Exploring the diagnostic and prognostic utility of resting state functional MRI connectivity in acute/sub-acute TBI

***M. K. CHEPISHEVA[1]**, X. SHEN[2], C. LACADIE[2], W. LUO[2], J. APPLETON[3], J. ARORA[2], J. BHAWNANI[2], A. MAHAJAN[2], B. OMAY[3], E. GILMORE[1], B. EDLOW[5], R. T. CONSTABLE[2], J. A. KIM[1]

Abstract

Traumatic brain injury (TBI) is a leading cause of disability worldwide. Yet, our understanding of the mechanisms of this condition is limited, especially in the acute setting. Here, we investigated the relationship between functional connectivity and common clinical assessments, like the Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) at admission and modified Rankin scale at 3-months (mRS) to determine if functional connectivity can provide a broader representation of the brain's networks than these standard tests.

We performed a retrospective analysis of resting state functional MRI and clinical data in 58 patients (41.28 ± 18.63) scanned acutely/subacutely (≤ 31 days). Then, for a secondary analysis, we included 50 more patients who presented after either a first or a repeat incident and were scanned either acutely/subacutely or chronically (<2 yrs) (all together 108 patients, 46.4 ± 20.1yrs). Using a 268-node functional atlas, we derived 35,778 unique edges, based on which we calculated the mean functional connectivity of 10 resting state networks and used those to establish a link to TBI severity and functional outcome.

Our analysis showed that when dividing sub/acute patients (n=58) based on GCS severity, only the Subcortical network showed a significant discrimination between mild and moderate-severe GCS at admission ($P<0.001$), with hyperconnectivity noted in mild patients, and hypoconnectivity – in moderate-severe GCS patients. This difference appeared to be mainly driven by the thalami (Right, $P=0.002$; Left $P<0.001$). Similar results were observed when investigating GCS subscores at admission (Eyes, Motor, Verbal, all $P<0.001$). Further, when evaluating mRS outcomes at 3-months against functional connectivity, differences were noted within the Motor, Cerebellum and Medial-Frontal networks, though none survived multiple comparisons. Importantly, we found the DMN and mRS to be correlated but with a limited relationship ($r^2= 0.18$). Lastly, we performed a post-hoc analysis (n=108) to investigate if the hyperconnectivity in the Subcortical network of sub/acute mild GCS patients remained irrespective of acuity of scanning (i.e. acute/ chronic) or frequency of TBI (i.e. first/ repeat). Our analysis showed that GCS severity appeared to be the

main driver of functional connectivity within the Subcortical network, whereas acuity of scanning, alongside GCS severity contributed to the results of chronically scanned patients.

While GCS and 3-month mRS scores offer some meaningful insights, their limited capture of the neural representation underscores the need to investigate whether other early clinical assessments correlate more robustly with early resting state networks or whether such networks themselves could predict future outcomes.

I. Introduction:

Traumatic brain injury (TBI) is a leading cause of disability worldwide. Yet, our understanding of the pathophysiology and mechanisms of this condition across the full spectrum of injury remains incomplete.

TBI severity has long been defined by clinical rating scores, of which the Glasgow coma scale (GCS) [1] has been the most widely used. However, the utility of GCS as a defining feature of TBI acuity has been increasingly debated [2], [3], [4], [5]. Similarly, functional outcomes, as measured by common outcome evaluations like the modified Rankin Scale (mRS) [6], and their reliability need to be better defined [7].

Clinicians and researchers alike have sought to refine the various characteristics which encompass the heterogeneous nature of TBI and improve its prognostic accuracy [8], [9], [10]. Advanced neuroimaging, such as functional MRI, has become increasingly utilized to study TBI patients [11], [12], [13]. However, its application remains primarily limited to the research setting or small-scale clinical pilot studies. In the clinical setting, structural MRI has been used to identify lesion burden and predict recovery after TBI, but the additional diagnostic and prognostic utility of more advanced MRI sequences is less well-defined. More recently, resting-state functional MRI (rsfMRI) has been employed to investigate whether alterations in the brain's intrinsic connectivity patterns reflect TBI-related pathophysiological manifestations. For example, some studies reported impaired small world topology and reduced network efficiency observed post TBI [14], [15], [16].

Despite these advancements, establishing a functional neuroimaging-based biomarker of TBI severity, especially in the early stage of TBI remains a challenge. Many rsfMRI studies are focused on chronic TBI patients and reported incomplete recovery and persistent symptoms, such as cognitive impairment, apathy or fatigue, all of which stemming from persisting regional or global changes in the brain's architecture [17], [18], [19]). Even patients with mild TBI can report symptoms up to 12 months post injury, and those with moderate-severe TBI can experience symptoms for an even longer duration [20], [21]. Prior studies report multiple regions with both increased and decreased

functional connectivity likely due to: (1) heterogeneous TBI etiologies, (2) varied brain regions under investigation, (3) studies spanning the full spectrum of TBI severity (mild, moderate, severe) and (4) differences in stage (acute, chronic) at the time of acquisition. The high variability that has been generally observed in the field [22], [23] and the large number of prognostic models [11], [24], [25], [26], [27] make it difficult to reach a consensus regarding possible outcome biomarkers of TBI.

To elucidate this knowledge, more real-world, i.e. clinical-based studies are needed. Despite their potential benefits [28], rsfMRI studies in the clinical setting are rare due to patient acuity of illness and limited ability to tolerate scans during the acute/sub-acute period post TBI. In the few studies which successfully acquired data in such a setting, research suggests that intact DMN connectivity is correlated with recovery of consciousness after TBI [29] and other severe illnesses with prolonged coma states like COVID-19 [12]. In another intensive care unit study [30] examining 25 acutely unresponsive patients, researchers showed that the visual and left frontoparietal networks play a critical role in the successful prediction of subsequent recovery. Consequently, some have proposed that a broader evaluation of the canonical networks might be more insightful compared to focusing solely on the importance of the DMN [31], [30]. However, whether resting state networks can be used to predict long-term functional outcomes beyond recovery of consciousness after TBI remains to be determined.

In this study, we investigated whether early resting-state functional connectivity is associated with (1) TBI severity, as measured by the GCS at admission, and (2) with a 3-month functional outcome, assessed using the mRS. We aimed to identify specific networks that may reflect TBI severity and to explore if these networks could serve as neural correlates of two common clinical scales and/or provide additional predictive value for long-term outcomes.

II. Material and Methods:

➢ Participants/recruitment/selection criteria for the study

We retrospectively screened 1,053 neurotrauma patients (05/2018 – 09/2022) who were seen in the Emergency Department of Yale New Haven Hospital (New Haven, CT, USA). The main inclusion criteria for this study were: (1) patients ≥18 years old, who experienced their first TBI, (2) had no neurological condition at baseline, (3) did not sustain another TBI within 3-months of their initial TBI encounter, (4) had rsfMRI ≤31 days post-TBI. (Figure.1). Patients who met these inclusion criteria were used for our main analysis (n = 58, mean ± SD, 41.28 ± 18.63 years, 33% F). A post-hoc analysis was also conducted for patients with either a first or a repeated TBI and an initial scan ≤31 or >31 days after their accident (main cohort + additional TBI patients, n = 108,

(mean ± SD, 46.4 ± 20.1 years)). Lastly, we selected 113 healthy controls (mean ± SD, 32.5 ± 12.6 years, 52% F) from a previously established cohort of participants, described elsewhere [32], to establish a non-statistical comparison group for all figures

This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA.

➢ Clinical assessment

Glasgow Coma Score (GCS)

GCS is a standard clinical assessment [1] comprised of three separate subscores making up a total score. Clinical staff assesses patients' Eyes opening (scored from 1 - 4), Motor (from 1 - 6) and Verbal (from 1 - 5) responses. These subscores were calculated based on clinical notes at the time of admission and summed to produce a total GCS score. The latter ranges from three (no eye opening, motor or verbal response) to 15 (fully alert, oriented and following commands). In this study, GCS values on admission were documented in the electronic health record as part of routine clinical care and were abstracted from the record and adjudicated by a neurointensivist (JAK).

