Morphometric analysis was performed on three-dimensional MRI scans of 10 male and 10 female young adults with four principal objectives: (1) to characterize in vivo volumes of whole brain and substructures, (2) to explore volumetric symmetry in bilateral structures, (3) to consider the extent to which volumetric measures are dimorphic in the male and female brain, and (4) to provide a normal volumetric database for the young adult brain. Total brain volumes ranged between 1173 and 1626 cm³. All bilateral structures were symmetric or nearly symmetric in volume, with the exception of a slightly larger right neocortex and amygdala, and larger left lateral ventricle. Male brains were larger in volume than female brains, a difference that reached significance for cerebellar but not for cerebral hemisphere volume. In females, there was less cerebral white matter while caudate volume was larger than in the male brains. The proportions of caudate and hippocampus relative to total cerebral volumes were larger in females than in males. These four measures accurately predicted gender in 85% of the subjects by discriminant analysis. No gender differences were noted in the structural symmetry analysis. These results represent the first step in establishing a comprehensive database of morphometric parameters, with unexpected findings relative to brain symmetry and sexual dimorphism.

Brain size is a useful general descriptor of ontogenetic process and outcome (Caviness et al., 1989; Filipek et al., 1992). Despite its potential contribution to studies of the normal and diseased brain, the parameter of size has had an ambiguous status in brain science. In part, this is the legacy of misuses of the parameter in the service of other than scientific agenda (Gould, 1981). Brain size has been a difficult parameter with which to work. In postmortem analyses, large and marginally predictable variability in the size of the brain or its anatomic components is inevitable, resulting from the sequence of processes spanning death and tissue preparation. Additionally, methods applicable to neuropathologic tissue are so tedious and time consuming that adequate sample sizes are seldom achieved (Filipek et al., 1989).

Some of the obstacles to the application of the parameter of size to brain science have been resolved by in vivo magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and computer-assisted algorithms for morphometric analyses. This general methodology is applied here to the brains of 10 male and 10 female young adult volunteers to characterize the volumes of whole brain and substructures in this cohort, with particular analyses of structural asymmetry and gender effects. It is well recognized that there is distinctive asymmetry of cerebral surface topography (e.g., Bear et al., 1986) and even of individual cytoarchitectonic fields (e.g., Galaburda et al., 1978; Rademacher et al., 1993). The present investigation was undertaken to evaluate whether these recognized cortical asymmetries are associated with volumetric asymmetries of cerebral structures.

It has been reported that the female brain is approximately 10% smaller than the male brain (Zatz et al., 1982; Swaab and Hofman, 1984). In addition, sexual dimorphism has been reported in measures of sylvan fissure and corpus callosum in the human brain (Risse et al., 1989; Witelson, 1989; Kimura, 1992; Steinmetz et al., 1992; Witelson and Kigar, 1992); these findings potentially reflect gender differences in hemispheric laterality rather than in absolute volume measures (Swaab and Hofman, 1984). We undertook this analysis, therefore, with the expectation that the female brain would be found to be smaller than that of the male. However, lacking an a priori precedent, we anticipated that the general proportionality of the male and female brains would predict the proportionality of the component structures.
The results of these analyses provide unexpected findings relating to volumetric proportions of brain structures, volumetric symmetry, and sexual dimorphism in the young adult brain. The requisite imaging technology is widely available, as are various morphometric algorithms. These measures initiate a database that may be shared and expanded by other investigators and clinical laboratories concerned with human brain science and human brain disorders.

Materials and Methods

Subjects

MRI scans were performed with informed consent on 10 male and 10 female young adult volunteers. These 20 subjects include seven volunteers reported previously (Filipek et al., 1989). The mean age of the male subjects was 27.4 ± 5.0 years (19–37 years), while that of the female subjects was 26.9 ± 5.3 years (17–33 years). Seven males and eight females were strongly right-handed (≥ 6/7 items) using a modified handedness questionnaire (Oldfield, 1971); the remaining subjects were considered to be non-right-handed. The mean Hollingshead (1975) socioeconomic level for the male subjects’ families was 54.1 ± 14.4 and for the female subjects was 56.2 ± 7.5.

Nine males and 10 females were enrolled in college or had attained at least a bachelor’s degree at the time of study; one male has an associate’s degree. Seven males and seven females hold graduate degrees.

MRI Image Acquisition

Coronal three-dimensional T₁-weighted spoiled gradient echo MRI scans were performed on two different imaging systems. Ten FLASH scans on four males and six females were performed on a 1.5 tesla Siemens Magnetom MR System (Iselin, NJ) with the following parameters: TR = 40 msec, TE = 8 msec, flip angle = 50°, field of view = 30 cm, slice thickness = contiguous 3.1 mm, matrix = 256 × 256, and averages = 1 (Filipek et al., 1989). Ten 3D-CAPR scans on six males and four females were performed on a 1.5 tesla General Electric Signa MR System (Milwaukee, WI), with the following parameters: TR = 50 msec, TE = 9 msec, flip angle = 50°, field of view = 24 cm, slice thickness = contiguous 3.0 mm, matrix = 256 × 256, and averages = 1. The MR image data sets were transferred by magnetic tape to our site for morphometric analyses.

