## **Merged Magnetic Resonance and Light Sheet Microscopy of the Whole Mouse Brain**

## **Supplemental Information**









*Table S1. Details of specimens and acquisition protocols for four different HiDiver experiments*

**Specimen Preparation**. All procedures were approved by the Duke University institution animal care and use committee. Four groups of animals were studied (**Table S1**). Experiment 1: Adult male and female C57BL/6J mice were purchased from The Jackson Laboratory (JAX) to create the HiDiver atlases. Experiment 2: Adult male and female B6.Cg-Tg (Thy1- YFG/HJrs/J ) mice were purchased from JAX to validate tractography. Experiment 3: A young (111 day) male BXD89 mouse and an old (687 day) male BXD 89 mouse were obtained from the University of Tennessee Health Science Center to demonstrate the application of the methods to our primary focus—the neurogenetics of aging at the highest spatial resolution. Experiment 4: A total of 111 animals in 13 of the BXD strains were obtained from the University of Tennessee Health Science Center to demonstrate the application of the methods in a high throughput study. All animals

were allowed to adjust to their new environment for one week or more. All animals were perfused with 10% Prohance (Gadoteridol) in buffered formalin [1] [2]. Prohance is a chelated gadolinium compound commonly used in clinical MRI as a contrast agent. It is used as an active stain in MRH to reduce the spin-lattice relaxation time (T1) from 1800 to 100 ms [1]. Animals were anesthetized to a surgical plane with pentobarbital. A 21-gauge needle connected to a peristaltic pump was inserted in the left ventricle. Blood was flushed using a 0.1% heparin saline solution, followed by perfusion with the Prohance/formalin mixture for  $\sim 6$  min. Heads were placed in buffered formalin for an additional 24 h. Mandibles were removed and skin and muscle removed to allow use of a smaller radiofrequency coil, and brains in the cranium were placed in an 0.5% Prohance/buffer solution.

**MRH Scalar Volumes**. The four echoes of the MGRE image were averaged together to generate an (AvgMGRE) image. A pipeline registered the 3D volumes to correct for eddy current distortions. It starts with a skull stripping algorithm [3]. The ANTs pipeline uses linear scaling and affine transforms to produce the average baseline image. The individual diffusion weighted volumes were then registered to Avgb<sub>0</sub> producing a 4D array of the registered 3D volumes using our SAMBA pipeline [4] [5]. A MATLAB script averaged all the diffusion weighted 3D volumes to produce the diffusion weighted image (DWI). The 4D denoised volume was passed to DSI Studio (http://dsi-studio.labsolver.org/) where a Perl script executed an initial pass using the diffusion tensor algorithm [6] to generate five different 3D scalar volumes: 1) axial diffusivity (AD); 2) radial diffusivity (RD); 3) mean diffusivity (MD); 4) fractional anisotropy (FA); and 5) the color fractional anisotropy (clrFA) images. These six 3D scalar images have decidedly different contrasts and highlight different anatomical features, boundaries, and orientations of cellular components (**Figure 1**). The DWI and FA images were used to drive the registration of the atlas and associated labels.



*Table S2. Summary of different contrast volumes generated in the standard HiDiver/MRH protocol including the algorithms used and the abbreviations*



*Figure S1. This is an extension of Figure 1. Panel E displays the fractional anisotropy where image intensity reflects the anisotropic diffusion in each voxel. The overlay in panel E is from the Allen Brain Atlas CCFv3 [7].Panel F adds color in which the primary axis of diffusion is encoded in color. It is straightforward in the color FA to define all tracts disambiguated in CCFv3.*



*Fig S2. Barrel cortex digital flatmount of a C57BL/6J (Specimen 200302-1:1). A. Coronal FA section in which the orientation of the tangential plane through layer 4 of the barrel field is highlighted by a long white twoheaded arrow. B. A single 15-µm-thick FA oblique slice of the left cortex in a plane tangential to the barrel field. The white calibration bars are 1 mm. In C we have juxtaposed an image of a cortical flatmount from the same strain taken from [8] (their figure 1B with its own thin black 1 mm calibration bar). The alignment is remarkably precise with only linear rescaling.* 



Figure S3. Comparison in vivo fractional anisotropy image @ 150  $\mu$ m<sup>3</sup> (left) with ex vivo MR histology fractional anisotropy image @ 15  $\mu$ m<sup>3</sup> (right). In vivo image Courtesy of Professor Ian Shih, University of North Carolina *(https://www.med.unc.edu/bric/camri/imaging-service/mouse-brain-in-vivo-epi-dti/)*



*Figure S4. Comparison of spatial and angular resolution A) Specimen 190415-2:1: 15* m, *61 angles; B) 190415-1:1 25* m, *108 angles; C) 25*m, *61 angles. Histograms of a ROI in corpus callosum show changes in precision in calculating FA. Scale bar is 1 mm.*

**Denoising**. St-Jean and colleagues have developed a novel denoising algorithm that exploits the fourth (angular) dimension of the data [9]. The volume is decomposed into 4D overlapping patches that sample both the spatial and angular resolution. A dictionary of atoms is learned on the patches and a sparse decomposition is generated by bounding the reconstruction error with the local noise variance. The method improved the visibility of structures while simultaneously reducing the number of spurious tracts. St-Jean and colleagues implemented the algorithm for high resolution clinical scans (matrix of 210x210x210) of ~ 20 MB/volume with 40 volumes (~800 MB). The atlases generated for this work were acquired with arrays as large 800x800x1600 with 108 angular samples plus 13 baseline images—a 4D volume that is more than 300 times larger (~252 GB).To accommodate the change of scale, the algorithm was implemented on the cluster (**Figure S14**) by breaking the volume into overlapping cubes that could be processed in parallel**.**



*Figure S5. Specimen 200316-1:1(Table 1) @ 15* m, isotopic spatial resolution A) before denoising; B) after denoising. *Histograms of a ROI in corpus callosum show changes in precision in calculating FA. Scale bar is 1 mm*



*Figure S6. Representative A) DWI and B) QA images from higher throughput (20 hr) 25 µm, 61 angle acquisition. Scan time has been reduced using a fast spin echo that acquired two lines of K space per TR.* The scale bar is 1 mm

![](_page_7_Picture_0.jpeg)

*Figure S7 Accurate transfer of ROIs across age and genotype. NeuN (left) and axial DWI (right); images are from an old BXD89 male (687 days, specimen* 200803-12:1*, also see Fig 6B and D). ROIs were lifted over from the C57BL/6J reference volume to the MRH using the SAMBA pipeline. ROIs were then transferred to the NeuN LSM channel using a second registration pipeline also built on ANTs. The final ROIs have been integrated into all three channels of the LSM at full resolution LSM (1.8 x 1.8 x 4.0 µm). Three cortical areas are marked—the primary motor area (MOp), the primary somatosensory area (SSp), and the supplemental (secondary) somatosensory area (SSs). The insets are 1.5X magnifications of these three areas. While LSM has higher resolution, the MRH DWI modality highlights cytoarchitectonic boundaries more prominently. The dark DWI band (arrows) in SSs is layer 4 whereas the adjacent light band is layer 5a (white triangles). In SSp, layer 4 is broadened whereas the deeper layer 5a is accentuated (black triangles). In comparison, layer 2 is accentuated in Mop. Here the comparison across MRH and LSM is particularly informative. For details on structure and function of these regions see [10] for MOp and* [11] *for SSp. Scale bar is 5 mm.*

![](_page_8_Figure_0.jpeg)

*Figure S8 Plot of age of animals in the hi throughput experiment (Experiment # 4) as a function of their lifespan showing clustering of 47 young animals (mean 102 days) and 64 old animals(mean 463 days)* 

![](_page_9_Figure_0.jpeg)

**Figure S9** A) Analysis of connectivity changes with age identified the BXD65b as the strain with the greatest global change between young and old animals and the BXD34 as the strain with the least change. B) The subiculum was one region in which there was significant change in connectivity with age with the largest change in the BXD29. C) By comparison, the change in the subiculum connectivity was limited for the BXD34. D) Tractography generated by seeding the right subiculum in the young BXD29 (red arrow in B). E) Tractography generated from the connectomes of the old BXD29 specimens (red arrow in B). The greater number of streamlines in E vs D are a visual demonstration of the differences in the connectome. These are raw unfiltered tracts.

![](_page_9_Picture_2.jpeg)

*Figure S10. Representative specimens from the study described in Figure S 9 showing reproducibility of the labeling in two of the old (418 days) BXD65b where there are age related differences. Labels have been superimposed to allow one to appreciate the robustness of the SAMBA pipeline.* 

*.* 

![](_page_10_Figure_0.jpeg)

*Figure S11 Combined MRH/LSM images from ongoing Alzheimer's disease study of resilience in the 5XFADBXD model. A) Fractional anisotropy image from 14-month female 5XFADBXD77 animal acquired with high throughput protocol described in Figure S6. B) LSM image of the a LSM volume aligned with the FA image. C) Tractogram from seeding right subiculum in the 14-month female nTgBXD77 (control) specimen. D) Tractogram from seeding the right subiculum in the 5XFADBXD77.*

![](_page_11_Figure_0.jpeg)

*Figure S12. Workflow for HiDIver. The actively stained brain (still in the cranium) is scanned in a 9.4T MRI system equipped with coils achieving gradients more than 100 times those of a clinical scanner. Compressed sensing is used to accelerate a high angular diffusion tensor acquisition. A series of image pipelines process the large (250 GB) 4D MRI data to derive scalar and tractography data. A new MR atlas acquired at 15* m *isotropic resolution includes a subset of 360 labels from the Allen Brain Atlas Common Coordinate Framework. A second pipeline maps these labels onto the strain under study. The brain is removed from the skull, cleared (SHIELD), stained (SWITCH) and scanned with structured plane illumination microscopy* @ 1.8 X1.8 x 4 µm. A third pipeline registers the light sheet data to the common space *defined by the MR histology image of the strain under study (in the skull) removing the distortions that accompany LSM. Image derived phenotypes from the 360 ROI are aggregated into a final summary. Black text describes the stage of the process. Yellow arrows show the workflow. Blue entries show the software and source.*

## **Detailed Methods**

**Data Acquisition**. MRH images were acquired on a 9.4T/89 mm vertical bore magnet with an Agilent Direct Drive console (Vnmrj 4.0). A Resonance Research Model BRG-88\_41 provided peak gradients up to 2500 mT/m. The brain was placed in a solenoid coil constructed from a single sheet of silver foil. Two imaging sequences were used; 1) a multigradient echo ( $n = 4$ ) sequence (TR/TE = 100/4.4 ms) and a Stesikal/Tanner spin echo sequence for diffusion tensor imaging (DTI) (TR/TE = 100/12-19 ms) [12]. Both sequences employed phase encoding along the short axes of the specimen (x and y) with the readout gradient applied along the long axis of the specimen (z).

**Compressed Sensing Reconstruction**. Compressed sensing was used in both sequences [13] [14]. A probabilistic map was generated for sparse sampling along the two-phase encoding axes **(Figure S13)**. A script on the scanner automated acquisition and transfer to the cluster (**Figure S14**). A Fourier transform was applied along the z axis producing 256–2000 2D files which were distributed to multiple processors for iterative reconstruction. A baseline acquisition was included in every 10–15th volume to monitor drift in the spectrometer.

**Label registration**. Labels from the atlas were transferred to the volume under study using our SAMBA pipeline [29]. Stage 1, the affine transform, used the DWI with Mattes and a stringent convergence threshold  $(x 10^{-8})$ . Stage 2, the diffeomorphic transform used hybrid images. High contrast edges were extracted from the DWI and projected onto the FA using maximum intensity projection. The resulting hybrid has a value of 1 anywhere a significant edge was detected e.g. around ventricles where there is limited definition in the FA. The diffeomorphic registration used cross correlation. This transform was inverted to map the labels back to the specimen in the laboratory space. The pipeline calculated a coefficient of variation between left and right hemispheres as a quality assurance check. With few localized exceptions, the CNS of mice is bilaterally symmetric, and the CVs of left and right are expected to be under 0.04 for cases without any neuropathology. Wang and colleagues found that these mean CV values average about 0.015 with a corresponding error term (see their Figure S10) [15]. We use L-R CV values to highlight possible errors introduced by complex technical workflows. The summary of regional scalar phenotypes was written to a spreadsheet with metadata [31].

**Tractography and connectome generation**. Tractography, track density images (TDI) and connectomes were generated in DSI Studio using the generalized q-sampling imaging (GQI) algorithm with multiple fibers (up to 4) in each voxel [16, 17]. Connectomes were generated using the labels from the label registration pipeline. Track density images were generated using a super sampling algorithm described by Calamante et al. [18, 19]. Images in these previous studies were acquired with 100 µm spatial resolution and 30 angles—a resolution index of  $\sim$ 3.0x10<sup>4</sup> [20]. The resolution index achieved here is 3.2x10<sup>7</sup>, about three orders of magnitude higher than previous work. Whole brain\_tractography was acquired by seeding the 4D volume 54 million points. Step size was set to 0.75 µm at a QA threshold of 0.1% of the peak QA histogram generating track density images with nominal sampling of 5  $\mu$ m.

**LSM registration**. The brain was extracted from the skull and shipped to LifeCanvas Technologies (Cambridge MA) where commercial protocols for clearing, immunohistochemistry and scanning were executed (Supplement). For each specimen three LSM volumes were acquired. The NeuN was registered to the DWI for the atlas creation and aging comparisons [21]. The autofluorescence images were registered to the DWI for the tractography comparisons. In step 1, the LSM volume was down sampled to the resolution of the MRH volume (15  $\mu$ m or 25  $\mu$ m). A pipeline built on ANTs executed the registration in three stages: 1) Affine transformation using mutual information; 2) B spline using cross correlation; 3) Diffeomorphic transform using mutual information. The transform from the low resolution (15 or 25 m) arrays was then applied to the full resolution LSM images. Images were examined in registration with MRH in Imaris (Oxford Instruments).

**Light Sheet Acquisition** Paraformaldehyde-fixed samples were preserved using SHIELD reagents (LifeCanvas Technologies) using the manufacturer's instructions [22]- each brain was incubated in 20mL of SHIELD-off solution for 4 d followed by 1 d of incubation in 20mL SHIELD-on solution. The meninges then were removed from each sample. Samples were incubated in Clearing Buffer A (LifeCanvas Technologies) overnight then actively delipidated using a LifeCanvas Technologies SmartClear II Pro device for 6 days using stochastic electrotransport [23] .After depilation the samples were washed in PBS with 0.1% Tween20 for 1 d to remove SDS. For immunolabeling the samples were incubated in SmartLabel Primary Sample Buffer (LifeCanvas Technologies) overnight with an additional 5-6 h incubation with fresh buffer before primary immunolabeling in a SmartLabel device employing eFLASH [24]technology which integrates stochastic electrotransport [23] and SWITCH [25] for 14 h. The samples were then washed in PBS for 7-8h before overnight fixation in 4% paraformaldehyde followed by incubation in secondary labeling buffer at 37 C with two refreshes over the course of 7-8h before secondary labeling in the SmartLabel device. For each brain, 10 µg of rabbit anti-Iba1 (Cell Signaling Technologies 17198S\*) primary antibody, 10 µg mouse anti-NeuN (Encor MCA-1B7), 6 µg rabbit anti-NeuN (Cell Signaling Technologies 24307S\*), or 20 µg mouse anti-MBP (Encor MCA-7G7). Secondary antibodies were used at a 2:1 Secondary:Primary molar ratio. After immunolabeling, samples were incubated in 50% EasyIndex (RI = 1.52, LifeCanvas Technologies) overnight at 37 C followed by 1 d incubation in 100% EasyIndex for refractive index matching. After index matching the samples were imaged using a SmartSPIM axially swept light sheet microscope using a 3.6x (0.2 NA) (LifeCanvas Technologies). The smart SPIM light sheet fluorescence microscope provides whole brain coverage (3650  $\mu$ m field of view) at 1.8 x 1.8 x 4.0  $\mu$ m with a 3.6X objective producing three stacks of registered 2D .tiff images—one stack for each excitation wavelength. Typical array size for a stack is 7600 x 10600 x 2250 or about 250 GB.

![](_page_14_Figure_0.jpeg)

*Figure S13 A pipeline integrates a 4-dimensional acquisition from the scanner with compressed sensing reconstruction in a high-performance Dell cluster. Data from the scanner is streamed from the scanner to the cluster. Fourier space is under sampled by a factor of 8 using a probabilistic distribution along two (phase) dimensions of acquisition. A Fourier transform along the fully sampled readout axis produces up to 2000 2 dimensional arrays which are launched as individual iterative reconstructions in the cluster. Upon completion of the iterative reconstruction, these 2D arrays are reassembled into a 3D volume. A script on the scanner launches the next scan.*

**Computer Resources**. Scaling MRH to the higher resolution reported here requires high-performance computer systems (**Figure S14**) that can handle multiple 3D arrays as large as 1 TB. In our implementation, source image files were streamed to a 604-core 18-node cluster for automated reconstruction, data reduction, and alignment. We relied on two servers with 1.5 TB of memory that enable interactive analysis of HiDiver data using Fiji (https://fiji.sc/), Slicer [\(https://www.slicer.org/\)](https://www.slicer.org/), and Imaris (https://imaris.oxinst.com). Large (100 TB) high performance RAIDs provided local storage to facilitate remote interactive analysis via Citrix.

![](_page_15_Figure_0.jpeg)

*Figure S14. High performance computer infrastructure to facilitate combined MRH and LSM with large multidimensional images. Key is the division of the workflow into 4 stages—acquisition, reconstruction, postprocessing, and sharing with computational resources optimized for large data files at each stage. The brown arrows show the flow of MRH data. The green arrows show the flow of LSM data. DHE-Duke Health Enterprise network hosting the Oracle archive. CIVM Image Space- dedicated image sharing application on an Amazon EC2/S3 allowing review and download of very large data sets.* 

![](_page_15_Picture_168.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_311.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_305.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_317.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_312.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_311.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_305.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Picture_313.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_314.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_284.jpeg)

*Table S3. Regions of interest for left hemisphere (ROI 1-180) and right hemisphere (ROI 1001-1180) for reduced CCFv3 (i.e. r1CCFv3 label set).*

## **Supplemental Figures and Tables References**

- 1. Johnson, G.A. and L.W. Hedlund, *Three-dimensional morphology by magnetic resonance imaging*, U.P. Office, Editor. 2000, Duke University: U.S.A.
- 2. Johnson, G.A., et al., *Morphologic phenotyping with magnetic resonance microscopy: the visible mouse.* Radiology, 2002. **222**(3): p. 789-793.
- 3. Badea, A., A.A. Ali-Sharief, and G.A. Johnson, *Morphometric analysis of the C57BL/6J mouse brain.* Neuroimage, 2007. **37**(3): p. 683-93.
- 4. Avants, B.B., Tustison, N.J., Wu, J., Cook, P.A., Gee, J.C., , *An open source multivariate framework for n-tissue segmentation with evaluation on public data. .* Neuroinformatics, 2011. **9**: p. 381-400.
- 5. Anderson, R.J., et al., *Small Animal Multivariate Brain Analysis (SAMBA) – a High Throughput Pipeline with a Validation Framework.* Neuroinformatics, 2019. **17**: p. 451-472.
- 6. Basser, P.J., J. Mattiello, and D. LeBihan, *MR diffusion tensor spectroscopy and imaging.* Biophys J, 1994. **66**(1): p. 259-67.
- 7. Wang, Q., Ding,SL,Li,Y et al *The Allen Mouse Brain Common Coordinate Framework: A 3D Reference Atlas.* Cell, 2020. **181**: p. 936-953.
- 8. Li, C.X., et al., *Genetic analysis of barrel field size in the first somatosensory area (SI) in inbred and recombinant inbred strains of mice.* Somatosens Mot Res, 2005. **22**(3): p. 141-50.
- 9. St-Jean, S., Coupe,P, Descoteaux,M, Medical image Analysis, 2016. **32**: p. 115-130.
- 10. Muñoz-Castañeda, R., et al., *Cellular anatomy of the mouse primary motor cortex.* Nature, 2021. **598**(7879): p. 159-166.
- 11. Adibi, M., *Whisker-Mediated Touch System in Rodents: From Neuron to Behavior.* Front Syst Neurosci, 2019. **13**: p. 40.
- 12. Stejskal, E.O. and J.E. Tanner, *Spin diffusion measurements: spin echoes in the presence of a timedependent field gradient.* Journal of Chemical Physics, 1963. **42**(1).
- 13. Lustig, M., Donoho,D, Pauly,JM, *Sparse MRI: The Application of Compressed Sensing for Rapid MR Imaging.* Magn Reson Medi, 2007. **58**: p. 1182-1195.
- 14. Wang, N., et al., *Whole mouse brain structural connectomics using magnetic resonance histology.* Brain Structure and Function, 2018. **223**(9): p. 4323-4335.
- 15. Wang N, A.R., Ashbrook DG, Gopalakrishnan V, Park Y, Priebe CE, Laoprasert R, Vogelstein JT, Williams RW, Johnson GA, *Variability and Heritability of Mouse Brain Structure: Microscopic MRI Atlases and Connectomes for Diverse Strains.* NeuroImage, 2020. **222**.
- 16. Yeh, F.-C., et al., *Deterministic Diffusion Fiber Tracking Improved by Quantitative Anisotropy.* PLoS ONE, 2013. **8**(11): p. e80713.
- 17. Yeh, F.-C., V.J. Wedeen, and W.-Y.I. Tseng, *Generalized q-Sampling Imaging.* IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging, 2010. **29**(9): p. 1626-1635.
- 18. Calamante, F., Tournier,JD,Jackson, GD, Connelly A, *Track-density imaging (TDI): Super-resolution white matter imaging using whole-brain track-density mapping.* NeuroImage, 2010. **53**(4).
- 19. Calamante, F., et al., *Super-resolution track-density imaging studies of mouse brain: Comparison to histology.* NeuroImage, 2012. **59**(1): p. 286-296.
- 20. Johnson, G.A., Wang, N, Anderson,R.J., Chen,M., Cofer,G.P., Gee, J.C., Pratson, F., Tustison,N., White, L.E. , *Whole mouse brain connectomics.* J Comp Neurol., 2018. **12**: p. 1-12.
- 21. Tian Y, C.J., Johnson GA, *Restoring morphology of light sheet microscopy data based on magnetic resonance histology.* Frontiers in Neuroscience, 2023. **16**(16:1011895.).
- 22. Park, Y.-G., et al., *Protection of tissue physicochemical properties using polyfunctional crosslinkers.* Nature Biotechnology, 2018. **37**(1): p. 73-83.
- 23. Kim, S.Y., et al., *Stochastic electrotransport selectively enhances the transport of highly electromobile molecules.* Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A, 2015. **112**(46): p. E6274-83.
- 24. Yun DH, e.a., *Ultrafast immunostaining of organ-scale tissues for scalable proteomic phenotyping.* BioRxiv, 2019.
- 25. Murray, E., et al., *Simple, Scalable Proteomic Imaging for High- Dimensional Profiling of Intact Systems.* Cell, 2015. **163**(6): p. 1500-1514.