

Seed-Based and Independent Component Based Analyses on **Polyvictimization in Adolescents Associated with Functional Connectivity** Zhuoyu Shi^{1,2}, Joshua Bizzell^{2,3}, & Aysenil Belger^{1,2,3}

INTRODUCTION

Victimization in Adolescents

- Victimization exposures in adolescence have been demonstrated to have a causal relationship with adverse outcomes, such as mental health problems and neurobiological consequences
- Unfortunately, 71% of children and youth in a national sample reported that they had experienced victimizations, and 69% of them had been exposed to at least one different type of victimization in a different episode within one year

Polyvictimization

- Exposures to more than one victimization categories are defined as polyvictimization
- Adolescents who have been exposed to polyvictimization are at high risk for developing more severe consequences compared to other adolescents, such as PTSD, trauma, and depression, and the adverse impacts are in a longer term

Neuroimaging

- Resting-state functional magnetic resonance imaging (rsfMRI) is often utilized in research to examine the blood oxygen level-dependent (BOLD) signal as a neurophysiological indicator, which displays spontaneous lowfrequency fluctuations in the resting brain
- The fluctuations indicate a high degree of temporal correlation across brain regions, demonstrating structural connectivity and potential functional brain neural networks

Characteristic	Category	Total (N = 97)			
Age	Mean (SD)	13.21 (2.31)			
Biological Sex	Female (%)	41.24%			
Race	White (%)	68.04%			
Medication	On Medication (%)	36.08%			
Victimization Status	Poly-Victimization (%)	74.23%			
	Single Victimization (%)	14.43%			
	Non-Victimization (%)	11.34%			

Nethods

Data

- Data: N = 100 adolescents, consisting of 41 females, with a mean age of 12.7 years (SD = 2.3, range = 9-16 years)
- Exclusion criteria: MRI contraindications, a history of head injury, an IQ < 80, lifetime or current DSM-IV-TR Axis I psychotic disorder, and current major depressive disorder, bipolar disorder, PTSD, or substance dependence

¹Department of Psychology & Neuroscience, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, ²Department of Psychiatry, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, ³Duke-UNC Brain Imaging and Analysis Center, Duke University Medical Center

JVQ

- The study utilized the 34-item Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire (JVQ) to measure the participants' exposure to victimization across five categories, including conventional crime, child maltreatment, peer and sibling victimization, sexual victimization, and witness and indirect victimization
- The total number of JVQ subscales exposed was added in total (range 0-5) to define non-victimization (with value 0), single victimization (with value 1), and polyvictimization (with value > 1)

RESULTS

Seed-Based (ROI) Analysis

ROIs' Significant (*p-value* < 0.05) Association Results with Victimization Score

Network	ROI-ROI	Correlation (<i>p-value</i>)				
Within DMN	mPFC – LP_L	-0.2096 (0.0393)				
Within SN	ACC – rPFC_L	0.2086 (0.0403)				
DMN - SN	mPFC – SMG_R	-0.3618 (0.0003)				
DMN - SN	LP_L – SMG_R	-0.2346 (0.0207)				
DMN - SN	mPFC – AI_R	-0.2241 (0.0273)				
DMN - SN	LP_R – rPFC_L	-0.2092 (0.0397)				
DMN - SN	LP_L – rPFC_L	-0.2069 (0.0421)				

ROIs' Significant (*p-value* < 0.05) t-test results

Group	Network	ROI-ROI	t-statistic (<i>p-value</i>)	ROI-ROI Visualization
Single vs Poly	DMN - SN	LP_L – rPFC_R	-2.9675 (0.0039)	AI-L AI-L AI-L AI-L AI-R AI-R AI-R AI-R AI-R AI-R AI-R AI-R
Single vs Poly	DMN - CEN	LP_L – PPC_L	2.0410 (0.0444)	AI-L AI-L AI-R AI-R AI-R AI-R AI-R AI-R AI-R AI-R
Single vs Poly	Within SN	ACC – rPFC_L	-2.0336 (0.0451)	AI-L AI-L AI-L AI-L AI-R AI-R AI-R AI-R AI-R AI-R AI-R AI-R