Morphometric Analyses

Positional Normalization

The image data sets were processed on Sun Microsystems, Inc. (Mountainview, CA) computer workstations. A three-dimensional cartesian coordinate system, referenced to the decussations of the anterior (AC) and posterior (PC) commissures, and bisecting the interhemispheric fissure at the level of the PC in the coronal plane, was imposed upon each imaged brain (Talairach and Tournoux, 1988; Filipek et al., 1991a). The axes of this coordinate system are defined as follows: x-axis increasing laterally from the subject’s right to left, y-axis increasing from posterior to anterior, and z-axis increasing from superior to inferior. Each native MRI scan was then reformatted by a homogeneous (nondeformation) transformation between the coordinates in each native MR image data set and the normalized presentation of that data set, consisting of three-dimensional translation and rotation. This transformation was imposed such that the AC-PC line is oriented along the y-axis, the mid-sagittal plane is in the y-z-plane, and the x-axis is, by definition, normal to the mid-sagittal plane (xy = transaxial, xz = coronal, and yz = sagittal orientations) (Talairach and Tournoux, 1988). The MR image data set was resliced into normalized 3.0 mm coronal and 1.0 mm sagittal scans for subsequent segmentation (Filipek et al., 1991a). This procedure eliminates the need for uniformity of head position at the time of imaging.

Image Segmentation

On each planar MR image, anatomic segmentation was performed using intensity contour mapping and differential intensity contour algorithms (Kennedy and Nelson, 1987; Filipek et al., 1989, Kennedy et al., 1989) on the positionally normalized T₁-weighted scan. In principle, the segmentation algorithms identify, classify, and create a continuous outline corresponding only to those voxel locations constituting the specified anatomic borders at image intensity transitions. This procedure does not rely on absolute signal intensity values, which is the premise of most global intensity thresholding techniques. Rather, it interpolates across signal intensity transition zones and assigns the pixels with intensity values closest to the contour value to constitute the border (Kennedy et al., 1989). Once the external borders of the hemispheres and ventricles have been extracted and saved on a given slice, a histogram of the signal intensity distribution for each hemisphere is used. Signal intensity characteristics of gray and white matter result in a bimodal distribution, the nadir of which defines the gray–white border (Kennedy et al., 1989). Each voxel is assigned, in its entirety, to the tissue class its signal intensity most closely matches. Voxels that actually contain both gray and white matter will have an intensity that is most similar to the tissue class occupying the majority of the voxel volume. To first approximation, the amount of white matter contained in voxels labeled as gray matter will be equivalent to the amount of gray matter included in voxels labeled as white matter. This approach decreases the error involved with visual choice of a border location, as well as error from some of the effects of volume averaging across the border. Further details on these operations have been described elsewhere (Kennedy, 1986; Kennedy and Nelson, 1987; Caviness et al., 1989; Filipek et al., 1989, 1991a, 1992; Kennedy et al., 1989).

All primary image segmentation for this analysis was performed in the normalized coronal plane.
Anatomic Definitions

Anatomic structures may be defined by “primary” borders, corresponding to signal intensity transitions at brain–cerebrospinal fluid or at gray–white matter interfaces; “secondary” borders, knowledge-based anatomic subdivisions within a gray or white matter field that are not defined unambiguously by signal intensity transitions, must be subsequently defined by hand or algorithm by the investigator. Using primary and secondary borders, cerebral cortex and white matter, ventricular system, basal ganglia, mesencephalon and diencephalon, hippocampus, amygdala, brainstem and cerebellum were segmented for this analysis.

The following criteria were used for placement of the primary and secondary borders for the segmented structures (Fig. 1)

Cerebral hemispheres were divided at the midline in the coronal plane by a hand-drawn line connecting the measured midpoint of the corpus callosum with the midpoint of the hypothalamus, third ventricle, cerebral aqueduct, and so on. Cerebral cortex was defined medially by the cortico-white matter interface, and otherwise by the cortico-cerebrospinal (CSF) interface; white matter was defined by the gray matter–white matter interfaces; ventricular system (lateral ventricles, including frontal, temporal, and occipital horns in continuum; third and fourth ventricle) was defined by the ventricular–parenchymal interfaces; caudate (in continuum: head, body, tail superior to ventricular trigone, and ventral striatum) was defined superomedially by the interface with the lateral ventricles, inferiorly by the interface with the adjacent rostral peduncle of the thalamus when present, and otherwise by the interface with the adjacent white matter; putamen was defined medially by the external medullary lamina of the globus pallidus, laterally by the external capsule, and otherwise by adjacent white matter; globus pallidus (I and II) was defined superomedially by the interface with the internal capsule, inferiorly by the anterior commissure, ansa lenticularis, or nucleus basalis, when present, and laterally by the external medullary lamina; central gray nuclei (thalamus, pulvinar, hypo-, epi-, and subthalamus, substantia nigra, red nucleus, medial and lateral geniculate bodies) were defined superiorly by the interface with the rostral peduncle of the thalamus or body of the lateral ventricle, inferiorly by either the diencephalic–CSF interface or the secondary boundary defined below, and laterally by the internal capsule.

The amygdala (including nucleus basalis) and hippocampus (including alveus, uncus, dentate, subiculum, and retrosplenial gyri, but not parahippocampal gyrus) were defined as a continuous volume. Amygdala was defined superiorly by the interface with the ansa peduncularis, medially by the CSF interface, inferolaterally by white matter, and inferomedially by a secondary border connecting the medial tip of the subjacent white matter with the uncial notch; hippocampus was defined superolaterally by the interface with the inferior horn of the lateral ventricle, inferolaterally by white matter, and inferomedially by a secondary border connecting the medial tip of the subjacent white matter with the subiculum–parahippocampal gyrus interface. Following Talairach and Tournoux (1988), the secondary ventromedial transition from the amygdala anteriorly to the hippocampus posteriorly (Fig. 2) was subsequently calculated as occurring at 10/24 of the distance between the AC and PC for each brain.

The transition between the central nuclear gray mass and the brainstem was defined as a plane established by a secondary line drawn on a reconstructed 1 mm midline sagittal slice connecting the posterior commissure and the most inferior point of the interpeduncular fossa (Fig. 3). The inferior brainstem–cervical border was defined in the same midline plane by a line perpendicular to the axis of the brainstem 1 mm inferior to the obex of the fourth ventricle (Fig. 3). These superior and inferior borders were transformed into the coronal plane for segmentation (Kennedy et al., 1991); the lateral borders of the brainstem were subsequently defined in the coronal plane by a secondary vertical line connecting the inferiormost interface between CSF and the lateral lemniscus with the glossopharyngeal nerve.

The total cerebellum was divided by a secondary border connecting the midline of the central lobule and uvula, excluding the fourth ventricle. Cerebellar cortex was defined at the cerebellar–CSF interfaces, white matter interface, or secondary brainstem border; cerebellar central mass (including the middle cerebellar peduncle) was defined by the interface with cerebellar cortex and secondary brainstem border, to include central gray matter structures, which were not felt to be reliably distinguished from the cerebellar white matter.

Volumetric Analysis

The total number of voxels for each structure was multiplied by the absolute volume of each voxel (Kennedy and Nelson, 1987; Kennedy et al., 1989), which was determined by the imaging parameters.

Data Analysis

All statistical computations were performed by SAS statistical analysis software (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC) Between-group comparisons for age, scanner system, and gender effects were performed using a multivariate approach to repeated measures analysis of variance (MANOVA) (Maxwell and Delaney, 1990). Comparisons of left–right volumetric symmetry were based upon a symmetry coefficient (Galaburda et al., 1987), \( (L - R) / \sqrt{0.5(L + R)} \), followed by the Student’s \( t \) test to assess the probability that the mean of the distribution of symmetry coefficients was nonzero. Correlations between left and right structures were performed using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient and significance probability. To control type I errors, the Bonferroni adjustment was used to maintain \( \alpha \) at 0.05 for the univariate symmetry coefficients and Pearson correlations.

A linear discriminant analysis was performed to
determine the extent to which the significant dimorphic measures are predictive of gender of each subject. A cross-validation method classified each subject in turn, using a discriminant function derived from the other 19 subjects. The resulting number of correct and incorrect classifications is reported. The morphometric correlations with handedness in this population will be considered in a subsequent analysis that will incorporate measures of the area of the corpus callosum.
Results

Subject Variability
There were no significant differences in age or socio-economic factor between the male and female adults. No significant effects on any of the measured volumes of ventricles, gray or white matter structures were found to result from the use of the two different MRI manufacturers in this analysis (Siemens FLASH vs General Electric 3D-CAPRY) or from the unequal distribution of males and females imaged by each scanner system ($p > 0.35$). There were also no differences...
in age between the male and female subjects scanned by the two scanner systems ($p > 0.53$).

**Volume Measures**
The total volume of the young adult brains in this series lies in the range of 1173.33–1625.62 cc (Table 1). The cerebrum is nearly 90% of total brain volume, eight times the volume of the cerebellum and over 50 times that of the brainstem or total ventricular system.

Gray matter structures contribute over 60% of total cerebral volume (Fig. 4). The neocortex is the dominant gray matter structure of the cerebrum, contributing 58% of total cerebral volume and 92% of total
gray matter volume. The volume of the cerebral white matter, composed principally of myelinated axons mediating neocortical connectivity, is 37% of total cerebral hemisphere. The ratio of cerebral white matter to neocortical volume is 0.64.

In contrast to the prominence of the neocortex, each of the separate subcortical gray matter structures of the cerebrum contributes only 0.5-1.7% of the total cerebral volume (Fig. 4). The ratios of neocortical volume to the volumes of the principal forebrain gray matter structures are therefore large (Fig. 5). These range from approximately 34:1 for the neocortical to-
diencephalic volumetric ratio, to 127:1 for the neocortical-to-amygdala ratio. The ratios of neocortical volume to the volumes of hippocampus and caudate nucleus are similar at approximately 70:1, and the ratio to the volume of the lenticular nucleus is approximately 50:1.

The volumes of the individual forebrain nuclear structures differ much less from each other (Table 1).

Thus, the volumes of the central gray nuclei and the striatum (the sum of caudate and putamen nuclei) are similar, as are the volumes of the caudate and putamen. The putamen is 2.5 times larger than the pallidum, while the hippocampus is nearly twice the volume of the amygdala.

The coefficients of variability (CV) for volumes of structures other than the lateral ventricles range from

Table 1
Volumes of principal brain structures in cc, combined male/female, right/left (N = 20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Mean ± SD</th>
<th>CV (%)</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole brain</td>
<td>1360.1 ± 113.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1173.3</td>
<td>1625.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cerebrum</td>
<td>1132.1 ± 107.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>1007.5</td>
<td>1435.5</td>
<td>86.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neocortex</td>
<td>688.8 ± 65.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>573.7</td>
<td>878.5</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White matter</td>
<td>443.8 ± 42.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>376.2</td>
<td>514.9</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caudate</td>
<td>8.5 ± 1.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenticulate</td>
<td>14.1 ± 1.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putamen</td>
<td>10.1 ± 0.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallidum</td>
<td>3.6 ± 0.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippocampus</td>
<td>9.9 ± 1.2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amygdala</td>
<td>5.5 ± 0.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central gray nuclei</td>
<td>20.5 ± 1.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cerebellum</td>
<td>143.4 ± 12.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>123.8</td>
<td>175.1</td>
<td>10.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortex</td>
<td>143.2 ± 12.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>102.9</td>
<td>146.3</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central mass</td>
<td>23.7 ± 2.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventricular system</td>
<td>21.3 ± 7.4</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>1.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral</td>
<td>18.1 ± 7.1</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thind</td>
<td>1.3 ± 0.6</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>1.9 ± 0.6</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basal ganglia</td>
<td>23.4 ± 3.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>1.7*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentage of total expressed as proportion of whole brain volume. Other substructures are expressed as proportion of total cerebrum, cerebellum, or ventricular system, respectively.
8% to 14%. The volumes measured for the lateral ventricles range from 7 to 34 cc, with a CV of 40%.

Comparison of Bilateral Brain Structures
Bilateral structures of the cerebrum and cerebellum, with the exceptions specified in the following paragraph, were not detectably asymmetric in volume. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were 0.9 or greater (p < 0.0001) for the right versus left volumes of the total cerebrum, neocortex, cerebro white matter, caudate, and cerebellum. Coefficients were greater than 0.5 for the estimated volumes of the remaining structures (Table 2).

Significant asymmetries of relatively small magnitude were noted between only three forebrain structures (Fig. 6). The neocortex of the right hemisphere averaged 3.7 cc7 larger than the left, but this asymmetry was consistent across the cohort (p < 0.004); the white matter measures were symmetric. Other significant asymmetries included a 9% larger right amygdala (p < 0.002), and 18% larger left lateral ventricle (p < 0.01). The mean volume of the right cerebral hemisphere tended to be slightly larger than the left, while the left hippocampus and left caudate tended to be larger than the right, but these differences were not significant in this cohort (p > 0.06). It should be noted that the relatively small sample size may limit the sensitivity of the analyses to true symmetry differences in the smaller structures.

Gender Effects
The male whole brain volume was 8% larger than the female volume (p < 0.02; Table 3, Fig. 7, top). The male cerebrum was 7% larger than that of the female, although this difference did not reach significance (p < 0.06). Among the structures of the cerebral hemispheres, only two were noted to demonstrate gender differences in these subjects (Fig. 7, bottom). The volume of the white matter was 8% less in female than male brains (p < 0.05), while the caudate nuclei were 12% larger in the female brains (p < 0.03).

The male cerebellum was 11% larger than that of the female (p < 0.002). Of note is the difference between the volumes of male and female cerebellar central mass (p < 0.05), which was of less magnitude than the differences between the cerebellar cortical measures (p < 0.0005)

In contrast to the gender differences noted for the absolute volumes, there were no differences noted between males and females for the following volumetric proportions (Table 4, Fig. 8): cerebrum, cerebellum, and brainstem relative to whole brain, or cerebellar cortex and central mass relative to total cerebellum. Only the volumetric proportions of caudate (p < 0.001) and hippocampus (p < 0.02) relative

---

**Table 2**

Comparison of bilateral brain structures, combined male/female (N = 20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Right (mean ± SD)</th>
<th>Left (mean ± SD)</th>
<th>Symmetry coefficient</th>
<th>p &lt;</th>
<th>Pearson coefficient</th>
<th>p &lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cerebrum</td>
<td>606.3 ± 53.5</td>
<td>603.9 ± 54.1</td>
<td>-0.0339</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neocortex</td>
<td>346.2 ± 33.0</td>
<td>347.6 ± 32.2</td>
<td>-0.0104</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White matter</td>
<td>221.8 ± 26.7</td>
<td>221.1 ± 22.2</td>
<td>-0.0036</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caudate</td>
<td>4.7 ± 0.7</td>
<td>4.8 ± 0.7</td>
<td>0.0244</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putamen</td>
<td>5.1 ± 0.4</td>
<td>5.0 ± 0.5</td>
<td>-0.0184</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallidum</td>
<td>1.9 ± 0.3</td>
<td>1.9 ± 0.3</td>
<td>0.0175</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central gray nuclei</td>
<td>10.2 ± 0.9</td>
<td>10.3 ± 0.9</td>
<td>0.0035</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amygdala</td>
<td>2.9 ± 0.4</td>
<td>2.9 ± 0.4</td>
<td>-0.0067</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippocampus</td>
<td>4.9 ± 0.7</td>
<td>5.1 ± 0.7</td>
<td>0.0336</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral ventricles</td>
<td>9.1 ± 3.1</td>
<td>9.8 ± 4.6</td>
<td>0.1620</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebellum</td>
<td>71.5 ± 6.4</td>
<td>71.9 ± 6.1</td>
<td>0.0047</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6. Graphic representation of symmetry coefficients. The error bars represent 1 standard deviation from the mean.

to total cerebrum differed between the sexes, with a larger proportion found for these structures in the female brain. None of the other cerebral volumetric proportions were found to be dimorphic, including the white matter. Thus, the proportions of the major brain regions, most cerebral and all cerebellar substructures were similar in male and female brains, with the exception of the caudate and hippocampus.

Discriminatory analysis on total cerebellar volume resulted in a correct classification of 19 of the 20 subjects, with one male misclassified. Analysis on absolute caudate and white matter volumes, and on proportions of caudate and hippocampus both resulted in correct classification of 17 of the 20 subjects. The same three subjects (one female and two males) were misclassified by the latter two analyses, but not the

Figure 7. Graphic representation of male and female whole brain (A) and structural (B) mean volume differences. The error bars represent 1 standard deviation from the mean.

Table 3
Male and female structural volumes in cc, right/ left combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Male (mean ± SD, N = 10)</th>
<th>Female (mean ± SD, N = 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole brain*</td>
<td>1434.8 ± 116.2</td>
<td>1325.4 ± 85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cerebrum**</td>
<td>1235.6 ± 109.6</td>
<td>1148.5 ± 77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neocortex</td>
<td>714.4 ± 68.4</td>
<td>663.2 ± 51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White matter**</td>
<td>462.4 ± 46.2</td>
<td>425.3 ± 30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caudate**</td>
<td>8.8 ± 1.2</td>
<td>10.1 ± 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenticulate</td>
<td>14.4 ± 1.2</td>
<td>13.1 ± 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippocampus</td>
<td>9.6 ± 1.4</td>
<td>10.4 ± 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amygdala</td>
<td>5.5 ± 0.7</td>
<td>5.6 ± 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central gray nuclei</td>
<td>20.7 ± 1.7</td>
<td>20.3 ± 1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cerebellum*</td>
<td>162.2 ± 10.5</td>
<td>154.6 ± 6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebellar cortex***</td>
<td>127.2 ± 8.9</td>
<td>112.3 ± 5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central mass***</td>
<td>24.8 ± 3.3</td>
<td>22.4 ± 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventricular system</td>
<td>22.8 ± 7.8</td>
<td>20.0 ± 7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral ventricles</td>
<td>18.9 ± 7.5</td>
<td>17.3 ± 7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III ventricle</td>
<td>1.5 ± 0.6</td>
<td>1.1 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV ventricle</td>
<td>2.1 ± 0.7</td>
<td>1.7 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brainstem</td>
<td>24.5 ± 3.4</td>
<td>22.3 ± 2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* MANOVA: whole brain subdivisions, F = 5.36, p < 0.01. ANOVA: whole brain total, F = 5.76, p < 0.02; cerebellum, F = 19.60, p < 0.0003.
** MANOVA: cerebral subdivisions, F = 3.44, p < 0.03. ANOVA: cerebrum total, F = 3.85, p < 0.06; caudate, F = 5.91, p < 0.03; white matter, F = 4.54, p < 0.05.
*** MANOVA: cerebellar subdivisions, F = 9.47, p < 0.002. ANOVA: cerebellum total, F = 19.60, p < 0.0003; cerebellar cortex, F = 19.60, p < 0.0003; cerebellar central mass, F = 4.61, p < 0.05.
male misclassified by the cerebellar discriminant analysis. The measures used for these gender classifications were preselected on the basis of their gender group mean differences, and therefore these rates may not generalize to a new subject sample.

There were no differences noted between males and females in the symmetry or Pearson coefficients for left and right volumes of cerebrum, cerebellum, or component substructures.

Discussion

MRI-based morphometric analyses in these young male and female adult subjects noted total brain volumes ranging between 1173 and 1626 cm³. Most substructures were symmetric in volume except for a larger right neocortex and amygdala, and larger left lateral ventricle. Male brains were larger in volume than female brains, a difference that reached significance for cerebellar but not for cerebral hemisphere volume. In females, there was less cerebral white matter while caudate volume was larger than in the male brains. The proportions of caudate and hippocampus relative to total cerebral volumes were larger in females than in males. These four measures accurately predicted gender in 85% of the subjects by discriminant analysis. No gender differences were noted in the structural symmetry analysis.

It remains to be established to what extent this series of 20 subjects is representative of a “normal population.” This analysis provides, in any event, an orienting perspective with regard to the volumes of the young adult brain. These values were obtained at ages when brain volume should be maximum, as brain volume of “normal” individuals progressively declines beyond the fourth or fifth decade at a rate variously estimated to be from 1% to 3.5% per decade (Dekaban and Sadowsky, 1978; Miller et al., 1980; Harper and Mina, 1981; Hubbard and Anderson, 1981; Hatazawa et al., 1982).

A variety of measurements have been recorded in the neuropathological literature for the total volume of the brain (or volume estimated from weight), for the major regions of the brain, and for certain substructures such as the hippocampus. These have been obtained after various schedules of fixation or histological processing methods, some with estimated corrections for the degree of postprocessing shrinkage. In general, these measurements range from about 25% to 30% less to approximately the same as the volumes reported here (Wessely, 1970; Paul, 1971; Dekaban and Sadowsky, 1978; Kretschmann et al., 1979, 1986b; Holloway, 1980; Harper and Mina, 1981; Klekamp et al., 1987; Pakkenberg, 1988). These values are also in accord with those determined by similar morphometric methods in this laboratory but based upon a sample of only seven subjects (Filipek et al., 1989).

Although many other imaging studies have reported various morphometric measures based on MRI over the past decade, many of these were limited to linear measures on single slices, or area measurements on slices separated by a 2–3 mm gap. Therefore, comparison of the volumes reported here with other prior studies must consider comparable scanning and morphometric techniques, as well as comparable subject populations and anatomic definitions (Filipek et al., 1989).

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Male (mean ± SD)</th>
<th>Female (mean ± SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cerebrum</td>
<td>86.1 ± 1.1*</td>
<td>85.6 ± 0.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neocortex</td>
<td>58.9 ± 1.6</td>
<td>58.9 ± 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White matter</td>
<td>36.5 ± 1.7</td>
<td>36.5 ± 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caudate*</td>
<td>0.7 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.9 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenticulate</td>
<td>1.2 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.2 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippocampus*</td>
<td>0.8 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.8 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amygdala</td>
<td>0.4 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.5 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central grey nuclei</td>
<td>1.7 ± 0.2</td>
<td>1.8 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cerebellum</td>
<td>10.7 ± 1.1*</td>
<td>10.7 ± 0.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebellar cortex</td>
<td>83.8 ± 1.7</td>
<td>83.4 ± 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central mass</td>
<td>16.4 ± 1.7</td>
<td>16.6 ± 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral ventricles</td>
<td>1.5 ± 0.5*</td>
<td>1.5 ± 0.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brainstem</td>
<td>1.7 ± 0.2*</td>
<td>1.7 ± 0.2*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage of total expressed as proportion of whole brain volume. Other substructures expressed as proportion of total cerebrum or cerebellum, respectively.

*MANOVA: cerebral subdivisions, F = 3.03, p < 0.05. ANOVA: caudate, F = 15.45, p < 0.001; hippocampus, F = 7.22, p < 0.02.
In general, our whole brain and cerebrum volumes are in accord with those of other investigators (DeLisi et al., 1991; Coffey et al., 1992; Harris et al., 1992). A conspicuous exception is with regard to our cerebellar volumes, which are over 20% larger than those reported by Escalona et al. (1991). These authors used substantially different methods involving systematic sampling and point counting for volume estimates. Their definition for inclusion or exclusion of voxels only partially containing cerebellum is not stated; excluding partial voxels would directly result in underestimation of cerebellum volume. Also, their anatomic definition of the cerebellum is not clearly comparable with the one used here, which may further contribute to the volume differences.

The caudate volumes are in accord with Breier et al. (1992), whose anatomic definitions appear very similar to those used here, in contrast to those studies that measured only the head of the caudate (DeLisi et al., 1991; Harris et al., 1992). Other studies of putamen (Harris et al., 1992) and lenticular (DeLisi et al., 1991) volumes are also concordant given somewhat differing imaging techniques.

The lateral ventricular volumes reported here differ from those previously reported in the literature, ranging from 25% to 45% larger; however, these latter ventricular volumes are still within 1 standard deviation (SD) of our mean volumes (DeLisi et al., 1991; Coffey et al., 1992; Shenton et al., 1992). The CV of the volumes in this study is 40%, while other studies report a CV of approximately 30% (DeLisi et al., 1991; Shenton et al., 1992). However, one study of normal adult volunteers, ranging in age from 30 to 91 years, has reported a CV of 70% for volumes of the lateral ventricles (Coffey et al., 1992). These differences probably reflect anatomic variation within the present subjects, rather than variability in measurement, as the borders between the ventricles and surrounding brain parenchyma are substantially less ambiguous than the borders defining other structures.

The absolute volumes for the amygdala and hippocampus reported here are 20% and 2% smaller, respectively, than those determined by MRI morphometry in a comparable, although smaller, group of young adults using similar imaging sequences (Watson et al., 1992). Although our exterior boundary criteria for these structures appear similar, our methods for this analysis differ in a significant regard. The rostral-caudal transition of amygdala to hippocampus can be difficult to define reliably, even using positionally normalized MRI scans. Therefore, an atlas-based (Talairach and Tournoux, 1988) algorithm-calculated secondary boundary was utilized, which may be the source of the differences. When the mean volumes for both structures are summed, the mean volumes of Watson et al. (1992) for "amygdala-hippocampus complex" are within 10% (1.1 SD) of our mean volumes.

Another study of amygdala and hippocampus volumes (Breier et al., 1992) followed somewhat similar exterior border definitions, but used the trigone of the lateral ventricles as the posterior border in the coronal plane (anterior to our posterior definitions).

This analysis also did not include slices visualizing the amygdala-hippocampal transition, resulting in individual volumes that are 25–40% smaller than those reported here. However, their reported volume of the hippocampus-amygdala complex, which included the transition slices, is only 15% (1.7 SD) smaller than the present volumes, most likely reflecting the differing posterior borders.

In contrast, the hippocampal volumes reported here are approximately 45% larger than those reported by Jack et al. (1989). This discrepancy can be explained partially by the fact that the latter study defines the posterior borders of the hippocampus by a plane perpendicular to the sylvian fissure that intersects the posterior commissure, and that appears to be approximately 65° oblique to the AC-PC line. Application of this posterior plane to the hippocampal outlines produced in this study results in a 24% decrease from the mean hippocampal volume reported in Table 1, which nonetheless remains approximately 20% larger (1.7 SD). Much of this remaining difference can be due to the fact that the volumes reported by Jack et al. (1989) were normalized for intracranial volume and did not include the volume of the uncus. Differences in the MRI pulse sequence parameters (spin echo vs spoiled gradient echo) as well as in slice thickness (5 mm to 3 mm) between the latter and present studies may also be significant in this regard (Filipek et al., 1992).

Overall, it would seem that comparable morphometric measures are being obtained from many laboratories. Most of the discrepancy in reported volumes can be attributed to differing anatomic definitions, with additional contributions from differing imaging parameters. It is also highly probable that, despite varying anatomic definitions, the greatly improved anatomic resolution noted in the successive generations of MRI scanner software will further decrease these discrepancies in future studies.