Modified Rankin Scale (mRS)

The mRS, [6], [33], is used as a functional outcome evaluation metric. More specifically, it measures the degree of disability in patients following a stroke, using a seven-degree scale from 0-6, with 0 referring to "no symptoms at all" and 6 – indicating patients who are deceased. However, as the mRS shows a strong agreement to another typically used assessment for TBI patients [34], [35], i.e. the Glasgow Outcome Scale (GOS) [36], the mRS can also be used to evaluate other cohorts as was done in this study at 3 months. In this study, mRS values at 3 months were extracted based on a retrospective chart review from the electronic health record and adjudicated by a neurointensivist (JAK).

➢ Imaging data

TBI patients

Structural and functional (rsfMRI) imaging was performed on a 3T Siemens Magnetom Verio Syngo clinical scanner at Yale New Haven Hospital. The TBI protocol used for the resting state acquisition was with the following parameters: number of slices = 34, FoV = 220mm, repetition time (TR) = 1760 ms, echo time (TE) = 25 ms, flip angle = 78°, matrix size = 64 × 64 (voxel size = 3.4 x 3.4 x 3.4mm), in-plane resolution = 3.4 mm^2 , slice thickness = 3.4 mm. Parameters of the

anatomical magnetization were as follows: number of slices per slab = 176, FoV = 250mm, TR = 2300 ms, TE = 2.34 ms, flip angle = 8°, matrix size = 256 × 256 (voxel size = 1.0 x 1.0 x 1.0mm).

Healthy Controls

Structural and resting state functional connectivity data for the group of 113 healthy controls were used from a previously acquired dataset [32]. This dataset was collected at the Yale Magnetic Resonance Research Center (MRRC, Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA) on a 3T Siemens Trio TIM scanner [32]. The resting state sequence was with the following parameters: repetition time (TR) = 1000 ms, echo time (TE) = 30 ms, flip angle = 62°, matrix size = 84 × 84, in-plane resolution = 2.5 mm^2, slice thickness = 2.5 mm. The structural (MPRAGE) sequence had the following parameters: 176 sagittal slices, TR = 2530 ms, TE = 3.32 ms, flip angle = 7°, matrix size = 256 × 256, in-plane resolution = 1.0 mm^2, slice thickness = 1.0 mm [37].

➢ Preprocessing

Anatomical and functional preprocessing was performed using Yale University's BioImage Suite [38] using a number of custom scripts/functions in bash and Matlab (Mathworks). The standard procedure has been described in detail elsewhere [39], [40], [41] and was applied to the TBI patients and healthy controls. In brief, it included skull-stripping, non-linear registration (for anatomical images) and slice-timing, motion correction (for functional images using SPM8 https://www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm/software/spm8/), linear registration (anatomical and functional images), and calculation of the resting state functional connectivity matrices using the Shen268-node brain atlas. Of note, there were additional procedures applied during the standard pre-processing including regression of mean time-courses in white matter (WM), cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) and global signal regression (GSR) and low-pass Gaussian filtering (approximate cut-off frequency of 0.12 Hz) [41]. Functional runs were discarded if the mean frame to frame displacement was greater than 1.2mm. The results after the skull-stripping, non-linear, and linear registrations steps were individually inspected to ensure reliable pre-processing output.

Considering some brain regions are generally more susceptible to signal loss during functional MRI acquisition (e.g. air/tissue, bone/tissue), special care was taken to investigate the signal availability in all nodes of each subject. If any such "signal-loss" nodes were noted even in a single patient, we applied the conservative approach of excluding these nodes in all subjects [40], i.e. patients and healthy controls. After the above pre-processing steps, only two such nodes were removed from all individual connectivity matrices for patients and healthy controls.

➢ Node and network definition

In this study, we used the functional Shen268-*node* atlas that was derived based on resting state fMRI data from a cohort of healthy participants [42], [43]. After the parcellation of the data into 268 nodes for each subject (i.e. patient/healthy control) [40], the mean time-course of each region of interest (i.e. a node) was computed. Then, the Pearson *r* correlation was calculated between each pair of nodes to yield a *268 × 268* matrix of correlations representing the function connections, or *edges* between nodes [41], [37]. Importantly, the Pearson correlation coefficients were Fisher Z-transformed. Considering only the upper triangle of the functional connectivity matrix, this calculation resulted in 35,778 unique edges for the whole brain [41].

Further, for the ROI analysis, the 268 nodes were assigned to 10 functionally derived resting state networks [42], [43], [44], [40]: (1). Cerebellum (CN), (2). DMN, (3). Fronto-parietal (FTP), (4). Medial frontal (MF), (5). Motor, (6). Salience (SN), (7). Subcortical (SBN), (8). Visual Association, (9). Visual I, (10). Visual II (Figure.2.A.).

Lastly, the Subcortical network was additionally divided into the Caudate (R/L), Thalamus (R/L), Hippocampus (R/L), Brainstem (R/L), Parahippocampus (R/L), and Putamen (R/L) for further detailed investigation, as per [42]. Due to the small size of the nodes in the last three regions, their R/L hemispheres were combined to form one univariate structure.

➢ Statistical analysis

To calculate the functional connectivity matrices, the mean time-courses of every node-pair were Pearson's correlated and their coefficients - Z-Fisher transformed [42], [43]. This resulted in 35,778 unique edges for the whole brain of each subject, or 35,245 edges, if taking into account the removal of two "signal-loss" nodes. Functional connectivity for each network of the Shen268 atlas [44] was defined by averaging the connectivity between all pairs of nodes that belonged to a specific network [12]. The healthy control subjects (n = 113) were scanned on a comparable, but separate 3T Siemens machine and thus were used only to visually guide the reader in the interpretation of the patients' data.

Next, Spearman's correlation and R^2 analyses were performed to investigate for any association between TBI patients' Z-scores for each resting state network and patients' clinical measures (i.e. GCS or mRS) and the fit of the model, respectively.

The Mann-Whitney U test was used to establish any association between the connectivity Z-scores of the resting state networks and patients GCS severity. This analysis was followed by similar investigation of the effect of TBI on the subscores of the GCS test (i.e. Eyes, Motor and Verbal). In this study, the GCS subscores were each binarized as follows: (1) Eyes "1-2" vs "3-4",

(2) Motor “1-5” vs “6” and (3) Verbal “1-4” vs “5”. Finally, GCS sub-group differences were evaluated within the Subcortical network using the same analytic approach. Associated p-values were Bonferroni corrected, except as indicated.

In this analysis, the selected independent variables and the small sample size did not allow for ordinal logistic regression or a higher classification model to be used in the prediction of mRS at 3months based on acute/sub-acute data. Thus, for mRS at 3-months, we again performed the Mann- Whitney U test after binarizing the mRS values (i.e. mRS scores from “0-1” vs “2-6”/alternatively, mRS from “0-2” vs “3-6”) (Ganesh et al., 2018). Associated p-values were Bonferroni corrected, except as indicated. Spearman correlation analysis was performed between the DMN functional connectivity scores and the mRS at 3-months.

Further, because of the non-normal distribution of behavioral data, Kruskal Wallis and Dunn’s analyses were conducted to explore the Subcortical functional connectivity across time and frequency (i.e. acute/longitudinal scan and/or first/repeat TBI). All associated p-values were Bonferroni corrected.

Lastly, ANCOVA was performed to test for the effect of motion noise and age on the resting state networks. To quantify the magnitude of the reported results, partial eta squared was provided for the F-tests.

Considering the ongoing controversy regarding the use of the global signal regression in resting state analysis [45], the statistical analysis for the Shen268 atlas [42] was repeated using matrices that were pre-processed without the use of GSR. The data showed similar results irrespective of the use of GSR.