Independent Component Analysis

Fig 1. Significant (<i>p-value</i> < 0.	05) IC Ass	sociation v	vith Victimiz	zation Sco	ore Result	S				IC	20		
Independent Component Features								z = -54	z = -46	z = -38	z = -30	z = -22	z = -14 ^{20.91}
Average Amplitude	Sta	ndard Devia	ation	Energy)	z = -6	Z=2	z = 10	z = 18	z = 26	z = 34
	IC 38	0.2751 (0.0064)		IC 20	0.2489 (0.0139)			z = 42	z = 50	z = 58	z = 66		-5.35
		0 2335		-	0 2475					IC	38		
	IC 20	(0.0214)		IC 38	(0.0145)			z = -54	z = -46	z = -38	z = -30	z = -22	z = -14 ^{11.54}
	IC 12	0.2153 (0.0342)		IC 3	0.2059 (0.0430)			2 = -6 2 = -6			z = 18	z = 26	z = 34
	IC 18	0.2129 (0.0363)		IC 1	0.2014 (0.0479)			z = 42	z = 50	z = 58	z = 66		-11.72
	10.1	0.2046								IC	; 1		
		(0.0444)						z = -54	z = -46	z = -38	z = -30	z = -22	z = -14 12.62
	IC 40	0.2043 (0.0447)									z = 18	z = 26	z = 34
	IC 30	0.2002 (0.0492)						z = 42	z = 50	z = 58	z = 66	V39/	-5.95

Standard Deviation t-test Result

Group	IC #	t-statistic (<i>p-value</i>)	IC Visualization	Group		IC #	t-statistic (<i>p-value</i>)	IC Visualization
Single vs Poly	IC 5	2.4226 (0.0176)			Single vs Poly	IC 5	2.7292 (0.0077)	
Non vo Doly	IC 30	-2.0317 (0.0455)			Non vo Doly	IC 22	2.0878 (0.0400)	
	IC 40	-2.5892 (0.0114)			NOT VS POly	IC 40	-2.4123 (0.0181)	
Non ve Single	IC 24	-2.2932 (0.0313)			Non ve Singlo	IC 24	-2.1401 (0.0432)	
	IC 40	-3.3592 (0.0027)	2 7)		Non vs Single	IC 40	-3.2033 (0.0039)	
z = -54 z = -46 z = -1	IC 5	z = -1416.21	IC	C 24	14884	z = -54 z = -	IC 40	z = -22 $z = -14$ 18.40
	s 🍪 🏟							🍪 🍪 💧
	$\begin{array}{c} z = 18 \\ \hline \\ $	z = 34		z = 1	$z = 26 \qquad z = 34$		$\sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{j=1}^{z=10} \sum_{i=1}^{z=18} \sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{j=1}^{2} \sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{j=1}^{2} \sum_{j=1}^{2} \sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{j=1}^{2} \sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{i=1}^{2$	z = 26 z = 34
		-8.53	$\begin{array}{c} z = 42 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hline \\ \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hline \\ \end{array} \\ \hline \\ \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hline \\ \end{array} \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \\ \\ \\$	z = 6	-8.52		$z = 58 \qquad z = 66$	-15.43

SVM Prediction Results with IC Features

IC Features

Average Amplitude

Standard Deviation

Energy

Special thanks to Dr. Aysenil Belger and Josh Bizzell for making this idea possible. Thanks to all the members in the UNC Neurocognition and Imaging Research Lab for their guidance and support throughout my undergraduate journey.



Fig 2. IC's Standard Deviation and Energy significant (*p-value* < 0.05) t-test results among Non-Vic, Single-Vic, and Poly-Vic group **Energy t-test Result**

10-Fold CV Accuracy (Standard Deviation)
0.7433 ± 0.0440
0.5789 ± 0.0751
0.6922 ± 0.0725

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS