

# DCM for evoked responses

Ryszard Auksztulewicz

SPM for M/EEG course





## Modelling aim and approach



#### \*M/EEG are complex data

Analyses / modelling: in time, frequency, time-frequency and space domains

Modelling Aim

Explain all data with few parameters

How to ...

Assume data are caused by few interacting brain sources ...

... and / or their respective intrinsic connectivity / intrinsic parameters

Adapted from Kiebel (n.a.), *Dynamic Causal Modelling for EEG and MEG,* Presentation at TU Dresden; Stoff (n.a.), *DCM for ERP/ERF,* Presentation at UCL



## Conventional analyses vs. DCM



A1 - left and right primary auditory cortex STG - left and right superior temporal gyrus

#### DCM Analysis

How do regions communicate? What role do intrinsic connections have?

Source space / effective connectivity



![](_page_3_Picture_0.jpeg)

Does network XYZ explain my data better than network XY? Which XYZ connectivity structure best explains my data? Are X & Y linked in a bottom-up, top-down or recurrent fashion? Is my effect driven by extrinsic or intrinsic connections? Which neural populations are affected by contextual factors? Which connections determine observed frequency coupling? How changing a connection/parameter would influence data?

![](_page_3_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_4_Picture_0.jpeg)

## The DCM analysis pathway

![](_page_4_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_5_Picture_0.jpeg)

## The DCM analysis pathway

![](_page_5_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_6_Picture_0.jpeg)

## Data for DCM for ERPs / ERFs

- 1. Downsample
- 2. Filter (e.g. 1-40Hz)
- 3. Epoch
- 4. Remove artefacts
- Average
   Per subject
   Grand average
- Plausible sources

   Literature / a priori
   Dipole fitting
   Source reconstruction

![](_page_6_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Picture_0.jpeg)

## The DCM analysis pathway

![](_page_7_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Picture_0.jpeg)

## The DCM analysis pathway

![](_page_8_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_0.jpeg)

## Models

load Study (Do	CM) filename ERF	ERP	•
save	data and design	CMC LFP MMM	
1 200	between-trial effects	trials MFM MMDA	
detrend 1  subsample 1			*
modes 8			-

#### frontiers in COMPUTATIONAL NEUROSCIENCE

REVIEW ARTICLE published: 28 May 2013 doi: 10.3389/fncom.2013.00057

![](_page_9_Picture_5.jpeg)

#### Neural masses and fields in dynamic causal modeling

Rosalyn Moran<sup>1,2,3</sup>\*<sup>†</sup>, Dimitris A. Pinotsis<sup>1†</sup> and Karl Friston<sup>1</sup>

![](_page_10_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### Neuronal (source) model

![](_page_10_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_0.jpeg)

 $\dot{p}_{7} = p_{8}$ 

Voltage change rate: f(current) Current change rate: f(voltage,current)

$$\dot{p}_8 = \frac{H_4}{\tau_4} (A^F S(p_2) - \gamma_{10} S(p_7) - \gamma_9 S(p_5)) - \frac{2p_8}{\tau_4} - \frac{p_7}{\tau_4^2}$$

![](_page_24_Picture_0.jpeg)

 $\dot{p}_7 = p_8$  Voltage change rate: f(current) Current change rate: f(voltage,current)

$$\dot{p}_8 = \frac{H_4}{\tau_4} (A^F S(p_2) - \gamma_{10} S(p_7) - \gamma_9 S(p_5)) - \frac{2p_8}{\tau_4} - \frac{p_7}{\tau_4^2}$$

H,  $\tau$ Kernels: pre-synaptic inputs -> post-synaptic membrane potentials $[H: \max PSP; \tau: rate constant ]$  $P(t)_e = \frac{H_e}{\tau_e} t exp(-t/\tau_e)$ SSigmoid operator: PSP -> firing rate

![](_page_24_Figure_5.jpeg)

David et al., 2006; Pinotsis et al., 2012

![](_page_25_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Figure_2.jpeg)

# **UCL**

![](_page_26_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Figure_2.jpeg)

Van Wijk et al., 2018

![](_page_27_Picture_0.jpeg)

## The DCM analysis pathway

![](_page_27_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Figure_2.jpeg)

**UCL** 

![](_page_34_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Picture_0.jpeg)

## The DCM analysis pathway

![](_page_35_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Picture_0.jpeg)

load Stud	ly (DCM) filename	ERP	- CM	с ,
save Mod	el1_split_Trial1.mat			new data
time window (ms)	data and o	lesign	display	>
60 460	bins: 5.0ms		trials (1)	hanning
	effects		1	
detrend 1				*
subsample 1				
modes 8	·	,		Ŧ
< MG •	electromagne	tic model	dipoles	>
	source names and locat	ions: prior mean (I	mm)	
onsets (ms)	left V4 right V4 left IPC	<ul> <li>-37 -80</li> <li>37 -82</li> <li>-31 -82</li> </ul>	-16 -16 35	*
120	right IPC left 7A	30 -80 -30 -68	40 50	
16	right 7A left SOG right SOG	34 -66 -26 58 ▼ 26 62	46 -4 -4	- load
	-		_	
< reset	neuronal r	model		invert DCM
forward	back	Modula	atory	innut
				0
			000000	
0000000				

![](_page_36_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Figure_4.jpeg)

mode 5

1.5

0.5

-0.5

-1.5

1.5

0.5

0 -0.5

-1

-1.5

50 100 150 200

50

100 150 200

mode 7

![](_page_37_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Figure_9.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Figure_10.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Figure_11.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Figure_4.jpeg)

250

![](_page_38_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Figure_8.jpeg)

Observed (adjusted) 2 0.01 0.01 0.005 0.005 time (ms) -0.005 -0.005 -0.01 <sup>L</sup>-----0 -0.01 Կ— 0 50 100 150 200 250 50 time (ms)

![](_page_38_Figure_10.jpeg)

H. Brown

![](_page_38_Figure_12.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Figure_13.jpeg)

![](_page_39_Picture_0.jpeg)

H. Brown

# Fitting DCMs to data

1. Check your data

![](_page_39_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_39_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_40_Picture_0.jpeg)

- 1. Check your data
- 2. Check your sources

![](_page_40_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_40_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_40_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_40_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_40_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_40_Figure_9.jpeg)

![](_page_41_Picture_0.jpeg)

- 1. Check your data
- 2. Check your sources
- 3. Check your model

![](_page_41_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_42_Picture_0.jpeg)

- 1. Check your data
- 2. Check your sources
- 3. Check your model
- 4. Re-run model fitting

![](_page_42_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_43_Picture_0.jpeg)

## The DCM analysis pathway

![](_page_43_Figure_2.jpeg)

**UC** 

![](_page_44_Figure_1.jpeg)

Friston et al., 2016

![](_page_45_Picture_0.jpeg)

## The DCM analysis pathway

![](_page_45_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_46_Picture_0.jpeg)

Does network XYZ explain my data better than network XY? Which XYZ connectivity structure best explains my data? Are X & Y linked in a bottom-up, top-down or recurrent fashion? Is my effect driven by extrinsic or intrinsic connections? Which connections/populations are affected by contextual factors?

![](_page_46_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_47_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### Example #1: Architecture of MMN

200 300 400

![](_page_47_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_47_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_47_Figure_4.jpeg)

Garrido et al., 2008

![](_page_48_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### Example #2: Role of feedback connections

![](_page_48_Figure_2.jpeg)

Garrido et al., 2007

![](_page_49_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### Example #3: Group differences

![](_page_49_Figure_2.jpeg)

Boly et al., 2011

![](_page_50_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Example #4: Factorial design & CMC

![](_page_50_Figure_2.jpeg)

Bastos et al., Neuron 2012

![](_page_51_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_51_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_52_Figure_1.jpeg)

Flexible factorial design Thresholded at p<.005 peak-level Corrected at a cluster-level pFWE<.05

![](_page_53_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_53_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_54_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_55_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_55_Figure_1.jpeg)

Winning model

![](_page_55_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_55_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_56_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_56_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_57_Picture_0.jpeg)

## Example #5: Same paradigm, different data

![](_page_57_Picture_2.jpeg)

Phillips et al., 2016

![](_page_58_Picture_0.jpeg)

## Example #5: Same paradigm, different data

A : ECoG DCM results

![](_page_58_Figure_3.jpeg)

D

![](_page_58_Figure_4.jpeg)

Phillips et al., 2016

![](_page_59_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Example #6: Hierarchical modelling

A Evoked response potentials at Fz r

![](_page_59_Figure_3.jpeg)

B Mismatch negativity waveform

![](_page_59_Figure_5.jpeg)

C Scalp topography of mismatch responses

![](_page_59_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_59_Figure_8.jpeg)

Rosch et al., 2017

![](_page_60_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### Example #6: Hierarchical modelling

#### A First level model space: Effects of repetition

![](_page_60_Figure_3.jpeg)

#### B Second level model space: Effects of ketamine

![](_page_60_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_60_Figure_6.jpeg)

S36

S36

AFWD

ABWD

B

Bawn

τ g

М Ν

Rosch et al., 2017

![](_page_61_Picture_0.jpeg)

## Example #6: Hierarchical modelling

![](_page_61_Figure_2.jpeg)

#### Bayesian model comparison on reduced models explaining ketamine effects

![](_page_61_Figure_4.jpeg)

Rosch et al., 2017

![](_page_62_Picture_0.jpeg)

## Motivate your assumptions!

![](_page_62_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_63_Picture_0.jpeg)

## References

#### Overview

Moran R, Pinotsis DA, Friston K. Neural masses and fields in dynamic causal modeling. Front Comput Neurosci. 2013 May 28;7:57. doi: 10.3389/fncom.2013.00057.
Bastos AM, Usrey WM, Adams RA, Mangun GR, Fries P, Friston KJ. Canonical microcircuits for predictive coding. Neuron. 2012 Nov 21;76(4):695-711. doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2012.10.038.

#### Model specifics

David O, Kilner JM, Friston KJ. Mechanisms of evoked and induced responses in MEG/EEG. Neuroimage. 2006 Jul 15;31(4):1580-91. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2006.02.034.
Kiebel SJ, Garrido MI, Moran RJ, Friston KJ. Dynamic causal modelling for EEG and MEG. Cogn Neurodyn. 2008 Jun;2(2):121-36. doi: 10.1007/s11571-008-9038-0.
Pinotsis DA, Moran RJ, Friston KJ. Dynamic causal modeling with neural fields. Neuroimage. 2012 Jan 16;59(2):1261-74. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.08.020.
van Wijk BCM, Cagnan H, Litvak V, Kühn AA, Friston KJ. Generic dynamic causal modelling: An illustrative application to Parkinson's disease. Neuroimage. 2018 Nov 1;181:818-830. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2018.08.039.

#### Group inference

Friston KJ, Litvak V, Zeidman P, et al. Bayesian model reduction and empirical Bayes for group (DCM) studies. Neuroimage. 2016 Mar;128:413-431. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.11.015.

#### Examples

Garrido MI, Kilner JM, Kiebel SJ, Friston KJ. Evoked brain responses are generated by feedback loops.
Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2007 Dec 26;104(52):20961-6. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0706274105.
Garrido MI, Friston KJ, Kiebel SJ, Stephan KE, Baldeweg T, Kilner JM. The functional anatomy of the MMN: a DCM study of the roving paradigm. Neuroimage. 2008 Aug 15;42(2):936-44. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2008.05.018.

- Boly M, Garrido MI, Friston K, et al. Preserved feedforward but impaired top-down processes in the vegetative state. Science. 2011 May 13;332(6031):858-62. doi: 10.1126/science.1202043.
- Auksztulewicz R, Friston K. Attentional Enhancement of Auditory Mismatch Responses: a DCM/MEG Study. Cereb Cortex. 2015 Nov;25(11):4273-83. doi: 10.1093/cercor/bhu323.
- Phillips HN, Blenkmann A, Rowe JB, et al. Convergent evidence for hierarchical prediction networks from human ECoG and MEG. Cortex. 2016 Sep;82:192-205. doi: 10.1016/j.cortex.2016.05.001.
- Rosch RE, Auksztulewicz R, Baldeweg T, et al. Selective Prefrontal Disinhibition in a Roving Auditory Oddball Paradigm Under NMDAR Blockade. Biol Psychiatry Cogn Neurosci Neuroimaging. 2019 Feb;4(2):140-150. doi: 10.1016/j.bpsc.2018.07.003.

## Thank you!

Karl Friston Gareth Barnes Andre Bastos Harriet Brown Hayriye Cagnan Jean Daunizeau Marta Garrido Stefan Kiebel Vladimir Litvak Rosalyn Moran Will Penny **Dimitris Pinotsis Richard Rosch** Bernadette van Wijk

![](_page_64_Picture_2.jpeg)