Validation and Reliability of the Morphometric Method

Measurements in this laboratory, based upon phantom models, indicate that volumetric estimates based upon this MRI-based method of morphometry lie within 5–10% of the actual volumetric values, with average coefficients of variation less than 10% (Caviness et al., 1989; Filipek et al., 1989, 1992). These validation studies with phantoms have confirmed, as might be expected, that error and variation of measurement are inversely related to object size and MRI slice thickness. Error and variability of measured increase with surface irregularity and when the long axis of the imaged structure is parallel to the imaging plane, rather than perpendicular (Kennedy et al., 1989). Error and variation are further increased for objects less than 10 cm³ in volume. These phantom studies also demonstrated that the coefficient of variability is minimized without an associated increase in measurement error by positional normalization of the imaged object prior to segmentation (Filipek et al., 1990).
The reliability of the method has been tested by repeated morphometric analyses of the same young adult brain, imaged seven times over several years on both imaging systems utilized for this study with segmentation performed by a single investigator. In this analysis of reliability, the coefficients of variation of the measures of the entire brain and the various substructures averaged less than 5% and did not exceed 8% (Filipek et al., 1991b). Interobserver reliability in the conduct of similar analyses elsewhere (Jack et al., 1990) has also been estimated at 93%.

**Bilateral Symmetry**

The measured volumes of most bilaterally represented structures are symmetric. The significant exceptions are the larger right cerebral cortex, right amygdala, and left lateral ventricle. These observations based upon MRI morphometry confirms the observation of symmetry in postmortem specimens (Kleckamp et al., 1987) and by computed tomographic-based morphometric analysis (Schwartz et al., 1985). Symmetry among a set of bilateral brain structures comparable to the set considered here has also been observed with the developing brains of *Macaca nemestrina* (DeVito et al., 1989).

In the analyses of Jack et al. (1989) and Watson et al. (1992), the right hippocampus was found to be approximately 10% greater in volume than the left hippocampus. In this study, analysis of symmetry did not demonstrate significant differences. When our hippocampal volumes were recalculated according to the definitions of Jack et al. (1989), the measures remained symmetric, as were those reported by Breier et al. (1992). Watson et al. (1992) also reported slightly larger right amygdala volumes (3%). These discrepancies in amygdala and hippocampal asymmetry may be the result of the differing anatomic definitions used, in particular the anterior boundary of the hippocampus, as discussed above. Further analyses will be needed to reconcile these and other discrepancies that may emerge in the volumetric measurement of small structures by this general MRI-based methodology using the present anatomic definitions.

Volumetric symmetry of structures of the human brain is, perhaps, surprising given the characteristic asymmetry of cerebral surface topography. This is particularly apparent in the asymmetry of the frontal and posterior transverse diameters (LeMay and Kido, 1978; Bear et al., 1986; Kertesz et al., 1990) and the size, relative position, and configuration of sylvian (Geschwind and Levitsky, 1968; Steinmetz et al., 1989, 1990; Falk et al., 1991; Witeelson and Kigar, 1992) and other fissures (Zilles et al., 1988; Ono et al., 1990; Bohm et al., 1991; Falk et al., 1991; Greitz et al., 1991, Rademacher et al., 1992). By implication, then, those developmental mechanisms that result in the symmetry of corresponding bilateral structures must not only be rigorously developmentally regulated, but must also act independently of the developmental mechanisms that govern the asymmetric shape and topographic details of the principal substructures. Indeed, Kertesz et al. (1990) have suggested that regional asymmetries, such as right frontal and left occipital petalas, might result from the effects of a threedimensional "torque" on the two hemispheres during development.

The areas of certain neocortical cytoarchitectonic fields, for example, those of the posterior temporal plane, may be substantially asymmetric in the two hemispheres of the same individual (Galaburda et al., 1978, Jouandet et al., 1989; Rademacher et al., 1992) whereas the areas of other fields are typically concordant in the two hemispheres (Rademacher et al., 1992, 1993). The volume of the right temporal lobe (rostral to an oblique coronal plane passing through the posterior commissure) has been found to be approximately 15-20% greater than that of the left (Jack et al., 1988). The volumetric symmetry of total hemisphere and neocortex suggests that asymmetry of architectonic fields and individual lobes of the brain must be associated with compensatory variations in the size of other fields or lobes rather than with relative variation of the overall hemispheric or neocortical volumes in the two hemispheres. Such compensations might be limited to a small number of fields or to lobes proximate to each other, or they might be more generally distributed among fields or lobes of the entire neocortex.

**Sexual Dimorphism**

The measures undertaken here confirm the general experience, based upon postmortem specimens (Swaab and Hofman, 1984), or by inference from measures of head circumference (Jermigan and Tallal, 1990), or computed tomography (Zatz et al., 1982), that the volume of the adult normal female brain is approximately 10% less than the volume of the male brain. Whereas crude proportional allometric scaling does occur across species, it does not account for dimorphism within species in general and in the human brain in particular (Jerison, 1973). The disproportionate variation in the volumes of male and female brain regions and substructures reported here is not consistent with a simple allometric explanation for the sexual dimorphism.

In the present series, the lower volume of the female brain was found to be dominated by lower volumes of the cerebellum and of the cerebral white matter. The proportionate volumes of the cerebellum with respect to the entire brain and the cerebral white matter with respect to the cerebrum did not differ in male and female brains. The caudate nucleus, by contrast, was not only larger in absolute volume in the female brain but the proportionate volume of this structure, and to a lesser extent of the hippocampus, to total cerebral volume was greater in female than male brains. Although it might be anticipated that the smaller female cerebellum might discriminate between males and females, the differences in the absolute volumes of caudate and white matter, and proportionate volumes of caudate and hippocampus, were also sufficiently large to permit classification of gender with 85% accuracy. No other structures within the forebrain were observed to be sexually dimorphic with regard to absolute or proportionate volumes.

