General additive models address statistical issues in diffusion MRI: An example with clinically anxious adolescents
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ABSTRACT
Statistical models employed to test for group differences in quantized diffusion-weighted MRI white matter tracts often fail to account for the large number of data points per tract in addition to the distribution, type, and interdependence of the data. To address these issues, we propose the use of Generalized Additive Models (GAMs) and supply code and examples to aid in their implementation. Specifically, using diffusion data from 73 periadolescent clinically anxious and no-psychiatric-diagnosis control participants, we tested for group tract differences and show that a GAM allows for the identification of differences within a tract while accounting for the nature of the data as well as covariates and group factors. Further, we then used these tract differences to investigate their association with performance on a memory test. When comparing our high versus low anxiety groups, we observed a positive association between the left uncinate fasciculus and memory overgeneralization for negatively valenced stimuli. This same association was not evident in the right uncinate or anterior forceps. These findings illustrate that GAMs are well-suited for modeling diffusion data while accounting for various aspects of the data, and suggest that the adoption of GAMs will be a powerful investigatory tool for diffusion-weighted analyses.

1. Introduction
Diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI) is a magnetic resonance imaging technique capitalizing on constrained water diffusion to approximate anatomical features such as axonal bundles across voxels. Modeling axonal bundles is desirable as modern neuroscience conceptualizes the functioning of the central nervous system as a dynamic graph where individual functional nodes are connected within a network (Feldman et al., 2010). Distinct regions form the functional nodes which are connected via axonal projections, constituting the network edges (Sotiropoulos and Zalesky, 2019). Accordingly, a systems-level description of the functioning central nervous system necessitates accurate characterization of both micro- and macro-anatomic pathways. Clinically, mental health, injury, and/or disease often are associated with white matter disruption (e.g. traumatic brain injury, multiple sclerosis, anxiety), and classification of these differences may serve as strong etiological biomarkers (Harrison et al., 2011; De Santis et al., 2019; Mesaros et al., 2012; Shenton et al., 2012; Hutchinson et al., 2018; Raizman et al., 2020; Delouche et al., 2016; Adluru et al., 2017; Jamieson et al., 2021). Additionally, developmental research will benefit from careful modeling given the role of myelination in both development and DWI metrics (Dumontheil, 2016; Østby et al., 2009).

Utilizing DWI data to sensitively investigate group differences remains a non-trivial task fraught with issues of multiple comparisons, data distribution and type, and interdependence. Accordingly, it is our goal to articulate a number of extant issues in modeling DWI data and propose a statistical approach that will address these issues, and demonstrate the utility of such an approach. To this end, we analyzed data collected from 73 periadolescent participants of both clinically anxious and no-psychiatric-diagnosis control populations. We demonstrate that our statistical proposal accounts for many of the troublesome aspects of DWI data and that such analyses are capable of identifying group differences that correlate with behavior outcomes.

Recent advancements in the quantification and analysis of DWI data has resulted in the development of the Automated Fiber Quantification (AFQ) software (Kruper et al., 2021; Yeatman et al., 2012; Yeatman et al., 2012; Yeatman et al., 2012; Yeatman et al., 2012). Corresponding author.
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AFQ utilizes a conjunction of techniques with the goal of robustly producing sensitive axonal pathway models, and results in tractographic profiles from which multiple diffusion metrics may be derived. Critically, AFQ resamples each tract into tractographic profiles from which multiple diffusion metrics may be robustly producing sensitive axonal pathway models, and results in differences within a tract, conducting an analysis on each tract node problematic for statistical analyses. Researchers using AFQ are often motivated to investigate group differences within a tract, conducting an analysis on each tract node (termed a “point-wise” analysis) which results in a non-trivial number of comparisons for which one must properly correct. Of the 36 papers we identified that used AFQ for DWI analyses (using a PubMed search query “automated fiber quantification” OR “AFQ” AND “diffusion” [Table 1]), 28 employed either a permutation-based multiple comparisons correction method (Nichols and Holmes, 2002), a false discovery rate correction or a Bonferroni adjustment. Unfortunately, such correction methods may trade sensitivity for proper family-wise error rates, or a Bonferroni adjustment. Fortunately, such correction methods may trade sensitivity for proper family-wise error rates, potentially inflating the probability of Type-II errors. A second issue with AFQ-derived diffusion statistics we note is the distribution of values for any given tract may not meet the requisite normality assumptions of Student’s t-test or analysis of variance testing, even if multiple comparisons are properly controlled. While certain studies noted and accounted for this distribution issue (Table 1), these studies are the minority, and the proper model fit to “wiggly” data, or data with an X–Y relationship that cannot be readily described with a polynomial (e.g. linear, quadratic, etc.) Additionally, and similar to generalized linear models, a range of link functions facilitate appropriate modeling of non-Gaussian and bounded data. The resulting GAM generates a smoothed spline fit to the data. For use with AFQ, separate splines may be produced for different groups when modeling a tract and by comparing group splines, it will be possible to identify the tract nodes which differ between groups, failing to meet basic assumptions of statistical models in the broader use of AFQ remains an issue. The non-normality complication is compounded with yet one more problem not unique to AFQ but relevant for all studies using diffusion data: diffusion metrics like FA values are not continuous but proportional, being bounded between 0 (perfect isotropy) and 1 (perfect anisotropy). Failing to account for the type of data may yet constitute another violation of the basic assumptions for the statistical models employed. Finally, and most seriously, there is a violation of independence due to the spatial correlation in the nodes which drastically inflates the resulting p-values. Together, then, we note three points and potential issues which must be considered during test selection for AFQ-derived DWI data: multiple comparisons, non-Gaussian distributions and proportional data type, and spatial dependencies.

A Generalized Additive Model (GAM; Wood, 2017) is an ideal method for modeling AFQ DWI values and addressing the aforementioned issues. From the family of regression models, a GAM models the relationship between independent and dependent variables utilizing a set of smoothing functions. These smoothing functions allow for a proper model fit to “wiggly” data, or data with an X–Y relationship that cannot be readily described with a polynomial (e.g. linear, quadratic, etc.) Additionally, and similar to generalized linear models, a range of link functions facilitate appropriate modeling of non-Gaussian and bounded data. The resulting GAM generates a smoothed spline fit to the data. For use with AFQ, separate splines may be produced for different groups when modeling a tract and by comparing group splines, it will be possible to identify the tract nodes which differ between groups, failing to meet basic assumptions of statistical models in the broader use of AFQ remains an issue. The non-normality complication is compounded with yet one more problem not unique to AFQ but relevant for all studies using diffusion data: diffusion metrics like FA values are not continuous but proportional, being bounded between 0 (perfect isotropy) and 1 (perfect anisotropy). Failing to account for the type of data may yet constitute another violation of the basic assumptions for the statistical models employed. Finally, and most seriously, there is a violation of independence due to the spatial correlation in the nodes which drastically inflates the resulting p-values. Together, then, we note three points and potential issues which must be considered during test selection for AFQ-derived DWI data: multiple comparisons, non-Gaussian distributions and proportional data type, and spatial dependencies.

Table 1

| Author, Year | Sample Size | Test | MCC Method | DOI |
|--------------|-------------|------|------------|-----|
| Angelopoulos et al. (2019) | 57 | node t-test | Perm | 10.3389/fnins.2019.01424 |
| Banfi et al. (2019) | 69 | node ANOVA | a/3 | 10.1002/hbm.24410 |
| Cai et al. (2019) | 55 | node t-test | Perm | 10.1007/s11682-019-00160-1 |
| Carbine et al. (2020) | 87 | Spline | | 10.1007/s11682-019-00363-4 |
| Chen et al. (2020) | 70 | node ANOVA node GLM | FWE | 10.1111/cns.13283 |
| Chen et al. (2020) | 81 | node GLM | FDR | 10.3389/fnins.2020.570123 |
| Clocksin et al. (2021) | 43 | tract LMM | | 10.1016/j.jmris.2020.02.001 |
| Deng et al. (2018) | 104 | node t-tests | Perm, FPC | 10.1016/j.pnpb.2017.09.006 |
| Dou et al. (2020) | 120 | node ANOVA | FDR | 10.1016/j.jcortext.2020.03.032 |
| Goodrich-Hanssatter et al. (2018) | 153 | node ANOVA | FDR | 10.1002/jtrr.21442 |
| Hall et al. (2016) | 20 | tract ANOVA | Bonf | 10.1371/journal.pone.0049790 |
| Huang et al. (2020) | 244 | node GLM | Perm | 10.3389/fragl.2020.598242 |
| Huang et al. (2019) | 8 | Case studies | | 10.3171/2019.5.PEDS19117 |
| Jiang et al. (2019) | 72 | node M–W U | Bonf | 10.3174/ajnr.A5914 |
| Jossering et al. (2021) | 42 | mean Wilcoxon node Wilcoxon | Perm | 10.1007/s00429-020-02210-7 |
| Kreilkamp et al. (2019) | 64 | mean K-W ANOVA along-the-tract | Bonf, FDR | 10.1016/j.jic.2019.10.02024 |
| Li et al. (2020) | 37 | mean t-test node t-test | FDR | 10.1038/s41598-020-73305-8 |
| Li et al. (2017) | 107 | node t-test | FDR | 10.3760/cma.issn.00376-2491.2017.13.003 |
| Li et al. (2020) | 42 | node t-test | Perm | 10.3760/cma.issn.00376-2491.2020.03.003 |
| Lin et al. (2020) | 14 | node t-test | Perm | 10.1007/s11682-018-0010-2 |
| Pascual-Diaz et al. (2020) | 120 | node t-test | Bonf | 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.117260 |
| SACCHET et al. (2014)* | 32 | mean t-test node t-test | FDR | 10.1186/2045-5380-4.8 |
| SACCHET et al. (2014)* | 32 | mean t-test node t-test | Perm | 10.1109/ISBI.2014.6867940 |
| SARICA et al. (2017) | 24 | node t-test | Perm | 10.1002/hbm.23412 |
| SARICA et al. (2019) | 44 | node t-test | Perm | 10.1159/000503970 |
| SOMMER et al. (2017) | 16 | mean NRMSE | Perm | 10.1002/brb3.588 |
| Unterriener et al. (2019) | 153 | node t-test | Perm | 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00667 |
| Valkhin et al. (2020) | 246 | mean ANOVA | Perm | 10.1093/nejm.v2019.4487 |
| Van Der Auwera et al. (2021) | 87 | node t-test | a/5, FDR | 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2021.118087 |
| Xue et al. (2019) | 13 | mean Pearson | | 10.1109/EMBC.2019.8857590 |
| YEATMAN et al. (2012) | 74 | Original Paper node t-test | Perm | 10.1371/journal.pone.0049790 |
| YEATMAN et al. (2018) | | Methods | | 10.1038/s41467-018-03297-7 |
| ZEINEH et al. (2015) | 29 | node t-test | Perm | 10.1148/radiol.141141079 |
| ZHANG et al. (2018) | 25 | mean t-test node t-test | Bonf | 10.3389/fninf.2018.000089 |
| ZHANG et al. (2019) | 158 | node t-test | Perm | 10.1016/j.pnia.2019.101723 |
| ZHOU et al. (2018) | 54 | node t-test | FDR | 10.1016/j.brainres.2018.07.003 |
mitigating the point-wise multiple comparisons problem. Additionally, covariates may be included in the GAM thereby allowing one to model a tract for multiple groups while controlling for various factors and parameters. It is our aim, then, to demonstrate the use of a GAM to model AFQ-derived FA values, and to facilitate future implementations, we supply and describe the requisite code.

2. Methods

2.1. Participants

Periadolescent participants, ages 10–13 years, were recruited from both community sources and pediatric anxiety clinics as part of an ongoing R01 study. Data from the subset of these participants who contributed a diffusion-weighted MR image was used in the current work, totaling 73 participants (44 female, age = 11.2 ± 1.1 years). Institutional Review Board approval was obtained at the outset of the study, and prior to beginning experimental procedures participants completed informed consent and assent. The clinical population had an inclusion criteria of an anxiety disorder diagnosis, and participants were evaluated for any MR contraindications and exclusionary major medical conditions, see below) was stratified by 3 levels of anxiety severity as symptom severity in the primary study, randomization (Sleep, Wake order, oppositional defiant disorder, psychotic disorders, obsessive compulsive disorder). All participants were right-handed and had normal or corrected-to-normal vision. Each participant was assessed for anxiety severity using the Pediatric Anxiety Rating Scale (PARS-6, described below), and pubertal development was assessed via the Pubertal Development Scale (PDS, Petersen et al., 1988). Scoring for the PDS followed Shirtcliff et al. (Shirtcliff et al., 2009), which is an approach that aims to approximate Tanner staging (Tanner, 1962). Following completion of the study protocol, participants were remunerated for their time.

2.2. Pediatric anxiety rating scale

The Pediatric Anxiety Rating Scale (PARS; Storch, 2012) is a semi-structured interview in which clinicians assess anxiety severity over the past week by probing 50 anxiety symptoms with both parent and child (interviewed separately), and then rating seven global severity items. The PARS-6 (range 0–30) is an established computation that eliminates symptom number from the total severity score given lack of direct contribution to severity, as severity can be driven by a single symptom dimension and frequency of all symptoms is already captured in the score (Caporino et al., 2013). To achieve a full distribution of symptom severity in the primary study, randomization (Sleep, Wake conditions, see below) was stratified by 3 levels of anxiety severity as assessed by PARS-6: 0–3 (Low), 4–12 (Medium), and 13–30 (High). Severity ranges were determined by a review of literature defining cut-points with high specificity and sensitivity for a clinical diagnosis (Ginsburg et al., 2011) and for likely remission in clinical trials (Caporino et al., 2013; Johnco et al., 2015), as well as a review of severity distributions in 3 archival datasets that included clinic and non-clinic samples in this age-range. Of the 73 participants whose data were used in this experiment, 34 participants were classified as Low, 20 as Medium, and 19 as High.

2.3. Memory experiment

Participants took part in an emotional version of the mnemonic similarity task (eMSST; Stark et al., 2019; Leal et al., 2014), which consisted of Study and Test sessions: the Study session involved an incidental encoding task during which participants viewed pictures of everyday scenes for two seconds and were instructed to endorse each scene as either emotionally negative, neutral, or positive. These stimuli were separated by a jittered inter-stimulus interval (2–6 s) during which a white central fixation was presented on a black background. Each scene was presented once resulting in a total of 175 images (58 negative, 57 neutral, 60 positive). Participants then returned one week later between the hours of 11:00 and 15:00 for a surprise memory test. This test consisted of presenting participants a random order of stimuli that were either identical to one encountered in the Study session (Targets), similar to but different from a Study session stimulus (Lures), or entirely novel (Fools). Participants were instructed to endorse each stimulus as either ‘Old’ or ‘New’, where ‘Old’ indicated they remembered the exact stimulus from the encoding session. Stimulus duration and inter-stimulus intervals were identical to the encoding session, and a total of 251 stimuli were presented: 48 Targets (16 negative, 15 neutral, 17 positive), 91 Lures (30 negative, 30 neutral, 31 positive), and 112 Foils (33 negative, 40 neutral, 39 positive). A complete description of the paradigm and an analysis of R01 pilot data are reported elsewhere (McMakin et al., 2021).

2.4. MRI

Imaging was conducted on a 3 Tesla Siemens MAGNETOM Prisma at the Florida International University Center for Imaging Science utilizing a 32-channel coil. Each participant contributed T1 and diffusion weighted images. T1-weighted structural scans were acquired using a magnetization-prepared rapid acquisition with gradient echo (MP-RAGE) sequence with the following parameters: TE = 29 ms, flip angle = 8°, TR = 2500 ms, FOV = 256 × 256, slices = 176 interleaved, voxel size = 1 mm³. Diffusion weighted scans were acquired with the following parameters: TE = 89 ms, flip angle = 90°, TR = 4200 ms, voxel size = 1.7 mm³, 103 slices, 7 reference volumes (b-value = 0 s/mm²), 4 shells (b-values = 500, 1000, 2000, and 3000 s/mm²), 96 directions, multi-band acceleration factor = 3, bandwidth = 1700 Hz/Px; all shells were utilized in DWI pre-processing. A diffusion field map was acquired utilizing the same protocol, save that TR = 12600 ms and reversed acquisition direction.

2.5. DWI pre-processing

Pre-processing of DWI data was conducted using FreeSurfer (version 7.1; Fischl, 2012) alongside FSL’s FDT suite (version 6.0.3; Behrens et al., 2003, 2007). First, a field map acquired in the P=Ax direction was combined with the extracted b₀ images from the diffusion acquisition (acquired A⇒P). Next, FSL’s TOPUP (Ashburner, 2003; Smith et al., 2004) then utilized this combined b₀ images to calculate the susceptibility distortion of the image at each b₀ image. Finally, FSL’s Eddy (Andersson and Sotiropoulos, 2016) used the resulting distortion map in conjunction with slice-timing information to produce a motion-corrected diffusion image for subsequent analyses.

2.6. Automated fiber quantification

AFQ utilizes pre-processed DWI data to generate node-specific diffusion metrics for a predetermined set of white matter tracts. Generally, there are six main steps in the process, and using the python version of AFQ (pyAFQ version 0.7.1; Kruper et al., 2021) allows for controlling the software via a single configuration toml file. Our implementation of AFQ capitalized on the command-line interface of pyAFQ and largely utilized the default options for the various parameters.

To briefly describe the approach implemented in AFQ (see Yeatman et al., 2012 for a full description), we first generated a whole-brain fiber tractography map utilizing a probabilistic approach; in tracking an individual bundle, the probabilistic approach accounts for local uncertainty and incorporates variability of the diffusion metrics into the tract calculation, resulting in maps that more accurately describe the geometric properties of fibers and their intermixing. Second, this fiber map was then parcellated for individual tracts. To accomplish this task AFQ
employs the Wakana et al. (Wakana et al., 2007) method of classifying fibers according to whether they pass through a number of a priori waypoint regions of interest (ROIs). These waypoint ROIs are defined in an MNI atlas space, and are moved into participant space via a symmetric, non-linear diffeomorphic transformation. Third, fiber tracts were refined by incorporating the probability maps of Hua et al. (Hua et al., 2008). Any tract fibers which take an idiosyncratic pathway between the two waypoint ROIs will have traversed a lower probability space for the tract, decreasing the likelihood that the fiber is a member of the tract. These low-probability fibers were removed from the tract bundle. Fourth, the tract was then cleaned of fibers that significantly differ from the average of the tract bundle. To determine which fibers of the tract node for each subject, factors for group and sex, and continuous covariate values; see Supplemental Materials, Table S1 for an example data frame. Next, we assessed the distribution of the FA values in order to select the proper family and link function (R Code 1).

R Code 1: Determining distribution of FA values. df tract = data frame for a specific tract, dti fa = column name corresponding to FA values.

```r
library("ftdistplus")
descdist(dtitract & dti_fa, discrete=F)
```

For each tract, we found a number of distributions could be used to model the data. Accordingly, we constructed a separate GAM to fit each potential distribution using the appropriate family (e.g. beta or gamma). These GAMs modeled FA values by fitting a spline for each group while controlling for sex, where each subject was modeled as a random effect. The logit link function was used to account for the bounded (ratio) FA values. Finally, the residual estimates of maximum likelihood (REML) method was used to assess model fit (R Code 2).

R Code 2: GAM of tract FA values using a gamma distribution. For the beta model, the ‘betar’ argument was used instead of ‘Gamma’. In this model, the ‘bam’ function was used to generate the GAM in order to reduce computation time on a large data set, but ‘gam’ could be employed for smaller data sets. dti_fa = column name of FA values, Group & Sex = factors, nodeID = AFQ node, k = basis dimension (knots), subjectID = subject identifier, df_tract = data frame for tract.

```r
library("mgcv")
fit.gamma <- bam(dti_fa ~ Group + Sex + s(subjectID, by=Group, k=40) + s(nodeID, by=Group, k=40) + s(subjectID, bs="re"), data = df_tract, family = Gamma(link = "logit"), method = "REML")
```

The resulting model fit was then assessed via the command gamma.check(fit.gamma, rep = 500) to verify the basis dimension (k) employed was appropriate, and the k parameter was iteratively updated until the factor k-index > 1. Next, the two GAM models using different families were compared directly (R Code 3), and the model with the best fit was used in subsequent analyses.

R Code 3: Determining which GAM produces the best fit. fit.gamma ~ GAM fitting a gamma distribution, fit.beta ~ GAM fitting using a beta distribution.

```r
library("itsadug")
compareML(fit.gamma, fit.beta)
```

Additionally, we opted to include a continuous covariate for pubertal development (PDS) as we were modeling data from an adolescent population (R Code 4). Adding a smooth term for the covariate resulted in a new GAM, and then the process of determining the k parameter was repeated. This covariate GAM, which modeled the tract FA values for each group while controlling for sex and PDS, was then compared

---

2.7. Statistical analyses

All statistical models and analyses were conducted in R version 4.0.3 (R Core Team, 2020), and the main packages used in this work include ftdistplus version 1.1.6 (Delignette-Muller and Dutang, 2015), mgcv version 1.8.38 (Wood, 2011), and itsadug version 2.4 (van Rij et al., 2020). Analyses reported in this main text focus on modeling FA values via a GAM, but we note that GAMs are equally appropriate to model the other DWI scalars and supply a model of mean diffusivity (MD) values in Supplemental Materials Section 5.1. First, in order to utilize a GAM to model FA values for white matter tracts of interest, we first organized the AFQ output into a data frame which contained the FA value of each

---

Fig. 1. Representative AFQ tract bundles overlaid on an extracted b<sub>0</sub> image.
against the non-covariate model (fit.gamma) in order to determine whether adding the covariate improved model fit.

R Code 4: GAM of FA data utilizing PDS as a covariate.

```
ft_cov.pds <- bam(dti_fa ~ Group +
                  Sex +
                  s(nodeID, by=Group, k=40) +
                  s(PDS, by=Sex) +
                  s(subjectID, bs="re") ,
                  data=df.tract,
                  family = Gamma(link = "logit"),
                  method = "REML")
```

Finally, the spline fit estimates and standard error at each node were compared between groups (R Code 5) which identified the tract nodes that differed in their FA values between groups. The averaged FA value of these nodes was then extracted for regression analyses with memory measures. Finally, given that multiple statistical tests were conducted in this manuscript, the interpretation of significance utilized a Bonferroni method.

AIC and model fit differences were compared between groups (R Code 5) which identified the tract nodes that differed in their FA values between groups. The averaged FA value of these nodes was then extracted for regression analyses with memory measures. Finally, given that multiple statistical tests were conducted in this manuscript, the interpretation of significance utilized a Bonferroni correction.

3. Results

3.1. GAM of the Left Uncinate

Diffusion-weighted MRI data of 73 periadolescent participants were modeled with pyAFQ to generate a set of white matter tracts for the left uncinate, right uncinate, and anterior forceps pathways. One benefit of the AFQ approach is that it allows to test for group differences along a tract. To this end, participants were grouped into Low, Medium, and High PARS-6 groups. These groups did not differ in age ($F_{(2,70)}=47, p=0.6, \eta^2=0.013$) or PDS ($F_{(2,70)}=0.8, p=0.92, \eta^2=0.002$). For the left uncinate, assessing the distribution of FA values revealed a beta or gamma function fit the data (Supplemental Materials, Fig. S1; distribution mean = 0.45 ± 0.07, skewness = −0.84, kurtosis = 3.55). Accordingly, we conducted two GAMs, one utilizing the “gamma” family (GAMc) and one using “beta” (GAMb; R Code 2); a basis dimension (k) of 40 in both GAMs resulted in k-indices > 1 for each group factor. Next, we tested GAMc against GAMb to determine which model best fit the data (Table 2, L. Uncinate). AIC and model fit difference testing (via compareML) indicated the Gamma family had better fit (GAMc: −REML = −8802.6, $R^2_{adj} = 82$; GAMb: −REML = 10561, $R^2_{adj} = 82$; AIC difference = −436.1); $\chi^2$ testing was not conducted as the two models had equal degrees of freedom.

The GAM, model for the left uncinate indicated both the Medium and High PARS-6 groups had significantly higher intercepts than Low PARS-6. Also Males did not differ in their intercept from Females (Table 3, L. Uncinate GAMc, Parametric Coefficients). For the smooth terms, the interaction of tract node with each group was significant, indicating non-flattness of the spline and that an interactive, and not additive, structure is necessary for modeling the data. This was not the case for the subject term (Table 3, Approximate Significance of Smooth Terms [top]).

GAM, modeled the left uncinate tract with separate splines for each group while controlling for sex, but as periodolence is a sensitive period for development, we computed another GAM which included PDS scores as a covariate (GAMc,). That is, as a sex × puberty onset age interaction exists such that females typically enter puberty at an early age than males, and this sex × pubertal onset age affects myelination (see Discussion), we attempted to control for developmental variance in tract FA values by incorporating a measure of puberty given that no age difference was detected between males and females (Welch Two Sample $t_{(62.3)} = -0.05, p = 0.95$) and that females had higher developmental scores as measured by the PDS (Welch Two Sample $t_{(60.1)} = 2.61, p = 0.011, 95% CI [0.13, 1.01]). In this regard we reasoned that PDS would better control for developmental related variance than age, thereby affording us greater sensitivity to investigate whether tract

![Image](image-url)
differences were associated with measures of anxiety (R Code 4).

This produced a set of splines that modeled tract FA values while also controlling for group, sex, and a measure of development, potentially allowing for more precise between-group testing (Fig. 2, top). The resulting covariate model GAMc was then compared against GAMc, and these analysis indicated that incorporating the developmental covariate increased model fit despite the added complexity (GAMc – REML = −9336; AIC difference = 1222; χ²(adj) = 533.4, p < .001). Accordingly, while GAM, demonstrated an R²(adj) = 0.82, adding a covariate resulted in an R²(adj) = 0.85 (Table 2, L. Uncinate). Parametric coefficients and smooth terms for GAMc were largely identical to GAMc (Table 3, bottom), while PDS interacted with sex.

By incorporating a developmental covariate into the GAM, we were able to produce a spline best fitting the tract FA values for each group while controlling for sex and PDS (Fig. 2, top). Next, we aimed to identify aspects of the tract that differed significantly between groups.

The R tool plot_diff (R Code 4) compares only two groups, and so we elected to compare the Low PARS-6 group to the High (although note that plot_diff also generates a data frame of model fit estimates and standard error which could be used to investigate interactions with >2 groups). This Low–High spline comparison identified all nodes for which the two group splines differed significantly (Fig. 2, bottom). Specifically, 83 nodes were significantly greater in FA fit estimates for the High compared to the Low group while controlling for sex and PDS. Node number 71 demonstrated the greatest FA fit estimate in the High relative to the Low PARS-6 group.

3.2. GAM of the right uncinate and anterior forceps

We used the same methods as detailed above to model both the right uncinate and anterior forceps. For the right uncinate, the distribution of FA values could be described with either a gamma or beta function just as the left uncinate (distribution mean = .47 ± .08, skewness = -.92, kurtosis = 3.77). Fit statistics indicated that GAM, better fit the data than GAMc (Table 2, R. Uncinate), and that adding a covariate (GAMc) also improved model fit (χ²(adj) = 461.8, p < .001). The distribution for the anterior forceps had less skewness, however, resulting in a distribution that could be described with either a Gaussian, beta, or gamma function (distribution mean = .57 ± 14, skewness = .03, kurtosis = 2.34). We used each distribution in separate GAM models, and we found the Gaussian function best fit the distribution of the data (Table 2, A. Forceps). Finally, as with the bi-hemispheric uncinate fasciculi, adding a covariate increased model fit (GAMc: χ²(adj) = 129.4, p < .001).

For parametric coefficients, each factor in the right uncinate GAMc significantly differed from the intercept while sex (Male) did not differ from the intercept for the anterior forceps GAMc model (Table 4), similar to the left uncinate GAMc (See Table 3). Additionally, each smooth term differed significantly from flatness, and the interactions of

**Table 4**

Statistics for the right uncinate fasciculus GAMc (Top) and anterior forceps GAMc (Bottom). Est = model estimate, SE = standard error, edf = estimated degrees of freedom, Ref.df = reference degrees of freedom, Sig = significance, n.s. = not significant.

| R. Uncinate GAMc | Parametric Coefficients | Est  | SE   | t-stat | p-value | Sig  |
|------------------|--------------------------|------|------|--------|---------|------|
| (Intercept)      | −1.24                    | 0.13 | −9.56| <.001  | ***     |
| Med              | 0.06                     | 0.00 | 18.44| <.001  | ***     |
| High             | 0.08                     | 0.00 | 22.14| <.001  | ***     |
| Male             | 0.05                     | 0.01 | 3.33 | <.001  | ***     |

| Approximate Significance of Smooth Terms | edf | Ref.df | F-stat | p-value | Sig  |
|-----------------------------------------|-----|--------|--------|---------|------|
| s(nodeID):Low                           | 30.96 | 35.43 | 1464.12 | <.001   | ***   |
| s(nodeID):Med                           | 28.48 | 33.35 | 999.09  | <.001   | ***   |
| s(nodeID):High                          | 27.49 | 32.43 | 1030.13 | <.001   | ***   |
| s(PDS):Female                           | 7.93  | 8.00  | 99.84  | <.001   | ***   |
| s(PDS):Male                             | 6.59  | 6.90  | 47.17  | <.001   | ***   |
| s(subjectID)                             | 0.99  | 1      | 68.24  | <.001   | ***   |

| A. Forceps GAMc | Parametric Coefficients | Est  | SE   | t-stat | p-value | Sig  |
|-----------------|-------------------------|------|------|--------|---------|------|
| (Intercept)     | −2.97                   | 0.17 | −16.97| <.001  | ***    |
| Med             | −0.03                   | 0.004| 6.23  | <.001  | ***    |
| High            | 0.02                    | 0.004| 4.85  | <.001  | ***    |
| Male            | 0.04                    | 0.03 | 1.51  | .13     | n.s.  |

| Approximate Significance of Smooth Terms | edf | Ref.df | F-stat | p-value | Sig  |
|-----------------------------------------|-----|--------|--------|---------|------|
| s(nodeID):Low                           | 35.34 | 38.13 | 1446.61| <.001   | ***   |
| s(nodeID):Med                           | 32.84 | 36.76 | 872.65 | <.001   | ***   |
| s(nodeID):High                          | 33.13 | 36.95 | 792.39 | <.001   | ***   |
| s(PDS):Female                           | 7.52  | 7.94  | 21.40  | <.001   | ***   |
| s(PDS):Male                             | 6.82  | 6.98  | 14.42  | <.001   | ***   |
| s(subjectID)                             | 0.99  | 1      | 358.45 | <.001   | ***   |

**Fig. 2.** GAMc modeling of left uncinate FA values. Top, separate splines are produced for each PARS-6 tertile group. Bottom, estimated FA differences of nodes which differ between Low and High group splines. Red shading indicates regions of significant difference, comparison is Low minus High PARS-6 group (Low–High).
group × tract node as well as PDS × sex were significant (Table 4). The resulting splines modeled the right uncinate and anterior forceps for each group while controlling for sex and PDS (Fig. 3, top). Finally, a large number of nodes (n = 78) in the right uncinate showed significantly greater FA fit estimates for the High compared to the Low group while controlling for sex and PDS, whereas the anterior forceps had demonstrably fewer nodes which exhibited a similar significant difference (n = 39, Fig. 3, bottom).

R Code 6: General Linear Model to test for group differences in tract FA values at each node, controlling for sex and PDS. dti_fa = FA value of node, group = PARS-6 tertile group, pds = PDS, family = a gamma family was used for the uncinate tracts and a Gaussian family for the anterior forceps, df_node = data frame for tract node, "glm" from stats version 4.0.3.

3.3. Point-wise analyses via a general linear model

To illustrate differences between the proposed GAM model and the more traditional method of conducting 'point-wise' or corrected multiple comparison analyses, we modeled the data at each node utilizing a General Linear Model (GLM). A GLM is capable of accounting for the distribution and (bounded) nature of the scalar data while investigating group differences and controlling for covariates and factors. To this end, a GLM was utilized to investigate PARS-6 group differences in tract node FA values while controlling for sex and PDS (R Code 6).

Next, to better relate the results of the GLM ‘point-wise’ analyses to the outcomes of comparing GAM splines in the sections above, we then extracted the High versus Low PARS-6 group statistic from each GLM and applied an FDR correction. The ‘point-wise’ method detected nodes that exhibited significantly greater average FA in the High compared to the Low group in only the right uncinate but not the left uncinate or anterior forceps (Fig. 4).

3.4. Correlating memory performance with FA differences

While the main aim of this work was to address limitations in DWI analyses, we additionally desired to demonstrate the utility of our proposed approach within the context of a larger experiment where DWI metrics were not the final aim. Accordingly, we next sought to determine whether the group tract differences detected above were associated with memory performance. The eMST paradigm elicits correct and incorrect
Target, Lure, and Foil test responses for negative, neutral, and positive stimuli, and analyses of such a task as well as our preliminary data are reported elsewhere (Leal et al., 2014; McMakin et al., 2021). An investigation into group × memory performances, as measured by lure generalization and detection indices (LGI and LDI, respectively, where LGI = p(Old/Lure)−p(Old/Foil) and LDI = p(New/Lure)−p(New/Target)), was conducted via MANOVA testing utilizing two within-subject factors (valence, memory) and one between-subject factor (group). While this was conducted via MANOVA testing utilizing two within-subject factors (valence, memory) and one between-subject factor (group), this analysis revealed a significant interaction of group × memory (\(F_{(2,70)} = 5.7, p < .01\), \(\eta^2_p = .034\)) as well as valence × memory (\(F_{(1,70)} = 28.12, p < .001\), \(\eta^2_p = .077\)), a valence × memory × group interaction was not detected (\(F_{(2,70)} = 1.38, p = .25\), \(\eta^2_p = .008\)). Consequently, we conducted an exploratory analysis wherein we removed the main effects of valence and memory in order to test only the interaction of valence-memory × group. That is, we combined the valence and memory factors in order to have one within-subject factor (valence-memory) and one between-subject factor (group) for MANOVA testing; this adjustment, while not recommended, adds a degree of freedom and gives more power to detect an interaction as the model is not testing main effects. This analysis revealed group differences on negative LGI performance (\(F_{(2,70)} = 3.85, p = .025\), \(\eta^2_p = .1\)), where the High PARS-6 group demonstrated significantly higher LGI scores than the Low group (Tukey’s HSD \(p = 0.02\), 95% CI [−.23, −.01], Fig. 5); all other statistics were not significant. For the sake of transparency, we explicitly note that the omnibus F-statistic of this exploratory model does not survive a Bonferroni correction (\(F_{8,136} = 2.14, p = .035\), \(\eta^2_p = .11\)).

The nature of this exploratory analysis tempers any conclusions or interpretations, but we remark that a subtle group difference, if true, may be “washed out” in a large MANOVA, and that any behavioral differences are impressionistic given that memory test data were acquired from periadolescent participants seven days after initial encoding. Additionally, such group differences on LGI are consistent with previous work, given the elevated likelihood of negative overgeneralization in anxious populations (Dymond et al., 2015; Greenberg et al., 2013), a developmental predisposition towards generalization (Keresztes et al., 2017; Lavenex and Banta Lavenex, 2013; Leal et al., 2014), and our prior work elucidating potential neural mechanisms of negative overgeneralization in a similar sample of anxious youth (McMakin et al., 2021). Nevertheless, critical evaluation is warranted and we reiterate that these analyses are supplied in order to demonstrate how the outcome of modeling tract profiles with GAMs may be utilized to investigate other questions.

To determine whether spline differences were associated with negative LGI performance, the average FA value for the nodes which differed between Low and High PARS-6 groups was calculated for each tract. A multiple linear regression then tested each tract for whether the averaged FA value was associated with negative LGI. Of the three tracts tested, only values from the left uncinate were significantly positively related with negative LGI (\(R_{adj}^2 = .16\); Table 5). Further, significance testing of the slope differences, given the average FA × group interaction differences, was significant (\(F_{(3,49)} = 4.75, p < .01\), \(\eta^2_p = .08\); Fig. 6).

4. Discussion

Automated fiber quantification (AFQ) was used to generate bilateral uncinate and anterior forceps tracts for 73 periadolescent participants. The fractional anisotropic (FA) values from nodes along the tracts were...
Multiple linear regression coefficients for predicting Low and High PARS-6 group negative LGI performance from tract FA differences. FAavg = averaged FA of nodes which differed between splines. Est = model estimate, SE = standard error.

|                      | L. Uncinate FA differences |                      | R. Uncinate FA differences | A. Forceps FA differences |
|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
|                      | Est | SE  | t-stat | p-value | Sig |
| (Intercept)          | −0.9509 | 0.4389 | −2.167 | 0.035 | * |
| FAavg                | 2.4262 | 0.9458 | 2.565 | 0.013 | * |
| Group                | 0.8339 | 0.3763 | 2.216 | 0.031 | * |
| FAavg:Group          | −1.6583 | 0.8030 | −2.065 | 0.044 | * |
| Group                | 0.1601 | 0.7216 | 0.222 | 0.825 | n.s. |
| Group FAavg          | 0.039 | 0.969 | n.s. |
| Group FAavg:Group    | −0.7405 | 0.6390 | −1.159 | 0.252 | n.s. |
| FAavg                | 1.8335 | 1.2817 | 1.431 | 0.159 | n.s. |
| Group                | 0.8167 | 0.5227 | 1.562 | 0.125 | n.s. |
| FAavg:Group          | −1.4926 | 1.0256 | −1.455 | 0.152 | n.s. |
| FAavg                | 0.0230 | 1.3257 | 0.017 | 0.986 | n.s. |
| Group                | −0.0387 | 0.9907 | −0.039 | 0.969 | n.s. |
| FAavg:Group          | 0.1841 | 1.7983 | 0.102 | 0.919 | n.s. |

then modeled using a generalized additive model (GAM) that (a) accounted for the distribution and non-continuous nature of FA values, (b) accounted for the independence of the data points, and (c) avoided the multiple comparisons issue by comparing differences between spline fits. Using these methods, we identified tract nodes which were significantly greater in the High compared to Low anxiety groups while controlling for covariates.

In this paper, we elucidated three limitations in using traditional ANOVAs to analyze FA values and introduced generalized additive models as a solution to said limitations. Here, we extended the smoothing spline method presented in Carbine et al. (Carbine et al., 2020) to a GAM, which allows for multiple smoothing functions, random effects, and linear covariates. Accordingly, utilizing a GAM to model diffusion-weighted imaging data is a potential resolution to the various issues noted earlier.

