| Antiepileptic Drug Use | 23 (55%) | 24 (55%) |
| Concurrent Chemotherapy | 20 (48%) | 21 (48%) |
| Adjuvant Chemotherapy | 25 (60%) | 26 (59%) |
| Progression at 6mo | 3 (7.1%) | 3 (6.8%) |

¹ N (%) or Median (range)

| Table 2 | Decision Stump | | Logistic Regression | | Spearman Correlation | | Non-parametric |
|-----------------------------|----------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------|----------------------|---------|----------------|
| | Cutoff (Gy) | AUC (95% CI) | OR (95% CI) | p-value | R _s | p-value | p-value |
| Corticospinal Tract | | | | | | | |
| <i>D</i> _{max} | 53.54 | 0.71 (0.57 - 0.85) | 1.05 (1.01 - 1.10) | 0.03 | 0.36 | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| <i>D</i> _{mean} | 19.53 | 0.73 (0.59 - 0.87) | 1.05 (1.01 - 1.11) | 0.03 | 0.39 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| Precentral Cortex | | | | | | | |
| <i>D</i> _{max} | 24.27 | 0.76 (0.62 - 0.89) | 1.04 (1.01 - 1.07) | 0.01 | 0.36 | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| <i>D</i> _{mean} | 13.47 | 0.74 (0.60 - 0.88) | 1.05 (1.01 - 1.10) | 0.03 | 0.36 | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| Precentral WM | | | | | | | |
| <i>D</i> _{max} | 27.09 | 0.75 (0.61 - 0.89) | 1.04 (1.01 - 1.07) | 0.01 | 0.38 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| <i>D</i> _{mean} | 15.40 | 0.74 (0.60 - 0.88) | 1.05 (1.01 - 1.09) | 0.02 | 0.38 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| Postcentral Cortex | | | | | | | |
| <i>D</i> _{max} | 43.80 | 0.71 (0.57 - 0.85) | 1.04 (1.01 - 1.07) | 0.01 | 0.39 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| <i>D</i> _{mean} | 17.70 | 0.70 (0.56 - 0.84) | 1.05 (1.01 - 1.11) | 0.03 | 0.37 | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| Postcentral WM | | | | | | | |
| <i>D</i> _{max} | 44.83 | 0.73 (0.59 - 0.87) | 1.04 (1.01 - 1.08) | 0.01 | 0.42 | 0.01 | <.001 |
| <i>D</i> _{mean} | 12.09 | 0.72 (0.58 - 0.86) | 1.05 (1.01 - 1.10) | 0.03 | 0.37 | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| Paracentral Cortex | | | | | | | |
| <i>D</i> _{max} | 6.71 | 0.72 (0.57 - 0.86) | 1.02 (1.00 - 1.05) | 0.11 | 0.29 | 0.07 | 0.04 |
| <i>D</i> _{mean} | 3.84 | 0.69 (0.54 - 0.83) | 1.02 (0.98 - 1.05) | 0.31 | 0.24 | 0.13 | 0.07 |
| Paracentral WM | | | | | | | |
| <i>D</i> _{max} | 59.46 | 0.59 (0.49 - 0.68) | 1.02 (1.00 - 1.05) | 0.08 | 0.28 | 0.08 | 0.04 |
| <i>D</i> _{mean} | 3.59 | 0.67 (0.52 - 0.81) | 1.02 (0.99 - 1.06) | 0.20 | 0.24 | 0.13 | 0.07 |
| Caudate | | | | | | | |
| <i>D</i> _{max} | 58.88 | 0.69 (0.56 - 0.83) | 1.03 (1.00 - 1.06) | 0.07 | 0.30 | 0.06 | 0.03 |
| <i>D</i> _{mean} | 33.70 | 0.76 (0.63 - 0.90) | 1.04 (1.01 - 1.08) | 0.02 | 0.34 | 0.03 | 0.02 |
| Pallidum | | | | | | | |
| <i>D</i> _{max} | 38.13 | 0.72 (0.58 - 0.86) | 1.03 (1.00 - 1.07) | 0.04 | 0.29 | 0.06 | 0.03 |
| <i>D</i> _{mean} | 20.24 | 0.71 (0.56 - 0.85) | 1.03 (1.00 - 1.07) | 0.03 | 0.29 | 0.07 | 0.04 |
| Putamen | | | | | | | |
| <i>D</i> _{max} | 40.94 | 0.72 (0.58 - 0.86) | 1.03 (1.00 - 1.07) | 0.03 | 0.30 | 0.06 | 0.03 |
| <i>D</i> _{mean} | 22.40 | 0.73 (0.59 - 0.87) | 1.04 (1.01 - 1.07) | 0.02 | 0.31 | 0.05 | 0.02 |
| Thalamus | | | | | | | |
| <i>D</i> _{max} | 53.36 | 0.74 (0.60 - 0.88) | 1.02 (1.00 - 1.06) | 0.11 | 0.24 | 0.13 | 0.07 |
| <i>D</i> _{mean} | 27.31 | 0.77 (0.63 - 0.90) | 1.04 (1.01 - 1.07) | 0.03 | 0.27 | 0.09 | 0.04 |
| Cerebellum Cortex | | | | | | | |
| <i>D</i> _{max} | 43.12 | 0.64 (0.52 - 0.75) | 0.98 (0.95 - 1.01) | 0.26 | -0.15 | 0.35 | 0.83 |
| <i>D</i> _{mean} | 17.54 | 0.62 (0.51 - 0.73) | 0.97 (0.90 - 1.03) | 0.32 | -0.08 | 0.60 | 0.70 |
| Cerebellum WM | | | | | | | |
| <i>D</i> _{max} | 41.88 | 0.64 (0.52 - 0.75) | 0.98 (0.95 - 1.01) | 0.29 | -0.16 | 0.33 | 0.84 |
| <i>D</i> _{mean} | 23.30 | 0.62 (0.51 - 0.73) | 0.98 (0.92 - 1.03) | 0.39 | -0.10 | 0.55 | 0.73 |
| Demographic/Clinical | | | | | | | |
| Adjuvant Chemotherapy | - | 0.59 (0.44 - 0.74) | 2.22 (0.62 - 8.73) | 0.23 | 0.19 | 0.24 | 0.34 |
| Age | 60.50 | 0.64 (0.51 - 0.77) | 1.02 (0.98 - 1.07) | 0.32 | 0.13 | 0.40 | 0.20 |
| Anti-Epileptic Drug Use | - | 0.63 (0.48 - 0.78) | 3.05 (0.86 - 12.13) | 0.09 | 0.26 | 0.09 | 0.12 |
| Concurrent Chemotherapy | - | 0.54 (0.39 - 0.70) | 1.43 (0.42 - 5.04) | 0.57 | 0.09 | 0.58 | 0.75 |
| Diagnosis (Other) | - | 0.57 (0.42 - 0.72) | 0.53 (0.13 - 1.91) | 0.34 | -0.15 | 0.35 | 0.5 |
| Dose | 60.60 | 0.56 (0.48 - 0.64) | 1.14 (0.98 - 1.38) | 0.12 | 0.21 | 0.19 | 0.10 |
| Ethnicity (Non-Hispanic) | - | 0.56 (0.49 - 0.63) | - | - | 0.23 | 0.15 | 0.26 |
| Handedness (R) | - | 0.50 (0.40 - 0.60) | 1.02 (0.15 - 8.48) | 0.98 | <.001 | 0.98 | 1.00 |

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--------------------|---------------------|------|-------|------|------|
| KPS (≤ 80) | - | 0.54 (0.45 - 0.63) | 3.20 (0.28 - 72.45) | 0.36 | 0.15 | 0.35 | 0.56 |
| Laterality (Dominant) | - | 0.68 (0.54 - 0.83) | 4.87 (1.31 - 21.49) | 0.02 | 0.36 | 0.02 | 0.03 |
| Progression at 6mo | - | 0.51 (0.43 - 0.59) | 0.72 (0.03 - 8.13) | 0.79 | -0.04 | 0.80 | 1.00 |
| Race (Other) | - | 0.53 (0.44 - 0.62) | 0.46 (0.02 - 3.96) | 0.52 | -0.10 | 0.52 | 0.64 |
| Radiation Modality (Protons) | - | 0.52 (0.37 - 0.67) | 1.16 (0.31 - 4.28) | 0.82 | 0.03 | 0.83 | 1.00 |
| Seizures | - | 0.65 (0.50 - 0.80) | 3.67 (1.03 - 14.24) | 0.05 | 0.31 | 0.05 | 0.06 |
| Sex (M) | - | 0.51 (0.35 - 0.66) | 0.95 (0.27 - 3.41) | 0.94 | -0.01 | 0.94 | 1.00 |
| Steroid Use | - | 0.70 (0.56 - 0.85) | 5.81 (1.57 - 24.21) | 0.01 | 0.41 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| Surgery (any) | - | 0.52 (0.41 - 0.63) | 0.70 (0.09 - 4.08) | 0.70 | -0.06 | 0.71 | 1.00 |
| Surgery (GTR) | - | 0.52 (0.39 - 0.65) | 0.81 (0.18 - 3.82) | 0.79 | -0.04 | 0.79 | 1.00 |

Table 2. Univariate Analyses for Dosimetric and Demographic/Clinical variables and association with decline on PDH at 6 months.

| | Logistic | LASSO | LASSO (w/ FS) | Random Forest |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| <i><u>Final Fitted Model</u></i> | | | | |
| AUC | 0.75 | 0.79 | 0.80 | 0.70 |
| Balanced Accuracy | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.76 | 0.68 |
| Brier Score | 0.19 | 0.20 | 0.18 | 0.21 |
| Calibration Slope | 1.00 | 2.89 | 1.39 | 0.79 |
| Calibration Intercept | 0.00 | 0.59 | 0.11 | -0.10 |
| Hosmer–Lemeshow p-value | 0.67 | 0.07 | 0.23 | 0.57 |
| R ² | 0.25 | 0.22 | 0.34 | |
| | | | | |
| <i><u>Nested Cross Validation</u></i> | | | | |
| AUC | 0.61 (SD 0.005) | 0.55 (SD 0.005) | 0.63 (SD 0.005) | 0.69 (SD 0.006) |
| Balanced Accuracy | 0.62 (SD 0.005) | 0.57 (SD 0.003) | 0.62 (SD 0.004) | 0.67 (SD 0.005) |
| Brier Score | 0.26 (SD 0.002) | 0.26 (SD 0.002) | 0.24 (SD 0.002) | 0.23 (SD 0.002) |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Table 3. Performance and characteristics for each model-building method.