Among vertebrate species, morphological dimor-
phism in male and female brains has been explored principally in rodents and avian species, but also in
gyrencephalic species including humans and other
primates (Goy and McEwen, 1980; Swaab and Hof-
man, 1984). In humans (LeVay, 1991) and in the pil-
fish (Bass, 1992), differential volumes in the rostral
hypothalamus and medullary motor nuclei, respec-
tively, have been reported to differentiate males with
different sexual or reproductive behavioral patterns.
The formal basis of such dimorphism includes dif-
f erences in neuronal or glial numbers, neuronal so-
matic or dendritic size, the richness of axonal arbor-
ization, and synaptic densities (Gorski, 1984, 1985;

In rodents, differential volumes or other morphe-
ological parameters between males and females have
been recognized in the sexually dimorphic nucleus
of the preoptic area (SDN-POA) (Gorski, 1984), the
hippocampus (Wimer and Wimer, 1985, 1989; Wimer
et al., 1988; Jacobs et al., 1990), right−left hemispheric
neocortical thickness (Diamond et al., 1983), the vi-
sual cortex (Guillamon et al., 1988), the cerebellum,
and central nuclei of the amygdaloid complex (Staud
and Dorner, 1976; Guillamon et al., 1988). Stria
tal dimorphism is cyclic in finches and other song birds
(Nottebohm, 1981, 1989). Thus, structures observed
here to be volumetrically dimorphic in the young
adult human brain are among those observed to be
dimorphic in other species. However, in rodents it is
observed that these volumetrically dimorphic struc-
tures are larger in the male than in the female brain.
The principal volumetrically dimorphic structures re-
ported here in the human brain, total cerebellum and
cerebral white matter, follow this male larger than
female pattern. However, the larger absolute and pro-
portionate volumes of caudate and the larger propor-
tionate volume of the hippocampus in females do
not. The larger proportionate volume of the female
hippocampus does have a precedent in rodents (Ja-
cobs et al., 1990). The examples of sexual dimor-
phism that have thus far come to light are in each
instance highly individual with respect to animal spe-
cies or strain and some may be correlated with sex-
ually dimorphic behaviors. Therefore, collectively,
examples in nonhuman species should be viewed only
cautiously as precedents for sexual dimorphism in
human brains.

It has been suggested that structurally dimorphic
features of the human brain are associated with a
greater dependence of praxic and language functions
upon posterior regions in the male but upon frontal
regions in the female brain (Kimura, 1992). Male fetal
brains have been found to have a significantly greater
degree of asymmetry in the striate/extrastriate regions
than female brains, and, generally, tended to have
cortical volumetric asymmetries favoring the right
hemisphere (de Lacoste et al., 1991). In addition, the
right hemispheres in the male fetal brains were, on
average, 3% larger than the left, while the female
hemispheres were either equal in volume or larger
on the left. This dimorphism was most notable in
specimens younger than 18 weeks of gestation, and
although less apparent by observation, was still pres-
ent after 29 weeks of gestation. The human brain ap-
proaches adult size by 4 years of age (Kretschmann
et al., 1986a) and the principal "pruning events" of
neocortical development appear to have occurred by
the end of the first decade of life (Huttenlocher et
al., 1982, 1982–1983; Huttenlocher, 1984; Innocenti,
1991; Jernigan et al., 1991; Oppenheim, 1991). If such
dimorphic fetal cortical and hemispheric volume
asymmetries disappear by adulthood, as implied by
the present measures, the underlying developmental
mechanisms might be modulated by the complex ex-
periential and hormonal environment operating
through puberty, in contrast to that occurring in utero.

Experiment has established that sexual hormones
are critical determinants of volumetric dimorphisms,
and these substances probably have their dimorphic
effects though complex combinatorial interactions
(Gorski, 1984; Toran-Allerand, 1984). Testosterone
acts directly in primate species and indirectly after
aromatization to β-estradiol in rodents (Steiner and
Hutchison, 1990); estrogenic substances act directly,
certainly in rodent species (Dohler et al., 1984; Toran-
Allerand, 1984). It has been suggested, for example,
by Witelson and associates (Witelson, 1991; Witelson
and Nowakowski, 1991) that low levels of testosterone
early in development may retard the regressive pro-
cesses that result in strong lateralization of functions
related to handedness, language, and other cognitive
functions. α-Fetoprotein is an example of yet another
modulating factor that may serve as a critical brake to
the neurotrophic or neurotropic histogenetic effects
of estrogen in mammalian species including man (To-
ran-Allerand, 1984). Other determinants, not so con-
fidently ascribed to gonadal (or perhaps adrenal) hor-
mones or specific peptides, may reside more broadly
within the male and female genotypes (Gorski, 1984;

Summary
This database and the methods by which it has been
obtained invite a host of additional applications (Cas-
cino et al., 1991; Filipek et al., 1991a; Jack et al., 1992).
As an immediate and direct application, the normal
values will serve as criteria for recognizing or char-
acterizing the progression of abnormalities of the brain
in conditions where the abnormality or the pattern of
progression can only be defined by morphometric
means (Caviness et al., 1989; Filipek et al., 1991a,
1992). The application of morphometry and analytic
tools that provide even finer grained regional anatomic
(Jouandet et al., 1989; Damasio and Frank, 1992;
Rademacher et al., 1992) or even architectonic (Da-
masio et al., 1991) localization, in tandem with rapid
imaging methods that offer high spatial–temporal res-
olution of cognitive events (Belliveau et al., 1991;
Kwong et al., 1992), may be expected to support an
approach to entirely new sets of hypotheses in cog-
nitive neuroscience.
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