Beginning with the multiple comparison issue, a univariate smoothing spline modeling the FA values along the 100 equidistant nodes significantly reduces the number of multiple comparisons needed to compare results between groups as noted in Carbine et al. (Carbine et al., 2020). Using the nodes as a covariate to predict the FA values from the AFQ method, the smooth spline helps researchers avoid the point-wise analysis issues while still allowing for the comparison of penalized regressions between groups. Without including smoothing functions, the model may under-estimate the true relationship between nodes and FA values, increasing the chance of a Type-II error. Finally, using a penalized regression with linear covariates addresses the multiple comparison problem as researchers can include an indicator variable for groups, allowing for the comparison of group-specific splines which model the data while accounting for other factors and covariates.

Another issue often occurring with FA values is the non-normal, non-linear, and proportional nature of the data. With a sum of smoothing functions, we are more able to account for the non-linearities in the data. As a generalization of an additive model, a GAM uses link functions to account for non-Gaussian distributions of data. Proper distribution modeling improves the sensitivity and specificity of the analysis, where using statistical tests with normality assumptions to model non-normal data will lead to confidence intervals that are either too narrow (inflated Type-I error) or too wide (inflated Type-II error). Next, the utility of link functions in the GAM can address the proportional nature of the FA data by transforming the data into an unbounded, continuous scale. Additionally, we note that GAMs are appropriate for use with scalars aside from FA (see Supplemental Materials, Section 5.1).

Third, and most importantly, a GAM is able to take the spatial dependencies inherent in DWI data into account. In linear regression (including ANOVAs), violating the independence assumption can seriously inflate both Type-I and Type-II error rates. In fact, Forstmeier et al. (Forstmeier et al., 2017) argue the non-independence of data points is one cause of the current replication crisis. By ignoring the spatial dependence when testing AFQ-derived node FA values, the resulting p-values may be artificially inflated. A GAM accounts for this issue by modeling nodes as a covariate or random effect when predicting FA values. Further, a GAM in R allows for the inclusion of a correlation matrix if there are more serious spatial dependencies in the data. In addition, including random effects in a GAM can help alleviate another often violated linear regression assumption of homoscedasticity. While minor heteroscedasticity is not much of a concern, exceedingly large heteroscedasticity (often seen in DWI data) will increase the Type-I error. Including random effects in a GAM can help mediate the heterogeneous variance by accounting for subject-level and trial-level variance. In short, GAMs have a strong potential and utility for modeling diffusion-weighted imaging data; the flexibility in specifying the type of smoothing function as well as the ability to include several smoothing methods in a single model can encompass interactions of factors while controlling for covariates.

Finally, we utilized methods more commonly employed with AFQ-
derived DWI data, namely by conducting a series of ‘point-wise’ analyses along the tract and then applying a multiple comparison correction (Section 3.3). In these analyses we elected to utilize a General Linear Model (GLM), rather than the more common ANOVA-styled tests (Table 1), because in doing so we were still able to account for the non-normal and proportional nature of the data while also including factors and covariates. Fewer nodes were identified as differing between the Low and High PARS-6 groups, implying a difference in sensitivities between the GLM and GAM approaches. As a GAM can also additionally account for multiple comparisons and spatial dependencies in the data, we propose that a GAM is the superior approach but also encourage the use of GLM-styled analyses if a certain research question cannot utilize the GAM approach, perhaps due to limitations of the technique.

As with all statistical techniques, there are limitations in modeling DWI data with GAMs. First, while GAMs are well-suited to model the distribution, bounded, and interdependent nature of individual DWI scalars (such as FA) derived from a single tract, they are not currently capable of modeling multiple scalars across multiple tracts in a single, multivariate model, as would be ideal when investigating traumatic brain injuries. In these instances, multiple models would still be required for each scalar × tract, and appropriate corrections applied. Here, we modeled FA values to demonstrate the utility of GAMs as FAs are a common metric, but incorporating all scalars into a statistical model while accounting for their interdependence remains an open issue and is beyond the scope of the current proposal. A second limitation is the propensity of a GAM to overfit the data, particularly when using a generalized cross-validation method. Fortunately, we can place a heavier penalty on the effective degrees of freedom to counteract a potential overfit; this correction can be used in the GAM function in the generalized cross-validation method. Fortunately, we can place a heavier penalty on the effective degrees of freedom to counteract a potential overfit; this correction can be used in the GAM function in the mgcv package in R (option gamma = x). Third, the GAM approach that we detail here involves a comparison between group splines, as the R package plot.diff is only written to compare the parameter estimates and standard deviation of one spline against another. If the research question necessitates the comparison of multiple splines, then a multiple comparison correction can be used in the GAM function in the mgcv package in R (option gamma = x). Finally, as such a correction would be smaller than the traditional ‘point-wise’ method. Additionally, as it is possible to construct a data frame of model estimates and standard errors, a multivariate comparison could be constructed. Finally, a GAM may not be ideal when the interaction of multiple factors is central to the aims of the study. We recommend both “Mixed effects models and extensions in ecology with R” by Alain Zuur (Zuur et al., 2009) and “Generalized additive models: An introduction with R” by Simon Wood (Wood, 2017) for more examples, code, and information on analyzing data with a GAM. In sum, we note that a “perfect” statistical model does not exist, but that each approach has strengths and weaknesses. Here, we detail how a GAM is likely a stronger method for modeling diffusion scalars derived from a tract than the majority of extant approaches, but are also well aware that such an approach does not resolve every statistical issue with DWI data. We propose that utilizing these approaches will better fit the data, thereby increasing sensitivity in analyses, but acknowledge difficulties remain.

The example analyses employed to demonstrate modeling DWI data with GAMs had a number of results. First, we note that incorporating a covariate for pubertal development (PDS) increased model fit in all tracts, and correspondingly, the GAMs explained a large portion of variance in modeling tract FA values (Table 2). Such strong model fits demonstrated the flexibility of the GAM model for DWI analyses. Further, these results show the appropriateness of accounting for pubertal stage in modeling periadolescent data: as myelination proceeds are demonstrably correlated with development, and pubertal onset is related to sex, including a covariate helped model fit by accounting for this sex × developmental interaction that would impact tract FA values (Dumoulin et al., 2016; Östby et al., 2009). We also note that we elected to not include age as a covariate in the model; the age range in this sample is narrow, age is collinear with puberty, and age may have lower explanatory power given the interaction of sex, age, and pubertal onset. Second, and correspondingly, we did not detect a main effect of sex (Male) in the parametric coefficients of either the left uncinate (Table 3) or the anterior forceps (Table 4). In these analyses, instead, the pubertal development term (PDS) interacted significantly with both sexes, suggesting that these structures are largely similar between the two sexes and any difference is a function of development. The Male parametric coefficient of the right uncinate, however, differed significantly from the intercept (Female) and potentially implicates a sexual dimorphism in this tract.

