Joint representations from multi-view MRI-based learning support cognitive and functional performance domains

Brian B Avants[1], Nicholas J Tustison[1], James R Stone[1]

[1]Department of Radiology and Medical Imaging, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA, USA

Corresponding author:
Brian B. Avants
avants@grasp.cis.upenn.edu

Abstract

Multi-view magnetic resonance imaging (M3RI) offers a unique opportunity to simultaneously characterize structural and functional aspects of brain health in vivo. Here, we evaluate integrative dimensionality reduction strategies for brain–behavior mapping using the similarity-driven multi-view linear reconstruction (SiMLR) framework. Training was conducted on a large population sample from the UK Biobank (UKB, n = 21,300), with independent evaluation across three complementary cohorts: the Normative Neuroimaging Library (NNL, n = 164), the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI, n = 308), and the Parkinson's Progression Markers Initiative (PPMI, n = 1,070). We compared multiple objective functions within SiMLR to derive joint M3RI embeddings and assessed their utility in participants aged 18–89 across all datasets. The optimal embeddings captured robust, systems-level representations of brain organization that generalized to diverse behavioral and clinical domains. This work represents the first systematic evaluation of a joint multi-modality learning framework using both objective data-driven metrics and heterogeneous behavioral phenotypes across the adult lifespan. The resulting models and resources establish a foundation for sensitive normative mapping of individual differences in brain health, with open-source methods and data available to qualified investigators.

*Data used in preparation of this article were obtained from the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) database (adni.loni.usc.edu). As such, the investigators within

the ADNI contributed to the design and implementation of ADNI and/or provided data but did not participate in analysis or writing of this report. A complete listing of ADNI investigators can be found at: http://adni.loni.usc.edu/wp-content/uploads/how_to_apply/ADNI_Acknowledgement_List.pdf

1 Introduction

The human brain is organized hierarchically, with its 86 billion neurons (Herculano-Houzel 2009) clustered into a few hundred cytoarchitectonically distinct regions (Amunts et al. 2020). These regions serve as computational units, defined by their characteristic cell types, laminar organization, signaling dynamics, and long-range connectivity profiles. Increasing biological and computational evidence suggests that interactions across these levels of organization give rise to low-dimensional neural representations (Gao and Ganguli 2015; Gallego et al. 2017). Such representations support efficient information processing, enabling flexible cognitive operations across functional domains including perception, language, and motor control (Shine et al. 2019).

Identifying the shared organizational principles of the human brain that underlie cognition remains a central challenge in cognitive neuroscience. Multi-modality magnetic resonance imaging (M3RI) provides a uniquely powerful framework for this endeavor, as it enables the concurrent characterization of cortical and subcortical anatomy (sMRI), white matter microstructure (dMRI), and large-scale functional connectivity (rsfMRI). Together, these modalities offer a complementary window onto the mechanisms of structure–function coupling in vivo (Calhoun and Sui 2016; Sui et al. 2020; Sporns 2005; Glasser et al. 2016). The integration of such diverse measurements is strongly motivated by foundational principles in systems neuroscience, which establish that the brain's functional architecture is inextricably shaped and constrained by its underlying anatomical substrate (Ramón y Cajal 1899; Mountcastle 1997; Passingham, Stephan, and Kötter 2002). Crucially, multivariate and fusion-based methods that capture the joint patterns across modalities move beyond the constraints of single-measure analyses, yielding a more holistic and biologically grounded account of how structural and functional features converge to support cognition.

Multi-view learning methods are ideally suited for this task when it is approached in a data-driven manner. Such methods take advantage of complementary information between modalities to enhance sensitivity and robustness. Methods such as multi-set canonical correlation analysis (mCCA) and joint independent component analysis (jICA) (Meng et al. 2016; Anowar, Sadaoui, and Selim 2021) have revealed distinct structure-function disruptions in neurological and psychiatric disorders including schizophrenia, Parkinson's disease, major depressive disorder, and Alzheimer's disease (Sui et al. 2015; Groves et al. 2011). Beyond clinical populations, multimodal fusion has proven invaluable for characterizing normative brain variability across the lifespan, particularly when combined with behavioral, cognitive, and genetic data (Karlaftis et al. 2019; Marek, Tervo-Clemmens, et al. 2022; Elliott et al. 2018). As neuroimaging

datasets become both deeper (larger sample sizes) and wider (more individual variables), integrative methods have become increasingly viable and even necessary for modeling the associated scientific questions.

Within the framework of multi-view methods, techniques that emphasize sparse, multivariate feature extraction are uniquely suited for uncovering interpretable latent patterns that only emerge when modalities are studied in concert (Sui et al. 2020; Mihalik et al. 2022). Our objective is to evaluate one such integrative framework: Similarity-driven Multi-view Linear Reconstruction (SiMLR) (Avants et al. 2021). SiMLR provides: biological specificity through interpretable features; statistical power through dimensionality reduction; and the ability to probe and quantify structure-function prediction of cognitive or behavioral outcomes (Smith et al. 2015; Cole 2020). SiMLR is well-suited to tasks wherein biological and statistical dependencies coexist across modalities. In M3RI, this directly reflects the notion that structural properties influence function and functional states are enabled by structure. SiMLR also provides clear feature-level interpretability within a multi-modal context allowing researchers to identify precisely which regions, cortical measures, white matter tracts, or functional networks within a given modality are most relevant to a given latent representation and in predicting a given outcome. This sparse and specific solution space is far more interpretable, both qualitatively and quantitatively, than a single, merged loading matrix derived from concatenated views of data (Shamy et al. 2011; McKeown et al. 1998; Calhoun et al. 2001).

Despite the clear motivation behind methods like SiMLR, there remains a lack of large-scale empirical evaluation of such frameworks in normative populations. Most prior applications have focused on clinical diagnostics or disorder classification, leaving a gap in understanding how multi-view methods can be used to study cognitive and functional variability across the general population (Cole 2020; Ivanova et al. 2021). The growing availability of large-scale resources such as the UK Biobank (UKB) (Miller et al. 2016) and the Normative Neuroimaging Library (NNL) (Gage et al. 2024) offers new opportunities to systematically examine how structural, functional, and white matter organization jointly relate to cognition and behavior across the adult lifespan.

The UK Biobank stands out as a uniquely comprehensive resource, offering tens of thousands of participants with sMRI, fMRI, and dMRI linked to detailed phenotypic and behavioral assessments. Multimodal analyses using UKB have shown that integrating across imaging modalities leads to reliable associations with cognition, aging, and disease risk (Smith et al. 2020; Cole 2020). However, a key challenge to demonstrating utility of multi-view learning for brain-behavior association is the availability and consistency of the data not only within but also across M3RI cohorts. The UKB, for instance, provides an enormous resource of data but provides relatively shallow cognitive phenotyping. The NNL, on the other hand, provides high quality cognitive phenotyping across a broad range of ages but lacks the enormous sample sizes of UKB. The Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initative (ADNI) and Parkinson's Progression Markers Initiative

(PPMI) represent populations that are not only healthy controls but also at-risk for or diagnosed with neurodegenerative disease. These cohorts provide both cross-sectional and longitudinal M3RI accompanied by study-specific cognitive and functional measures.

In this work, we seek to address these limitations by stacking and linking evaluation opportunities across these datasets. We thus train SiMLR on M3RI data from a cross-sectional subset of UKB. We then evaluate the learned structure-function patterns in test (cross-sectional) and a separate longitudinal partition of the UKB in order to further characterize the impact of objective function choice. We then evaluate SiMLR-derived patterns in complementary participant studies in order to demonstrate that patterns learned from large-scale cohorts are generalizable. Lastly, we demonstrate the best-performing SiMLR incarnation as a normative model of neurological health (normative neurological health, NNH) using a held-out longitudinal sub-population.

The contributions of this study include:

1. Data-driven evaluation of the SiMLR parameter space for deriving compact, interpretable and biologically relevant representations from multimodal MRI;
2. Presentation of the reusability, characterization and hierarchical interpretations of the latent representations that are derived from applying SiMLR;
3. Demonstration of how pre-trained, reusable multi-view bases can be applied across datasets to capture stable brain-behavior associations in cognitive and functional domains.

By adopting a training and testing framework and leveraging data from multiple healthy and clinical populations, we contribute to the field of neuroimaging by clarifying the role of multi-view feature learning in scalable, reproducible brain-behavior modeling. Additionally, we demonstrate the sensitivity of these learned patterns to longitudinal change at the individual level and thus their potential for normative assessments. All tools are open-source via the ANTsR platform (Avants et al. 2021). Table G provides a glossary of terms used in this document.



Figure 1: The overall learning framework used across SiMLR configurations.

2 Results

Figure 1 illustrates the overall SiMLR learning framework, while Figure 2 summarizes the evaluation metrics employed to compare different SiMLR configurations. Below, we present an overview of the evaluation results.

2.1 Overview of evaluation results

We aggregated evaluation results from 144 SiMLR configurations run on tabular representations of M3RI and an additional baseline (PCA) method for reference. All methods used a basis size of 31 which was automatically selected based on analysis of the scree plots of individual modality tabular matrices. After standardization, each solution was scored by objective metrics (feature orthogonality, the RV coefficient), prediction tasks (age prediction in UKB train to UKB test and cognition prediction from UKB to NNL) and a cumulative detection task (detecting longitudinal change in the brain in UKB). Each metric was weighed equally. As such, the evaluation balances performance on multi-view inter-modality association (the RV coefficient), cross-cohort predictive accuracy (UK Biobank processing speed to a related score in the NNL (Carlozzi et al. 2015)), feature-space orthogonality and longitudinal detection power indicators (Cohen's d for the multivariate mixed effects model improvement provided by the interaction of SiMLR derived variables with time measured as years from baseline). By applying the `rank_methods_by_performance` function from the `R` package `subtyper`, we obtained an overall ordering of the SiMLR configurations. The resulting ranks, shown in Table 1, highlight which configurations achieve superior performance. Additional details of these results are discussed in the



Figure 2: Evaluation metrics used to compare SiMLR configurations.

methods section.

2.2 Results for best performing configuration

The best performing configuration, as determined by the weighted ranking of evaluation metrics, was acc.pca.dom.0.5.corth1x1.n26. This configuration utilized absolute canonical covariance as the similarity measure, PCA for identifying the mixed latent space in SiMLR, and incorporated domain knowledge priors along with orthogonality constraints. The following sections present detailed results for this configuration, including inter-modality association analysis, cognitive prediction performance, and age prediction in the UK Biobank test cohort. We also provide detailed neuroscientific interpretation of the learned features and apply these for tracking longitudinal brain changes in individual subjects.

2.2.1 RV coefficient

The RV coefficient is a multivariate generalization of the Pearson correlation coefficient, measuring the similarity between two sets of variables. It ranges from 0 (no association) to 1 (perfect association). In this analysis, we computed the RV coefficients between pairs of imaging modalities in the UK Biobank dataset and compare the RV in the training data (on which SiMLR was computed) and the test data. This provides evidence that the results are not overfit to the training data. The results are further supported by comparing the coefficient values against that in permuted data and summarized in Table 2.

2.2.2 Age prediction in the UKB test cohort

SiMLR embeddings were used to predict age in the UK Biobank test cohort. The results are summarized in Figure 3. These results use the full set of bases concatenated across modalities in a linear regression model (`lm` in `R`) trained in the UK Biobank training cohort. The results show good prediction accuracy, with a mean absolute error (MAE) of 3.802 years and an R-squared value of 0.619. The scatter plot illustrates the relationship between predicted and actual ages, indicating that the model captures age-related brain changes effectively. A typical MAE for well-regarded models is in the 3–5 year range. This includes models using either deep learning or more traditional machine learning approaches, often trained on publicly available datasets like UKB (Rokicki et al. 2021).