III. Results

We screened 1,053 patients from the Yale New Haven Hospital database and identified 58 patients (mean ± SD, 41.28 ± 18.63years, 33% F) who met the inclusion criteria for our main analyses (Figure 1). An additional 50 patients (either scanned acutely/subacutely or longitudinally and with either a first or repeat TBI) were identified and combined with the main cohort of 58 patients for post-hoc analysis, yielding a total sample of 108 patients (Figure 1.B). Then, we selected 113 healthy control subjects for non-statistical (i.e. figure reference) comparison only (mean ± SD, 32.5 ± 12.6years, 52% F).

➢ Comparison of resting state functional connectivity based on GCS (sample size - n = 58)

All main cohort patients combined (n = 58, Figure 1.A.) showed a significant Spearman’s correlation between Total GCS score and functional connectivity Z-scores of the (1) Subcortical

(rho = 0.47, $P < 0.001$), (2) Motor (rho = 0.36, $P = 0.005$), (3) Salience (rho = 0.3, $P = 0.021$) and (4) DMN (rho = 0.33, $P = 0.011$). A subsequent coefficient of determination analysis showed $R^2 = 0.18$ (Subcortical), $R^2 = 0.12$ (Motor), $R^2 = 0.15$ (Salience) and $R^2 = 0.09$ (DMN), indicating that despite the significant correlation, GCS could not completely account for the variability in the functional connectivity of these resting state networks and suggesting other factors might still contribute to this variability. Due to the clinical interest in the subscores of GCS, we also explored resting state network relations to the Eye, Motor and Verbal subscores. With a single exception, these significant Spearman's correlations for the Total GCS score were also confirmed across the GCS subscores (See Supplementary Table.S.1).

Next, we dichotomized patients based on GCS severity (moderate-severe vs mild). The Mann-Whitney U test was performed to compare for the difference in Z-scores functional connectivity between TBI groups, which were defined based on GCS Total score (moderate-severe vs mild) or the Eyes/Motor/Verbal GCS subscores. For the Total GCS score, we found statistically significant functional connectivity in the Subcortical network (U = 694, $P < 0.001$), Motor (U = 571, $P = 0.018$) and Salience networks (U = 575, $P = 0.015$), but not the DMN (U = 514, $P = 0.147$) (Figure.2.B). However, after multiple comparisons, only the Subcortical network remained statistically significant, with mild TBI patients showing higher median Z-scores than moderate-severe patients (Hodges-Lehmann (HL) estimate = 0.05, 95% CI [0.028, 0.072]).

For the individual GCS subscore analysis (i.e. Eyes/Motor/Verbal) (Figure.2.C), the Subcortical, Salience, Motor and DMN networks were found to statistically discriminate between subscores groups. However, after Bonferroni corrections, again only the Subcortical network remained statistically significant for all subscores (with $P < 0.001$) for Eyes (U = 209; HL = -0.037, 95% CI for HL [-0.062, -0.015]), Motor (U = 185; HL = -0.043, 95% CI [-0.064, -0.02]) and Verbal (U = 180; HL = -0.045, 95% CI [-0.065, -0.021]), with some exceptions for the Verbal subscore (See Supplementary Table.S.2).

➢ Sub-Regions of the Subcortical resting state network (sample size - n = 58)

Given the prominence of the Subcortical network in the GCS-based analysis, we conducted a subregional analysis by subdividing this network into its components based on the Shen268 functional atlas (Figure.3).

The Mann-Whitney U test for the Subcortical network indicated the Thalamus Right (U = 615, $P = 0.002$) and Thalamus Left, (U = 661, $P < 0.001$) alongside the Caudate Right (U = 575, $P = 0.015$) as regions statistically discriminating between GCS severity groups. However, after

multiple comparisons correction, only the Thalamus (R/L) remained statistically significant (Right - (HL = 0.178, 95% CI [0.063, 0.289]), Left - (HL = 0.16, 95% CI [0.083, 0.237])).

➢ mRS at 3months and its prediction power based on resting state functional connectivity (sample size - n = 58)

Spearman correlation analysis between mRS at 3-months and the functional connectivity Z-scores of the 10 resting state networks showed significant associations to the (1) DMN (rho = -0.382, *P* = 0.003) and (2) Motor (rho = -0.365, *P* = 0.005) networks. A coefficient of determination analysis showed moderate R^2 = 0.18 (DMN) (Figure.4.B) and R^2 = 0.12 (Motor) indicating that despite the strong statistical correlation to these two resting state networks, mRS at 3-months could not explain a large portion of the variability in the neural correlates represented by the DMN/Motor resting state functional connectivity.

Given inconsistencies in the literature defining optimal cutoff points for dichotomizing functional outcome scales, we evaluated resting state network differences using two mRS groupings for "minor symptoms" vs "symptomatic (0-1 vs 2-6 and 0-2 vs 3-6). Using these two binarization methods, we performed the Mann – Whitney U test across the 10 resting state networks (Figure.4.A). These comparisons showed that the 0-2 vs 3-6 division better aligned with the correlation analyses compared to the 0-1 vs 2-6 division, particularly for the DMN. While the 0-1 vs 2-6 mRS division, only showed a trend towards significance in the DMN (U = 512, *P* = 0.083), the mRS 0-2 vs mRS 3-6 division showed a significant difference in the DMN (U = 527, *P* = 0.016, HL = 0.051, 95% CI [0.008, 0.091]) (Figure.4.A). The latter analysis suggested the difference might be driven by patients with an mRS2 (n = 15). However, these patients had an evenly distributed GCS score (seven: - GCS 6-8; and eight: GCS 14-15). Additionally, even after excluding patients with mRS2 the difference in DMN functional connectivity remained statistically significant.

Beyond the DMN, the 0-1 vs 2-6 dichotomization also revealed statistical discrimination between patients' scores at 3-months in the (1) Motor (U = 536, *P* = 0.034, HL = 0.028, 95% CI [0.004, 0.048]) and (2) Cerebellum networks (U = 530, *P* = 0.043, HL = 0.055, 95% CI [0.0005, 0.12]). On the other hand, the alternative 0-2 vs 3-6 division indicated the importance of the (1) Motor network (U = 519, *P* = 0.023, HL = 0.029, 95% CI [0.004, 0.052]) and (2) the Medial - Frontal network (U = 518, *P* = 0.024, HL = 0.037, 95% CI [0.007, 0.077]), alongside the DMN results.

None of the mRS analysis results, irrespective of mRS dichotomization used, survived multiple comparison corrections (Figure.4.A).

➢ Prediction of GCS at admission to mRS at 3-months (sample size - n = 58)

Next, we explored whether admission GCS could predict 3-month functional outcome based on DMN connectivity during the acute/subacute timeframe (Figure.4.C).

Regardless of how the mRS was dichotomized, DMN functional connectivity did not predict functional outcome based on mRS at 3-months in mild TBI patients (Figure.4.C - right plot, left panel; Figure.4.C - left plot, left panel). However, when evaluating moderate-severe TBI patients, DMN Z-scores managed to predict the functional outcome based on 3-month mRS when comparing 0-1 vs 2-6 as assessed by the Mann-Whitney U test (Figure.4.C - left plot, right panel) (U = 123, P = 0.037, HL = 0.078, 95% CI [0.01, 0.152]). A similar trend was observed when comparing mRS 0-2 vs mRS 3-6 with higher DMN Z-scores in the better outcome group although this did not reach statistical significance (Figure.4.C - right plot, right panel) (U = 150, P = 0.12). This lack of significance may be partially explained by the inclusion of several patients (n=7) in the mRS 2 group, all of whom with severe GCS scores.

Of note, only mild and moderate patients achieved “complete” recovery at 3-month post-TBI, based on their mRS = 0 at 3-months (i.e. 9% if only “mRS 0”, or 39% if “mRS 0 + mRS 1”).