Third, group × tract node interactions were detected between Low and High anxiety (PARS-6) groups, particularly in the left uncinate. In all instances, the Low anxiety group had lower FA values at the differential nodes than the High group (Fig. 2). This result was surprising. Previous work has consistently detected a negative relationship between the left uncinate FA values and measures of anxiety, and often interpret such a relationship as suggestive of insufficient executive down-regulation of limbic systems (e.g. Tromp et al., 2012; Liao et al., 2014; Hanson et al., 2015; Ho et al., 2017; Hein et al., 2018; Jamieson et al., 2021). A number of differences set our work apart from previous studies, however, and while a full methodological investigation of the impact of differing processing pipelines, software, and statistical models on the uncinate-anxiety outcomes is beyond the scope of this paper, we postulate that the unique characteristics of this study and dataset explain our discrepant findings: (A) Rather than recruit convenience samples of an adolescent population and subsequently administer anxiety assessments, we recruited clinically anxious periadolescent individuals from pediatric anxiety clinics in addition to the no-psychiatric-diagnosis control participants. During recruitment, we specifically excluded current or past diagnosed mood disorders given the parent grant interest in periadolescence as a sensitive developmental window when processes relevant to the progression from anxiety to depression may be taking shape. Our exclusion of mood disorders was to ensure that we would be able to characterize the developmental progression, and accordingly our sampling was uniquely focused on anxiety. In our review of the literature, these recruitment efforts yielded a unique data set which rather specifically targets clinical anxiety at a narrow window in development. Previous work investigating anxiety and the uncinate fasciculus have largely utilized either young adult clinical populations (Phan et al., 2009; Tromp et al., 2012; Modi et al., 2013; Hanson et al., 2015), community samples (Ho et al., 2017), or individuals in a different pediatric age range (Liao et al., 2014; Hein et al., 2018). (B) We opted to use probabilistic tractography when modeling the DWI data. Although a deterministic approach would still be well-modeled with a GAM, and was the major tractographic method employed in the reviewed literature, recent work suggests that a probabilistic approach may be superior when tracing a specific tract (Petersen et al., 2017; Sarwar et al., 2019; Sotiropoulos and Zalesky, 2019). Follow-up work is planned to more fully elucidate the role of tractography in the study of the uncinate fasciculus, development, anxiety, and memory. (C) The AFQ method produces weighted FA values for each node along the tract. Weighted FA values account for the Mahalanobis distance of nearby voxels and this results in node FA values which account for local tract properties. Further, when modeling tracts from FA values to test for group differences, we accounted for the interaction of sex and pubertal development stage. As far as we are aware, this is a unique approach in the study of the uncinate fasciculus-anxiety relationship, and even similar work done by Huo et al., (2017), was not utilized to study sex differences, but stress in a periadolescent group, averaged FA values for regions of the uncinate fasciculus and did not include sex or developmental covariates. (D) We utilized a DWI protocol that capitalized on multi-band acceleration factors, multiple shells, and a large number of directions. We also note that, somewhat uniquely, all participants were scanned within an early-afternoon window (between 11:00 and 15:00). As both scanning protocol and time-of-day are known to affect diffusion metrics (Tanner, 1962; Jiang et al., 2014; Bernardi et al., 2016; Celik, 2016; Jones, 2010;
Barrio-Arranz et al., 2015), we specifically established our protocol to best fit our population (Pines et al., 2020) while controlling for diurnal effects. In sum, we interpret greater FA values in High relative to Low anxiety groups as indicative of aberrant tract development that is associated with clinical anxiety in a periadolescent population. While greater myelination in High anxiety could explain the elevated FA values, a reduction in intermixing factors such as merging, kissing, branching, and/or crossing along the insular portion of the tract would also result in increased FA values, but the investigation of these possibilities are beyond the scope of this work. If greater uncinate FA values in High relative to Low anxiety groups are indeed the result of “increased structural integrity”, rather than a reflection of decreased local intermixing, then one possible interpretation would be that clinical anxiety in this population is associated with greater availability of emotionally valenced information resulting from more efficient amygdalo-frontal connectivity via uncinate projections (Heide et al., 2013; Eden et al., 2015; Baur et al., 2012). To find convergence with the extant literature, then, it is possible that a generalization could subsequently be affected in later pubertal development, resulting in the typically observed negative correlation of uncinate FA values and anxiety, possibly due to the adverse effects of hypercortisolaemia on myelination (Plasecka et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2020; Wong et al., 2013; Garg and Mittal, 2020; Jamison et al., 2021), but this is conjecture.

Fourth, and finally, when correlating tract differences with negative memory overgeneralization (LGI), only the left uncinate group differences were related in any way with memory generalization despite the fact that group FA differences were detected in each tract. We note that these test statistics did not survive a Bonferroni correction despite decent effect sizes, and so while we will interpret them it is possible that we are merely capitalizing on noise. The detection of the left uncinate association with memory generalization relates to recent work by Granger et al., (Granger et al., 2021), who demonstrated in an identical eMST paradigm that only differences in uncinate diffusion metrics were associated with medial temporal processes during correct lure discrimination. Where Granger et al., (Granger et al., 2021) did not detect a relationship between uncinate integrity and lure discrimination, however, we demonstrate a group × left uncinate FA interaction during negative lure generalization. This interaction is interesting as (a) the High anxiety group had significantly larger FA values (Fig. 2), (b) High anxiety participants were significantly more likely to overgeneralize to negatively valenced stimuli (Fig. 5), and (c) a positive correlation between negative memory generalization and uncinate FA was detected only in the Low anxiety group (Fig. 6). Taken together, it appears that greater left uncinate FA values are deleterious to negative Lure test performance and this corresponds with our postulation above where prefrontal regions receive more emotionally valenced information in clinically anxious periadolescent populations. In this interpretation, the information carried by the uncinate would largely reflect generalization processes, possibly driven by amygdaloid responses to negatively valenced information. As a positive association of negative generalization and uncinate FA values are detected in Low but not High anxiety groups, it is possible that data from clinically anxious children demonstrate a ceiling effect in the FA × negative generalization interaction, given their high uncinate FA values, increased propensity to generalize, and flat FA × negative LGI correlation.

In conclusion, we demonstrated the utility of modeling AFQ-derived diffusion metrics with a generalized additive model. We found such models to be robust in their application, fitting the aspects of DWI data well while addressing substantial, extant issues in DWI analyses. We also found GAMs to be externally valid, detecting tract differences which were predictive of independent behavior measures.
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