Females exhibit smaller volumes of brain activation and lower inter-subject variability during motor tasks

Justin W. Andrushko[1,2], Shie Rinat [1], Eric D. Kirby[3], Julia Dahlby [1], Chelsea Ekstrand[4,*], Lara A. Boyd[1,2,*]

1. Department of Physical Therapy, Faculty of Medicine, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada
2. Djavad Mowafaghian Centre for Brain Health, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada
3. Faculty of Individualized Interdisciplinary Studies, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, Canada
4. Department of Neuroscience, University of Lethbridge, Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada

* Co-senior authors

Correspondence

Lara A. Boyd, Ph.D.
Email: lara.boyd@ubc.ca
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2828-4549
Department of Physical Therapy
The University of British Columbia

and

Chelsea Ekstrand, Ph.D.
Email: Chelsea.ekstrand@uleth.ca
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1330-1924
Department of Neuroscience
The University of Lethbridge

Keywords:
Sex differences, functional magnetic resonance imaging, somatotopic motor mapping

Abstract

Past work has shown that there are both structural and functional differences in the brains of females versus males [Ritchie et al., 2018]. Specifically, males have larger cortical and sub-cortical volume and surface area (both total and subregional), while females have greater cortical thickness in most brain regions. Given these differences it is possible that males may show larger volumes of brain activation and greater variability in patterns of brain activity. Yet to date little work has systematically considered whether patterns of brain activity indexed with functional MRI differ between females and males. The current study sought to remediate this issue by employing brain somatotopic motor mapping from a previously published [Ma et al., 2022] and openly available dataset to test differences in patterns of functional brain activity associated with 12 voluntary movement patterns in females versus males. We discovered that females exhibited smaller volumes of brain activation across all 12 movement tasks, and lower patterns of variability between female participants in 10 of the 12 movements. We also observed that in these data females had greater cortical thickness which is in alignment with previous structural sex difference analyses [Ritchie et al., 2018; Wierenga et al., 2022]. Overall, these findings provide a basis for considering sex differences in future fMRI research and provide a foundation of understanding for which various neurological pathologies may present different between females and males.

Introduction

Females and males have anatomical and functional differences in their nervous systems [Aboitiz et al., 1992; Kulynych et al., 1994; Swaab et al., 2001]. These differences manifest in lateralization, motor planning, motor skill, language, memory, and spatial ability [Andreano and Cahill, 2009; Cohen et al., 2010; Diamond, 1991; Harasty et al., 1997; Hegarty, 2018; Jones et al., 2003]. However, our understanding of the neuronal or somatotopic representations of the body within the brain with respect to biological sex is limited. Although there has been a push to modernize our understanding of the classic sensorimotor "homunculus", including the proposal of an updated female "hermunculus", the focus has been largely on the sexual and reproductive dimorphisms between the sexes and their respective neuronal representations [Di Noto et al., 2013].

Sex differences in brain structure have been observed [Liu et al., 2020; Lotze et al., 2019; Wierenga et al., 2022]. Males show differences in grey matter volume, cortical surface area, and increased variability of these measures compared to females. Previous research suggests that males have significantly greater grey matter volume in areas such as the amygdala, temporal pole, fusiform gyrus, putamen, and premotor cortex than females [Liu et al., 2020; Lotze et al., 2019]. Further, a large meta-analysis of 16,683 healthy participants found that males exhibit greater subcortical volume than females, with the largest differences found in the thalamus and pallidum, bilaterally [Wierenga et al., 2022]. Males also exhibit greater cortical surface area than females. Importantly, males not only exhibit greater mean differences in subcortical volume and cortical surface area as compared to females, but also significantly greater *variability* in these measures [Wierenga et al., 2022]. This variability is most pronounced in motor related regions such as the pallidum, right inferior parietal cortex, and paracentral region [Wierenga et al., 2022]. This suggests that, compared to females, males have less consistent brain structure, particularly in motor related regions.

Females also show important differences in grey matter volume and cortical thickness compared to males. Specifically, females have greater grey matter volume than males primarily in

prefrontal and superior parietal cortices, as well as the superior temporal sulcus, orbitofrontal cortex, and posterior insula [Liu et al., 2020; Lotze et al., 2019]. Females also exhibit greater cortical thickness compared to males [Ritchie et al., 2018; Wierenga et al., 2022]. Further, Wierenga et al. [2022] noted regional differences in cortical thickness between females and males; females had greater cortex thickness for 38 of 68 regions, which were primarily in the frontal and parietal cortices. These structural differences suggest that brain function may also differ by sex, which in turn may have important implications for understanding sex differences in brain health and disease.

Sex related differences may affect the efficiency of neural activation patterns, with females potentially having more localized and precise, and males having more distributed and varied, neuronal processing. Several sex differences in brain activation have been observed with functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) across a range of tasks. Sex differences in mental rotation tasks [Thomsen et al., 2000], auditory verbal working memory [Goldstein et al., 2005], task switching [Kuptsova et al., 2015], and resting-state spontaneous brain activity [Xu et al., 2015] have been observed. However, to date, few have considered whether sex differences affect somatotopic sensorimotor mapping across the entire brain. Researching sex specific patterns of brain activation with respect to area and variability across a range of motor tasks may shed light on key differences in brain function that informs future research. For instance, in fMRI research, a common approach to investigate brain activation patterns is through region of interest (ROI) analyses. However, using ROIs that are derived from an atlas that is not sex-specific could potentially lead to data selection bias that does not fully capture differences in functional organization between females and males.

Using fMRI whole brain somatotopic motor mapping from a previously published and openly available dataset [[Ma et al., 2022], https://openneuro.org/datasets/ds004044/versions/2.0.3], the current study investigated the differences in cortical activation patterns between females and males during a variety of motor tasks. Based on previous observations of structural differences in the brain between females and males, we hypothesized that across movement tasks, females would exhibit lower

variability and smaller volumes of brain activation than males, reflecting more focal neural processing. This concerted effort to further quantify the anatomical localization and functional differences will aid our understanding of the inherent differences in somatotopic maps between the sexes, and inform ROI selection strategies for future fMRI research by illustrating whether sex specific somatotopic brain parcellations are needed.

Methods

Participants

A total of 62 neurologically intact right-handed young adults (22.76 ± 2.22 years) were used from the Ma *et al*. [2022] database. Of the 62 participants, 34 were female (22.56 ± 2.16 years), and 28 were male (23.00 ± 2.34 years). The original study from which these data were collected was approved by the Institutional Review Board at Beijing Normal University [Ma et al., 2022].

Motor tasks

Twelve voluntary movement patterns were each performed for 16 seconds twice during every fMRI scan. A total of six fMRI scans were acquired for each participant, resulting in a total of 12 event blocks for each of the 12 movement types (i.e.,192 seconds of task evoked data for each movement). These movement conditions included bilateral toes, ankles, fingers, wrists, forearms, upper arms, and eyes, in addition to jaw, lip, and tongue movements, and separate unilateral movements for the left and right legs. Detailed movement instructions can be found in table 1. All movements were performed at a self-selected pace between 0.5 and 5 Hz. For further details about the nature of the experiment and motor tasks please review the published dataset manuscript [Ma et al., 2022].

Table 1. Movement conditions and instructions

Body movements	Movement patterns and instructions
Eyes	Blink or saccade eyes.
Jaw	Bite or twist jaws.
Lips	Expand and contract the lips with the teeth being bitten and tongue still.
Tongue	Circular tongue with the teeth being bitten and lips closed.
Upper arms	Lift and lower the upper arms (maximum 20°) with the upper arms, forearms, wrist, and fingers straight.
Forearms	Flex and release both forearms at the elbow (maximum 20°) with the wrists and fingers straight.

Wrists	Pitch and roll both wrists with clenched fists.
Fingers	Clench and loose both fists.
Left leg	Lift and lower the left leg (maximum 10°) with the leg, ankle, and toes straight.
Right leg	Lift and lower the right leg (maximum 10°) with the leg, ankle, and toes straight.
Ankles	Dorsiflex and release both ankles.
Toes	Flex and extend the toes from both feet.
Rest	Fixate on the dot presented in the center of the screen.

Preprocessing structural MRI data

The T1-weighted (T1w) anatomical scans were preprocessed using FSL's [Jenkinson et al., 2012] anatomical preprocessing script *fsl_anat*. Briefly, this script performs image reorientation to align with standard space template coordinates, crops the T1w image in the z-direction to remove the neck and other non-brain aspects of the image, implements bias-field correction using FSL's FAST [Zhang et al., 2001], and then extracts the brain using a non-linear reverse transformation of a standard-space brain mask.

First level functional MRI processing

The previously preprocessed and manually denoised fMRI data [for more information regarding the original preprocessing and denoising please review Ma et al. [2022]] were linearly registered to the bias-field corrected and brain extracted T1w image using FSL's FLIRT [Jenkinson et al., 2002; Jenkinson and Smith, 2001], and then non-linearly registered to the MNI152_2mm brain template using FNIRT [Andersson et al., 2007]. Each of the 12 motor tasks were modelled using the event timing files provided in the downloaded data with a double-gamma function and with a temporal derivative applied to the model in FSL's FEAT [Woolrich et al., 2001]. White matter BOLD signal was not treated as a nuisance regressor in the present work even though this remains a controversial technique [Ding et al., 2013; Fabri et al., 2014; Frizzell et al., 2020; Gawryluk et al., 2011a; Gawryluk et al., 2011b; Gawryluk et al., 2014; Gore et al., 2019; Grajauskas et al., 2019; Helenius et al., 2003; Jiang et al., 2021; Mazerolle et al., 2010; Mazerolle et al., 2013; Newman et al., 2010; Peer et al., 2017; Rostrup et al., 2000; Tettamanti et al., 2002; Weis et al., 2011]. Therefore, to prevent a bias towards grey matter BOLD signal and to truly investigate whole-brain fMRI signal we retained white matter

BOLD in our analyses to avoid the potential historical blind spot in fMRI research [Grajauskas et al., 2019].

Second level fixed effects functional MRI processing

Since each participant performed the same tasks over six separate runs, a fixed effects analysis was carried out in FEAT [Woolrich et al., 2001] prior to performing group-level analyses. The fixed effects analysis was used to average the parameter estimates of the task-based activations across the six runs to create a single activation map and effect size for each motor task for every participant. These averaged parameter estimates were then carried forward for group level analyses in FEAT [Woolrich et al., 2004].

Structural MRI analysis

T1w images for each participant were segmented using Fastsurfer [Henschel et al., 2020]. Overall brain volume without ventricles was first analyzed to determine if there were differences between females and males in brain size. Next, cortical surface area, cortical thickness, and grey matter volume for each hemisphere were extracted for analysis and normalized as a ratio to overall brain volume on a participant-by-participant basis to account for differences in brain size. We then compared each of these normalized metrics for each hemisphere between females and males separately using two-tailed independent samples *t*-tests implemented using the *permutation_test* module from SciPy stats in Python 3.10 [Virtanen et al., 2020] with 20,000 permutations. A manual Bonferroni correction to adjust for multiple comparisons was performed and a result was deemed to be significant if the *p*-value was ≤ 0.007 ($\alpha = 0.05/7$).

Group level functional MRI analysis

For group-level analyses, two one-sample *t*-tests were performed to compute spatial maps for males and females separately. Additionally, two one-tailed independent samples *t*-tests were carried out to determine if there were differences in the somatotopic representations of each of the 12 motor movements between male and females (*t*-test #1: females > males; *t*-test #2: males > females contrasts).

Non-parametric permutation testing was performed on each contrast using *randomise* with 5,000 permutations, and threshold free cluster enhancement was used for statistical inference with a family wise error rate set to $\alpha \leq 0.05$ for each contrast.

Sex difference analyses

To address the question of sex differences for somatotopic motor mapping, two approaches were taken. First, the two *t*-tests previously described (*t*-test #1: females > males; *t*-test #2: males > females contrasts) were assessed and reported when a significant contrast was detected (figure 1). Second, to further investigate sex differences, the mean activation map for each movement was computed separately for males and females and the spatial maps were correlated to assess their degree of similarity. To do this, for males and females the group-level *p*-value threshold statistical maps ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) for each movement condition were temporally merged together using *fslmerge*. Then correlation analyses between the spatial maps was carried out with *fslcc*. The correlation coefficients for same movement conditions between females and males were then reported and the inter-task correlations were disgarded.

Sex differences in brain activation variability

To assess within group variability in motor responses, we performed pairwise correlations for both females and males. To do so, we used the raw *t*-statistic image for each participant for each contrast and calculated the voxel-to-voxel correlation of these images for each pair of participants separately for each group using in-house python code. We then compared the pairwise correlations between females and males for each contrast using two-tailed independent samples *t*-tests implemented using the *permutation_test* module from SciPy stats in Python 3.10 [Virtanen et al., 2020] with 20,000 permutations. A manual Bonferroni correction to adjust for multiple comparisons was performed and a result was deemed to be significant if the *p*-value was ≤ 0.004 ($\alpha = 0.05/12$).

Results

Sex differences in brain structure

Permutation *t*-testing with 20,000 permutations revealed sex differences in total brain volume [Females: 1,099,719.242 ± 55040.247 mm^3; Males: 1,230,966.679 ± 110273.860 mm^3; $t(59) = -5.912$, $p = 1.00E-04$, $d = -1.480$]. There was also a significant difference in normalized cortical thickness in the left [Females: 2.18E-06 ± 1.17E-07; Males: 1.99E-06 ± 1.75E-07; $t(59) = 4.950$, $p = 1.00E-04$, $d = 1.251$] and right [Females: 2.19E-06 ± 1.17E-07; Males: 1.99E-06 ± 1.70E-07; $t(59) = 5.268$, $p = 1.00E-04$, d = 1.333] hemispheres with females having thicker cortex. However, no differences were observed for normalized grey matter volume in the left [Females: 0.211 ± 0.008; Males: 0.214 ± 0.007; $t(59) = 1.451$, $p = 0.155$, $d = -0.376$], or right [Females: 0.212 ± 0.008; Males: 0.215 ± 0.007; $t(59) = -1.740$, $p = 0.089$, $d = -0.451$] hemisphere, or normalized surface area in the left [Females: 0.075 ± 0.002; Males: 0.075 ± 0.002; $t(59) = 0.653$, $p = 0.509$, $d = 0.165$], or right [Females: 0.075 ± 0.002; Males: 0.075 ± 0.002; $t(59) = 0.653$, $p = 0.509$, $d = 0.165$] hemisphere. These findings suggest that although males have larger overall brains, females exhibited thicker cortex in both hemispheres.

Sex differences for group-level contrasts

Significant differences were found in male > female contrasts in seven out of the 12 movements including ankles, fingers, jaw, lips, tongue, upper arms, and wrists (figure 1; supplementary data tables S1-S8). The only contrast that showed a significant female > male difference was right leg movements. It is important to note that the figure only shows six of the eight contrasts. The two contrasts not represented only contained cluster sizes of 1 and 2 voxels respectively and were not visible in the figures (see supplementary data tables S1-S8).



227

Figure 1. *Sex difference contrasts for 6 of the 8 significant conditions. The other two contrasts were not visible and are therefore found in the supplemental data. Significantly greater BOLD signal for males (Red/Yellow) and females (White/Blue) are plotted. Images are family-wise error corrected p-value maps with a p value threshold of 0.05. Figure was made in MRIcoGL* [Rorden and Brett, 2000].

Sex differences for group-level spatial maps

Across all 12 movement tasks, males (mean across 12 tasks: 32,974 ± 13,181.47 voxels) exhibited larger volumes of activation compared to females (mean across 12 tasks: 19,528.67 ± 10,000.85 voxels), which equates to males having a mean 87.18 ± 69.68% larger volumes of activation across the whole brain (figure 2; table 8). The spatial maps between females and males were moderately correlated [Akoglu, 2018] with a mean Pearsons correlation strength $r = 0.62 \pm 0.06$, and a range across the 12 tasks from $r = 0.48$ for ankle movements to $r = 0.72$ for left leg movements (table 2).

Table 2. Group-level whole brain spatial maps and correlations between sexes

	Total number of significant voxels*		**Spatial map similarity**	
Condition	**Females**	**Males**	**Difference (%)****	***r*-values*****
Eyes	33,429	47,035	40.70	0.65
Jaw	17,674	30,752	74.00	0.62
Lips	25,939	29,277	12.87	0.65
Tongue	31,624	43,223	36.68	0.62
Upper Arms	9,339	23,022	146.51	0.53
Forearms	19,865	39,633	99.51	0.58
Wrists	24,690	45,753	85.31	0.63
Fingers	26,591	43,500	63.59	0.66
Left Leg	6,050	8,637	42.76	0.72
Right Leg	4,838	10,067	108.08	0.64
Ankles	9,187	34,538	275.94	0.48
Toes	25,118	40,251	60.25	0.60

*Voxel size = 2 × 2 × 2 mm
**Percent difference of voxels activated in each condition for males compared to females
*** Pearson's *r* correlation coefficients from a cross-correlation analyses between females and males



239

Figure 2. *P-value spatial maps for all 12 movement tasks. Female spatial maps are in blue on the left, male spatial maps are in red/orange on the right. Cerebral and cerebellar flatmaps showing unique and overlap are in the centre two columns respectively. Cerebral inflated brains and flatmaps were*

made in pycortex [Gao et al., 2015], *and cerebellar flatmaps were made in SUIT* [Diedrichsen and Zotow, 2015].

Sex differences in brain activation variability

Using permutation testing to assess sex differences in correlations derived from whole-brain voxelwise *t*-statistics for each contrast, we found that females had significantly higher between subject consistency in 10 of the 12 motor tasks (table 3; $p < 0.004$, two-tailed, 20,000 permutations).

Table 3. Permutation testing of within group, between subject whole-brain voxelwise brain activation correlations

	Mean Correlation ± Standard Deviation		
Condition	**Females**	**Males**	**Independent samples t-tests**
Eyes	0.205 ± 0.073	0.177 ± 0.058	$t(904) = 6.210$, $p = 1.00E-04$, $d = 0.426$ *
Jaw	0.200 ± 0.052	0.155 ± 0.051	$t(904) = 12.779$, $p = 1.00E-04$, $d = 0.863$ *
Lips	0.197 ± 0.056	0.164 ± 0.063	$t(904) = 8.347$, $p = 1.00E-04$, $d = 0.557$ *
Tongue	0.234 ± 0.067	0.218 ± 0.054	$t(904) = 3.994$, $p = 3.00E-04$, $d = 0.274$ *
Upper Arms	0.162 ± 0.066	0.153 ± 0.050	$t(904) = 2.155$, $p = 0.029$, $d = 0.148$
Forearms	0.182 ± 0.055	0.158 ± 0.049	$t(904) = 6.975$, $p = 1.00E-04$, $d = 0.474$ *
Wrists	0.226 ± 0.054	0.198 ± 0.051	$t(904) = 7.948$, $p = 1.00E-04$, $d = 0.538$ *
Fingers	0.220 ± 0.060	0.203 ± 0.053	$t(904) = 4.203$, $p = 1.00E-04$, $d = 0.286$ *
Left Leg	0.171 ± 0.077	0.147 ± 0.071	$t(904) = 4.772$, $p = 1.00E-04$, $d = 0.324$ *
Right Leg	0.155 ± 0.080	0.156 ± 0.070	$t(904) = -0.352$, $p = 0.724$, $d = -0.024$
Ankles	0.158 ± 0.064	0.142 ± 0.064	$t(904) = 3.550$, $p = 9.00E-04$, $d = 0.239$ *
Toes	0.171 ± 0.056	0.143 ± 0.050	$t(904) = 7.806$, $p = 1.00E-04$, $d = 0.531$ *

Note: * significant at $p < 0.05$ Bonferroni corrected [$\alpha = 0.004$; (0.05/12)], two-tailed, 20,000 permutations.

Discussion

In this study, we sought to determine if there were sex differences in somatotopic motor maps with a range of movements across the human body. Based on previous research, there are distinct structural differences in cortical organization between females and males, with females having greater cortical thickness [Ritchie et al., 2018; Wierenga et al., 2022], and males having larger cortical surface area; this is particularly the case for the motor and somatosensory regions [Ritchie et al., 2018; Wierenga et al., 2022] which are known to have somatotopic organization [Penfield and Rasmussen, 1950]. Given these previously observed differences, we hypothesized that females would exhibit more focal (i.e., smaller volumes of activation) and consistent (i.e., lower variability between females for each task) patterns of brain activation, compared to males across the 12 different body movements. To

answer these questions, we used a freely available fMRI dataset that included a total of 62 participants, of which 34 were females and 28 were males.

Males generally exhibit larger magnitudes of brain activation

In seven of the movements under investigation (jaw, tongue, upper arms, wrists, fingers, ankles, and toes) we observed greater BOLD signal in males than females. In contrast, females only exhibited greater activation than males in one small cluster during right leg movements, and no differences were seen with the remaining four movements (eyes, lips, forearms, and left leg).

Females exhibit smaller volumes of brain activation across all movement conditions

Smaller activation maps were observed in females across all 12 motor tasks (on average males had 87.18 ± 68.68% larger activation maps than females, ranging from 12.87% larger for lip movements to 275.94% larger for ankle movements; table 8, figure 2). These data support our hypothesis that females would have more focal volumes of brain activation given the previous findings that males have larger overall cortical and subcortical volume and surface area [Ritchie et al., 2018; Wierenga et al., 2022], and provide support for females having better cortical efficiency [Luders et al., 2006] during simple movements across the body.

Lower whole-brain activation variability in females during all movement conditions

Based on our novel whole-brain voxelwise correlation analysis, females consistently had higher correlations between subjects compared to males (table 2), and these differences were significantly different between sex. These findings should be viewed as complementary to the volume of activation data reported in this work, given the smaller volumes of brain activation paired with the lower between subject variability seen in females may be indicative of greater neural efficiency compared to males.

Our findings contribute to the growing body of evidence indicating that extensive sex differences in brain organization and function exist [Cahill, 2017; Liu et al., 2020; Murray et al., 2018; Ritchie et al., 2018]. Importantly, Ritchie *et al.*, [2018] noted that the observed sex differences in cortical measures in their work may be related compensatory interactions between sex-specific

hormones and the neural underpinnings that govern human voluntary movement [Hyde, 2014; McCarthy and Arnold, 2011; De Vries, 2004]. It is plausible that these hormonal differences may impact both behaviour and the structure and function of the human brain, which could explain at least in part the differences observed in the present study.

It is well known that the primary motor cortex is organized somatotopically, with adjacent body parts represented by neighbouring regions of the cortex [Penfield and Rasmussen, 1950]. Recently, the accuracy of the motor homunculus has been brought into question, with a proposed update to the cortical representation maps [Gordon et al., 2023]. However, little is known about the extent to which this organization may vary between females and males. There is accumulating evidence from recent years suggesting sex differences in brain structure, and specifically in motor areas, including the premotor cortex, putamen, and cerebellum [GM volume higher in males > females [Lotze et al., 2019; Ritchie et al., 2018; Ruigrok et al., 2014]]. Yet, the majority of these findings refer to structural differences in volume, surface area or cortical thickness, with limited data regarding functional imaging differences or their associations with motor behaviour. Greater spatial distributions and/or magnitudes of BOLD signal have been observed, without differences in task performance, for males during verbal and spatial tasks [Gur et al., 2000], in addition to cognitive and motor tasks [Bell et al., 2006]. These findings paired with the present work suggest that females typically show lower magnitudes, and smaller volumes of brain activation across cognitive-motor tasks.

Implications of sex differences in functional brain imaging research analyses

Importantly, there are many methods to analyze functional brain imaging data. These analysis and interpretation approaches often rely on previous findings, and as a result neglect to acknowledge sex differences. For example, a ROI based analysis that is derived from an atlas, could prevent true ROI identification if it does not consider sex differences in functional organization of the brain, and is instead a product of group averaging. Some brain atlases that are commonly used in fMRI research for ROI selection include the Harvard-Oxford cortical and subcortical atlases (16 females, 21 males,

between the ages of 18-50), the Brainnectome atlas (10 females, 10 males, all right handed, between the ages of 19-25), and the Shaefer atlas (665 males, 905 females, between the ages of 18-35). Each of these atlases were created by mixing female and male participants, which may lead to suboptimal parcellations given our findings that males tend to exhibit larger volumes of BOLD signal across a range of motor tasks. Our data suggests that future studies should consider selection of sex specific ROIs based on functional activation [Nieto-Castanon et al., 2003; Nieto-Castañón and Fedorenko, 2012; Poldrack, 2007], when possible.

Implications of sex differences in neurological impairments

As discussed, a knowledge gap exists regarding the dimorphisms in somatotopic maps between females in males. While filling this gap is generally useful for research purposes, it cannot be understated how important these findings may be for the understanding of the etiology, prognosis, and recovery from injury or disease in females versus males. The incidence and presentation of many neurological conditions, and movement disorders differ between sexes, suggesting underlying differences in brain function or structure [Meoni et al., 2020]. For example, females experience increased severity, more impairment, and longer recovery from stroke [Kim et al., 2010; Persky et al., 2010; Phan et al., 2019]. Although many explanatory factors have been identified, incorporating somatotopic differences into this phenomenon should be discussed. As identified in this research, females use less of their cortex to generate voluntary movements, and do so with significantly lower brain activation variability. Although this may be beneficial in healthy, neurologically intact populations, this approach may be detrimental in the presence of a neurological injury. For example, with stroke, injury to the central nervous system interrupts the normal motor output pathways and leads to motor impairment. Acute stroke severity is often classified using clinical tests of neurological function, such as the National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale (NIHSS; [Kwah and Diong, 2014]. This scale includes assessments of motor function in the arm and leg, with a higher score indicating more impairment. Females present with higher NIHSS scores on average at stroke onset [Tomita et al.,

2015], indicating a greater degree of motor impairment than males, however one study has suggested that males have, on average, larger infarcts than females [Appelros et al., 2009]. Our data showing that females have smaller volumes of cortical activation than males, and lower variability, shows that comparisons against standard ROI atlases may lead to misinterpretation of data and fundamentally limit our understanding of brain function.

Limitations and future directions

As this study used a publicly available data, our analysis was restricted to the previously collected data. Therefore, we were unable to include gender in our analysis. Recent studies indicate that gender differences in both brain structure and brain function exist [Zhang et al., 2020], and future studies should collect the appropriate data to allow for both sex- and gender-based analyses. Additionally, force output can influence brain activation [Andrushko et al., 2021; Noble et al., 2011; Noble et al., 2013], and in the present data there are no behavioural metrics to quantify the movement force, velocity, or movement quality. This is a noted limitation that future work should consider measuring to better link movement kinematics to cortical measures of activation.

Conclusions

In this study we found significant sex differences in the magnitude of brain activation for eight out of the 12 movement conditions, with males having significantly greater brain activation in seven out of the 12 conditions and females showing greater brain activation in one condition. Interestingly, we observed smaller volumes of brain activation in all 12 movement conditions and significantly lower whole-brain activation variability in 10 of the 12 movement conditions for females. With a cross-correlation analysis to compare the spatial map similarity between sexes, we found the spatial maps were moderately correlated for each movement conditions between sexes. The difference in volume is an important consideration when creating ROIs based on functional localizers, as clear and visible differences can be observed between sexes, and has potentially significant implications for understanding the neurobiology of various neurological impairments in females and males (figure 2).

We propose these data provide important insight into the need for sex specific ROIs for functional localization to accurately study brain-behaviour relationships using fMRI, and likely have important clinical implications for understanding impairment severity and rehabilitation strategies for each sex independently.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the original authors of the open dataset Sai Ma, Taicheng Huang, Yukun Qu, Xiayu Chen, Yajie Zhang and Zonglei Zhen. Without their support of open science practices, this work would not have been made possible.

Funding sources

This work was funded by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (PI L.A.B., PJT-148535) to L.B. and an NSERC Discovery Grant and NSERC Discovery Launch Supplement to C.E. (RGPIN-2021-03568 and DGECR-2021-00297). J.W.A., is funded by a Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) fellowship and a Michael Smith Foundation for Health Research postdoctoral award, S.R. is supported by awards from the University of British Columbia, E. K. is funded by an NSERC Canada Graduate Master's award, J.D. is funded by a CIHR Canada Graduate Master's award.

Author contributions

J.W.A. processed and analyzed the data, and assisted in writing the manuscript. S.R. processed and analyzed the data and assisted in writing the manuscript. E.K. created the figures and assisted in writing the manuscript. J.D. assisted with writing the manuscript and approving the final version. C.E. assisted in data analysis and writing the manuscript, and C.E. and L.B. were involved with the overall conception and direction of this study, and edited and approved the manuscript.

References

Aboitiz F, Scheibel AB, Zaidel E (1992): Morphometry of the sylvian fissure and the corpus callosum, with emphasis on sex differences. Brain 115:1521–1541. https://academic.oup.com/brain/article/115/5/1521/322252.

Akoglu H (2018): User's guide to correlation coefficients. Turkish J Emerg Med 18:91–93.

Andersson JLR, Jenkinson M, Smith S (2007): Non-linear registration aka spatial normalisation FMRIB Technial Report TR07JA2.

Andreano JM, Cahill L (2009): Sex influences on the neurobiology of learning and memory. Learn Mem 16:248–266. http://learnmem.cshlp.org/content/16/4/248.full.

Andrushko JW, Gould LA, Renshaw DW, Ekstrand C, Hortobágyi T, Borowsky R, Farthing JP (2021): High force unimanual handgrip contractions increase ipsilateral sensorimotor activation and functional connectivity. Neuroscience 452:111–125.

Appelros P, Stegmayr B, Terent A (2009): Sex differences in stroke epidemiology. Stroke 40:1082–1090. https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/abs/10.1161/STROKEAHA.108.540781.

Bell EC, Willson MC, Wilman AH, Dave S, Silverstone PH (2006): Males and females differ in brain activation during cognitive tasks. Neuroimage 30:529–538.

Cahill L (2017): An issue whose time has come. J Neurosci Res 95:12–13. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/jnr.23972.

Cohen NR, Pomplun M, Gold BJ, Sekuler R (2010): Sex differences in the acquisition of complex skilled movements. Exp Brain Res 205:183–193. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00221-010-2351-y.

Diamond MC (1991): Hormonal effects on the development of cerebral lateralization. Psychoneuroendocrinology 16:121–129.

Diedrichsen J, Zotow E (2015): Surface-based display of volume-averaged cerebellar imaging data. PLoS One 10. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26230510/.

Ding Z, Newton AT, Xu R, Anderson AW, Morgan VL, Gore JC (2013): Spatio-temporal correlation tensors reveal functional structure in human brain. PLoS One 8:e82107. https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0082107.

Fabri M, Pierpaoli C, Barbaresi P, Polonara G (2014): Functional topography of the corpus callosum investigated by DTI and fMRI. World J Radiol 6:895–906. https://www.wjgnet.com/1949-8470/full/v6/i12/895.htm.

Frizzell TO, Grajauskas LA, Liu CC, Ghosh Hajra S, Song X, D'Arcy RCN (2020): White matter neuroplasticity: Motor learning activates the internal capsule and reduces hemodynamic response variability. Front Hum Neurosci 14:456.

