The EEG multiverse of schizophrenia

Authors: Janir Ramos da Cruz[1,2,a], Dario Gordillo[1,a]*, Eka Chkonia[3,4], Wei-Hsiang Lin[1], Ophélie Favrod[1], Andreas Brand[1], Patrícia Figueiredo[2], Maya Roinishvili[4,5], and Michael H. Herzog[1]

Affiliations:

[1] Laboratory of Psychophysics, Brain Mind Institute, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Lausanne, Switzerland

[2] Institute for Systems and Robotics – Lisboa (LARSyS), Department of Bioengineering, Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal

[3] Department of Psychiatry, Tbilisi State Medical University, Tbilisi, Georgia

[4] Institute of Cognitive Neurosciences, Free University of Tbilisi, Tbilisi, Georgia

[5] Laboratory of Vision Physiology, Beritashvili Centre of Experimental Biomedicine, Tbilisi, Georgia

[a] These authors contributed equally

***Corresponding author:**

Dario Gordillo, Laboratory of Psychophysics, Brain Mind Institute, School of Life Sciences, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland

Phone number: +41 76 633 40 47

Email: dario.gordillolopez@epfl.ch

Keywords: Electroencephalography, Schizophrenia, Psychosis, Neuroimaging, Resting-State, Psychiatry

ABSTRACT: *190 WORDS*

MAIN TEXT: *3981 WORDS*

Abstract

Research on schizophrenia typically focuses on one paradigm, for which clear-cut differences between patients and controls are established. Great care is taken to understand the underlying genetical, neurophysiological, and cognitive mechanisms, which eventually may explain the clinical outcome. One tacit assumption of these *deep rooting* approaches is that paradigms tap into common and representative aspects of the disease. Here, we analyzed the resting-state electroencephalogram (EEG) of 121 schizophrenia patients and 75 controls. Using multiple signal processing methods, we extracted 194 EEG features. Sixty-nine out of the 194 EEG features showed a significant difference between patients and controls indicating that these features capture an important aspect of the disease. Surprisingly, the correlations between these features were very low, potentially because each feature picks up a different aspect of the disease. Our results are an invitation to rethink the current approach in schizophrenia research, which is centered on drawing general conclusions of schizophrenia based on single features extracted from one paradigm. We propose that complementing *deep* with *shallow* rooting approaches, where many roughly independent features are extracted from one paradigm (or several paradigms), will strongly improve diagnosis and potential treatment of schizophrenia.

Introduction

Schizophrenia patients show strong abnormalities in many domains including personality, cognition, perception, and even immunology. In many experimental paradigms, the differences between patients and controls have large effect sizes, indicating that important aspects of the disease are detected. This provokes two questions: what do these abnormalities have in common and how representative are they for the disease? For example, patients exhibit strong deficits in cognition, such as in working memory tasks [1], which are attributed to abnormalities of cortico-cerebellar-thalamic-cortical circuits [2]. Patients show

also diminished skin flushing with the niacin skin test [3], which is attributed to dysfunctional phospholipase A2 arachidonic acid signaling [4]. How do the working memory deficits correspond to deficits in skin functioning? Very few studies have correlated deficits with each other [5–10]. The Consortium on the Genetics of Schizophrenia studied neurocognitive and neurophysiological abnormalities in schizophrenia patients with a battery of 15 paradigms [9]. They found that neurocognitive measures shared a significant amount of variance while neurophysiological measures were almost entirely independent. Price and colleagues [8] studied four candidate electrophysiological endophenotypes of schizophrenia (mismatch negativity, P50, P300, and antisaccades). Even though patients *and* their family members showed deficits in each of these endophenotypes, the features were largely uncorrelated.

Here, we took another road. Instead of comparing different paradigms, we analyzed the very same data of the very same patients with different electroencephalogram (EEG) analysis methods. Schizophrenia patients show atypical patterns in multiple resting-state EEG features [11–14,15,16–18]. Resting-state EEG features revealing significant differences between schizophrenia patients and controls are thought to tap into brain functions linked to important aspects of the disease. For example, schizophrenia patients exhibit reduced long-range temporal correlations (LRTC) in the alpha and beta frequency bands [16]. These responses were proposed to reflect excessive switching of neuronal states in patients. Patients also have shown atypical patterns in the dynamics of EEG microstates classes C and D [13,19]. These responses were proposed to correspond to imbalances in attentional and information processing in schizophrenia. Schizophrenia patients have shown increased power in the delta, theta, and beta frequency bands [20]. Increased beta power was suggested to reflect cortical hyperexcitability, increased power in the delta and theta bands were proposed to relate to atypical dopaminergic function, to name a few examples. All these results, individually, suggest that each EEG feature captures important aspects of schizophrenia. But how representative are these abnormalities of the disorder? Does a patient showing abnormal microstate dynamics also show deficits in LRTC, or in other EEG features? Even though all these atypical patterns in

patients are obtained from the same EEG data, no study has evaluated how these EEG features relate to each other. This is not only the case for resting-state EEG studies, but constitutes the conventional approach in schizophrenia research. This approach is centered on drawing general conclusions about schizophrenia based on one paradigm, assumed to unveil common and representative aspects of the disease.

