

RE: [External] Re: Control limits for Stage 2

From: **Patrick Lyden** | plyden@usc.edu

Tuesday, Jun 22,
12:26 PM

To: **Diniz, Marcio A** | Marcio.Diniz@cshs.org, '**Andre Rogatko (Andre.Rogatko@cshs.org)**' |

Andre.Rogatko@cshs.org, **Ryan Cabeen** | Ryan.Cabeen@loni.usc.edu

Cc: **Jessica Lamb** | jlambj@usc.edu, **Karisma A Nagarkatti** | nagarkat@usc.edu

Marcio and Ryan,

As you may recall, we got into trouble in Stage 1 because we did not provide the sites timely feedback on their Day-2 lesion volumes, and two sites wandered out of control. I would like to be setting up the control limits for Stage 2. I believe we agreed to use the IV/IP control subjects from Stage 1. However, upon further reflection, I think it is more nuanced. First of all, we are waiting for the statistical comparison of IV vs IP controls vs RIC SHAM. Hopefully they will be concordant. Then there is the issue of JH. I think we should construct the Stage 2 control limits using all 3 control groups, excluding JH. I prefer one set of control limits for the entire network, even though we did briefly discuss site-specific control limits.

Finally, to compare rats and mice on the same graph, we would need to use stroke FRACTION, rather than actual lesion volume. There are several formulae to use. If possible, the best would be Day-2 lesion volume divided by contralateral hemisphere. Ryan, can you remind me what the variable names are in the output file you generate?

To make all this work, we need to be sure the sites upload their MRI weekly. That Ryan runs the pipeline often and sends the data in CSV to Marcio (and to Karisma for archiving). That Marcio directs Sungjin to produce the Control Limits graph on a timely basis. I hope we can produce a report every 2 weeks. We are drafting an SOP to codify this plan.

What do you all think?

Patrick D. Lyden, MD, FAAN, FAHA, FANA

Professor of Physiology and Neuroscience

Professor of Neurology

Zilkha Neurogenetic Institute

USC Keck School of Medicine of USC

O: (323) 442-3917

ZNI 245 MC 2821

1501 San Pablo Street

Los Angeles, CA 90089-2821

plyden@usc.edu

From: **Ryan Cabeen** | ryan.cabeen@loni.usc.edu

Wednesday, Jun 23,
10:27 PM

To: **Diniz, Marcio A** | Marcio.Diniz@cshs.org, '**Andre Rogatko (Andre.Rogatko@cshs.org)**' | Andre.Rogatko@cshs.org, **Patrick Lyden** | plyden@usc.edu

Cc: **Jessica Lamb** | lambj@usc.edu, **Karisma A Nagarkatti** | nagarkat@usc.edu

Sounds good and doable — attached is a copy of the data dictionary. The lesion volume is “volume_lesion” and the left and right hemisphere volumes are “midline_tissue_volume_left” and “midline_tissue_volume_right” respectively.

Ryan P. Cabeen, PhD
Chan Zuckerberg Imaging Scientist
Assistant Professor of Research Neurology
Laboratory of Neuro Imaging
USC Stevens Neuroimaging and Informatics Institute
Keck School of Medicine of USC
University of Southern California
2025 Zonal Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90033
Tel: (323) 44-BRAIN
Email: rcabeen@loni.usc.edu
Web: cabeen.io
www.ini.usc.edu

From: **Patrick Lyden** | plyden@usc.edu

Tuesday, Jun 22, 12:26 PM

Marcio and Ryan,

As you may recall, we got into trouble in Stage 1 because we did not provide the sites timely feedback on their Day-2 lesion volumes, and two sites wandered out of control. I would like to be setting up the control limits for Stage 2. I believe we agreed to use the IV/IP control subjects from Stage 1. However, upon further reflection, I think it is more nuanced. First of all, we are waiting for the statistical comparison of IV vs IP controls vs RIC SHAM. Hopefully they will be concordant. Then there is the issue of JH. I think we should construct the Stage 2 control limits using all 3 control groups, excluding JH. I prefer one set of control limits for the entire network, even though we did briefly discuss site-specific control limits.

Finally, to compare rats and mice on the same graph, we would need to use stroke FRACTION, rather than actual lesion volume. There are several formulae to use. If possible, the best would be Day-2 lesion volume divided by contralateral hemisphere. Ryan, can you remind me what the variable names are in the output file you generate?