Figure 3: Age prediction in the UKB cohort from the best performing (overall) SiMLR embeddings. The base model uses only biological sex and the townsend deprivation index (TDI). The SiMLR model adds the full set of SiMLR embeddings from all modalities.

2.2.3 Cross-cohort cognitive prediction

Cognitive Phenotype Training in UK Biobank (UKB): A predictive SiMLR embedding-based ensemble model was developed using linear regression (`lm`). The models were trained on two separate data splits (UKB train and UKB test). The outcome variable for training was the "Symbol-Digit Match" test, a measure of processing speed. This measure was chosen because of the presence of closely related cognitive construct measurements in other data (e.g. a task from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Toolbox-Cognitive Battery (NIHTB-CB) adjusted to account for a participant's age). The trained linear models were used to generate a predicted pseudo-processing speed score for participants in two independent validation cohorts: ADNI and the NNL study. For each participant in these external cohorts, the final biomarker score was calculated as the average of the predictions from the two UKB-trained models.

Cognitive Outcome Harmonization: Because the cognitive assessments in the validation cohorts differed from the training data, a statistical harmonization technique was applied. This process, known as quantile normalization, transforms the statistical distribution of a target variable to match that of a reference based on the shape of the histograms. In this analysis, the cognitive outcome measures from the validation cohorts (ADNI mPACC Trails B, and NIH Toolbox Processing Speed score) were transformed to match the quantile distribution of the UKB Symbol-Digit Match test from the ukbbTrain dataset. This ensures that the outcome variables are on a comparable scale across all studies. The results of these analyses in Figure 4 show that the UKB-derived biomarker is significantly associated with the harmonized cognitive outcomes in both validation cohorts, demonstrating its potential utility for cross-cohort cognitive prediction. Table 3 details regression results for the NNL prediction.

2.2.4 Longitudinal detection power in the UKB longitudinal cohort

Longitudinal analysis of SiMLR embeddings revealed varying sensitivities to brain changes over time in the UK Biobank cohort. Covariates included age, biological sex, baseline brain volume with participant ID as a random intercept to account for individual baseline variation. Among the 93 embeddings (31 each for structural, diffusion, and resting-state functional MRI), 14 exhibited moderate-to-large longitudinal effects (|Cohen's d| 0.35). Notably, diffusion-based embeddings dtPC3 (d = -0.519), dtPC11 (d = -0.506), dtPC15 (d = -0.502), dtPC16 (d = -0.553), dtPC23 (d = -0.508), dtPC27 (d = -0.547), and dtPC28 (d = -0.453) showed the strongest effects, indicating significant declines in diffusion-related features over time. Structural embeddings t1PC12 (d = -0.377), t1PC16 (d = -0.399), t1PC20 (d = -0.411), and t1PC23 (d = -0.369) also surpassed the threshold, suggesting sensitivity to longitudinal structural changes. No resting-state functional embeddings (rsfPC1-rsfPC31) reached the |d| 0.35 threshold, with rsfPC21 (d = -0.217) being the largest.

For these significant embeddings, spaghetti and population-level plots (e.g., Fig-



Figure 4: Cross-cohort cognitive prediction using the SiMLR-derived biomarker trained in UKB. The right panel shows the association in the ADNI cohort (mPACC Trails B score) and the left panel shows the association in the NNL cohort (NIH Toolbox Processing Speed score). Both outcomes have been quantile normalized to match the distribution of the UKB Symbol-Digit Match test used for training. The biomarker is significantly associated with both outcomes, demonstrating its utility for cross-cohort cognitive prediction.

ure 5) illustrated individual trajectories and model-predicted trends, confirming consistent declines with narrow confidence intervals. These findings highlight SiMLR's ability to capture longitudinal changes in diffusion and structural modalities, supporting its utility in normative modeling for neurological health monitoring, particularly for detecting age-related declines.

2.2.5 Brain-Behavior validation across performance domains

We evaluated human performance validity of the SiMLR embeddings using three independent datasets: the Normative Neuroimaging Library (NNL) focusing on healthy aging and cognition, the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) encompassing the aging context (neurodegenerative disease participants were excluded), and the Parkinson's Progression Markers Initiative (PPMI) centered on Parkinson's disease populations. Each dataset provided a unique context to assess the robustness of the SiMLR-derived features in predicting cognitive and functional outcomes. Validation dataset demographics are presented in more detail in the methodology section along with detailed cognitive/functional measure definitions.

The SiMLR embeddings derived from the UK Biobank were applied to each validation dataset using the same linear transformation learned during training. This ensured that the embeddings were directly comparable across datasets. We then conducted a series of cross-sectional and longitudinal regression analy-



Figure 5: Longitudinal trajectories of SiMLR embeddings in the UK Biobank cohort for embeddings with |Cohen's d| 0.35. Left panels show spaghetti plots of individual trajectories, and right panels display population-level trends with 95% confidence intervals, highlighting significant declines in diffusion (e.g., dtPC16: d = -0.553, dtPC27: d = -0.547) and structural (e.g., t1PC20: d = -0.411) MRI modalities over time.



Figure 6: Cognitive Variables Categorized by Study and Measurement Type. Each cognitive variable from the NNL, ADNI, and PPMI studies is categorized by its respective study and measurement type. This categorization aids in interpreting the associations between brain imaging features and cognitive outcomes.

ses to assess the associations between these embeddings and relevant cognitive and functional measures. The same covariates were used across studies: brain volume, chronological age, biological sex and educational attainment (years). The individual cognitive or clinical measurements were collected into groups of variables with similar performance domains (e.g., memory, executive function, motor) to facilitate interpretation of the results. The cognitive variable categorizations are summarized in Figure 6. Results of the associations – mapped to Cohen's f-squared effect sizes – are summarized in Figure 7. The results demonstrate that the SiMLR embeddings capture meaningful brain-behavior relationships across diverse populations and cognitive domains, underscoring their potential utility in clinical and research settings. Figure 8 shows a heatmap representing top features (imaging derived phenotypes, IDPs) for each key embedding and their associated cognitive domains.

2.2.6 Assignment of performance domains to embeddings

To link cognitive domains to each of the 31 SiMLR embeddings (i.e. where a component is the sMRI, dMRI and rsfMRI contribution acting as a whole) a maximum-only matching approach was used. This assigns each cognitive domain to the embedding with the strongest association based on Cohen's f^2 effect sizes from cross-sectional data in NNL, PPMI and ADNI. This approach identifies the "champion" embedding for each domain but does not account for cases where multiple embeddings show similar strengths of association. The diversity of brain-to-behavior mappings therefore is reflective of the uniqueness of the underlying embedding and its emergent cognitive profile. We detail the



Figure 7: Heatmap of Top SiMLR Components Across All Performance Tasks. This heatmap visualizes the effect sizes (Cohen's f-squared) of the top SiMLR components across various cognitive and clinical performance tasks from multiple datasets. The components are filtered to show only significant associations (FDR corrected p-value $<= 0.05$), allowing for easy identification of the most impactful features. The color gradient indicates the strength of the association, with brighter colors representing higher effect sizes.

key neurobiolgical contributors to each of the top brain-behavior associations below and comment on the potential mechanistic relevance of the data-driven results. The following interpretation is provisional and should be validated via targeted studies.

2.2.6.1 PC-1 → Working Memory – Interpretation: A visually-anchored attentional-memory network: Pericalcarine (visual input) → cholinergic modulation (Basal Nucleus of Meynert) → long-range limbic tracts (Fornix, Cingulum-Hippocampus) → frontal control (Rostral Middle Frontal Gyrus). Supports visual working memory maintenance and top-down attention.

Plausibility: Moderate plausibility: canonical working memory loop but visual anchoring is speculative.

2.2.6.2 PC-3 → Cognitive Flexibility, Global Cognition – Interpretation: A frontoparietal–salience–basal ganglia loop: Supramarginal (parietal control) + Insula (salience) + Globus Pallidus/Pars Orbitalis (subcortical and ventral PFC) enable set-shifting and cognitive flexibility; posterior internal capsule indicates cortico-subcortical projection involvement.

Plausibility: High plausibility: frontoparietal and basal ganglia circuits consistently support flexibility.

2.2.6.3 PC-10 → Functional Daily Living Activities, Semantic Integration – Interpretation: A multisensory integration and motor-planning network: auditory/temporal (Transverse Temporal, Middle Temporal), supramarginal-driven semantic mapping, entorhinal memory inputs, and motor coordination (Red Nucleus, Inferior Cerebellar Peduncle) to support daily activity planning.

Plausibility: Lower plausibility: speculative role of red nucleus in daily activity planning.

2.2.6.4 PC-17 → Multimodal Sensorimotor Function – Interpretation: A cortical–basal ganglia–limbic circuit: pre/postcentral sensorimotor + GP/Putamen/Ventral Pallidum/Nucleus Accumbens + medial OFC for valuation. Supports multimodal sensorimotor function and motivated action.

Plausibility: High plausibility: well-established motor-basal ganglia loop with motivational input.

2.2.6.5 PC-22 → Processing and Reasoning – Interpretation: A ventral visual–semantic–executive pathway: Fusiform (object/face recognition) → lateral OFC + pars opercularis (semantic/phonologic rule application), modulated by midbrain/parabrachial pigmented nucleus. Supports higher-order processing and reasoning.



Figure 8: Heatmap of top feature weights for each key PC.

Plausibility: Moderate plausibility: fusiform-semantic-prefrontal links supported, midbrain modulation less direct.

2.2.6.6 PC-23 → Cognitive Aging – **Interpretation:** A cholinergic–frontal–parietal aging-vulnerability circuit: frontal decline + basal forebrain cholinergic degeneration disrupt parietal integration, with midbrain/splenial disconnection contributing to cognitive aging.

Plausibility: High plausibility: basal forebrain degeneration and frontoparietal decline strongly tied to aging.

2.2.6.7 PC-24 → Episodic Memory – **Interpretation:** A hippocampal–parietal–prefrontal episodic memory network: CA1 + fornix/cingulum (mnemonic core) interacting with parietal (inferior/supramarginal) and frontal monitoring nodes; insula contributes salience of retrieved memory traces.

Plausibility: High plausibility: canonical episodic memory network, robust evidence across modalities.

2.2.7 Application to normative neurological health assessment

To demonstrate the clinical utility of the SiMLR features, we present a case study involving the normative profiling of an individual without clinical diagnosis of neurodegenerative disease from the ADNI cohort. This approach visualizes an individual's brain metrics in relation to a large normative distribution, offering a quantitative method for tracking neurological status over time. This individual's data was assessed at two time points: baseline and a follow-up visit four years later. For each time point, a feature set—comprising demographic data (age, sex), cognition and several SiMLR-derived embeddings (T1- and DTI-based PCs with targeted longitudinal and domain-specific interpretations)—was used to generate a normative summary report.

This longitudinal assessment (Figure 9) demonstrates how interpretable SiMLR features can be used to track an individual's trajectory relative to a normative model. While not intended for diagnosis, this method provides an objective, data-driven profile that could aid clinicians in monitoring neurodegenerative changes and assessing an individual's deviation from an expected healthy aging path. In this case, changes over the visits are demonstrated that may also relate to changes in cognition here represented by the ADAS13 score (higher is more impairment). Additional prospective application will be needed to determine the clinical utility of this approach.

3 Discussion

This study systematically evaluated the SiMLR framework for learning joint representations from multi-modality MRI data and assessed their utility for



Figure 9: Normative summary plots for an ADNI control subject at baseline and follow-up. The subject data is compared to a normative distribution where we visualize how the subject values shift over time. The subjects ADAS13 (cognitive impairment) score increases while the longitudinally and cognitively specific sMRI, dMRI embeddings show evidence of atrophy.

brain-behavior mapping across diverse cohorts and longitudinal settings. We demonstrated that SiMLR, utilizing different cost functions, can effectively integrate information from sMRI, rsfMRI, and dMRI to generate meaningful low-dimensional representations that are sensitive to cognitive function, clinical status, and longitudinal change. In particular, the best performing model – identified by data-driven evaluations – revealed neuroscientifically interpretable systems in the brain. While these systems are indeed complex and multi-faceted, they align well, overall, with established knowledge of brain organization and function.

Our unsupervised evaluation on the UK Biobank provided a critical foundation, allowing selection of robust SiMLR parameter sets based on cross-study prediction power, representation quality and longitudinal sensitivity, independent of the specific behavioral outcomes tested later. This multi-phase approach enhances the reliability and generalizability of the findings. The comparison between cost functions (e.g. regression (Reg), normalized correlation, logcosh, and Absolute Canonical Covariance (ACC)) revealed that the latter provided overall more consistent results. In particular, SiMLR-ACC with PCA as mixing method, orthogonality constraints and a domain-knowledge prior, produced the best results overall. However, we note that the choice between energy functions should be guided by the specific research question at hand and that these results may not generalize to new problems.

The successful application of UKB-derived bases to the NNL, ADNI, and PPMI cohorts underscores the potential for leveraging large population datasets to create generalizable normative brain representations in a multi-view context. The SiMLR embeddings captured significant variance related to cognitive performance and aging-related clinical presentation. Crucially, the multi-modal representations in SiMLR embeddings demonstrated the capacity to map to specific cognitive domains without direct supervision by those domains. This may arise from the large-scale training data available in the UKB and the multimodal nature of the data, which together enable the model to learn rich, biologically relevant patterns. Lastly, the demonstration of individual profiling against normative distributions illustrates a practical application of these SiMLR bases for tracking neurological health, potentially identifying response to experience or to intervention based on multi-modal brain signatures.

Limitations and Future Directions: The multivariate nature of the derived embeddings, by necessity, loses some degree of granularity in comparison to traditional focal analyses of brain and behavior links as in single-subject lesion studies. This is perhaps a necessary compromise when analyzing data from high n healthy participant cohorts. Noise is further amplified by the imperfect nature of the psychometric and clinical measurements used here which are subject to age effects, learning effects and imperfect unimodal specificity. While standard cognitive tests were used, they represent only a fraction of human behavior. Additionallly, this analysis, while comprehensive, relies on aggregated metrics. Future work might dissect successes at a finer-grained level by investigating,

for instance, *which specific PCs* are driving the predictions for the cross-study outcomes. Furthermore, the high-level nature of multivariate MRI-derived features suggests that additional data enabling a deeper biological interpretation would add value; e.g. correlating the top-performing PCs with known maps of neuronal cell types or gene expression profiles would be a crucial next step.

Additionally, the specific feature extraction and preprocessing steps influence the final representations. Harmonization across different scanners and cohorts remains a challenge, although using a fixed UKB-derived basis provides some robustness as demonstrated by two cross-cohort prediction results. Finally, interpreting the precise neurobiological meaning of complex, multivariate components requires careful follow-up investigation beyond the scope of this initial evaluation.

4 Conclusion

In conclusion, this comprehensive evaluation successfully identifies an optimal end-to-end analysis strategy for converting high-dimensional multi-modal MRI data into a panel that is appropriate for representing neurological health. Focusing, for example, only on the embeddings that are annotated with known relationships to the performance domains shown here (e.g. working memory, cognitive flexibility, episodic memory) would provide a compact and interpretable and accessible visual representation for future studies of aging, exposure, performance and/or risk. Additionally, the generated features are exceptionally potent for capturing longitudinal change, making them a powerful tool for studies of training or experience. However, we acknowledge that such data is relatively rarely available in non-clinical populations and that other broadly known technical challenges to longitudinal data collection remain.

This work is grounded in a biologically principled view of brain organization, wherein structure and function are deeply intertwined across spatial and temporal scales (Passingham, Stephan, and Kötter 2002; Mountcastle 1997). We align with emerging frameworks that conceptualize brain health not as binary but as a continuum, with pathology representing deviations from normative developmental and aging trajectories (Gaser, Kalc, and Cole 2024; Reicher et al. 2025). In this context, multi-view learning offers a principled strategy to capture and interpret M3RI data enabling us to identify patterns that are relevant to not only normal populations but also, potentially, clinical populations. Therefore, the results of this work will provide a foundation for future studies that seek to understand how multi-modal brain features relate to not only normal cognition and aging but also high performing individuals, exposures and experience across diverse populations.

5 Methods

5.1 Datasets

- **UK Biobank (UKB):** Primary dataset for training and parameter selection. We utilized M3RI data (T1-weighted sMRI, rsfMRI, dMRI) from approximately N=~8,500 participants selected from the larger imaging cohort (Miller et al. 2016) based on data availability and quality control. Table 4, 5 and 6 detail the number of subjects used for each component of the analysis. The UKB cohort is predominantly middle-aged to older adults (age range 44-82 years, mean age ~64 years).
- **Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI):** Used for validation in the context of aging and risk for Alzheimer's disease ("Alzheimers Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) Database," n.d.). We included M3RI data and cognitive/functional scores (e.g., ADAS-Cog, CDR-SB, FAQ - see definitions below) from ADNI 1/GO/2/3 phases, encompassing healthy controls or subjective memory concern defined as MMSE ≥ 24 & DX $\neq$ AD. Both cross-sectional and longitudinal data (up to 5+ years) were analyzed. See Table 7 and 8 for demographic details.
- **Normative Neuroimaging Library (NNL):** A locally curated dataset comprising M3RI data from healthy adults across a wide age range (n=164). This dataset includes comprehensive cognitive assessments covering standard cognitive domains assessed in the NIH toolbox. NNL served as the primary validation set for cognitive associations in a healthy population. See Table 9 for demographic details.
- **Parkinson's Progression Markers Initiative (PPMI):** Used for validation in the context of Parkinson's disease ("Parkinsons Progression Markers Initiative (PPMI) Database," n.d.). We included M3RI data and cognitive/clinical scores (e.g., MoCA, MDS-UPDRS Part III) from PPMI. Both cross-sectional and longitudinal data were utilized. See Table 10 for demographic details.

5.2 ANTsPyMM-derived Imaging Phenotypes (IDPs)

All M3RI data underwent standardized preprocessing using ANTs tools along with their pythonic wrapping (Avants et al. 2011) and ANTsR (Avants et al. 2021). ANTsPyMM is a Python-based toolkit in the ANTsX ecosystem for multi-modality MRI processing and IDP extraction, supporting modalities such as T1-weighted structural MRI, diffusion MRI, resting-state fMRI, arterial spin labeling (ASL), and vascular/MRA. oai_citation:0‡GitHub Below is a summary of key types of IDPs derived by ANTsPyMM, their neurobiological interpretation, and typical usage in brain-behavior mapping.

5.2.1 Structural / T1-weighted MRI IDPs

- **Cortical and subcortical morphometry**
  Measures include cortical thickness, surface area, volume, and subcortical volumes (e.g. hippocampus, basal forebrain, cerebellum). These are computed after brain extraction, tissue segmentation (CSF, gray matter, white matter, deep nuclei), and parcellation into anatomical regions. oai_citation:1‡GitHub
  - *Interpretation*: These IDPs quantify macroscopic brain structure, allowing investigation of atrophy, regional volumetric change, and structural correlates of cognition or disease.
  - *Typical use*: As predictors or covariates in brain–behavior models, or as morphological anchors when integrating with diffusion or functional data.
- **Super-resolution interpolation / registration to template space**
  ANTsPyMM may apply super-resolution (SR) steps or precise registration of T1 images to a common template space (e.g. 0.5 mm isotropic) prior to quantification. oai_citation:2‡ResearchGate
  - *Interpretation*: Improves spatial fidelity and inter-subject alignment, reducing partial-volume artifacts in morphometric measures.
  - *Typical use*: Ensures consistent regional labeling across subjects and modalities.

5.2.2 Diffusion MRI (dMRI) / Microstructure IDPs

- **Fractional Anisotropy (FA), Mean Diffusivity (MD), and related metrics**
  After motion correction, registration to T1 space, and diffusion model fitting (e.g. via DIPY), ANTsPyMM yields regional (atlas-based) summary statistics of FA, MD, and possibly other diffusion metrics (e.g. radial or axial diffusivity). oai_citation:3‡GitHub
  - *Interpretation*: FA and MD characterize white matter microstructural integrity (e.g. degree of directional water diffusion, cellular barriers).
  - *Typical use*: As correlates of connectivity, aging, pathology, or predictors of cognitive performance.
- **Tractography-based connectivity summaries**
  Dense tractography and connectivity matrices (e.g. streamline counts or weights between parcels) may also be output, along with regional fiber metrics. oai_citation:4‡GitHub
  - *Interpretation*: Provides a structural network view linking brain regions by estimated white-matter paths.

- *Typical use*: Graph-theoretic modeling, multimodal fusion with functional networks.

5.2.3 Resting-State fMRI (rsfMRI) / Functional IDPs

- **Temporal statistics & motion metrics**
  Outputs include measures such as framewise displacement (FD), DVARS, temporal standard deviation (tSTD), signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), and motion-derived nuisance metrics (e.g. CompCor). oai_citation:5‡GitHub
  - *Interpretation*: These quantify data quality, physiological noise, and signal stability, which are essential for later connectivity analysis.
  - *Typical use*: As quality control covariates, screening, or correction variables.
- **Functional connectivity matrices (region-to-region correlations)**
  After preprocessing (motion correction, denoising, filtering), time series are averaged within parcels (e.g. via homotopic parcellation or Yeo parcellations) and Pearson (or similar) correlation or connectivity strength is computed between each region pair. oai_citation:6‡GitHub
  - *Interpretation*: Represents synchronized activity across brain regions, reflecting functional networks (default mode, attention, visual, etc.).
  - *Typical use*: As features in brain–behavior mapping, or functional network modes in multivariate models.
- **Derived metrics (e.g. fALFF, mPerAF, ALFF variants)**
  ANTsPyMM may compute amplitude-based metrics like fractional ALFF (fALFF), modified ALFF, or mean Percent Amplitude of Fluctuation (mPerAF) to quantify regional spontaneous activity amplitude. oai_citation:7‡ResearchGate
  - *Interpretation*: Captures local fluctuation magnitude or baseline spontaneous activity variation.
  - *Typical use*: Regional brain physiology marker, or as contrast features in functional regression models.