Aiming to shed light on this EEG *multiverse* of schizophrenia, in this work, we analyzed the resting-state EEG data of 121 schizophrenia patients and 75 healthy controls with multiple methods. This allowed us to extract 194 EEG features, such as time-domain features, frequency-domain and connectivity features both in electrode and source space, and nonlinear dynamical features, including many that have shown strong atypical patterns in patients [11–14,15,16–18]. Then, we correlated the features revealing group differences to evaluate how these abnormalities/deficits relate to each other. We also examined whether EEG features show adequate predictive power to clinical scales measuring key symptoms of schizophrenia. Finally, we propose that future studies in schizophrenia research should consider multiple features extracted from the same and/or different paradigms in order to improve diagnosis and potential treatment.

Methods

Participants

Two groups of participants joined the experiment: schizophrenia patients (n = 121) and healthy controls (n = 75). All participants took part in a battery of tests comprising perceptual and cognitive tasks as well as EEG recordings. Patients were recruited from the Tbilisi Mental Health Hospital or the psycho-social rehabilitation center. Patients were invited to participate in the study when they had recovered sufficiently from an acute psychotic episode. Thirty-five were inpatients and 86 were outpatients. Patients were diagnosed using the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders Fourth Edition (DSM-IV)

by means of an interview based on the Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV, Clinical Version, information from staff, and study of patients' records. Psychopathology of patients was assessed by an experienced psychiatrist using the Scale for the Assessment of Negative Symptoms (SANS) and the Scale for the Assessment of Positive Symptoms (SAPS). Out of the 121 patients, 106 were receiving neuroleptic medication. Chlorpromazine (CPZ) equivalents are indicated in **Table 1**. Controls were recruited from the general population in Tbilisi, aiming to match patients' demographics as closely as possible. All controls were free from psychiatric axis I disorders and had no family history of psychosis. General exclusion criteria were alcohol or drug abuse, severe neurological incidents or diagnoses, developmental disorders (autism spectrum disorder or intellectual disability), or other somatic mind-altering illnesses, assessed through interview by certified psychiatrists. All participants were no older than 55 years. Group characteristics are presented in **Table 1**. All participants signed informed consent and were informed that they could quit the experiment at any time. All procedures complied with the Declaration of Helsinki (except for pre-registration) and were approved by the Ethical Committee of the Institute of Postgraduate Medical Education and Continuous Professional Development (Georgia). Protocol number: 09/07. Title: "Genetic polymorphisms and early information processing in schizophrenia".

Table 1 - Group average statistics (±SD)

	Patients	Controls	Statistics
Gender (F/M)	22/99	39/36	$\chi^2(1) = 24.702$, $p = 6.690e\text{-}7$[b]
Age (years)	35.8 ± 9.2	35.1 ± 7.7	$t(194) = 0.519$, $p = 0.604$[c]
Education (years)	13.3 ± 2.6	15.1 ± 2.9	$t(194) = -4.418$, $p = 1.657e\text{-}5$[c]
Handedness (L/R)	6/115	4/71	$\chi^2(1) = 0.013$, $p = 0.908$[b]
Illness duration (years)	10.8 ± 8.7		
SANS	10.1 ± 5.2		
SAPS	8.6 ± 3.2		
CPZ equivalent[a]	561.1 ± 389.4		

SANS - Scale for the Assessment of Negative Symptoms, SAPS - Scale for Assessment of Positive, CPZ - chlorpromazine
[a]Average CPZ equivalents calculated over the 106 Patients receiving neuroleptic medication

[b]Pearson's chi-squared test
[c]Two-sided independent samples *t*-test

105

106 ## *EEG recording and data processing*

107 Participants were sitting in a dim lit room. They were instructed to keep their eyes closed and to relax for
108 5 minutes. Resting-state EEG was recorded using a BioSemi Active Two Mk2 system (Biosemi B.V., The
109 Netherlands) with 64 Ag-AgCl sintered active electrodes, referenced to the common mode sense
110 electrode. The recording sampling rate was 2048 Hz. Offline data were downsampled to 256 Hz and
111 preprocessed using an automatic pipeline [21]. Preprocessed EEG data were analyzed using multiple signal
112 processing methods in the electrode and source space. In total, 194 EEG features were extracted (See
113 Supplementary Table 1). Out of the 194 EEG features, 50 were obtained in the source space and 144 in
114 the electrode space. For source space analysis, we defined 80 brain regions (40 per hemisphere) according
115 to the AAL atlas (See Supplementary Table 4). See Supplementary Methods for details.

116 ## *Group comparisons*

117 We compared patients' and controls' scores for each of the 194 EEG features. For each of the J variables
118 (i.e., 64 electrodes, 80 brain regions, or 12 microstate parameters, depending on the number of variables
119 of each EEG feature) of a given feature, we performed a two-way ANCOVA, with Group (patients and
120 controls) and Gender (male and female) as factors and Education as a covariate. *P*-values for the effect of
121 Group were corrected for J comparisons using False Discovery Rate (FDR; with an error rate of 5%). Group
122 effects' η^2 were converted to Cohen's *d*.

Pearson and partial least squares correlations

First, for each EEG feature that contained at least one variable showing a significant difference between patients and controls (after correcting for multiple comparisons), we selected the variable (i.e., electrode, brain region, or microstate parameter) with the biggest effect size to be the representative variable for that feature. Then, for patients and controls separately, we computed pairwise Pearson correlations between the representative variables of each significant EEG feature. Second, to quantify the overall relationship, i.e., the amount of *shared information*, between pairs of multivariate EEG features, we used Partial Least Squares Correlation (PLSC). PLSC generalizes correlations between two variables to two matrices [22,23]. The *shared information* can be quantified as the *inertia* common to the two features [24]. The statistical significance of the inertia was assessed using a permutation test [25,26]. The inertia values were normalized. Hence, the normalized inertias ($\mathfrak{I}_{relative}$) ranged from 0 (the two EEG features are completely unrelated) to 1 (the two EEG features contain the same information). PLSC analysis was done for patients and controls separately. See Supplementary Methods for details.

Regression analysis

To evaluate whether EEG features predict psychopathology scores (SAPS and SANS) adequately, we used elastic net regression models [27]. Elastic nets can handle regression problems where the number of predictors is relatively large compared to the number of samples as well as multicollinearity (i.e., the predictors are not linearly independent) by combining the L1 and L2 penalties to achieve regularization. For each of the 194 EEG features (with all its variables), we built two regression models, one to predict SAPS scores and one to predict SANS scores. We performed 20 repetitions of a 3-fold nested cross-validation procedure. First, one third of the data (1 fold) was left out for validation (test set), while the remaining data (2 folds; train set) were used to find the optimal parameters, namely the amount of penalization and the compromise between L1 and L2 penalties, using 3-fold cross-validation. The model

146 with the parameters leading to best performance in the train set was tested on the left-out data (test set).
147 The entire procedure was repeated 20 times, with different allocations of the patients in the train and
148 test sets. Using the same cross-validation procedure, i.e., 20 repetitions of a 3-fold cross-validation, we
149 also evaluated predictive performance using a nonlinear random forest regression model, setting the
150 maximum depth of the tree to 10 and the number of trees to 100. Random forests are meta estimators
151 that average several decision trees trained on subsets of the dataset to improve accuracy and avoid
152 overfitting. Prediction performance was calculated using the coefficient of determination (R^2) and the root
153 mean squared error (*RMSE*). The distribution of the prediction performance values was obtained from the
154 60 aggregated RMSE and R^2, across repetitions of the procedure.

155 Results

156 *Multiple EEG features reveal significant group effects*

157 For 121 patients (22 females, 35.8 ± 9.2 years old, 13.3 ± 2.6 years of education) and 75 age-matched
158 healthy controls (39 females, 35.1 ± 7.7 years old, 15.1 ± 2.9 years of education; Table 1), we extracted in
159 total 194 features from the resting-state EEG recordings, including time-domain, frequency-domain,
160 connectivity, and nonlinear dynamical features (Supplementary Table 1). Among the 194 EEG features, 69
161 (35.57%) showed significant differences between patients and controls with medium to large effect sizes
162 (Cohen's *d* varied from 0.463 to 1.037, **Figure 1**). Patients showed significantly reduced values in 24 out
163 of the 69 EEG features revealing significant group differences (illustrated as negative effect size in **Figure**
164 **1**). Patients exhibited significantly higher values than controls in 45 EEG features.


significant group difference
non-significant group difference
ampl total power alpha
ampl total power delta
ampl total power theta>
asymmetry ampl alpha<
asymmetry ampl delta
asymmetry ampl theta<
betw cen e-dtf beta
betw cen e-dtf gamma
betw cen e-icoh alpha
betw cen e-icoh delta
betw cen e-icoh theta
betw cen e-plv beta
betw cen e-plv gamma>
betw cen s-ips alpha
betw cen s-ips delta
betw cen s-ips theta
betw cen s-lcoh beta
betw cen s-lcoh gamma<
betw cen s-lps alpha
betw cen s-lps delta
betw cen s-lps theta
clust coeff e-dtf beta
clust coeff e-dtf gamma
clust coeff e-icoh alpha
clust coeff e-icoh delta
clust coeff e-icoh theta>
clust coeff e-plv beta>
clust coeff e-plv gamma>
clust coeff s-ips alpha>
clust coeff s-ips delta
clust coeff s-ips theta>
clust coeff s-lcoh beta
clust coeff s-lcoh gamma
clust coeff s-lps alpha
clust coeff s-lps delta
clust coeff s-lps theta>
coeff of var ampl beta<
coeff of var ampl gamma
correlation dimension
dfa exponent beta<
dfa exponent gamma
hfd alpha<
hfd delta>
hfd theta>
hjorth complexity
hurst exponent<
kfd beta
kfd gamma>
kurtosis ampl alpha<
kurtosis ampl delta
kurtosis ampl theta<
life time beta<
life time gamma>
lyapunov exponent<
lzc primitive
mean ampl beta
mean ampl gamma>
microstates temporal>
mod index alpha-beta
mod index beta-gamma
mod index delta-beta<
mod index theta-alpha
mod index theta-gamma
node str e-dtf beta
node str e-dtf gamma
node str e-icoh alpha
node str e-icoh delta
node str e-icoh theta>
node str e-plv beta>
node str e-plv gamma>
node str s-ips alpha>
node str s-ips delta
node str s-ips theta>
node str s-lcoh beta
node str s-lcoh gamma>
node str s-lps alpha
node str s-lps delta
node str s-lps theta>
relative ampl beta<
relative ampl gamma
rqa determinism
rqa laminarity
rqa max vertical
rqa rte
sample entropy
skewness ampl beta<
skewness ampl gamma
source ampl alpha
source ampl delta
source ampl theta
spectral entropy beta
spectral entropy gamma>
std ampl alpha
std ampl delta
std ampl theta>
waiting time beta<
waiting time gamma>
ampl total power beta
ampl total power gamma>
approx entropy
asymmetry ampl beta
asymmetry ampl gamma
betw cen e-dtf alpha
betw cen e-dtf delta
betw cen e-dtf theta
betw cen e-icoh beta
betw cen e-icoh gamma
betw cen e-plv alpha
betw cen e-plv delta>
betw cen e-plv theta
betw cen s-ips beta<
betw cen s-ips gamma
betw cen s-lcoh alpha
betw cen s-lcoh delta
betw cen s-lcoh theta
betw cen s-lps beta
betw cen s-lps gamma
clust coeff e-dtf alpha
clust coeff e-dtf delta
clust coeff e-dtf theta
clust coeff e-icoh beta
clust coeff e-icoh gamma
clust coeff e-plv alpha
clust coeff e-plv delta>
clust coeff e-plv theta >
clust coeff s-ips beta
clust coeff s-ips gamma
clust coeff s-lcoh alpha
clust coeff s-lcoh delta
clust coeff s-lcoh theta>
clust coeff s-lps beta
clust coeff s-lps gamma>
coeff of var ampl alpha<
coeff of var ampl delta
coeff of var ampl theta<
dfa exponent alpha<
dfa exponent delta
dfa exponent theta
hfd beta<
hfd gamma
hjorth activity
hjorth mobility
kfd alpha
kfd delta>
kfd theta>
kurtosis ampl beta
kurtosis ampl gamma>
life time alpha
life time delta
life time theta
lzc exhaustive
mean ampl alpha
mean ampl delta
mean ampl theta>
microstates transitions>
mod index alpha-gamma>
mod index delta-alpha<
mod index delta-gamma>
mod index theta-beta
node str e-dtf alpha
node str e-dtf delta
node str e-dtf theta
node str e-icoh beta
node str e-icoh gamma>
node str e-plv alpha>
node str e-plv delta>
node str e-plv theta>
node str s-ips beta
node str s-ips gamma
node str s-lcoh alpha
node str s-lcoh delta
node str s-lcoh theta>
node str s-lps beta
node str s-lps gamma>
relative ampl alpha
relative ampl delta
relative ampl theta>
rqa entropy
rqa max diagonal
rqa mean diagonal
rqa trapping time
skewness ampl alpha
skewness ampl delta
skewness ampl theta<
source ampl beta
source ampl gamma
spectral entropy alpha<
spectral entropy delta>
spectral entropy theta<
std ampl beta
std ampl gamma>
waiting time alpha
waiting time delta
waiting time theta
Small effect
Medium effect
Large effect
−0.8 −0.5 −0.2 0.2 0.5 0.8
Cohen's d

165

Figure 1. Effect size (Cohen's *d*) of the group differences between patients and controls for each of the 194 EEG features. We took the values of the electrode, brain region, or microstate parameter with the largest effect size according to Cohen's *d* (η^2 values were converted to Cohen's *d*) to be the representative variable for each feature. Significant group differences, after correction for multiple comparisons (using FDR), are depicted in red, with dotted red vertical lines serving as a guide to their labels. > and < were added to the feature labels to indicate if patients had significantly higher or lower values than controls, respectively. The non-significant effects are shown in blue. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals (C.I.). A list with the abbreviations and the corresponding name of each feature is presented in Supplementary Table 1.

Correlations between EEG features

To evaluate to what extent features that showed significant group differences are sensitive to the same aspects of the disorder we computed Pearson's correlations between pairs of features (**Figure 2**). As the representative variable for each feature, we took the values of the electrode, brain region, or microstate parameter that showed the largest group difference according to Cohen's *d* (**Figure 1**). Surprisingly, we found that in the patients group only 36.49% of the pairwise correlations were significant at a level of 0.05 (without correcting for multiple comparisons). For the control group, only 26.73% of the correlations were significant. Since significance depends on the sample size, here, we focus on the magnitude of the correlation coefficients (r-values). In general, the magnitudes of the r-values were very low in both patients (0.055, 0.122, 0.251, for the 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles, respectively) and controls (0.059, 0.129, 0.242, for the 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles, respectively; **Figure 2**). Strong correlations were found mainly for pairs of very closely related features, such as between waiting-time statistics of gamma bursts

(*waiting time gamma*) and life-time statistics of gamma bursts (*life time gamma*; r=0.836 and r=0.926, in patients and controls, respectively).



Figure 2. Pairwise correlations between the 69 EEG features that showed significant group differences between patients and controls. Patients' r-values are presented in the upper

triangle and controls' r-values are shown in the lower triangle. Strong negative and positive r-values are depicted in red and blue, respectively, and r-values around 0 in yellow. For each feature, we used the values of the electrode, brain region, or microstate parameter that showed the largest effect size as the representative variable for the correlations. A list with the abbreviations and corresponding name of each feature is shown in Supplementary Table 1.

To quantify the overall *shared information* between pairs of EEG features, which showed significant group differences, by taking not only variables with the largest effect size into account but all variables of the features we used partial least squares correlation (PLSC). For the patients, 55.92% of the pairwise inertias were significant (without correcting for multiple comparisons) and for controls, 40.28%. In general, relative inertias were not very high in both patients (0.254, 0.329, 0.409, for the 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles, respectively) and controls (0.305, 0.387, 0.472, for the 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles, respectively; **Figure 3**). As in the Pearson's correlation results, features that showed strong associations were mainly similar features, such as the same network statistics for different connectivity measures in the theta band, for example, at the electrode level: clustering coefficient connectivity estimated with phase locking value (*clust coeff e-plv theta*) and with imaginary part of coherence (*clust coeff e-icoh theta*; $\mathfrak{I}_{relative}$=0.804 and $\mathfrak{I}_{relative}$=0.826, in patients and controls, respectively).



Figure 3. Shared information between the 69 EEG features that showed significant group differences, as measured by the relative inertia ($\mathfrak{I}_{relative}$) computed with partial least squares correlations (PLSC). The relative inertia ranges from 0 (two features are completely unrelated) to 1 (the two features' values move together by the exact same percentage). Patients' relative inertias are presented in the upper triangle and controls'

relatives are shown in the lower triangle. A list with the abbreviations and corresponding name of each feature is shown in Supplementary Table 1.

Prediction of psychopathology scores

We evaluated whether EEG features were adequate predictors of psychopathology scores determined by the Scale for the Assessment of Positive Symptoms (SAPS) and the Scale for the Assessment of Negative Symptoms (SANS), which target positive (hallucinations, delusions, bizarre behavior, and positive formal thought disorder) and negative (affective flattening, alogia, apathy, anhedonia, and attention) symptoms, respectively. All 194 EEG features exhibited very weak out-of-sample predictive ability to both the SANS and SAPS scores. Results were very similar for both the linear (i.e., elastic net) and nonlinear (i.e., random forest) models. See Supplementary Table 2 and Supplementary Table 3 for details.

Discussion

Traditionally, schizophrenia research focuses on a single experimental paradigm and analysis method showing significant differences between patients and controls, and then tries to derive the underlying genetic or neurophysiological causes of the disorder. This approach has been quite successful in the formulation of hypotheses, such as the dopamine hypothesis [28], the social brain hypothesis [29], the glutamate hypothesis [30], or the dysconnection hypothesis [31], just to name a few. Here, we examined to what extent abnormalities quantified by different EEG features correlate with each other. Many of the investigated features were previously linked to different abnormalities of brain processes in schizophrenia, and, here, we reproduced many of these results, such as imbalance in microstates dynamics [13,19], decreased long-range temporal correlations in the alpha and beta bands [16], decreased life- and waiting-times in the beta band [17], increased spectral amplitude in the theta band [12], increased connectivity in the theta band at the source level [11,14], decreased Lyapunov exponent [15], among others.

238 With our systematic analysis, we also found abnormalities in EEG features, which, to the best of our
239 knowledge, have not been reported yet, namely, delta-phase gamma-amplitude coupling, range EEG
240 coefficient of variation and asymmetry in the theta and alpha bands, etc. In some way, deeper analysis of
241 each feature may have warranted an in-depth study and a potential publication. However, we did not
242 want to elaborate on these methods individually because we wanted to understand how all EEG features
243 relate to each other in their entirety. The surprising insight from our analysis is that, even though we are
244 probing the same signals from the same participants, we found only weak correlations between the 69
245 significant features. The only strong correlations were between features that are similar from the outset,
246 thereby resembling test-retests. This suggests that, even though EEG features reveal clear-cut and
247 reproducible atypical patterns in patients, none of the features is truly representative for the disease, but
248 rather that all these features pick up more or less independent aspects of schizophrenia. Hence, the
249 traditional approach of focusing on a single experimental paradigm and analysis method has its
250 limitations. These results remind us that schizophrenia is indeed a very heterogeneous disease, a well-
251 known fact, which is however not always taken seriously enough because, as mentioned above, most
252 research tries to find the one or a few causes of schizophrenia within one well described paradigm by
253 digging as deep as possible into the underlying neurophysiological and genetic mechanisms. In analogy to
254 botany, one may call these approaches “deep rooting” approaches.

255 We propose that it may be useful to complement these deep rooting approaches with “shallow rooting”
256 approaches, representing schizophrenia within a high-dimensional space, where many tests and analysis
257 outcomes are the basis variables. The outcomes should ideally have large effect sizes, low mutual
258 correlations, and a “flat” factor structure. Whether this is possible is an open question and depends very
259 much on the underlying causes of schizophrenia. On the lowest complexity level, there may be only a few
260 independent causes (or even only one), which were not found yet. Given the heterogeneity of the disease,
261 including abnormalities in the cognitive [2] but also the skin functioning domain [4], the causes need to be on

262 a rather general level, likely subcellular, present in all human functioning. Alternatively, schizophrenia
263 may be an approximatively "additive" disease, where many small abnormalities add up to severe
264 symptoms. In an even more complex scenario, only certain combinations of redundant functions, each
265 coming with at least two variants, cause the disease. For instance, if one function is up-regulated and
266 another one down-regulated in an individual, there are no abnormalities. Deficits manifest only when all
267 or most functions are either up- or down-regulated. In such a combinatorial scenario, it would be difficult
268 to find the underlying causes since each variant itself does not lead to a deficit; only certain combinations
269 do. Our correlation analysis provides evidence supporting the more complex/multifactorial scenario,
270 where each feature makes up its own factor and manifests differently in different patients. Since our data
271 shows that each EEG feature is sensitive to roughly independent aspects of schizophrenia, each brain
272 process captured by the analysis methods might be neither necessary nor sufficient to explain important
273 aspects of the disease. Indeed, we found that EEG features showed very weak predictive power to key
274 symptoms of schizophrenia, suggesting that there is little information about individual differences in
275 psychopathology. Our results are an invitation to rethink the current approach in schizophrenia research
276 and suggest that new study designs conflating multiple features from the same and different paradigms
277 are more adequate, since they are more aligned with the heterogeneity of the disorder. In the next steps,
278 it will be important to find the right set of features, which may stem from cognitive tests but also
279 potentially immunological markers, of which each may contribute with a variety of features. Previous
280 research has shown that combining features improved classification and predictive performance in
281 psychosis studies [32,33].

282 Our study has several limitations. There are demographic differences between patients and controls,
283 which might affect our group comparisons. However, we attempted to minimize these demographic
284 effects by using education as a covariate and gender as factor in the analyses. Similarly, we cannot exclude
285 effects of medication in our results. Nonetheless, we find similar patterns of correlations between EEG

286 features, i.e., weak associations, in both patients and controls, suggesting that if there is an effect of
287 medication, it is small. Further, our sample size is relatively small for achieving reliable estimates of
288 predictive power [34–36].

289 Our results may explain a deep mystery in schizophrenia research. Schizophrenia has an estimated
290 heritability of 70 to 85% [37]. For example, the chance to also suffer from schizophrenia for monozygotic
291 twins is about 33% when the partner twin has the disease [38]. Furthermore, about 0.25 to 0.75% people of
292 a population suffer from schizophrenia and related psychotic disorders [39–41]. These values are rather stable
293 across cultures [42]. Given that schizophrenia patients have less offspring [43–46], this provokes the question
294 why schizophrenia has not been extinguished during the course of evolution [45,47]. In the above-mentioned
295 combinatorial scenario with many redundant functions this may simply happen because evolution
296 operates on the individual single-nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) level and not on the combinatorial one.
297 As long as most of the population shows average functioning, there will be no change of the allele
298 distributions. In the additive scenario, evolution may extinct harmful alleles, of which each constitutes
299 only a little risk, very slowly and these may be replaced by harmful de novo mutations [45]. To what extent
300 such considerations hold true will be shown by shallow rooting approaches using a plethora of paradigms
301 and a multiverse of analysis methods. In a nutshell, deep rooting will help to understand the different
302 aspects of the disorder, while shallow rooting will help to better diagnose schizophrenia by finding
303 subpopulations, leading to more personalized treatment.

304 Acknowledgements

305 We would like to thank Marc Repnow for his comments and Ben Lönnqvist for proofreading the
306 manuscript. M.H.H., E.C., A.B., and M.R. designed the research; M.R. and E.C. performed the research;
307 J.R.C., D.G., W.H.L., and O.F. analyzed data; J.R.C., D.G., O.F. A.B., P.F., and M.H.H. wrote the paper. Data

of 101 patients and 75 controls have already been published in different contexts [13,48–50]. The code that support the findings of this study are available upon request. The authors declare no competing interests.

Funding

This work was partially funded by the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia under grant FCT PD/BD/105785/2014 and the National Centre of Competence in Research (NCCR) Synapsy financed by the Swiss National Science Foundation under grant 51NF40-185897.

References

1. Meyer-Lindenberg A, Poline J-B, Kohn PD, et al. Evidence for Abnormal Cortical Functional Connectivity During Working Memory in Schizophrenia. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2001;158(11):1809-1817. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.158.11.1809

2. Andreasen NC, Paradiso S, O'Leary DS. "Cognitive Dysmetria" as an Integrative Theory of Schizophrenia: A Dysfunction in Cortical-Subcortical-Cerebellar Circuitry? *Schizophr Bull*. 1998;24(2):203-218. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.schbul.a033321

3. Rybakowski J, Weterle R. Niacin test in schizophrenia and affective illness. *Biol Psychiatry*. 1991;29(8):834-836. doi:10.1016/0006-3223(91)90202-W

4. Messamore E. Niacin subsensitivity is associated with functional impairment in schizophrenia. *Schizophr Res*. 2012;137(1-3):180-184. doi:10.1016/j.schres.2012.03.001

5. Braff DL, Freedman R, Schork NJ, Gottesman II. Deconstructing Schizophrenia: An Overview of the Use of Endophenotypes in Order to Understand a Complex Disorder. *Schizophr Bull*. 2007;33(1):21-32. doi:10.1093/schbul/sbl049

6. Braff DL, Light GA, Swerdlow NR. Prepulse Inhibition and P50 Suppression Are Both Deficient but not Correlated in Schizophrenia Patients. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2007;61(10):1204-1207. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2006.08.015

7. Dickinson D, Goldberg TE, Gold JM, Elvevag B, Weinberger DR. Cognitive Factor Structure and Invariance in People With Schizophrenia, Their Unaffected Siblings, and Controls. *Schizophr Bull*. 2011;37(6):1157-1167. doi:10.1093/schbul/sbq018