Gao JS, Huth AG, Lescroart MD, Gallant JL (2015): Pycortex: An interactive surface visualizer for fMRI. Front Neuroinform 9. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26483666/.

Gawryluk JR, Mazerolle EL, D'Arcy RCN (2014): Does functional MRI detect activation in white matter? A review of emerging evidence, issues, and future directions. Front Neurosci 8:239.

Gawryluk JR, D'Arcy RCN, Mazerolle EL, Brewer KD, Beyea SD (2011a): Functional mapping in the corpus callosum: A 4 T fMRI study of white matter. Neuroimage 54:10–15.

Gawryluk JR, Mazerolle EL, Brewer KD, Beyea SD, D'Arcy RCN (2011b): Investigation of fMRI activation in the internal capsule. BMC Neurosci 12:1–7. https://bmcneurosci.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1471-2202-12-56.

Goldstein JM, Poldrack R, Breiter HC, Makris N, Goodman JM, Jerram M, Anagnoson R, Tsuang MT, Seidman LJ (2005): Sex differences in prefrontal cortical brain activity during fMRI of auditory verbal working memory. Neuropsychology 19:509–519. /doiLanding?doi=10.1037%2F0894-4105.19.4.509.

Gordon EM, Chauvin RJ, Van AN, Rajesh A, Nielsen A, Newbold DJ, Lynch CJ, Seider NA, Krimmel SR, Scheidter KM, Monk J, Miller RL, Metoki A, Montez DF, Zheng A, Elbau I, Madison T, Nishino T, Myers MJ, Kaplan S, Badke D'Andrea C, Demeter D V., Feigelis M, Ramirez JSB, Xu

T, Barch DM, Smyser CD, Rogers CE, Zimmermann J, Botteron KN, Pruett JR, Willie JT, Brunner P, Shimony JS, Kay BP, Marek S, Norris SA, Gratton C, Sylvester CM, Power JD, Liston C, Greene DJ, Roland JL, Petersen SE, Raichle ME, Laumann TO, Fair DA, Dosenbach NUF (2023): A somato-cognitive action network alternates with effector regions in motor cortex. Nat 2023:1–9. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-023-05964-2.

Gore JC, Li M, Gao Y, Wu TL, Schilling KG, Huang Y, Mishra A, Newton AT, Rogers BP, Chen LM, Anderson AW, Ding Z (2019): Functional MRI and resting state connectivity in white matter - a mini-review. Magn Reson Imaging 63:1–11.

Grajauskas LA, Frizzell T, Song X, D'Arcy RCN (2019): White matter fMRI activation cannot be treated as a nuisance regressor: Overcoming a historical blind spot. Front Neurosci 13:1024.

Gur RC, Alsop D, Glahn D, Petty R, Swanson CL, Maldjian JA, Turetsky BI, Detre JA, Gee J, Gur RE (2000): An fMRI study of sex differences in regional activation to a verbal and a spatial task. Brain Lang 74:157–170.

Harasty J, Double KL, Halliday GM, Kril JJ, McRitchie DA (1997): Language-associated cortical regions are proportionally larger in the female brain. Arch Neurol 54:171–176. https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamaneurology/fullarticle/594431.

Hegarty M (2018): Ability and sex differences in spatial thinking: What does the mental rotation test really measure? Psychon Bull Rev 25:1212–1219. https://link.springer.com/article/10.3758/s13423-017-1347-z.

Helenius J, Perkiö J, Soinne L, Østergaard L, Carano RAD, Salonen O, Savolainen S, Kaste M, Aronen HJ, Tatlisumak T (2003): Cerebral hemodynamics in a healthy population measured by dynamic susceptibility contrast MR imaging. Acta radiol 44:538–546. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1080/j.1600-0455.2003.00104.x.

Henschel L, Conjeti S, Estrada S, Diers K, Fischl B, Reuter M (2020): FastSurfer - A fast and accurate deep learning based neuroimaging pipeline. Neuroimage 219:117012.

Hyde JS (2014): Gender similarities and differences. Annu Rev Psychol 65:373–398. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23808917/.

Jenkinson M, Bannister P, Brady M, Smith S (2002): Improved optimization for the robust and accurate linear registration and motion correction of brain images. Neuroimage 17:825–841. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12377157.

Jenkinson M, Beckmann CF, Behrens TEJ, Woolrich MW, Smith SM (2012): FSL. Neuroimage 62:782–790. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21979382.

Jenkinson M, Smith S (2001): A global optimisation method for robust affine registration of brain images. Med Image Anal 5:143–156. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11516708.

Jiang Y, Duan M, Li X, Huang H, Zhao G, Li X, Li S, Song X, He H, Yao D, Luo C (2021): Function–structure coupling: White matter functional magnetic resonance imaging hyper-activation associates with structural integrity reductions in schizophrenia. Hum Brain Mapp 42:4022–4034. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/hbm.25536.

Jones CM, Braithwaite VA, Healy SD (2003): The evolution of sex differences in spatial ability. Behav Neurosci 117:403–411. /doiLanding?doi=10.1037%2F0735-7044.117.3.403.

Kim JS, Lee KB, Roh H, Ahn MY, Hwang HW (2010): Gender differences in the functional recovery after acute stroke. J Clin Neurol 6:183. /pmc/articles/PMC3024522/.

Kulynych JJ, Vladar K, Jones DW, Weinberger DR (1994): Gender differences in the normal lateralization of the supratemporal cortex: MRI surface-rendering morphometry of heschl's gyrus and the planum temporale. Cereb Cortex 4:107–118. https://academic.oup.com/cercor/article/4/2/107/346638.

Kuptsova S V., Ivanova M V., Petrushevsky AG, Fedina ON, Zhavoronkova LA (2015): Sex-related differences in task switching: An fMRI study. Hum Physiol 41:611–624. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1134/S0362119715050084.

Kwah LK, Diong J (2014): National institutes of health stroke scale (NIHSS). J Physiother 60:61.

Liu S, Seidlitz J, Blumenthal JD, Clasen LS, Raznahan A (2020): Integrative structural, functional, and transcriptomic analyses of sex-biased brain organization in humans. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 117:18788–18798. https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.1919091117.

Lotze M, Domin M, Gerlach FH, Gaser C, Lueders E, Schmidt CO, Neumann N (2019): Novel findings from 2,838 adult brains on sex differences in gray matter brain volume. Sci Rep 9. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30737437/.

Luders E, Narr KL, Thompson PM, Rex DE, Woods RP, DeLuca H, Jancke L, Toga AW (2006): Gender effects on cortical thickness and the influence of scaling. Hum Brain Mapp 27:314–324. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/hbm.20187.

Ma S, Huang T, Qu Y, Chen X, Zhang Y, Zhen Z (2022): An fMRI dataset for whole-body somatotopic mapping in humans. Sci data 9. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35999222/.

Mazerolle EL, Beyea SD, Gawryluk JR, Brewer KD, Bowen C V., D'Arcy RCN (2010): Confirming white matter fMRI activation in the corpus callosum: Co-localization with DTI tractography. Neuroimage 50:616–621.

Mazerolle EL, Gawryluk JR, Dillen KNH, Patterson SA, Feindel KW, Beyea SD, Stevens MTR, Newman AJ, Schmidt MH, D'Arcy RCN (2013): Sensitivity to white matter fMRI activation increases with field strength. PLoS One 8:e58130. https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0058130.

McCarthy MM, Arnold AP (2011): Reframing sexual differentiation of the brain. Nat Neurosci 14:677–683. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21613996/.

Meoni S, Macerollo A, Moro E (2020): Sex differences in movement disorders. Nat Rev Neurol 2020 162 16:84–96. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41582-019-0294-x.

Murray SO, Schallmo MP, Kolodny T, Millin R, Kale A, Thomas P, Rammsayer TH, Troche SJ, Bernier RA, Tadin D (2018): Sex differences in visual motion processing. Curr Biol 28:2794-2799.e3. http://www.cell.com/article/S0960982218307760/fulltext.

Newman AJ, Supalla T, Hauser P, Newport EL, Bavelier D (2010): Dissociating neural subsystems for grammar by contrasting word order and inflection. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 107:7539–7544. https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.1003174107.

Nieto-Castañón A, Fedorenko E (2012): Subject-specific functional localizers increase sensitivity and functional resolution of multi-subject analyses. Neuroimage 63:1646–1669. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22784644/.

Nieto-Castanon A, Ghosh SS, Tourville JA, Guenther FH (2003): Region of interest based analysis of functional imaging data. Neuroimage 19:1303–1316. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12948689/.

Noble JW, Eng JJ, Boyd LA (2013): Effect of visual feedback on brain activation during motor tasks: an FMRI study. Motor Control 17:298–312. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23761430/.

Noble JW, Eng JJ, Kokotilo KJ, Boyd LA (2011): Aging effects on the control of grip force magnitude: An fMRI study. Exp Gerontol 46:453–461.

Di Noto PM, Newman L, Wall S, Einstein G (2013): The hermunculus: What is known about the representation of the female body in the brain? Cereb Cortex 23:1005–1013. https://academic.oup.com/cercor/article/23/5/1005/797920.

Peer M, Nitzan M, Bick AS, Levin N, Arzy S (2017): Evidence for functional networks within the human brain's white matter. J Neurosci 37:6394–6407. https://www.jneurosci.org/content/37/27/6394.

Penfield W, Rasmussen T (1950): The cerebral cortex of man: A clinical study of localization of function. Macmillan.

Persky RW, Turtzo LC, McCullough LD (2010): Stroke in women: Disparities and outcomes. Curr Cardiol Rep 12:6. /pmc/articles/PMC2861793/.

Phan HT, Reeves MJ, Blizzard CL, Thrift AG, Cadilhac DA, Sturm J, Otahal P, Rothwell P, Bejot Y, Cabral NL, Appelros P, Kõrv J, Vibo R, Minelli C, Gall SL (2019): Sex differences in severity of stroke in the INSTRUCT study: A meta-analysis of individual participant data. J Am Heart Assoc

8. https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/abs/10.1161/JAHA.118.010235.

Poldrack RA (2007): Region of interest analysis for fMRI. Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci 2:67–70. https://academic.oup.com/scan/article/2/1/67/2362895.

Ritchie SJ, Cox SR, Shen X, Lombardo M V., Reus LM, Alloza C, Harris MA, Alderson HL, Hunter S, Neilson E, Liewald DCM, Auyeung B, Whalley HC, Lawrie SM, Gale CR, Bastin ME, McIntosh AM, Deary IJ (2018): Sex differences in the adult human brain: Evidence from 5216 UK biobank participants. Cereb Cortex 28:2959–2975. https://academic.oup.com/cercor/article/28/8/2959/4996558.

Rorden C, Brett M (2000): Stereotaxic display of brain lesions. Behav Neurol 12:191–200. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11568431/.

Rostrup E, Law I, Blinkenberg M, Larsson HBW, Born AP, Holm S, Paulson OB (2000): Regional differences in the CBF and BOLD responses to hypercapnia: A combined PET and fMRI study. Neuroimage 11:87–97.

Ruigrok ANV, Salimi-Khorshidi G, Lai MC, Baron-Cohen S, Lombardo M V., Tait RJ, Suckling J (2014): A meta-analysis of sex differences in human brain structure. Neurosci Biobehav Rev 39:34–50. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24374381/.

Swaab DF, Chung WCJ, Kruijver FPM, Hofman MA, Ishunina TA (2001): Structural and functional sex differences in the human hypothalamus. Horm Behav 40:93–98.

Tettamanti M, Paulesu E, Scifo P, Maravita A, Fazio F, Perani D, Marzi CA (2002): Interhemispheric transmission of visuomotor information in humans: fMRI evidence. J Neurophysiol 88:1051–1058. https://journals.physiology.org/doi/10.1152/jn.2002.88.2.1051.

Thomsen T, Hugdahl K, Ersland L, Barndon R, Lundervold A, Smievoll AI, Roscher BE, Sundberg H (2000): Functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) study of sex differences in a mental rotation task. Med Sci Monit 6:1186–1196. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11232158/.

Tomita H, Hagii J, Metoki N, Saito S, Shiroto H, Hitomi H, Kamada T, Seino S, Takahashi K, Baba Y,

Sasaki S, Uchizawa T, Iwata M, Matsumoto S, Shoji Y, Tanno T, Osanai T, Yasujima M, Okumura K (2015): Impact of sex difference on severity and functional outcome in patients with cardioembolic stroke. J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis 24:2613–2618. http://www.strokejournal.org/article/S1052305715004024/fulltext.