➢ Subcortical functional connectivity from acute to longitudinal and from first TBI to repeat TBI (sample size - n = 108)

A post-hoc analysis was performed to further explore the relationship of the Subcortical functional connectivity on TBI acuity and severity (Figure.5). Thus, we extended our cohort (Figure 1.B) to include patients who were also scanned outside of the acute time window (i.e. referred to as a “longitudinal scan”) or had a history of prior TBI (i.e. referred to as a “repeat TBI”). Our extended cohort of 108 patients was divided into four groups based on the time between the traumatic event and the scan, alongside frequency of TBI (i.e. first or non-first = repeat). Thus, we had (1) acute/sub-acute first TBI (n = 58), (2) acute/sub-acute repeat TBI (n = 12), (3) longitudinal first TBI (n = 28) and (4) longitudinal repeat TBI (n = 10). The acute/sub-acute first TBI group continued to be separated into mild and moderate-severe patients (28 mild + 30 moderate-severe, median group GCS = 15 and GCS = 7, respectively), as in the previous analysis. All other groups were kept as a single group, due to their smaller sample size and predominant GCS scores. In particular, (A) acute/sub-acute repeat TBI (4 mild + 8 moderate-severe, median group GCS = 9), (B) longitudinal first TBI (25 mild + 3 moderate – severe, median group GCS = 15) and (C) longitudinal repeat TBI (8 mild + 2 moderate-severe, median group GCS = 15).

The Kruskal- Wallis for Subcortical functional connectivity across time and frequency range was significant ($\chi_2(4) = 28.31$, $P < 0.001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.24$) (Figure.5). Subsequent Dunn’s *Post hoc* confirmed

a notable effect of sub-group for (A) mild and moderate-severe TBI (acute/sub-acute first TBI) ($P_{bonf} < 0.001$), (B) moderate-severe TBI (acute/sub-acute first TBI) and longitudinal first TBI ($P_{bonf} = 0.001$) and (C) moderate-severe TBI (acute/sub-acute first TBI) and longitudinal repeat TBI ($P_{bonf} = 0.002$).

We also explored the link between the Thalamus and the rest of the resting state networks not only during the acute/sub-acute stage, but also over time and frequency of TBI (See Supplementary Figure.S.3).

➢**Motion noise and Age as covariates**

Motion noise is an essential concern in MRI scans, even more so in clinical scans. Mean motion noise for each patient was calculated as the mean of frame-to-frame displacement of the functional image < 1.2mm. After a robust motion noise cleaning procedure, motion noise from the clinical scans still correlated to Total GCS ($P < 0.001$) and the Subcortical network ($P < 0.001$), but not to the DMN ($P = 0.83$) or mRS ($P = 0.25$). After regressing out the motion noise [$F(1,54) = 18.21$, $P < 0.001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.25$], ANCOVA showed that GCS still retained its meaningful impact on the discrimination of Subcortical functional connectivity Z-scores among patients [$F(1,54) = 24.13$, $P < 0.001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.31$].

Similarly, we accounted for the effect of age – age was not notably correlated to any resting state networks or mRS, but to GCS ($P < 0.001$). However, ANCOVA showed that age did not have any effect [$F(1,54) = 0.035$, $P = 0.85$, $\eta_p^2 < 0.001$] on the discrimination of the Subcortical functional connectivity based on GCS severity.

Importantly, in this study, we did not use GCS Total as a continuous variable (which initially showed the significant correlation), but a dichotomized variable based on the continuous one. Thus, the above-mentioned considerations might be unnecessary.

IV. Discussion

In this study, we investigated the relationship between resting state functional connectivity and two common clinical measures, based on TBI severity and functional outcome. We found that acquiring acute/sub-acute functional connectivity scans may provide complementary functional brain-based information about TBI severity to GCS by highlighting the utility of resting state substrates, particularly of the Subcortical network. In addition, our findings suggest the DMN may correlate with functional outcome at 3-months post-TBI in moderate-severe TBI patients.

➢ GCS at admission was reflected in the Subcortical network

Ideally, a clinical score should be a relatively good representation of the canonical brain networks to ensure that disruptions caused by injuries like TBI are accurately captured in routinely collected clinical assessments. However, based on our findings and previous research [2], [3], [4], [5], the GCS appears to lack the sensitivity to broadly reflect these network perturbations. While the total GCS was significantly linked to the Subcortical, DMN, Salience and Motor networks based on our correlation analysis, the low R^2 values suggested that GCS failed to explain a lot of the variability in these networks. Many TBI studies focus on one specific severity sub-group in their analyses [20], [22], [16], thereby limiting our understanding of TBI brain-behavior correlates when trying to compare across the full spectrum of TBI severity. While there is certain natural variability that is not related to brain injuries, clinical tools most commonly used to assess TBI severity, like GCS, remain cursory. One of the main findings of this study highlights how limited the GCS may be as a tool when constructing a comprehensive brain-behavioral representation of TBI severity.

Within these acknowledged limits and after detailed examination of the 10 resting state networks [42], [43], we found that the Subcortical network was the only network which significantly discriminated between mild and moderate-severe TBI patients, also after correcting for multiple comparisons. Since GCS primarily reflects patient consciousness levels, our finding that its discriminative power was largely centered in the Subcortical network during acute/sub-acute TBI is well supported [46], [47], [48]. This observation was independent of whether the investigation was done using Total GCS or GCS Subscores (i.e. Eyes, Motor, Verbal). Previous research stressed the importance of this network in showing its abnormal functional connectivity in disorder of consciousness patients [46], [47], [48]. Together with the DMN and other cortical networks, the Subcortical network indicated that its degree of alteration might be linked to the level of consciousness impairment and that subsequent recovery was a consequence of the normalization of its connectivity [47].

Despite its central role in the establishment of consciousness [49], [31], in our study, DMN connectivity did not survive correction for multiple comparisons when discriminating between moderate-severe vs mild GCS during the acute/sub-acute phase. This suggests that GCS may be too superficial a behavioral measure to distinguish between TBI categories in other canonical networks, like the DMN. Alternatively, these other networks may only be robust to comparisons to networks of “control-patients” interactions rather than between the impaired networks of injured patients.

➢ Mild TBI hyperconnectivity vs moderate-severe TBI hypoconnectivity

Further analysis among the regions of the Subcortical network pointed to the right and left thalami, substantiating not only the potential importance of the brain’s relay station for mild TBI and patients’ outcome [50], [51], [52] but also for the initial response to brain trauma [53], [54] and consciousness

[46], [55]. Interestingly, the thalamus not only showed the only statistically different functional connectivity levels among GCS severity groups, but its strongest functional connectivity was within the Subcortical network, rather than outside of this network (See Supplementary Table.S.3). Additionally, we found that at both Subcortical and thalamic levels, mild TBI patients exhibit expressed hyperconnectivity relative to their moderate-severe TBI counterparts. This suggests the two severity groups may not rely on the same compensatory mechanisms post-injury. Hyperconnectivity is suggested to be a basic response to neurological disease, including TBI [56], [57], [58]. It has mainly been proposed as a response to enhance the neural network performance and restore communication, recruiting increased resources to detour otherwise damaged pathways. Both centralized and regional hyperconnectivity have previously been described. Regional hyperconnectivity depends on the use of regional resources, whereas centralized hyperconnectivity uses well established critical networks hubs (one of which is the thalamus) and does not depend on the etiology or location of the TBI [57]. When compared, centralized hyperconnectivity, which reflects a group of highly connected and conveniently positioned nodes [57], is more metabolically efficient than regional increases spread across the brain. Our findings of thalamic hyperconnectivity in mild TBI are corroborated by previous research [19], and support a potential theory of bypassing damaged pathways by recruiting centralized thalamic networks in search of compensatory mechanisms.

Interestingly, functional hyperconnectivity in TBI is a more often cited response to TBI than hypoconnectivity, the latter considered to be linked to extensive resource loss in the affected regions [56], as seen in severe TBI cases like our moderate-severe cohort. By being able to make a direct comparison across TBI severities, the network pathology among TBI patients appeared exaggerated within the specified region examined. We postulate two reasons for the observed Subcortical hypoconnectivity: (1) that overall damage was too critical and thus centralized attempts to compensate were not possible resulting in persistently low functional connectivity levels, (2) moderate-severe TBI brain mechanisms attempted to offload to the thalamus, but the overstimulation was too energy-consuming leading to metabolic exhaustion and relative hypointensity.

Lastly, the MRI radiological reports of the acute/sub-acute patients were reviewed. Due to the lack of reported structural damage to the thalamus, this area might not have been considered for further investigation. However, the increased sensitivity of the resting state networks functional maps detected the differences among the GCS patient groups.

➢ At 3-months, mRS showed a correlation to the DMN resting state functional connectivity

To evaluate patients outcome at 3-months, we examined functional connectivity Z-scores in the 10 resting state networks explored in this study [42], [43]. When comparing patients with "no/minor symptoms" (mRS 0-1) versus "moderate/severe symptoms" (mRS 2-6), we found that the differences mainly emphasized networks related to motor functions (i.e. the Motor network) and balance (i.e. the Cerebellum network). On the other hand, dichotomizing patients based on the likelihood of functional and cognitive dependence (mRS 0-2 vs mRS 3-6), highlighted differences in the Medial-Frontal network and DMN. Still, we remain cautious about the overinterpretation of these results, as neither of them remained statistically important after Bonferroni corrections. Whereas there are more task-based fMRI studies which support fMRI prediction of TBI outcome [47], [59] fewer resting-state studies were conducted in the acute state post-TBI. However, those that exist appear to support a correlation between reduced functional connectivity in the DMN and functional outcome [60], though predictive performance remains ambiguous [30]. Interestingly, the Subcortical network did not statistically discriminate between patient outcomes at 3-months. This may be related to the broader symptoms and functions assessed for when calculating mRS compared to GCS, thus no longer highlighting the contrast in TBI GCS severity noted previously in the Subcortical network.

➢ Subcortical functional connectivity appeared to be reflective of the severity of the injury

In our final post-hoc analysis, we aimed to understand whether chronicity, frequency of injury or injury severity has the greatest impact on hyperconnectivity of mild TBI patients and/or the hypoconnectivity of moderate-severe TBI observed in the Subcortical network. Despite the complexity of interpreting repeat TBI and the lack of understanding of its molecular mechanisms [61], these patients constitute a commonly presenting population of TBI patients to the Emergency department (ED). Therefore, considering that they are more susceptible to neurodegeneration [62], [61], [63], more research is warranted to elucidate the neuronal sequelae of their TBI.

Our results suggested that in our cohort injury severity, as measured by the GCS, had a more pronounced effect on functional connectivity than chronicity or frequency of injury. However, combining mild injury severity with repeated injury appeared to produce the most pronounced hyperconnectivity in mild TBI patients compared to all other groups. Previous research comparing first vs repeat mild TBI (scanned on average 12.5days (SD ± 9.9) post TBI) [63] showed that the repeat TBI patients had an even further exacerbated hyperconnectivity compared to the acute

first TBI, postulating the neurological effects of repeat TBI might be cumulative [63]. While differentiation among mild TBI patients might highlight injury frequency as a significant factor, the inclusion of a moderate-severe TBI cohort in our study revealed that TBI severity appears to be the primary determinant of functional connectivity differences among groups.

While our and previous research [19], [63] suggest that Subcortical hyperconnectivity persists over time, it is unclear how advantageous such a response might be long-term. While undoubtedly beneficial in the short-term, long-term thalamic hyperconnectivity may lead to the network hubs becoming more susceptible to secondary pathological processes due to "chronically elevated metabolic stress" [57]. Research suggests that long-term hub "overload" might be a sign of pathology [64] and these sites are vulnerable to increased amyloid beta deposition, a marker of Alzheimer's disease [57]. As there may be an ultimate "cost-efficiency negotiation" during the follow-up period as a response of the brain optimization and adaptation to the energy consuming demands of the injury [58], [57], all this might hold numerous implications for long-term outcome after TBI [58].

➢ Limitations of this study

We recognize that despite its strengths, our study has some limitations. First, collecting acute/sub-acute MRI scans remains challenging, and therefore limited sample sizes are mostly available. Second, due to the clinical protocol under which these scans were acquired, dedicated healthy controls were not acquired for this study and thus institutional proxy controls were used for visualization. Consequently, this study emphasized the difference between patient groups, that despite being more subtle, are more clinically relevant to our question in comparison to differences observed between patients and healthy control subjects. Thirdly, we did not segment the thalamus into nuclei as there is no single widely accepted thalamic resting state functional atlas, despite several valuable examples being available [65]. Fourth, our available functional outcome scores were limited to the 3-month follow-up timeframe. In future studies it would be important to reassess correlations and prediction of outcome using outcome data at later timeframes.

V. Conclusion

Our goal in this study was to determine whether two widely used clinical tools, GCS and mRS, could be used to link to the brain's performance and diagnostic prognostication after TBI. We found that GCS at admission is reflected by increased resting state functional connectivity in the Subcortical network, particularly in the thalamus. This increased functional connectivity showed clear discrimination between GCS severity groups, with hyperconnectivity in mild TBI patients.

Our study also showed that the DMN functional connectivity in the acute/sub-acute stage showed a potential link to 3-month mRS performance, which could provide valuable prognostication, if confirmed in a larger cohort.

While GCS and 3-month mRS scores offer some meaningful insights, their limited capture of neural representation underscores the need to investigate whether other early clinical assessments correlate more robustly with early resting state networks or whether resting state networks themselves could predict future outcomes.

Data availability

Anonymized raw data might be available upon reasonable request.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank all patients whose records were used in this retrospective review study.

Funding

This research was supported by Yale University, School of Medicine Award K23NS112596-01A1. In addition, JAK was supported by the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, Swebilius Foundation and American Academy of Neurology.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

VI. References

1. Teasdale, G. & Jennett, B. Assessment of coma and impaired consciousness. A practical scale. *Lancet* **2**, 81–4 (1974).
2. Reith, F. C. M., Brennan, P. M., Maas, A. I. R. & Teasdale, G. M. Lack of standardization in the use of the glasgow coma scale: Results of international surveys. *J. Neurotrauma* **33**, 89–94 (2016).
3. Bodien, Y. G. *et al.* Diagnosing Level of Consciousness: The Limits of the Glasgow Coma Scale Total Score. *J. Neurotrauma* **38**, 3295–3305 (2021).
4. Åkerlund, C. A. I. *et al.* Clustering identifies endotypes of traumatic brain injury in an intensive care cohort: a CENTER-TBI study. *Crit. Care* **26**, 1–15 (2022).
5. Jain, S. & Iverson, L. M. Glasgow Coma Scale. in *Glasgow Coma Scale* (StatPearls Publishing, 2024, 2023). doi:pmid: 30020670.
6. J Rankin. Cerebral vascular accidents in patients over the age of 60. II. Prognosis. *Scott Med J* **May;**, 200–15 (1957).
7. Quinn, T. J., Dawson, J., Walters, M. R. & Lees, K. R. Reliability of the modified rankin scale: A systematic review. *Stroke* **40**, 3393–3395 (2009).
8. Jagoda, A. S. *et al.* Clinical Policy: Neuroimaging and Decisionmaking in Adult Mild Traumatic Brain Injury in the Acute Setting. *J. Emerg. Nurs.* **35**, 5–40 (2009).
9. Calzolari, E. *et al.* Vestibular agnosia in traumatic brain injury and its link to imbalance. *Brain* **144**, 128–143 (2021).
10. Maas, A. I. R. *et al.* Traumatic brain injury: progress and challenges in prevention, clinical care, and research. *Lancet Neurol.* **21**, 1004–1060 (2022).
11. Yuh, E. L. *et al.* MRI improves 3-month outcome prediction in mild traumatic brain injury. *Ann. Neurol.* **73**, 224–235 (2013).
12. Fischer, D. *et al.* Intact Brain Network Function in an Unresponsive Patient with COVID-19. *Ann. Neurol.* **88**, 851–854 (2020).
13. Ferrazzano, P. A. *et al.* MRI and Clinical Variables for Prediction of Outcomes after Pediatric Severe Traumatic Brain Injury. *JAMA Netw. Open* e2425765 (2024) doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.25765.
14. Pandit, A. S. *et al.* Traumatic brain injury impairs small-world topology. *Neurology* **80**, 1826–1833 (2013).
15. Sharp, D. J., Scott, G. & Leech, R. Network dysfunction after traumatic brain injury. *Nat. Rev. Neurol.* **10**, 156–66 (2014).
16. Huang, S. *et al.* Structural and functional connectivity of the whole brain and subnetworks

in individuals with mild traumatic brain injury: predictors of patient prognosis. *Neural Regen. Res.* **19**, 1553–1558 (2024).

17. Venkatesan, U. M., Dennis, N. A. & Hillary, F. G. Chronology and Chronicity of Altered Resting-State Functional Connectivity after Traumatic Brain Injury. *J. Neurotrauma* **252–64**, 252–264 (2015).
18. De Simoni, S. *et al.* Altered caudate connectivity is associated with executive dysfunction after traumatic brain injury. *Brain* **141**, 148–164 (2018).
19. Woodrow, R. E. *et al.* Acute thalamic connectivity precedes chronic post-concussive symptoms in mild traumatic brain injury. *Brain* **146**, 3484–3499 (2023).
20. Nelson, L. D. *et al.* Recovery After Mild Traumatic Brain Injury in Patients Presenting to US Level I Trauma Centers: A Transforming Research and Clinical Knowledge in Traumatic Brain Injury (TRACK-TBI) Study. *JAMA Neurol.* **76**, 1049–1059 (2019).
21. MacHamer, J. *et al.* Symptom Frequency and Persistence in the First Year after Traumatic Brain Injury: A TRACK-TBI Study. *J. Neurotrauma* **39**, 358–370 (2022).
22. Rosenthal, S., Gray, M., Fatima, H., Sair, H. I. & Whitlow, C. T. Functional MR Imaging: Blood Oxygen Level–Dependent and Resting State Techniques in Mild Traumatic Brain Injury. *Neuroimaging Clin. N. Am.* **28**, 107–115 (2018).
23. Kashou, A. W. *et al.* Drivers of resting-state fMRI heterogeneity in traumatic brain injury across injury characteristics and imaging methods: a systematic review and semiquantitative analysis. *Front. Neurol.* **15**, 1–17 (2024).
24. Song, M. *et al.* Prognostication of chronic disorders of consciousness using brain functional networks and clinical characteristics. *Elife* **7**, (2018).
25. Nelson, L. D. *et al.* Acute Clinical Predictors of Symptom Recovery in Emergency Department Patients with Uncomplicated Mild Traumatic Brain Injury or Non-Traumatic Brain Injuries. *J. Neurotrauma* **259**, 249–259 (2018).
26. Falk, H. *et al.* A Prognostic Model for Predicting One-Month Outcomes among Emergency Department Patients with Mild Traumatic Brain Injury and a Presenting Glasgow Coma Scale of Fifteen. *J. Neurotrauma* **38**, 2714–2722 (2021).
27. Amiri, M. *et al.* Multimodal Prediction of 3- and 12-Month Outcomes in ICU Patients with Acute Disorders of Consciousness. *Neurocrit. Care* **40**, 718–733 (2024).
28. Fox, M. D. & Greicius, M. Clinical applications of resting state functional connectivity. *Front. Syst. Neurosci.* **4:19**, (2010).
29. Threlkeld, Z. D. *et al.* Functional networks reemerge during recovery of consciousness after acute severe traumatic brain injury. *Cortex* **106**, 299–308 (2018).

30. Kolisnyk, M. *et al.* Predicting neurologic recovery after severe acute brain injury using resting-state networks. *J. Neurol.* **270**, 6071–6080 (2023).
31. Li, J. *et al.* NeuroImage Mapping the subcortical connectivity of the human default mode network. *Neuroimage* **245**, 118758 (2021).
32. Barron, D. S. *et al.* Transdiagnostic, Connectome-Based Prediction of Memory Constructs across Psychiatric Disorders. *Cereb. Cortex* **31**, 2523–2533 (2021).
33. Van Swieten, J. C., Koudstaal, P. J., Visser, M. C., Schouten, H. & Van Gijn, J. Interobserver agreement for the assessment of handicap in stroke patients. *Stroke* **19**, 604–607 (1988).
34. Gaastra, B. *et al.* Evidence-based interconversion of the Glasgow Outcome and modified Rankin scales: pitfalls and best practices. *J. Stroke Cerebrovasc. Dis.* **31**, 1–6 (2022).
35. Tilley, B. C. *et al.* Use of a global test for multiple outcomes in stroke trials with application to the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke t-PA Stroke Trial. *Stroke* **27**, 2136–2142 (1996).
36. Jennett, B. & Bond, M. Assessment of outcome after severe brain damage. *Lancet* **305**, P480-484 (1975).
37. Rosenberg, M. D. *et al.* Functional connectivity predicts changes in attention observed across minutes, days, and months. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **117**, 3797–3807 (2020).
38. Joshi, A. *et al.* Unified framework for development, deployment and robust testing of neuroimaging algorithms. *Neuroinformatics* **9**, 69–84 (2011).
39. Rosenberg, M. D. *et al.* A neuromarker of sustained attention from whole-brain functional connectivity. *Nat. Neurosci.* **19**, 165–171 (2015).
40. Greene, A. S., Gao, S., Scheinost, D. & Constable, R. T. Task-induced brain state manipulation improves prediction of individual traits. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, (2018).
41. Horien, C. *et al.* A generalizable connectome-based marker of in-scan sustained attention in neurodiverse youth. *Cereb. Cortex* **33**, 6320–6334 (2023).
42. Shen, X., Tokogly, F., Papademetris, X. & Constable, R. T. Groupwise whole-brain parcellation from resting-state fMRI data for network node identification. *Neuroimage* 403–415 (2013) doi:doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.05.081.
43. Finn, E. S. *et al.* Functional connectome fingerprinting: Identifying individuals using patterns of brain connectivity. *Nat. Neurosci.* **18**, 1664–1671 (2015).
44. Noble, S. *et al.* Influences on the Test-Retest Reliability of Functional Connectivity MRI and its Relationship with Behavioral Utility. *Cereb. Cortex* **27**, 5415–5429 (2017).
45. Murphy, K. & Fox, M. D. Towards a consensus regarding global signal regression for

resting state functional connectivity MRI. *Neuroimage* **154**, 169–173 (2017).

46. Giacino, J. T., Fins, J. J., Laureys, S. & Schiff, N. D. Disorders of consciousness after acquired brain injury: The state of the science. *Nat. Rev. Neurol.* **10**, 99–114 (2014).
47. Bodien, Y. G., Chatelle, C. & Edlow, B. L. Functional Networks in Disorders of Consciousness. *Semin Neurol.* **37**, 485–502 (2017).
48. Cambareri, M. K., Horn, A., Lewis, L. D., Li, J. & Edlow, B. L. Subcortical Hubs of Brain Networks Sustaining Human Consciousness. *bioRxiv* (2024) doi:doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.04.616722.
49. Vanhaudenhuyse, A. *et al.* Default network connectivity reflects the level of consciousness in non-communicative braindamaged patients. *Brain* **133**, (2009).
50. Grossman, E. J. & Inglese, M. The role of thalamic damage in mild traumatic brain injury. *J. Neurotrauma* **33**, 163–167 (2016).
51. Banks, S. D. *et al.* Thalamic Functional Connectivity in Mild Traumatic Brain Injury: Longitudinal Associations With Patient-Reported Outcomes and Neuropsychological Tests. *Arch. Phys. Med. Rehabil.* **97**, 1254–1261 (2016).
52. Nathan, D. E. *et al.* Assessing Quantitative Changes in Intrinsic Thalamic Networks in Blast and Nonblast Mild Traumatic Brain Injury: Implications for Mechanisms of Injury. *BRAIN Connect.* **6**, 389–402 (2016).
53. Tang, L. *et al.* Thalamic Resting-State Functional Networks : Disruption in Patients with Mild Traumatic Brain Methods. *Radiology* **260**, 831–840 (2011).
54. Iraji, A. *et al.* Resting State Functional Connectivity in Mild Traumatic Brain Injury at the Acute Stage: Independent Component and Seed-Based Analyses. *J. Neurotrauma* **32**, 1031–1045 (2015).
55. Panda, R. *et al.* Disruption in structural–functional network repertoire and time-resolved subcortical fronto-temporoparietal connectivity in disorders of consciousness. *Elife* **11**, 1–19 (2022).
56. Hillary, F. G. *et al.* Hyperconnectivity is a Fundamental Response to Neurological Disruption Introduction : Disconnecting the Brain. in *Neuropsychology* vol. 29 59–75 (2015).
57. Hillary, F. G. & Grafman, J. H. Injured Brains and Adaptive Networks: the benefits and costs of hyperconnectivity. *Trends Cogn. Sci.* **21**, 385–401 (2017).
58. Roy, A. *et al.* The evolution of cost-efficiency in neural networks during recovery from traumatic brain injury. *PLoS One* **12**, 1–26 (2017).
59. Edlow, B. L. *et al.* Early detection of consciousness in patients with acute severe traumatic

brain injury. *Brain* **140**, 2399–2414 (2017).

60. Thompson, W. H., Thelin, E. P., Lilja, A., Bellander, B. M. & Fransson, P. Functional resting-state fMRI connectivity correlates with serum levels of the S100B protein in the acute phase of traumatic brain injury. *NeuroImage Clin.* **12**, 1004–1012 (2015).
61. Sakthivel, R. *et al.* Fixed Time-Point Analysis Reveals Repetitive Mild Traumatic Brain Injury Effects on Resting State Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging Connectivity and Neuro-Spatial Protein Profiles. *J. Neurol.* **40**, 2037–2049 (2023).
62. McKee, A. C. *et al.* Chronic traumatic encephalopathy in athletes: Progressive tauopathy after repetitive head injury. *J. Neuropathol. Exp. Neurol.* **68**, 709–735 (2009).
63. Woodrow, R. E. *et al.* Repeat traumatic brain injury exacerbates acute thalamic hyperconnectivity in humans. *Brain Commun.* **6**, 1–8 (2024).
64. Stam, C. J. Modern network science of neurological disorders. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **15**, 683–695 (2014).
65. Kumar, V. J., Oort, E. van, Scheffler, K., Beckmann, C. F. & Grodd, W. Functional anatomy of the human thalamus at rest. *Neuroimage* 678–691 (2017) doi:doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.12.071.



Figure.1. Study Flowchart of Participant Inclusion and Exclusion criteria: (A). Cohort of acute/subacute first TBI patients for primary analyses, based on the following inclusion criteria: (1) TBI patients ≥18 years old and scanned within 31 days of their first TBI event, (2) Good quality rsfMRI scans*, (3) no subsequent TBIs within 3months and(4) with no history of neurological deficit at baseline**. This criteria resulted in a final cohort of 58 TBI patients. **(B).** Cohort for post-hoc investigation of the Subcortical network. One-hundred and eight TBI patients identified and divided into four groups: (1) sub-acute/acute first TBI (n = 58) - main cohort presented in Figure.1. A – patients who were scanned acutely/sub-acutely (i.e. <= 31 days) and had their first TBI, (2) sub-acute/acute repeat TBI (n = 12) – patients who were scanned acutely/sub-acutely (i.e. <= 31 days) but had a prior history of a TBI, (3) longitudinal first TBI (n = 28) – patients scanned > 31 days after their initial TBI encounter, with no prior history of TBI and (4) longitudinal repeat TBI (n = 10) – patients scanned > 31 days after the TBI event of interest with a history of a prior TBI. **Key:** rsfMRI = resting-state fMRI; *Good quality rsfMRI = was considered acceptable quality for resting state analysis, i.e. frame-to-frame displacement of the functional image < 1.2mm, alongside no visual disturbances (e.g. lines) or other artifacts masking the brain image; **No history of neurological deficit at baseline = patients' medical records were examined to ensure no patients with previous history of a general neurological disorder/brain condition (e.g., brain cancer, stroke, epilepsy, bipolar disorder), neurodegenerative disorder (e.g., Huntington's disease, mild cognitive impairment (MCI) or dementia (e.g., Alzheimer's disease (AD), fronto-temporal dementia (FTD) or vascular dementia (VaD))) or neurodevelopmental disorder (e.g., Down syndrome, Social Anxiety Disorder (SAD)) were included in the study.; Excluded – conditions that did not comply with the general requirement.

Demographics of Acute/Subacute First TBI patients (Main Cohort)

	Total Cohort	***Mild GCS Subgroup***	***Moderate-severe GCS Subgroup***
Sample size (n)	*58/58*	*28/58*	*30/58*
GCS at admission (Mdn [IQR])	*10.5 [7,15]*	*15 [14.75, 15]*	*7 [6,8.75]*
Eyes	*3 [1,4]*	*4 [4,4]*	*1 [1,2]*
Motor	*6 [4,6]*	*6 [6,6]*	*4 [4,5]*
Verbal	*3.5 [1,5]*	*5 [5,5]*	*1 [1,1.75]*
mRS at 3months (Mdn [IQR])	*2 [1,3]*	*1 [1,2]*	*3 [2,4]*
Age (Mean ±SD)	*41.28 ± 18.63*	*48.29 ± 19.85*	*34.73 ± 14.97*
Gender, % F	*33%*	*43%*	*23%*
Mechanism of injury, n (%/within group)			
accel/decel	*39 (67%)*	*12(43%)*	*27(90%)*
fall > 3f	*5 (9%)*	*5(18%)*	*-*
fall from standing	*11 (19%)*	*10 (36%)*	*1(3%)*
direct impact	*2(3%)*	*-*	*2(7%)*
not clear	*1 (2%)*	*1(3%)*	*-*

Table.1. Demographics of Acute/Subacute First TBI patients (Main Cohort). Columns separated by patient numbers for total cohort and moderate-severe vs mild subgroups. **Key:** GCS=Glasgow Coma Scale; GCS subscores = GCS Eyes + GCS Motor + GCS Verbal; mRS = Modified Ranking Scale; accel/decel = acceleration/deceleration, fall > 3f = fall from a higher elevation, fall from standing = fall from a standing position or a normal walking position, direct impact = indicates a hit to the head by an object, not clear – not clear etiology of TBI.



<u>Figure.2. Association between Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) and functional connectivity across 10 resting state networks.</u> <u>(A).</u> Ten resting state networks derived from the Shen268 atlas [42]. These are Medial-Frontal (MF), Fronto-Parietal (FTP), DMN (Default Mode Network), Motor, Visual I (Vis I), Visual II (Vis II), Visual Association (Vis Assoc), Salience (SN), Subcortical (SCN) and Cerebellum (CN) networks, respectively (CITE). **<u>(B).</u>** Network analysis based on TBI severity classified by Total GCS on admission score (moderate-severe (dark blue; GCS 3-12) vs mild (light blue; GCS 13-15)). The Mann-Whitney U test was used to establish any association between the Z-scores connectivity maps of the resting state networks and patients GCS severity (i.e. moderate-severe vs mild). The x-axis, displays the 10 resting state networks based on the Shen268 atlas and the y-axis shows the functional connectivity Z-scores. Healthy controls (white) are displayed for visual reference only. **<u>(C).</u>** Network analysis for each GCS subscore on admission. Each GCS subscore was dichotomized. <u>GCS Eyes Subscore</u>**:** 1-2 vs 3-4 (1 = no response, 4 =spontaneous eye opening); <u>GCS Motor Subscore</u>**:** 1-5 vs 6 (1 = no response, 6 = obeys command); <u>GCS Verbal Subscore</u>**:** 1-4 vs 5 (1 = no response, 5 =fully oriented). The Mann-Whitney U test was used to establish any association between the Z-scores connectivity of the resting state networks and patients GCS subscores (i.e. Eyes, Motor and Verbal scores, respectively). The x-axis displays the 10 resting state networks based on the Shen268 atlas and the y-axis shows the functional connectivity Z-scores. Healthy controls (light grey) are displayed for visual reference only. **<u>Key:</u>** blue * denote significant results that did not survive multiple comparisons; black * are results that remain statistically significant after Bonferroni corrections, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$; Medial- Frontal network = MF, Fronto-Parietal network = FTP; Default Mode Network = DMN, Visual I network = Vis I, Visual II network = Vis II, Visual Association = Vis Assoc, Salience = SN, Subcortical network = SCN, Cerebellar network = CN.



Figure.3. Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) and functional connectivity alterations within the Subcortical network. The Mann-Whitney U test was performed to establish any association between the functional connectivity Z-scores within the Subcortical network components and patients GCS severity (i.e. moderate-severe vs mild). On the x-axis, we display the sub-regions of the Subcortical network, based on the Shen268 atlas: caudate, hippocampus, thalamus, brainstem, parahippocampus and putamen. On the y-axis, we display the functional connectivity Z-scores. Healthy controls (white) are displayed for visual reference only. **Key:** L – left, R – right, GCS – Glasgow Coma Scale; blue * denote significant results that did not survive multiple comparisons; black * are results that remain statistically significant after Bonferroni corrections, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.



Figure.4. Associations between functional connectivity (FC) patterns and modified Rankin Scale (mRS) at 3months. (A). Network analysis based on mRS at 3 months. Outcomes were dichotomized based on two divisions: (1) minimal (mRS 0-1) vs persistent/disabling symptoms (mRS 2-6); (2) independent (mRS 0-2) vs moderate/severe symptoms. (mRS 3-6). The Mann-Whitney U test was used to establish any association between the functional connectivity Z-scores of the resting state networks and patients mRS at 3months scores. The x-axis shows 10 resting state networks based on the Shen268 atlas and the y-axis displays the Z-scores of the functional connectivity. Healthy controls (white) are displayed for visual reference only. **(B).** A Spearman correlation analysis between the DMN functional connectivity and mRS at 3months was performed. **(C).** DMN functional connectivity for the prediction of mRS at 3 months in TBI patients based on GCS at admission. Patients are first split into two plots based on mRS dichotomization along the x-axis (either 0-1 vs 2-6 (left plot) or 0-2 vs 3-6 (right plot)). The y-axis shows Z-score functional connectivity of the DMN. Each plot is then further divided based on TBI severity classified as "mild" or "moderate-severe" using total GCS on admission. The Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare between mRS subgroups, e.g., between 0-1 vs 2-6 within the moderate-severe GCS group. No multiple comparison test was required for this part of the analysis. **Key:** blue * denote significant results that did not survive multiple comparisons; black * are results that remain statistically significant after Bonferroni corrections, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$; Medial- Frontal network = MF, Fronto-Parietal network = FTP; Default Mode Network = DMN, Visual I network = Vis I, Visual II network = Vis II, Visual Association = Vis Assoc, Salience = SN, Subcortical network = SCN, Cerebellar network = CN; **Figure.4.C.** - left plot, left panel – mild TBI GCS patients divided into their mRS scores – 0-1 (n = 16) and 2-6 (n = 12), left plot, right panel – moderate-severe TBI GCS patients divided into their mRS scores – 0-1 (n = 7) and 2-6 (n = 23), right plot, left panel – mild TBI GCS patients divided into their mRS scores – 0-2 (n = 24) and 3-6 (n = 4), right plot, right panel – moderate-severe TBI GCS patients divied into their mRS scores – 0-2 (n = 14) and 3-6 (n = 16).



Figure.5. Subcortical functional connectivity (FC) based on time, frequency and severity of TBI. Differences in functional connectivity of the Subcortical network based on TBI severity, TBI acuity and exposure to repeated injury are displayed. The x-axis shows five distinct patient groups: **(1)** acute/sub-acute mild first TBI (n=30), **(2)** acute/sub-acute moderate-severe first TBI (n=28), **(3)** acute/sub-acute repeat TBI (n=12), **(4)** longitudinal first TBI (n=28), **(5)** longitudinal repeat TBI (n=10). The y-axis displays the Z-scores of the functional connectivity . Healthy controls (lilac colour) are displayed for visual reference only. The Kruskal- Wallis test assessed Subcortical functional connectivity differences across time and frequency. Dunn's test with Bonferroni correction identified pairwise comparison remaining significant after multiple comparisons. **Key:** acute/sub-acute scan (i.e. <= 31 days); longitudinal scan (>31 days post injury); repeat (>1 TBI event); * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

Supplementary

Table.S.1.

Spearman's Correlations				
			Spearman's rho	p
Eyes_GCS_admission	-	DMN	0.378	0.003**
Eyes_GCS_admission	-	Motor	0.434	< .001***
Eyes_GCS_admission	-	Visual Association	0.336	0.01**
Eyes_GCS_admission	-	Salience	0.335	0.01*
Eyes_GCS_admission	-	Subcortical	0.525	< .001***
Motor_GCS_admission	-	DMN	0.3	0.022*
Motor_GCS_admission	-	Motor	0.288	0.029*
Motor_GCS_admission	-	Salience	0.307	0.019*
Motor_GCS_admission	-	Subcortical	0.413	0.001**
Verbal_GCS_admission	-	Motor	0.344	0.008**
Verbal_GCS_admission	-	Visual Association	0.268	0.042*
Verbal_GCS_admission	-	Salience	0.284	0.031*
Verbal_GCS_admission	-	Subcortical	0.522	< .001***

Table.S.2.

Eyes-GCS at admission			Motor-GCS at admission			Verbal-GCS at admission		
	U	P		U	P		U	P
Medial Frontal	355	0.347	Medial Frontal	324	0.168	Medial Frontal	252	0.016*
Fronto-parietal	359	0.38	Fronto-parietal	323	0.163	Fronto-parietal	254	0.018*
DMN	284	0.039*	DMN	278	0.035*	DMN	273	0.04*
Motor	266	0.019*	Motor	256	0.013*	Motor	212	0.002**
Visual I	326	0.163	Visual I	292	0.059	Visual I	298	0.099
Visual II	433	0.798	Visual II	415	0.975	Visual II	311	0.149
Visual Association	304	0.081	Visual Association	325	0.173	Visual Association	219	0.003**
Salience	258	0.013*	Salience	271	0.026*	Salience	246	0.012*
Subcortical	209	< .001***	Subcortical	185	< .001***	Subcortical	180	< .001***
Cerebellum	347	0.287	Cerebellum	316	0.132	Cerebellum	304	0.12

Table.S.1. Spearman correlations between GCS subscores and resting state networks of all TBI patients. Due to space constraints, only correlations that were statistically significant (before or after multiple comparisons) are displayed. **Key:** blue * denote significant results that did not survive multiple comparisons; black * are results that remain statistically significant after Bonferroni corrections, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

Table.S.2. Discrimination between GCS subscores groups based on their functional connectivity. Key: blue * denote significant results that did not survive multiple comparisons; black * are results that remain statistically significant after Bonferroni corrections, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.



Figure.S.3. Relationship between Thalamic functional connectivity (FC) and all resting state networks **based on time, frequency and severity of TBI. (A). Acute/Subacute first TBI vs acute/subacute repeat TBI** - Comparison between Thalamic acute/subacute first TBI and Thalamic acute/subacute repeat TBI functional connectivity. **(B). Acute/Subacute first TBI vs longitudinal first TBI** - Comparison between Thalamic acute/subacute first TBI and Thalamic longitudinal first TBI functional connectivity maps and **(C). Acute/Subacute first TBI vs longitudinal repeat TBI** - Comparison between Thalamic acute/subacute first TBI and Thalamic longitudinal repeat TBI patients. **Key:** blue * denote significant results that did not survive multiple comparisons; black * are results that remain statistically significant after Bonferroni corrections, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$; on all plots – healthy controls (red colour), acute/subacute mild TBI (blue colour), acute/subacute moderate-severe TBI (pink colour), acute/subacute repeat TBI (orange colour), longitudinal first TBI (brown colour) and longitudinal repeat TBI (green colour).