5.2.4 Usage Notes & Considerations

- **Quality control & automated QC filters**
  As ANTsPyMM's primary goal is robust IDP generation, it integrates an automated T1-weighted image quality reviewer (e.g. `resnetGrader`) to flag low-quality scans before subsequent processing. oai_citation:10‡ResearchGate
  - Poor-quality T1 images may abort the pipeline or be excluded, because accurate anatomical labels underpin downstream dMRI and rsfMRI alignment.
- **Neuroanatomical labeling & coordinate systems**

The outputs are linked to standard parcellations (e.g. homotopic parcellation, DKT, JHU white-matter atlas) to facilitate interpretability and cross-subject alignment. oai_citation:11‡ResearchGate

- **Modality missingness**
  ANTsPyMM is designed to be modular: not all modalities are strictly required for a subject; missing modalities can be handled gracefully in downstream analyses. oai_citation:12‡ResearchGate

- **Interpretation caution for tractography**
  While tractography outputs are provided, we note that performance evaluation for dense tractography is ongoing and recommend cautious use (e.g. preferring summary connectivity measures over voxel-level streamlines). oai_citation:13‡ResearchGate

- **Open source & reproducibility**
  ANTsPyMM is open-source, and its processing steps are transparent, facilitating reproducibility and extensibility in large-scale, cross-study datasets. Docker files enabling containerization are also provided. oai_citation:14‡GitHub

Processed voxel-wise maps (or regional summaries, e.g., based on standard atlases) from each modality (e.g., GM density, cortical thickness, ALFF, FA) were vectorized per subject and compiled into modality-specific matrices $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p_i}$, ensuring subject alignment across matrices and enabling multi-view learning. Each matrix was column-wise z-scored to standardize feature scales and then divided by its eigenvalue spectrum to balance variance contributions across modalities. Subjects with missing modalities were excluded from the SiMLR training set to ensure complete data for multi-view integration.

5.3 SiMLR Framework

Similarity-driven Multi-view Linear Reconstruction (SiMLR) is a flexible framework for deriving low-dimensional, interpretable embeddings from high-dimensional, multi-modal data. It extends methods like PCA and ICA by leveraging inter-modality relationships through a reciprocal modeling approach. Implemented in the ANTsR package, SiMLR uncovers shared latent structures in datasets such as neuroimaging or multi-omics data (Avants et al. 2021). Let there be Z modalities (views), such as cortical thickness, white matter diffusion metrics, or functional connectivity. Each modality is represented as a data matrix

$$X_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p_i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, Z,$$

where n is the number of samples (subjects) and p_i is the number of features in modality i. SiMLR assumes a **shared latent embedding** $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$, with

$k \ll \min_i p_i$, capturing common variation across all modalities. Each modality is linearly mapped to this shared embedding through a matrix

$$V_i \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times p_i}.$$

The columns of U represent subject-level latent scores, while the rows of V_i represent multivariate loadings (e.g., spatial maps for brain regions or connectivity measures). The embedding $U_{\neq i}$, approximating the true U, is derived from the concatenated set of $X_j V_j^T$ for all $j \neq i$, using dimensionality reduction techniques like PCA, ICA, or SVD.

Optimization Objective:

The SiMLR optimization problem is defined as:

$$\underset{V_i, U_{\neq i}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^{Z} S(X_i, U_{\neq i}, V_i) + \text{Regularization},$$

where:

- i indexes modalities from 1 to Z.
- S is a similarity function measuring the alignment between modalities.
- $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p_i}$ is the data matrix for modality i.
- $U_{\neq i} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ is the low-dimensional embedding derived from all modalities except X_i, formed by applying PCA, ICA, SVD, or averaging over $\{X_j V_j^T \mid j \neq i\}$.
- $V_i \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times p_i}$ is the latent feature matrix for modality i, analogous to regression coefficients or loadings.

5.3.1 Energy Functions

The data fidelity term $S(X_i, U_{\neq i}, V_i)$ supports multiple objectives, each emphasizing different properties of the latent space. Below, we detail each energy function, its interpretation, strengths and limitations.

5.3.1.1 Regression / Reconstruction Error Definition:

$$S_{\text{reg}} = \|X_i - U_{\neq i} V_i\|_F^2,$$

or its centered/normalized variants.

Interpretation: Encourages $U_{\neq i} V_i$ to reconstruct X_i, capturing maximum variance within modality i. Suitable for reconstructing data like cortical thickness maps in neuroimaging.

Strengths: - Convex in V_i, simplifying optimization. - Prioritizes within-modality data fidelity, ensuring high variance capture.

Limitations: - Emphasizes within-modality variance, potentially neglecting cross-modality alignment. - Sensitive to noise and outliers, which may dominate the Frobenius norm.

5.3.1.2 Normalized Correlation / Procrustes Correlation Definition:

$$S_{\text{nc}} = -\frac{\text{tr}((U_{\neq i})^T X_i V_i)}{\|(U_{\neq i})^T X_i V_i\|_F}.$$

Interpretation: Maximizes correlation (up to rotation/scale) between $X_i V_i$ and $U_{\neq i}$, similar to canonical correlation analysis but normalized by the Frobenius norm. Useful for aligning functional connectivity with structural features in neuroimaging.

Strengths: - Scale-invariant, focusing on geometric alignment of subspaces. - Enhances cross-modality similarity, supporting multimodal integration.

Limitations: - Non-convex, sensitive to initialization and optimization challenges. - May prioritize alignment over reconstruction accuracy.

5.3.1.3 Absolute Canonical Covariance Definition:

$$S_{\text{acc}} = -\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{k} |((U_{\neq i})^T X_i V_i)_{j,j}|}{\|U_{\neq i}\|_F \|X_i V_i\|_F}.$$

Interpretation: Maximizes absolute diagonal correlations between $U_{\neq i}$ and $X_i V_i$, capturing canonical structure despite sign ambiguities. Relevant for aligning latent factors across modalities with positive or negative connectivity strengths.

Strengths: - Robust to sign flips, ensuring consistent alignment. - Enhances interpretability of canonical relationships.

Limitations: - Focus on diagonal correlations may miss off-diagonal interactions. - Normalization can be sensitive to small singular values.

5.3.1.4 Independence / non-Gaussianity Definition (logcosh example):

$$S_{\text{osh}} = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \log(\cosh(\chi_{i,j})), \quad \chi = (U_{\neq i})^T X_i V_i.$$

Interpretation: As with all of these metrics, this is optimized with respect to the V_i and, as such, promotes non-Gaussianity within the low-dimensional

shared representation. The logcosh function approximates negentropy, encouraging sparse or independent latent factors, useful for separating distinct neural processes (e.g., motor vs. memory signals).

Strengths: - Captures sparse or independent factors, aligning with biological assumptions. - Robust to Gaussian noise due to non-Gaussianity focus.

Limitations: - Sensitive to non-linearity choice (e.g., logcosh) and data scaling. - May overfit to non-Gaussian artifacts without careful tuning.

5.3.1.5 Domain Knowledge Priors Definition:

$$S_{\text{domain}} = -\gamma_i \|M_i V_i\|_F^2,$$

where $M_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p_i}$ encodes prior information (e.g., anatomical or cognitive domain mappings).

Interpretation: Encourages V_i to align with prior knowledge by maximizing the energy of $M_i V_i$. In neuroimaging, M_i may represent cognitive domains, ensuring learned factors respect biological priors.

Strengths: - Integrates priors (e.g., anatomical atlases) for interpretable solutions. - Flexible: M_i can be sparse or derived from prior studies. - Supports hypothesis-driven research in neuroscience.

Limitations: - Requires accurate priors; restrictive M_i may bias results. - Performance depends on the tuning parameter γ_i.

This quadratic regularizer penalizes deviation from the domain-consistent subspace, guiding optimization toward solutions that reflect the prior structure.

5.3.2 Summary of Energy Functions

Each energy function targets a distinct property:

- **Regression**: Prioritizes within-modality variance for data reconstruction.
- **Normalized Correlation**: Enhances cross-modality subspace alignment.
- **Absolute Canonical Covariance**: Ensures robust canonical relationships.
- **ICA**: Disentangles independent neural signals.
- **Domain Alignment/Domain Knowledge Priors**: Integrates priors to influence solutions toward interpretability.

5.3.3 Regularization

Regularization is applied to the V_i matrices to impose structure (e.g., sparsity).

$$\sum_i \sum_k \gamma_i \|G_\sigma^i v_{i,k}\|_{\ell_p}^+$$

where $v_{i,k}$ is the k-th feature vector in V_i, G_σ^i is a sparse regularization matrix, and γ_i is a scalar weight.

5.4 Impact of D_k (PCA vs. SVD vs. ICA)

The choice of the dimensionality reduction method D_k significantly influences the nature of the latent space $U_{\neq i}$. This choice affects the interpretability, computational properties, and alignment of the shared latent embedding across modalities. Below, we discuss PCA, SVD, and ICA in the context of SiMLR.

5.4.1 PCA (Principal Component Analysis)

Definition: PCA computes a low-dimensional representation by projecting the data onto the top k eigenvectors of the data covariance matrix, maximizing the variance captured in the latent space. In SiMLR, applying PCA as D_k to the concatenated set yields the principal components corresponding to the largest eigenvalues.

Mathematical Formulation: For a matrix $Y_i = [X_j V_j \mid j \neq i] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \sum_{j \neq i} k}$, PCA solves:

$$\max_{U_{\neq i}} \operatorname{tr}((U_{\neq i})^\top Y_i Y_i^\top U_{\neq i}), \quad \text{s.t.} \quad (U_{\neq i})^\top U_{\neq i} = I_k,$$

where I_k is the $k \times k$ identity matrix. This is equivalent to the eigendecomposition of the covariance matrix $\frac{1}{n-1} Y_i Y_i^\top$.

Interpretation: PCA produces orthogonal components that capture the directions of maximum variance across modalities $j \neq i$. In neuroimaging, for example, if X_i represents cortical thickness and X_j (for $j \neq i$) represents functional connectivity, PCA ensures $U_{\neq i}$ reflects the dominant patterns of variation in $X_j V_j$, such as major connectivity networks.

Strengths:

- Convex and computationally efficient, with a unique global solution (up to sign flips).
- Well-suited for high-dimensional data ($p_i \gg n$), as it focuses on variance, reducing noise sensitivity.
- Provides interpretable components, as principal components are linear combinations of features weighted by their contribution to variance.

Limitations:

- Assumes Gaussian-like data distributions, as it relies on second-order statistics (variance). Non-Gaussian structures (e.g., sparse neural signals) may be poorly captured.
- May prioritize variance over cross-modality alignment, potentially missing subtle shared signals.

- Sensitive to scaling differences across modalities, requiring preprocessing (e.g., centering or normalization).

5.4.2 SVD (Singular Value Decomposition)

Definition: SVD decomposes a matrix $Y_i = [X_j V_j \mid j \neq i]$ into $Y_i = P\Sigma Q^\top$, where $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times k}$, $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times k}$ is diagonal with singular values, and $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{\sum_{j\neq i} k\times k}$. In SiMLR, $U_{\neq i}$ is typically set to P, the left singular vectors corresponding to the top k singular values.

Interpretation: SVD provides orthogonal components that maximize variance in the data, similar to PCA but applied directly to Y_i rather than its covariance. In SiMLR, SVD ensures $U_{\neq i}$ captures the principal directions of variation in the concatenated projections $X_j V_j$.

Strengths:

- Numerically stable and unique (up to sign flips), making it robust for high-dimensional data.
- Equivalent to PCA when data is centered, providing a direct link to variance maximization.
- Computationally efficient for large matrices, leveraging optimized linear algebra libraries.

Limitations:

- Like PCA, SVD focuses on variance, potentially missing non-Gaussian or sparse signals.
- Does not inherently account for statistical independence, limiting its ability to disentangle distinct processes (e.g., motor vs. memory signals in neuroimaging).
- Requires preprocessing to handle modality-specific scaling or noise.

5.4.3 ICA (Independent Component Analysis)

Definition: ICA seeks statistically independent components by maximizing non-Gaussianity, often using measures like negentropy or kurtosis. In SiMLR, applying ICA as D_k to $Y_i = [X_j V_j \mid j \neq i]$ produces $U_{\neq i}$, where the columns are independent components.