Virtanen P, Gommers R, Oliphant TE, Haberland M, Reddy T, Cournapeau D, Burovski E, Peterson P, Weckesser W, Bright J, van der Walt SJ, Brett M, Wilson J, Millman KJ, Mayorov N, Nelson ARJ, Jones E, Kern R, Larson E, Carey CJ, Polat İ, Feng Y, Moore EW, VanderPlas J, Laxalde D, Perktold J, Cimrman R, Henriksen I, Quintero EA, Harris CR, Archibald AM, Ribeiro AH, Pedregosa F, van Mulbregt P, Vijaykumar A, Bardelli A Pietro, Rothberg A, Hilboll A, Kloeckner A, Scopatz A, Lee A, Rokem A, Woods CN, Fulton C, Masson C, Häggström C, Fitzgerald C, Nicholson DA, Hagen DR, Pasechnik D V., Olivetti E, Martin E, Wieser E, Silva F, Lenders F, Wilhelm F, Young G, Price GA, Ingold GL, Allen GE, Lee GR, Audren H, Probst I, Dietrich JP, Silterra J, Webber JT, Slavič J, Nothman J, Buchner J, Kulick J, Schönberger JL, de Miranda Cardoso JV, Reimer J, Harrington J, Rodríguez JLC, Nunez-Iglesias J, Kuczynski J, Tritz K, Thoma M, Newville M, Kümmerer M, Bolingbroke M, Tartre M, Pak M, Smith NJ, Nowaczyk N, Shebanov N, Pavlyk O, Brodtkorb PA, Lee P, McGibbon RT, Feldbauer R, Lewis S, Tygier S, Sievert S, Vigna S, Peterson S, More S, Pudlik T, Oshima T, Pingel TJ, Robitaille TP, Spura T, Jones TR, Cera T, Leslie T, Zito T, Krauss T, Upadhyay U, Halchenko YO, Vázquez-Baeza Y (2020): SciPy 1.0: Fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. Nat Methods 17:261–272. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41592-019-0686-2.

De Vries GJ (2004): Minireview: Sex differences in adult and developing brains: compensation, compensation, compensation. Endocrinology 145:1063–1068. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/14670982/.

Weis S, Leube D, Erb M, Heun R, Grodd W, Kircher T (2011): Functional neuroanatomy of sustained memory encoding performance in healthy aging and in alzheimer’s disease. Int J Neurosci

121:384–392. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.3109/00207454.2011.565892.

Wierenga LM, Doucet GE, Dima D, Agartz I, Aghajani M, Akudjedu TN, Albajes-Eizagirre A, Alnæs D, Alpert KI, Andreassen OA, Anticevic A, Asherson P, Banaschewski T, Bargallo N, Baumeister S, Baur-Streubel R, Bertolino A, Bonvino A, Boomsma DI, Borgwardt S, Bourque J, den Braber A, Brandeis D, Breier A, Brodaty H, Brouwer RM, Buitelaar JK, Busatto GF, Calhoun VD, Canales-Rodríguez EJ, Cannon DM, Caseras X, Castellanos FX, Chaim-Avancini TM, Ching CRK, Clark VP, Conrod PJ, Conzelmann A, Crivello F, Davey CG, Dickie EW, Ehrlich S, van't Ent D, Fisher SE, Fouche JP, Franke B, Fuentes-Claramonte P, de Geus EJC, Di Giorgio A, Glahn DC, Gotlib IH, Grabe HJ, Gruber O, Gruner P, Gur RE, Gur RC, Gurholt TP, de Haan L, Haatveit B, Harrison BJ, Hartman CA, Hatton SN, Heslenfeld DJ, van den Heuvel OA, Hickie IB, Hoekstra PJ, Hohmann S, Holmes AJ, Hoogman M, Hosten N, Howells FM, Hulshoff Pol HE, Huyser C, Jahanshad N, James AC, Jiang J, Jönsson EG, Joska JA, Kalnin AJ, Klein M, Koenders L, Kolskår KK, Krämer B, Kuntsi J, Lagopoulos J, Lazaro L, Lebedeva IS, Lee PH, Lochner C, Machielsen MWJ, Maingault S, Martin NG, Martínez-Zalacaín I, Mataix-Cols D, Mazoyer B, McDonald BC, McDonald C, McIntosh AM, McMahon KL, McPhilemy G, van der Meer D, Menchón JM, Naaijen J, Nyberg L, Oosterlaan J, Paloyelis Y, Pauli P, Pergola G, Pomarol-Clotet E, Portella MJ, Radua J, Reif A, Richard G, Roffman JL, Rosa PGP, Sacchet MD, Sachdev PS, Salvador R, Sarró S, Satterthwaite TD, Saykin AJ, Serpa MH, Sim K, Simmons A, Smoller JW, Sommer IE, Soriano-Mas C, Stein DJ, Strike LT, Szeszko PR, Temmingh HS, Thomopoulos SI, Tomyshev AS, Trollor JN, Uhlmann A, Veer IM, Veltman DJ, Voineskos A, Völzke H, Walter H, Wang L, Wang Y, Weber B, Wen W, West JD, Westlye LT, Whalley HC, Williams SCR, Wittfeld K, Wolf DH, Wright MJ, Yoncheva YN, Zanetti M V., Ziegler GC, de Zubicaray GI, Thompson PM, Crone EA, Frangou S, Tamnes CK (2022): Greater male than female variability in regional brain structure across the lifespan. Hum Brain Mapp 43:470–499. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/hbm.25204.

Woolrich MW, Behrens TEJ, Beckmann CF, Jenkinson M, Smith SM (2004): Multilevel linear modelling for FMRI group analysis using Bayesian inference. Neuroimage 21:1732–1747. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15050594/.

Woolrich MW, Ripley BD, Brady M, Smith SM (2001): Temporal autocorrelation in univariate linear modeling of FMRI data. Neuroimage 14:1370–1386. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11707093.

Xu C, Li C, Wu H, Wu Y, Hu S, Zhu Y, Zhang W, Wang L, Zhu S, Liu J, Zhang Q, Yang J, Zhang X (2015): Gender differences in cerebral regional homogeneity of adult healthy volunteers: A resting-state fMRI study. Biomed Res Int 2015.

Zhang X, Liang M, Qin W, Wan B, Yu C, Ming D (2020): Gender differences are encoded differently in the structure and function of the human brain revealed by multimodal MRI. Front Hum Neurosci 14:244.

Zhang Y, Brady M, Smith S (2001): Segmentation of brain MR images through a hidden Markov random field model and the expectation-maximization algorithm. IEEE Trans Med Imaging 20:45–57.