To make all this work, we need to be sure the sites upload their MRI weekly. That Ryan runs the pipeline often and sends the data in CSV to Marcio (and to Karisma for archiving). That Marcio directs Sungjin to produce the Control Limits graph on a timely basis. I hope we can produce a report every 2 weeks. We are drafting an SOP

to codify this plan.

What do you all think?

Patrick D. Lyden, MD, FAAN, FAHA, FANA
Professor of Physiology and Neuroscience
Professor of Neurology
Zilkha Neurogenetic Institute
USC Keck School of Medicine of USC
O: (323) 442-3917
ZNI 245 MC 2821
1501 San Pablo Street
Los Angeles, CA 90089-2821
plyden@usc.edu

From: **Diniz, Marcio A** | Marcio.Diniz@cshs.org

Monday, Jun 28,
3:48 PM

To: **Ryan Cabeen** | Ryan.Cabeen@loni.usc.edu, **Rogatko, Andre** | Andre.Rogatko@cshs.org, **Patrick Lyden** | plyden@usc.edu

Cc: **Jessica Lamb** | jlambj@usc.edu, **Karisma A Nagarkatti** | nagarkat@usc.edu

Hi all,

Please see below a few questions, so I can start calibrating the control chart:

1. Is volume fraction defined as $\text{midline_tissue_volume_left} / \text{volume_lesion}$?
2. Will we plot all mice/rats or only the control ones? This issue was pointed by the Yale PI more than once. If we plot all animals, MRI volume data at day 2 may be contaminated by treatment effect, therefore, sites out of control could be generated because of treatment effect. If we plot only controls, then we have 20 animals per site which might limit our ability to identify a site out of control.

Also, in addition to the MRI dataset from Ryan, we need treatment labels for mice/rats already randomized produced by Jessica/Karisma. Otherwise, I am not able to filter only control mice/rats.

Kind regards,

Marcio

From: **Ryan Cabeen** | Ryan.Cabeen@loni.usc.edu

To: **Diniz**

Wednesday, Jun 23, 10:27 PM

Sounds good and doable — attached is a copy of the data dictionary. The lesion volume is “volume_lesion” and the left and right hemisphere volumes are “midline_tissue_volume_left” and “midline_tissue_volume_right” respectively.

Ryan P. Cabeen, PhD
Chan Zuckerberg Imaging Scientist
Assistant Professor of Research Neurology
Laboratory of Neuro Imaging
USC Stevens Neuroimaging and Informatics Institute
Keck School of Medicine of USC
University of Southern California
2025 Zonal Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90033
Tel: (323) 44-BRAIN
Email: rcabeen@loni.usc.edu
Web: cabeen.io
<http://www.ini.usc.edu>

WARNING

This email is from an external source. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe. Protect your username and password.

IMPORTANT WARNING: This message is intended for the use of the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged and confidential, the disclosure of which is governed by applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this information is strictly prohibited. Thank you for your cooperation.

From: **Patrick Lyden** | plyden@usc.edu

Tuesday, Jun 22, 12:26 PM

Marcio and Ryan,

As you may recall, we got into trouble in Stage 1 because we did not provide the sites timely feedback on their Day-2 lesion volumes, and two sites wandered out of control. I would like to be setting up the control limits for Stage 2. I believe we agreed to use the IV/IP control subjects from Stage 1. However, upon further reflection, I think it is more nuanced. First of all, we are waiting for the statistical comparison of IV vs IP controls vs RIC SHAM. Hopefully they will be concordant. Then there is the issue of JH. I think we should construct the Stage 2 control limits using all 3 control groups, excluding JH. I prefer one set of control limits for the entire network, even though we did briefly discuss site-specific control limits.

Finally, to compare rats and mice on the same graph, we would need to use stroke FRACTION, rather than actual lesion volume. There are several formulae to use. If possible, the best would be Day-2 lesion volume divided by contralateral hemisphere. Ryan, can you remind me what the variable names are in the output file

you generate?

To make all this work, we need to be sure the sites upload their MRI weekly. That Ryan runs the pipeline often and sends the data in CSV to Marcio (and to Karisma for archiving). That Marcio directs Sungjin to produce the Control Limits graph on a timely basis. I hope we can produce a report every 2 weeks. We are drafting an SOP to codify this plan.

What do you all think?

Patrick D. Lyden, MD, FAAN, FAHA, FANA
Professor of Physiology and Neuroscience
Professor of Neurology
Zilkha Neurogenetic Institute
USC Keck School of Medicine of USC
O: (323) 442-3917
ZNI 245 MC 2821
1501 San Pablo Street
Los Angeles, CA 90089-2821
plyden@usc.edu

From: **Patrick Lyden** | plyden@usc.edu

Tuesday, Jul 6,
5:13 AM

To: **Diniz, Marcio A** | Marcio.Diniz@cshs.org, **Ryan Cabeen** | Ryan.Cabeen@loni.usc.edu, **Rogatko, Andre**
| Andre.Rogatko@cshs.org

Cc: **Jessica Lamb** | ljambj@usc.edu, **Karisma A Nagarkatti** | nagarkat@usc.edu

1. Volume fraction is defined as $\text{volume_lesion} / \text{midline_tissue_volume_left}$
2. Controls only, but we await your study of IV vs IP controls vs RIC SHAMs.

From: **Diniz** | Marcio.Diniz@cshs.org

To: **Ryan.Cabeen@loni.usc.edu**

Monday, Jun 28, 6:49 PM

Hi all,

Please see below a few questions, so I can start calibrating the control chart:

1. Is volume fraction defined as $\text{midline_tissue_volume_left} / \text{volume_lesion}$?
2. Will we plot all mice/rats or only the control ones? This issue was pointed by the Yale PI more than once. If we plot all animals, MRI volume data at day 2 may be contaminated by treatment effect, therefore, sites out of control could be generated because of treatment effect. If we plot only controls, then we have 20 animals per site which might limit our ability to identify a site out of control.

Also, in addition to the MRI dataset from Ryan, we need treatment labels for mice/rats already randomized produced by Jessica/Karisma. Otherwise, I am not able to filter only control mice/rats.

Kind regards,

Marcio

From: **Ryan Cabeen** | Ryan.Cabeen@loni.usc.edu

To: **Diniz**

Wednesday, Jun 23, 10:27 PM

Sounds good and doable — attached is a copy of the data dictionary. The lesion volume is “volume_lesion” and the left and right hemisphere volumes are “midline_tissue_volume_left” and “midline_tissue_volume_right” respectively.

Ryan P. Cabeen, PhD
Chan Zuckerberg Imaging Scientist
Assistant Professor of Research Neurology
Laboratory of Neuro Imaging
USC Stevens Neuroimaging and Informatics Institute
Keck School of Medicine of USC
University of Southern California
2025 Zonal Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90033
Tel: (323) 44-BRAIN
Email: rcabeen@loni.usc.edu
Web: <http://cabeen.io>
<http://www.ini.usc.edu>

WARNING

This email is from an external source. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe. Protect your username and password.

IMPORTANT WARNING: This message is intended for the use of the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged and confidential, the disclosure of which is governed by applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this information is strictly prohibited. Thank you for your cooperation.

From: **Patrick Lyden** | plyden@usc.edu

Tuesday, Jun 22, 12:26 PM

Marcio and Ryan,

As you may recall, we got into trouble in Stage 1 because we did not provide the sites timely feedback on

their Day-2 lesion volumes, and two sites wandered out of control. I would like to be setting up the control limits for Stage 2. I believe we agreed to use the IV/IP control subjects from Stage 1. However, upon further reflection, I think it is more nuanced. First of all, we are waiting for the statistical comparison of IV vs IP controls vs RIC SHAM. Hopefully they will be concordant. Then there is the issue of JH. I think we should construct the Stage 2 control limits using all 3 control groups, excluding JH. I prefer one set of control limits for the entire network, even though we did briefly discuss site-specific control limits.

Finally, to compare rats and mice on the same graph, we would need to use stroke FRACTION, rather than actual lesion volume. There are several formulae to use. If possible, the best would be Day-2 lesion volume divided by contralateral hemisphere. Ryan, can you remind me what the variable names are in the output file you generate?

To make all this work, we need to be sure the sites upload their MRI weekly. That Ryan runs the pipeline often and sends the data in CSV to Marcio (and to Karisma for archiving). That Marcio directs Sungjin to produce the Control Limits graph on a timely basis. I hope we can produce a report every 2 weeks. We are drafting an SOP to codify this plan.

What do you all think?

Patrick D. Lyden, MD, FAAN, FAHA, FANA
Professor of Physiology and Neuroscience
Professor of Neurology
Zilkha Neurogenetic Institute
USC Keck School of Medicine of USC
O: (323) 442-3917
ZNI 245 MC 2821
1501 San Pablo Street
Los Angeles, CA 90089-2821
plyden@usc.edu