Mathematical Formulation: ICA optimizes a contrast function, such as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{ICA}} = -\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{k}\log(\cosh(S_{i,j})), \quad S = (U_{\neq i})^\top Y_i,$$

to promote non-Gaussianity in the components of $U_{\neq i}$.

Interpretation: ICA disentangles statistically independent signals across modalities $j \neq i$. In neuroimaging, this might separate distinct neural processes (e.g., motor vs. cognitive networks) in $X_j V_j$.

Strengths:

- Captures non-Gaussian structures, aligning with biological assumptions about sparse or independent signals (e.g., distinct brain networks).
- Robust to Gaussian noise, as it focuses on higher-order statistics.

Limitations:

- Non-convex optimization, leading to potential local optima and sensitivity to initialization.
- Computationally intensive, as each $U_{\neq i}$ update involves a sub-optimization problem, adding complexity to SiMLR's iterative process.
- Interpretability may be challenging, as independent components may not align with variance-based patterns.

5.4.4 Comparative Impact on $U_{\neq i}$

- **Variance vs. Independence**: PCA and SVD prioritize variance maximization, producing orthogonal components that capture dominant patterns in $X_j V_j$. ICA, conversely, prioritizes statistical independence, which may better capture sparse or distinct signals but risks overfitting to non-Gaussian artifacts.

- **Computational Complexity**: PCA and SVD are convex and computationally efficient, with unique solutions (up to sign flips), making them suitable for large-scale data. ICA's non-convexity introduces additional computational overhead and variability in solutions due to local optima.

- **Interpretability**: PCA and SVD yield components that are easily interpretable as directions of maximum variance, often corresponding to broad patterns (e.g., major brain networks). ICA components are independent but may be less intuitive, as they emphasize non-Gaussianity over variance.

- **Cross-Modality Alignment**: PCA and SVD may prioritize within-modality variance over cross-modality alignment, potentially missing subtle shared signals. ICA's focus on independence can enhance cross-modality alignment by isolating shared non-Gaussian signals but requires careful tuning to avoid artifacts.

- **Application Context**: In SiMLR, PCA and SVD are preferred when modalities (e.g., cortical thickness, functional connectivity) exhibit strong variance-driven patterns. ICA is better suited for applications requiring separation of distinct processes (e.g., identifying independent neural signals in multi-omics or neuroimaging data).

5.4.5 Practical Considerations in SiMLR

- The choice of D_k depends on the data and task. For example, in a neuroimaging dataset with X_i as cortical thickness and X_j as white matter metrics, PCA or SVD might capture broad structural patterns, while ICA could isolate specific neural processes.
- Preprocessing (e.g., centering, scaling) is critical for PCA and SVD to ensure fair contribution from all modalities. ICA requires careful selection of the non-linearity (e.g., logcosh) and initialization to stabilize results.
- SiMLR's iterative optimization, where $U_{\neq i}$ is updated using D_k, amplifies the impact of the chosen method. PCA and SVD provide stable updates, while ICA's non-convexity may lead to variability in $U_{\neq i}$, affecting convergence and interpretability.

5.5 SiMLR Tuning

Parameters: Key parameters include matrix pre-processing, regularization weights and matrices and the choice of similarity measurement.

Initialization: SiMLR can be initialized randomly, using a joint SVD across concatenated modalities, or from other existing low-rank methods (e.g., RGCCA). Multiple starting points are recommended.

Optimization Approach: SiMLR uses a gradient-based alternating minimization scheme. V_i are updated via gradient descent steps (default optimizer is a "look ahead" approach) with soft thresholding and line search. $U_{\neq i}$ is updated via a dimensionality reduction step (PCA, SVD or ICA) on the concatenation of transformed embeddings from other modalities ($\{X_{j\neq i}V_{j\neq i}^T\}$).

5.6 Optimization and Convergence Properties

The optimization of SiMLR involves an iterative alternating minimization scheme, which warrants a closer look at its convergence properties and the landscape of its objective functions.

Objective Functions and Non-Convexity:

The overall objective function is of the form:

$$E(\{V_i\}, \{U_{\neq i}\}) = \sum_i S(X_i, U_{\neq i}, V_i) + \text{Regularization}(\{V_i\})$$

SiMLR employs an alternating minimization strategy over the full objective, taking advantage of analytical gradients with respect to V_i for each term in the function. This means it iteratively optimizes for one block of variables while holding others fixed.

- **Step 1: Optimize V_i (given fixed $U_{\neq i}$):** For a fixed $U_{\neq i}$ (and thus fixed $X_j V_j^T$ for $j \neq i$), the sub-problem for optimizing a single V_i (e.g., for reconstruction error) becomes:

$$\min_{V_i} \|X_i - U_{\neq i} V_i\|^2 + \text{Regularization}(V_i)$$

  This is a standard least squares problem with regularization (e.g., L1 or L2 regularization often used with matrix factorization). When $U_{\neq i}$ is fixed, this sub-problem is **convex** with respect to V_i. The gradient calculation presented, $\partial E / \partial V_i = -2(X_i^T - V_i U_{\neq i}^T) U_{\neq i}$, and subsequent update with thresholding (for ℓ_0/ℓ_1 norm regularization) and line search, aims to find the optimal V_i for this convex sub-problem.

  For the covariance forms, optimizing V_i given fixed $U_{\neq i}$ often transforms into a generalized eigenvalue problem or a series of linear updates. These steps are typically well-behaved and can be solved optimally (or sub-optimally but efficiently) for fixed $U_{\neq i}$. Analytical gradients are available for all the energies discussed, and the optimization can be performed using advanced gradient-based methodology.

- **Step 2: Optimize $U_{\neq i}$ (given fixed V_j for all j):** This step involves constructing $U_{\neq i}$ from the current $X_j V_j^T$ for $j \neq i$. Specifically, it's defined as $D_k(B)$ where $B = \{X_{j \neq i} V_{j \neq i}^T\}$ and D_k is a dimensionality reduction step (PCA, SVD or ICA) on the concatenation of these matrices. Given *fixed* V_j values, the transformed matrices $X_j V_j^T$ are also fixed. Concatenating them and performing SVD is a *deterministic and direct computation* (not an optimization in this step). If ICA is used for D_k, then ICA itself involves a non-convex optimization, but *within the context of SiMLR's overall loop*, D_k is treated as a "black-box" function that delivers $U_{\neq i}$ given the input B.

Convergence Properties and Guarantees:

- **Local Optimum Guarantee:** The core strength of alternating minimization for non-convex problems is that if each block's sub-problem is solved (approximately) optimally, the overall algorithm is guaranteed to converge to a *local optimum* (or at least a stationary point) of the objective function. This is because each step either decreases the objective function or leaves it unchanged. Since the objective function (a sum of squared errors or normalized covariance) is bounded below (e.g., by zero for reconstruction errors, or by -1 for normalized covariances if maximizing a similarity means bringing it close to 1), convergence is assured. The line search with ϵ_i explicitly ensures that only "energy improving steps" are allowed, thus guaranteeing monotonic decrease of the total energy E.

- **No Guarantee of Global Optimum:** Since the overall objective function is non-convex, there is no guarantee that the algorithm will converge

to the global optimum. The final converged solution can be heavily dependent on the initialization strategy.

- **Sensitivity to Initialization:** SiMLR can be sensitive to initialization, especially with strong sparseness penalties. This is a direct consequence of the non-convex nature of the problem, leading to multiple local minima in the objective landscape. One approach is to try multiple starting points to directly addresses this limitation. However, our default strategy is to initialize the latent spaces $U_{\neq i}$ using a joint SVD across all modalities, which provides a reasonable starting point that captures the overall structure of the data.

5.7 SiMLR is Appropriate for Neuroimaging Data

SiMLR's methodology provides a principled framework to directly address the complex, coupled nature of neuroimaging data:

1. **Explicit Multi-View Coupling:** Neuroimaging is fundamentally multi-view (e.g., structure, function, connectivity, genetics, behavior). SiMLR's objective function inherently models how each modality's low-dimensional representation ($X_i V_i$) can be "explained" by or is "similar" to a latent space ($U_{\neq i}$) derived from *all other modalities*. This directly reflects the notion that structural properties influence function, and functional states are enabled by structure.

2. **Reciprocal Interplay through Dynamic $U_{\neq i}$:** The "form recapitulates function" principle implies a reciprocal relationship. SiMLR's dynamic construction of $U_{\neq i}$ is uniquely suited to model this. For instance, in an analysis involving structural (sMRI) and functional (fMRI) data:

   - When optimizing for V_{sMRI}, $U_{\neq sMRI}$ would be derived from functional aspects ($X_{fMRI} V_{fMRI}$). This explicitly asks: "How well can my structural features be predicted/explained by the latent functional organization?" Indeed, SiMLR can be provided with bootstrapping or permutation approaches to estimate statistical significance for these relationships.

   - Conversely, when optimizing for V_{fMRI}, $U_{\neq fMRI}$ would be derived from structural aspects ($X_{sMRI} V_{sMRI}$). This asks: "How well can my functional networks be predicted/explained by the latent structural architecture?" This inherent "mutual explanation" mechanism allows SiMLR to computationally explore the reciprocal dependencies that define "form recapitulates function" in a data-driven manner.

3. **Feature-Level Interpretability within a Multi-Modal Context:** The modality-specific V_i matrices are crucial for neuroscientific discovery. They allow researchers to identify precisely which regions, cortical thickness measures, white matter tracts, or functional networks within a given modality are most relevant to the common latent representations

influenced by other modalities. This is far more interpretable than a single, merged loading matrix from concatenated approaches. For example, V_{sMRI} might reveal specific anatomical regions whose morphology is highly predictive of latent functional patterns captured by $U_{\neq sMRI}$.

4. **Flexibility in Defining Multi-Modal Relationships:** Different types of coupling may exist between neuroimaging modalities.
   - For instance, one might hypothesize that structural changes directly *reconstruct* functional activity (e.g., using a reconstruction error objective).
   - Alternatively, one might propose that latent structural and functional spaces are *linearly related* or *co-vary* (e.g., using the Canonical Covariance objective). SiMLR's ability to switch between these similarity definitions allows for exploring diverse hypotheses about how brain structure and function are related, moving beyond a single model of association.
5. **Robustness to Diverse Noise Profiles:** Neuroimaging data is known for its varying noise characteristics across modalities. Structural MRI is generally high signal-to-noise and stable, while fMRI is susceptible to physiological noise, motion artifacts, and scanner instabilities. SiMLR's potential robustness to view-specific noise could be highly beneficial. It mitigates the risk of one particularly noisy modality contaminating the underlying inferred latent components that are crucial for understanding the integrated brain system.

In conclusion, SiMLR offers a computationally elegant and neurobiologically appropriate framework for dissecting the intricate relationships between different facets of brain organization and activity. By explicitly modeling how each modality is explained by the collective information from all others, SiMLR provides a powerful tool to investigate the "form recapitulates function" principle, paving the way for deeper insights into brain health and disease.

5.8 SiMLR Implementation Within This Study

We evaluated SiMLR using $m = 3$ modalities derived from sMRI, rsfMRI, and dMRI features. Key SiMLR parameters and variations tested included:

- **Number of Components (k):** Fixed at 31 based on the scree plot of each data matrix in the UKB training data; 31 components explained 95% variance for the smallest input data matrix which limits the learnable rank.
- **Source Separation Function (f):** Compared Independent Component Analysis (ICA, using `fastICA`), Principal Component Analysis (PCA), and Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) for generating the shared basis $\tilde{U}_{\neq i}$ in standard SiMLR nomenclature.
- **Similarity Function (S):** Systematically compared:

  - **Reconstruction Loss (Reg)**
  - **Absolute Canonical Covariance Loss (ACC)**
  - **Normalized Correlation (NC)**
  - **Independence (Log-Cosh) (osh)**

- **Regularization:** Sparse regularization (ℓ_1 penalty, implemented via soft-thresholding in the projected gradient descent) was applied to V_i. Sparsity level was typically set to retain ~10-25% of features depending on the distribution and loss functions; this value was not explored and was selected based on prior work. Non-negativity constraints were enforced on V_i for interpretability. Alternative graph regularization was not explicitly explored in the primary analyses reported here.
- **Orthogonality Constraint:** We compared enforcing orthogonality on V_i (i.e., $V_i^T V_i = I$) versus no orthogonality constraint.
- **Domain Knowledge Prior:** We evaluated the inclusion of a domain knowledge prior by projecting the V_i onto a set of known brain networks derived from independent datasets and literature review. This amounts to a soft ridge constraint encouraging the learned components to align with known functional and structural brain networks. We compared results with and without this prior at different strengths.
- **Parameter Combinations:** 144 combinations of mixing algorithm, similarity function, orthogonality constraint and inclusion of prior domain knowledge were evaluated.

5.8.1 Evaluation Strategy

1. **Phase 1: Unsupervised Evaluation & Parameter Selection (UK Biobank):**
   - SiMLR models with different parameter combinations (Table 1) were trained on a large subset of UKB M3RI data.
   - **Metrics:** Models were ranked based on feature orthogonality, RV coefficient, detection power, prediction and longitudinal sensitivity. The RV coefficient from permutation testing assessed the strength of the multi-view relationship captured beyond chance.
   - Based on a composite ranking incorporating these metrics, representative parameter configurations were selected for a deep dive in reporting.
2. **Phase 2: Brain-Behavior Association Validation (NNL, ADNI, PPMI):**

- For each validation dataset, preprocessed M3RI data X_i^* was projected onto the UKB-derived feature bases: $U_i^* = X_i V_i$. This yields k embedding scores per modality for each subject.
- **Association Analysis:** Linear models were used to assess the relationship between the embedding components U_i^* (used individually or combined) and the cognitive/functional outcome variables.
  - **Cross-sectional:** Cognitive/Functional Score ~ SiMLR Component(s) + Covariates (age, sex, education, brain volume/ICV). Performance measured by component p-values (Bonferroni corrected), effect sizes (Cohen's d where appropriate), and overall model fit (R^2).
  - **Longitudinal:** Using linear mixed-effects models: Score ~ Time * SiMLR Component(s) + Covariates + (Time | SubjectID). Assessed if component scores predicted the cognitive/functional assessments.
- **Comparison:** Performance was compared across the different SiMLR configurations trained in Phase 1.

5.9 Cognitive and Functional Measures Used to Interpret SiMLR Embeddings

NNL scores were derived from the NIH Toolbox Cognition Battery (NIHTB-CB) (Weintraub et al. 2013; Carlozzi et al. 2015) and include age-corrected standard scores for individual tests as well as composite scores for cognitive domains. ADNI cognitive and functional measures included the Alzheimer's Disease Assessment Scale-Cognitive Subscale (ADAS-Cog) (Rosen, Mohs, and Davis 1984), Clinical Dementia Rating Sum of Boxes (CDR-SB) (Morris 1993), Functional Activities Questionnaire (FAQ) (Pfeffer et al. 1982), Rey Auditory Verbal Learning Test (RAVLT) (Rey 1964), and the Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) (Folstein, Folstein, and McHugh 1975). PPMI measures included the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) (Nasreddine et al. 2005) and Movement Disorder Society-Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale Part III (MDS-UPDRS III) (Goetz et al. 2008). Below are brief descriptions of key cognitive and functional measures used in this study:

5.9.1 Trials (NNL)

- **Category**: Episodic Memory
- **Measures**: Immediate recall performance across learning trials.
- **Scoring**: Based on the number of items recalled per trial, with higher totals indicating stronger learning efficiency.

5.9.2 Delayed Recall (NNL)

- **Category**: Episodic Memory
- **Measures**: Retention of learned material after a delay.
- **Scoring**: Number of items recalled after a set delay; higher values indicate stronger memory consolidation.

5.9.3 Total Recall (NNL)

- **Category**: Episodic Memory
- **Measures**: Overall recall ability combining immediate and delayed performance.
- **Scoring**: Sum of recalled items across trials and delay periods.

5.9.4 Picture Vocabulary Test Age 3+ v2.0 (NIHTB-CB; NNL)

- **Category**: Language & Crystallized Intelligence
- **Measures**: Receptive vocabulary knowledge across development.
- **Scoring**: Accuracy in identifying pictured items; higher scores reflect greater crystallized verbal ability.

5.9.5 Flanker Inhibitory Control and Attention Test Age 12+ v2.1 (NIHTB-CB; NNL)

- **Category**: Executive Function / Attention
- **Measures**: Ability to suppress responses to distracting stimuli while focusing on target stimuli.
- **Scoring**: Speed and accuracy of responses; higher composite scores indicate stronger inhibitory control.

5.9.6 List Sorting Working Memory Test Age 7+ v2.1 (NIHTB-CB; NNL)

- **Category**: Executive Function / Attention
- **Measures**: Capacity to store, update, and manipulate information in working memory.

- **Scoring**: Total number of correctly sorted items, with higher scores indicating better working memory capacity.

5.9.7 Dimensional Change Card Sort Test Age 12+ v2.1 (NIHTB-CB; NNL)

- **Category**: Executive Function / Attention
- **Measures**: Cognitive flexibility and ability to switch between sorting rules.
- **Scoring**: Composite of accuracy and reaction time, with higher scores reflecting stronger cognitive flexibility.

5.9.8 Pattern Comparison Processing Speed Test Age 7+ v2.1 (NIHTB-CB; NNL)

- **Category**: Processing Speed
- **Measures**: Speed of visual processing and discrimination.
- **Scoring**: Number of correct comparisons within a set time; higher values indicate faster processing.

5.9.9 Picture Sequence Memory Test Age 8+ Form A v2.1 (NIHTB-CB; NNL)

- **Category**: Episodic Memory
- **Measures**: Ability to encode and recall temporal sequences of visual stimuli.
- **Scoring**: Accuracy in recalling the correct order of picture sequences.

5.9.10 Oral Reading Recognition Test Age 3+ v2.0 (NIHTB-CB; NNL)

- **Category**: Language & Crystallized Intelligence
- **Measures**: Word reading and pronunciation ability.
- **Scoring**: Accuracy in reading printed words aloud; higher scores indicate stronger crystallized reading ability.

5.9.11 Cognition Fluid Composite v1.1 (NIHTB-CB; NNL)

- **Category**: Global Cognition
- **Measures**: Composite of fluid cognitive domains (processing speed, executive function, memory).
- **Scoring**: Standardized composite score; higher values indicate better performance across fluid domains.

5.9.12 Cognition Crystallized Composite v1.1 (NIHTB-CB; NNL)

- **Category**: Global Cognition
- **Measures**: Composite of crystallized abilities (language, vocabulary, reading).
- **Scoring**: Standardized composite score; higher values reflect stronger crystallized knowledge.

5.9.13 Cognition Total Composite Score v1.1 (NIHTB-CB; NNL)

- **Category**: Global Cognition
- **Measures**: Overall measure of cognition combining fluid and crystallized composites.
- **Scoring**: Standardized total score; higher values indicate stronger overall cognition.

5.9.14 Cognition Early Childhood Composite v1.1 (NIHTB-CB; NNL)

- **Category**: Global Cognition
- **Measures**: Broad measure of cognitive development for younger participants.
- **Scoring**: Composite of age-appropriate NIHTB measures; higher values indicate more advanced early childhood cognition.

5.9.15 Rey Auditory Verbal Learning Test – Immediate Recall (RAVLT; ADNI)

- **Category**: Episodic Memory

- **Measures**: Learning ability across multiple word list trials.
- **Scoring**: Total words recalled across trials, with higher scores reflecting stronger immediate recall.

5.9.16 Rey Auditory Verbal Learning Test – Forgetting (RAVLT; ADNI)

- **Category**: Episodic Memory
- **Measures**: Retention and forgetting rate.
- **Scoring**: Calculated as the difference between immediate and delayed recall, with higher values indicating greater forgetting.

5.9.17 Alzheimer's Disease Assessment Scale – Cognitive Subscale, Word Recall (ADAS-Cog Q4; ADNI)

- **Category**: Episodic Memory
- **Measures**: Word recall performance as part of ADAS-Cog.
- **Scoring**: Fewer words recalled corresponds to greater impairment.

5.9.18 Modified Preclinical Alzheimer's Cognitive Composite – Trail Making Test Part B (mPACC Trails B; ADNI)

- **Category**: Cognitive Flexibility
- **Measures**: Executive function and task switching.
- **Scoring**: Longer completion times reflect greater impairment.

5.9.19 Modified Preclinical Alzheimer's Cognitive Composite – Digit Symbol Substitution (mPACC Digit; ADNI)

- **Category**: Working Memory / Processing Speed
- **Measures**: Processing speed and executive function.
- **Scoring**: Number of correct symbol-digit pairings; lower scores indicate impairment.

5.9.20 Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE; ADNI)

- **Category**: Cognitive Aging

- **Measures**: Global cognition including orientation, attention, memory, language, and visuospatial ability.
- **Scoring**: 30-point scale; lower scores indicate impairment.

5.9.21 Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA; ADNI, PPMI)

- **Category**: Cognitive Aging
- **Measures**: Global cognition, sensitive to mild cognitive impairment.
- **Scoring**: 30-point scale; higher scores indicate better cognition.

5.9.22 Alzheimer's Disease Assessment Scale – Cognitive Subscale, 13-item (ADAS-Cog 13; ADNI)

- **Category**: Cognitive Aging
- **Measures**: Multiple domains including memory, language, and praxis.
- **Scoring**: Higher scores indicate greater impairment.

5.9.23 Clinical Dementia Rating – Sum of Boxes (CDR-SB; ADNI)

- **Category**: Cognitive Aging
- **Measures**: Severity of impairment across six functional and cognitive domains.
- **Scoring**: 0–18 scale; higher scores reflect greater impairment.

5.9.24 Functional Activities Questionnaire (FAQ; ADNI)

- **Category**: Functional Daily Living Activities
- **Measures**: Independence in instrumental daily living activities.
- **Scoring**: Higher scores indicate greater functional difficulty.

5.9.25 Everyday Cognition Scale (ECog; ADNI)

- **Category**: Functional Daily Living Activities
- **Measures**: Perceived everyday cognitive functioning (patient and study partner report).
- **Scoring**: Higher scores indicate greater functional difficulty.

5.9.26 Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale – Part II: Motor Experiences of Daily Living (UPDRS II; PPMI)

- **Category**: Multimodal Sensorimotor Function
- **Measures**: Motor aspects of daily living in Parkinson's disease.
- **Scoring**: Higher scores indicate greater impairment.

5.9.27 Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale – Part III: Motor Examination (UPDRS III; PPMI)

- **Category**: Multimodal Sensorimotor Function
- **Measures**: Motor symptoms and severity of Parkinson's disease.
- **Scoring**: Higher scores indicate greater impairment.

5.9.28 Postural Instability and Gait Difficulty (PIGD; PPMI)

- **Category**: Multimodal Sensorimotor Function
- **Measures**: Balance and gait-related function in Parkinson's disease.
- **Scoring**: Higher scores indicate greater postural and gait impairment.

References

"Alzheimers Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) Database." n.d. adni.loni.usc.edu.

Amunts, Katrin, Hartmut Mohlberg, Stefan Bludau, and Karl Zilles. 2020. "Julich-Brain: A 3D Probabilistic Atlas of the Human Brain's Cytoarchitecture." *Science* 369 (6506): 988–92. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abb4588.

Anowar, Farzana, Samira Sadaoui, and Bassant Selim. 2021. "Conceptual and Empirical Comparison of Dimensionality Reduction Algorithms (PCA, KPCA, LDA, MDS, SVD, LLE, ISOMAP, LE, ICA, t-SNE)." *Computer Science Review* 40: 100378.

Avants, Brian B, Nicholas J Tustison, Gang Song, Philip A Cook, Arno Klein, and James C Gee. 2011. "A Reproducible Evaluation of ANTs Similarity Metric Performance in Brain Image Registration." *Neuroimage* 54 (3): 2033–44.

Avants, Brian B, Nicholas J Tustison, James R Stone, the Pediatric Imaging Neurocognition, and Genetics Study. 2021. "Interpretable Similarity-Driven Multi-View Embeddings from High-Dimensional Biomedical Data." *bioRxiv*. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.07.329715.

Calhoun, Vince D, Tulay Adali, Godfrey D Pearlson, and James J Pekar. 2001. "A Method for Making Group Inferences from Functional MRI Data Using Independent Component Analysis." *Human Brain Mapping* 14 (3): 140–51.

Calhoun, Vince D, and Jing Sui. 2016. "Multimodal Fusion of Brain Imaging Data: A Key to Finding the Missing Links in Complex Mental Illness." *Biological Psychiatry: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging* 1 (3): 230–44.

Carlozzi, Noelle E, Jennifer L Beaumont, David S Tulsky, and Richard C Gershon. 2015. "The NIH Toolbox Pattern Comparison Processing Speed Test: Normative Data." *Arch. Clin. Neuropsychol.* 30 (5): 359–68.

Cole, James H. 2020. "Multimodality Neuroimaging Brain-Age in UK Biobank: Relationship to Biomedical, Lifestyle, and Cognitive Factors." *Neurobiology of Aging* 92: 34–42.

Elliott, Maxwell L, Alexander Romer, Annchen R Knodt, and Ahmad R Hariri. 2018. "A Connectome-Wide Functional Signature of Transdiagnostic Risk for Mental Illness." *Biological Psychiatry* 84 (6): 452–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2018.03.012.

Folstein, Marshal F., Susan E. Folstein, and Paul R. McHugh. 1975. "'Mini-Mental State': A Practical Method for Grading the Cognitive State of Patients for the Clinician." *Journal of Psychiatric Research* 12 (3): 189–98. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-3956(75)90026-6.

Gage, Allyson T., James R. Stone, Elisabeth A. Wilde, Stephen R. McCauley, Robert C. Welsh, John P. Mugler, Nick Tustison, et al. 2024. "Normative Neuroimaging Library: Designing a Comprehensive and Demographically Diverse Dataset of Healthy Controls to Support Traumatic Brain Injury Diagnostic and Therapeutic Development." *Journal of Neurotrauma* 41 (23-24): 2497–2512. https://doi.org/10.1089/neu.2024.0128.

Gallego, Juan A, Matthew G Perich, Lee E Miller, and Sara A Solla. 2017. "Neural Manifolds for the Control of Movement." *Neuron* 94 (5): 978–84.

Gao, Peiran, and Surya Ganguli. 2015. "On Simplicity and Complexity in the Brave New World of Large-Scale Neuroscience." *Current Opinion in Neurobiology* 32: 148–55.

Gaser, Christian, Polona Kalc, and James H Cole. 2024. "A Perspective on Brain-Age Estimation and Its Clinical Promise." *Nature Computational Science* 4 (10): 744–51.

Glasser, Matthew F., Timothy S. Coalson, Emma C. Robinson, Carl D. Hacker, John Harwell, Essa Yacoub, Kamil Ugurbil, et al. 2016. "A Multi-Modal Parcellation of Human Cerebral Cortex." *Nature* 536 (7615): 171–78. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature18933.

Goetz, Christopher G., Barbara C. Tilley, Susan R. Shaftman, Glenn T. Stebbins, Stanley Fahn, Pablo Martinez-Martin, Nancy R. LaPelle, et al. 2008. "Movement Disorder Society-Sponsored Revision of the Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (MDS-UPDRS): Scale Presentation and Clinimetric Testing Results." *Movement Disorders* 23 (15): 2129–70. https://doi.org/10.1002/mds.22340.

Groves, Adrian R, Christian F Beckmann, Stephen M Smith, and Mark W Woolrich. 2011. "Linked Independent Component Analysis for Multimodal

Data Fusion." *NeuroImage* 54 (3): 2198–2217.

Herculano-Houzel, Suzana. 2009. "The Human Brain in Numbers: A Linearly Scaled-up Primate Brain." *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* 3: 31. https://doi.org/10.3389/neuro.09.031.2009.

Ivanova, Maria V, Timothy J Herron, Nina F Dronkers, and Juliana V Baldo. 2021. "An Empirical Comparison of Univariate Versus Multivariate Methods for the Analysis of Brain-Behavior Mapping." *Human Brain Mapping* 42 (4): 1070–1101.

Karlaftis, Vasilis M, Joseph Giorgio, Petra E Vértes, Rui Wang, Yuan Shen, Peter Tino, Andrew E Welchman, and Zoe Kourtzi. 2019. "Multimodal Imaging of Brain Connectivity Reveals Predictors of Individual Decision Strategy in Statistical Learning." *Nature Human Behaviour* 3 (3): 297–307.

Marek, Scott, Brenden Tervo-Clemmens, et al. 2022. "Reproducible Brain-Wide Association Studies Require Thousands of Individuals." *Nature* 603 (7902): 654–60. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-04492-9.

McKeown, Martin J, Scott Makeig, Gregory G Brown, Tzyy-Ping Jung, S S Kindermann, Anthony J Bell, and Terrence J Sejnowski. 1998. "Analysis of fMRI Data by Blind Separation into Independent Spatial Components." *Human Brain Mapping* 6 (3): 160–88.

Meng, Chen, Oana A Zeleznik, Gerhard G Thallinger, Bernhard Kuster, Amin M Gholami, and Aedn C Culhane. 2016. "Dimension Reduction Techniques for the Integrative Analysis of Multi-Omics Data." *Briefings in Bioinformatics* 17 (4): 628–41.

Mihalik, Agoston, James Chapman, Rick A. Adams, Nils R. Winter, Fabio S. Ferreira, John Shawe-Taylor, and Janaina Mourão-Miranda. 2022. "Canonical Correlation Analysis and Partial Least Squares for Identifying Brain–Behavior Associations: A Tutorial and a Comparative Study." *Biological Psychiatry: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging* 7 (11): 1055–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpsc.2022.07.012.

Miller, Karla L, Fidel Alfaro-Almagro, Neal K Bangerter, David L Thomas, Essa Yacoub, Junqian Xu, Andreas J Bartsch, et al. 2016. "Multimodal Population Brain Imaging in the UK Biobank Prospective Epidemiological Study." *Nature Neuroscience* 19 (11): 1523–36.

Morris, John C. 1993. "The Clinical Dementia Rating (CDR): Current Version and Scoring Rules." *Neurology* 43 (11): 2412–14. https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.43.11.2412-a.

Mountcastle, Vernon B. 1997. "The Columnar Organization of the Neocortex." *Brain* 120 (4): 701–22. https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/120.4.701.

Nasreddine, Z. S., N. A. Phillips, V. Bédirian, S. Charbonneau, V. Whitehead, I. Collin, J. L. Cummings, and H. Chertkow. 2005. "The Montreal Cognitive Assessment, MoCA: A Brief Screening Tool for Mild Cognitive Impairment." *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society* 53 (4): 695–99. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2005.53221.x.

"Parkinsons Progression Markers Initiative (PPMI) Database." n.d. www.ppmi-info.org/data.

Passingham, Richard E, Klaas E Stephan, and Rolf Kötter. 2002. "The Anatom-

ical Basis of Functional Localization in the Cortex." *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 3 (8): 606–16. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn893.

Pfeffer, R. I., T. T. Kurosaki, C. H. Harrah, J. M. Chance, and S. Filos. 1982. "Measurement of Functional Activities in Older Adults in the Community." *Journal of Gerontology* 37 (3): 323–29. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronj/37.3.323.

Ramón y Cajal, Santiago. 1899. *Histology of the Nervous System of Man and Vertebrates*. Imprenta y Librería de Moya.

Reicher, Lior, Shay Shilo, Anastasia Godneva, et al. 2025. "Deep Phenotyping of Health–Disease Continuum in the Human Phenotype Project." *Nature Medicine*. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-025-03790-9.

Rey, André. 1964. *L'examen Clinique En Psychologie*. Presses Universitaires de France.

Rokicki, Jaroslav, Thomas Wolfers, Wibeke Nordhøy, Natalia Tesli, Daniel S Quintana, Dag Alnæs, Genevieve Richard, et al. 2021. "Multimodal Imaging Improves Brain Age Prediction and Reveals Distinct Abnormalities in Patients with Psychiatric and Neurological Disorders." *Human Brain Mapping* 42 (6): 1714–26.

Rosen, W. G., R. C. Mohs, and K. L. Davis. 1984. "A New Rating Scale for Alzheimer's Disease." *American Journal of Psychiatry* 141: 1356–64. https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.141.11.1356.

Shamy, Joni L, Erica Heuer, Victoria Choi, Katherine A Phillips, Sharon K Presty, Gene H Lee, Christine A Buckmaster, et al. 2011. "Volumetric Correlates of Spatiotemporal Working and Recognition Memory Impairment in Aged Rhesus Monkeys." *Cerebral Cortex* 21 (7): 1559–73.

Shine, James M, Michael Breakspear, Peter T Bell, Kaylena A Ehgoetz Martens, Richard Shine, Oluwasanmi Koyejo, Olaf Sporns, and Russell A Poldrack. 2019. "Human Cognition Involves the Dynamic Integration of Neural Activity and Neuromodulatory Systems." *Nature Neuroscience* 22 (2): 289–96.

Smith, Stephen M, Thomas E Nichols, Diego Vidaurre, Anderson M Winkler, Timothy EJ Behrens, Matthew F Glasser, Kamil Ugurbil, Deanna M Barch, David C Van Essen, and Karla L Miller. 2015. "A Positive-Negative Mode of Population Covariation Links Brain Connectivity, Demographics and Behavior." *Nature Neuroscience* 18 (11): 1565–67.

———. 2020. "Enhanced Brain Imaging Genetics in UK Biobank." *Nature Neuroscience* 24 (5): 737–45.

Sporns, Giulio AND Kötter, Olaf AND Tononi. 2005. "The Human Connectome: A Structural Description of the Human Brain." *PLOS Computational Biology* 1 (4): null. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.0010042.

Sui, Jing, Rui Jiang, Juan Bustillo, and Vince D Calhoun. 2020. "Neuroimaging-Based Individualized Prediction of Cognition and Behavior for Mental Disorders and Health: Methods and Promises." *Biological Psychiatry* 88 (11): 818–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2020.02.016.

Sui, Jing, Godfrey D Pearlson, Yuhui Du, Qingbao Yu, Thomas R Jones, Jiayu Chen, Tianzi Jiang, Juan Bustillo, and Vince D Calhoun. 2015. "In Search of Multimodal Neuroimaging Biomarkers of Cognitive Deficits in Schizophre-

nia." *Biological Psychiatry* 78 (11): 794–804.

Weintraub, Sandra, Sureyya S Dikmen, Robert K Heaton, David S Tulsky, Philip D Zelazo, Patricia J Bauer, Noelle E Carlozzi, et al. 2013. "Cognition Assessment Using the NIH Toolbox." *Neurology* 80 (11 Suppl 3): S54–64.

Table G: Terminology glossary

Key terms and their definitions

Term	Definition
Similarity-driven multiview linear reconstruction (SiMLR)	A dimensionality reduction technique for integrating multi-modal data by learning a joint low-dimensional representation across multiple data views.
Multiple modality magnetic resonance imaging (M3RI)	Combining different MRI modalities, such as structural MRI, resting functional MRI and/or diffusion tensor imaging to provide a comprehensive view of tissue characteristics, connectivity, metabolic processes, and functional activity.
IDP	Imaging data phenotype, a summary measurement appropriate for representing and interpreting imaging data in tabular form.
sMRI	Structural Magnetic Resonance Imaging, a type of (usually T1-weighted) MRI that provides detailed images of brain anatomy.
dMRI	Diffusion Magnetic Resonance Imaging, a type of MRI that measures the diffusion of water molecules in the brain, providing information on white matter tracts and brain connectivity.
rsfMRI	Resting-state functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging, a type of functional MRI that measures brain activity while a person is at rest, providing information on brain functional connectivity.
Normative neurological health (NNH)	The baseline or typical range of M3RI features observed in a large reference population.
Brain behavior mapping	The process of linking specific brain regions, networks, or neural activity patterns to observable behaviors, cognitive functions, or psychological processes.
acc, reg, osh, nc	Short hand notation for SiMLR data objectives operating on mappings between matrices and the associated features: absolute canonical covariance, regression/reconstruction, log-cosh (measuring statistical independence) and normalized correlation respectively.
pca, svd, ica	Short hand notation for SiMLR operations for deriving modality-mixing bases: Principal Component Analysis (PCA), Singular Value Decomposition (SVD), and Independent Component Analysis (ICA).
dom, corth	Short hand notation for auxiliary constraints added to the SiMLR objective followed by their weighting factors.

Table 1: **Evaluation results** Top 20 of 145. The baseline PCA method is ranked 80th. Method names encode, in shorthand, the similarity measure (acc = absolute canonical covariance; osh = logcosh; reg = regression; nc = normalized correlation), mixing method (svd, PCA, ICA) and constraints used in the configuration (dom and corth are domain knowledge priors and orthogonality constraints respectively).

Methods ranked by an average of z-scored performance metrics (subset of metrics shown).

Rank	Method	UKB.RV	UKB.NNL	UKB.Lo
1	acc.pca.dom.0.5.corth1x1.n26	0.074	0.137	0.374
2	nc.ica.dom.1.cnone.n91	0.085	0.114	0.343
3	acc.pca.dom.0.5.corth1x10.n35	0.075	0.127	0.366
4	osh.svd.dom.0.5.cnone.n116	0.102	0.117	0.348
5	osh.svd.dom.0.cnone.n117	0.100	0.122	0.336
6	acc.pca.dom.1.corth1x5.n28	0.074	0.137	0.343
7	acc.ica.dom.0.cnone.n21	0.092	0.110	0.364
8	acc.svd.dom.1.corth1x10.n10	0.074	0.126	0.351
9	acc.svd.dom.0.corth1x10.n12	0.076	0.112	0.343
10	osh.svd.dom.1.cnone.n115	0.101	0.114	0.359
11	reg.svd.dom.1.corth1x1.n37	0.068	0.133	0.369
12	nc.pca.dom.0.5.corth1x5.n101	0.072	0.120	0.369
13	acc.pca.dom.0.5.corth1x5.n29	0.077	0.121	0.360
14	nc.svd.dom.0.5.corth1x1.n74	0.078	0.125	0.349
15	nc.svd.dom.0.5.corth1x5.n77	0.075	0.125	0.334
16	acc.pca.dom.0.corth1x1.n27	0.078	0.110	0.362
17	osh.ica.dom.0.cnone.n129	0.101	0.107	0.342
18	reg.pca.dom.0.cnone.n69	0.073	0.114	0.380
19	reg.ica.dom.0.5.corth1x10.n59	0.071	0.119	0.365
20	nc.svd.dom.0.5.cnone.n80	0.074	0.124	0.308
80	base.pca.cnone.n145	0.074	0.127	0.210

Table 2: Pairwise RV Coefficient Analysis with t-test (lower better) and p-value assessed by permutation.

Pairwise RV Coefficient Analysis

Comparing Inter-Modality Relationships

param_set	Mod. 1	Mod. 2	RV.Train	RV.Test	t-stat	p-value	FDR
26	t1	dt	0.217	0.201	-4,153.702	1.38×10^{-29}	4.15×10^{-29}
26	dt	rsf	0.015	0.010	-176.166	3.11×10^{-17}	4.67×10^{-17}
26	t1	rsf	0.009	0.010	-124.618	7.01×10^{-16}	7.01×10^{-16}

Table 3: Data from UKB Symbol-Digit Match to Predict NNL Proc.Speed

Term	Estimate	Std. Error	Statistic	p-value	95% CI
(Intercept)	8.924	19.458	0.459	0.647	[-29.51, 47.36]
predicted_biomarker	4.282	0.859	4.987	0.000	[2.59, 5.98]

Model Fit Statistics: R-squared = 0.137 ; Adj. R-squared = 0.131 ; n = 159

Table 4. UKB training set population characteristics.

Characteristic	**Female** N = 4,491[1]	**Male** N = 3,870[1]
age.mri	65 (59, 71)	67 (60, 72)
townsend.deprivation	-2.54 (-3.83, -0.38)	-2.66 (-3.88, -0.60)
Unknown	3	2
fluid.inteligence.sc	7.00 (5.00, 8.00)	7.00 (5.00, 8.00)
Unknown	3,040	2,596
t1hier.resnetgrade	1.73 (1.48, 2.01)	1.68 (1.43, 1.95)
snr	10.09 (8.87, 11.35)	10.45 (9.07, 11.82)

[1]Median (Q1, Q3)

Table 5. UKB testing set population characteristics.

Characteristic	**Female** N = 4,353[1]	**Male** N = 4,008[1]
age.mri	65 (59, 71)	67 (61, 72)
townsend.deprivation	-2.61 (-3.88, -0.44)	-2.58 (-3.93, -0.39)
Unknown	4	3
fluid.inteligence.sc	7.00 (5.00, 8.00)	7.00 (5.00, 8.00)
Unknown	2,942	2,664
t1hier.resnetgrade	1.74 (1.49, 2.00)	1.68 (1.43, 1.96)
snr	10.17 (8.97, 11.42)	10.35 (8.99, 11.72)

[1]Median (Q1, Q3)

Table 6. UKB Longitudinal Population Characteristics.

Characteristic	**Female** N = 2,398[1]	**Male** N = 2,180[1]
age.mri	62 (56, 68)	64 (57, 70)
townsend.deprivation	-2.57 (-3.87, -0.42)	-2.72 (-3.95, -0.68)
Unknown	6	4
fluid.inteligence.sc	7.00 (5.00, 8.00)	7.00 (5.00, 8.00)
Unknown	1,602	1,416
t1hier.resnetgrade	1.77 (1.51, 2.06)	1.69 (1.45, 1.97)
snr	10.03 (8.95, 11.26)	10.55 (9.21, 11.98)

[1]Median (Q1, Q3)

Table 7: Baseline ADNI Population Characteristics

Characteristic	**Female** N = 152[1]	**Male** N = 99[1]
AGE	69 (65, 73)	71 (67, 76)
PTEDUCAT	16.00 (15.50, 18.00)	18.00 (16.00, 20.00)
Race		
non.white	31 (20%)	10 (10%)
white	121 (80%)	89 (90%)
MMSE	29.00 (29.00, 30.00)	29.00 (28.00, 30.00)
CDRSB	0.00 (0.00, 0.00)	0.00 (0.00, 0.50)
FAQ	0.00 (0.00, 0.00)	0.00 (0.00, 0.00)
Unknown	4	2
DTI_dti_FD_mean	1.68 (1.19, 2.19)	1.80 (1.42, 2.31)
rsfMRI_fcnxpro122_FD_mean	0.12 (0.08, 0.16)	0.11 (0.07, 0.16)
T1Hier_resnetGrade	1.77 (1.47, 2.06)	1.53 (1.24, 1.86)
snr	10.3 (7.7, 13.8)	8.8 (5.5, 12.1)
joinedDX		
CN	42 (28%)	26 (26%)
MCI	14 (9.3%)	19 (19%)
SMC	94 (63%)	54 (55%)
Unknown	2	0

[1]Median (Q1, Q3); n (%)

Table 8: Followup ADNI Population Characteristics

Characteristic	**Female** N = 52[1]	**Male** N = 41[1]
AGE	69 (66, 75)	73 (68, 76)
PTEDUCAT	18.00 (15.00, 18.00)	18.00 (16.00, 19.00)
Race		
non.white	8 (15%)	4 (9.8%)
white	44 (85%)	37 (90%)
MMSE	30.00 (29.00, 30.00)	29.00 (28.00, 30.00)
Unknown	23	14
CDRSB	0.00 (0.00, 0.00)	0.25 (0.00, 0.50)
Unknown	23	13
FAQ	0.00 (0.00, 0.00)	0.00 (0.00, 0.00)
Unknown	24	13
DTI_dti_FD_mean	1.77 (1.20, 2.18)	2.05 (1.56, 2.26)
rsfMRI_fcnxpro122_FD_mean	0.13 (0.09, 0.15)	0.11 (0.08, 0.17)
T1Hier_resnetGrade	1.64 (1.44, 1.96)	1.49 (1.26, 1.67)
snr	12.4 (7.7, 14.4)	9.0 (5.4, 11.4)
joinedDX		
CN	18 (35%)	10 (24%)
MCI	7 (13%)	10 (24%)
SMC	27 (52%)	21 (51%)

[1]Median (Q1, Q3); n (%)

Table 9: NNL Population Characteristics

Characteristic	**0** N = 53[1]	**1** N = 111[1]
Age	39 (29, 57)	45 (30, 56)
YearsEducation	16.00 (15.00, 18.00)	16.00 (14.00, 18.00)
RaceWhite		
0	7 (13%)	9 (8.1%)
1	46 (87%)	102 (92%)
Delayed recall	53 (42, 60)	49 (44, 58)
Picture Vocabulary Test Age 3+ v2.0	120 (113, 127)	114 (106, 123)
Unknown	0	2
List Sorting Working Memory Test Age 7+ v2.1	113 (103, 120)	107 (99, 118)
Unknown	4	4
Dimensional Change Card Sort Test Age 12+ v2.1	117 (102, 130)	108 (98, 124)
Unknown	1	4
Pattern Comparison Processing Speed Test Age 7+ v2.1	106 (90, 121)	107 (92, 119)
Unknown	0	5
Cognition Crystallized Composite v1.1	118 (109, 126)	115 (106, 122)
Unknown	1	2
Cognition Total Composite Score v1.1	115 (106, 123)	114 (104, 123)
Unknown	2	2
DTI_dti_FD_mean	2.24 (1.81, 2.48)	2.00 (1.78, 2.35)
rsfMRI_fcnxpro122_FD_mean	0.10 (0.08, 0.14)	0.10 (0.08, 0.13)
T1Hier_resnetGrade	2.09 (1.82, 2.37)	2.23 (1.96, 2.40)
snr	8.51 (6.20, 10.82)	9.94 (8.39, 12.10)

[1]Median (Q1, Q3); n (%)