8. Price GW, Michie PT, Johnston J, et al. A Multivariate Electrophysiological Endophenotype, from a Unitary Cohort, Shows Greater Research Utility than Any Single Feature in the Western Australian Family Study of Schizophrenia. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2006;60(1):1-10. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2005.09.010

9. Seidman LJ, Hellemann G, Nuechterlein KH, et al. Factor structure and heritability of endophenotypes in schizophrenia: Findings from the Consortium on the Genetics of Schizophrenia (COGS-1). *Schizophr Res*. 2015;163(1):73-79. doi:10.1016/j.schres.2015.01.027

10. Toomey R, Faraone SV, Seidman LJ, Kremen WS, Pepple JR, Tsuang MT. Association of neuropsychological vulnerability markers in relatives of schizophrenic patients. *Schizophr Res*. 1998;31(2-3):89-98. doi:10.1016/S0920-9964(98)00025-5

11. Andreou C, Leicht G, Nolte G, et al. Resting-state theta-band connectivity and verbal memory in schizophrenia and in the high-risk state. *Schizophr Res*. 2015;161(2-3):299-307. doi:10.1016/j.schres.2014.12.018

12. Boutros NN, Arfken C, Galderisi S, Warrick J, Pratt G, Iacono W. The status of spectral EEG abnormality as a diagnostic test for schizophrenia. *Schizophr Res*. 2008;99(1–3):225-237. doi:10.1016/j.schres.2007.11.020

13. da Cruz JR, Favrod O, Roinishvili M, et al. EEG microstates are a candidate endophenotype for schizophrenia. *Nat Commun*. 2020;11. doi:10.1038/s41467-020-16914-1

14. Di Lorenzo G, Daverio A, Ferrentino F, et al. Altered resting-state EEG source functional connectivity in schizophrenia: the effect of illness duration. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2015;9. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2015.00234

15. Kim D-J, Jeong J, Chae J-H, et al. An estimation of the first positive Lyapunov exponent of the EEG in patients with schizophrenia. *Psychiatry Res Neuroimaging*. 2000;98(3):177-189. doi:10.1016/S0925-4927(00)00052-4

16. Nikulin VV, Jönsson EG, Brismar T. Attenuation of long-range temporal correlations in the amplitude dynamics of alpha and beta neuronal oscillations in patients with schizophrenia. *NeuroImage*. 2012;61(1):162-169. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.03.008

17. Sun J, Tang Y, Lim KO, et al. Abnormal Dynamics of EEG Oscillations in Schizophrenia Patients on Multiple Time Scales. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng*. 2014;61(6):1756-1764. doi:10.1109/TBME.2014.2306424

18. Uhlhaas PJ, Singer W. Abnormal neural oscillations and synchrony in schizophrenia. *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2010;11(2):100-113. doi:10.1038/nrn2774

19. Rieger K, Diaz Hernandez L, Baenninger A, Koenig T. 15 Years of Microstate Research in Schizophrenia – Where Are We? A Meta-Analysis. *Front Psychiatry*. 2016;7. doi:10.3389/fpsyt.2016.00022

20. Venables NC, Bernat EM, Sponheim SR. Genetic and Disorder-Specific Aspects of Resting State EEG Abnormalities in Schizophrenia. *Schizophr Bull*. 2009;35(4):826-839. doi:10.1093/schbul/sbn021

21. da Cruz JR, Chicherov V, Herzog MH, Figueiredo P. An automatic pre-processing pipeline for EEG analysis (APP) based on robust statistics. *Clin Neurophysiol*. 2018;129(7):1427-1437. doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2018.04.600

22. McIntosh AR, Bookstein FL, Haxby JV, Grady CL. Spatial Pattern Analysis of Functional Brain Images Using Partial Least Squares. *NeuroImage*. 1996;3(3):143-157. doi:10.1006/nimg.1996.0016

23. Tucker LR. An inter-battery method of factor analysis. *Psychometrika*. 1958;23(2):111-136. doi:10.1007/BF02289009

24. Krishnan A, Williams LJ, McIntosh AR, Abdi H. Partial Least Squares (PLS) methods for neuroimaging: A tutorial and review. *NeuroImage*. 2011;56(2):455-475. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.07.034

25. Abdi H, Williams LJ. Partial Least Squares Methods: Partial Least Squares Correlation and Partial Least Square Regression. In: Reisfeld B, Mayeno AN, eds. *Computational Toxicology*. Vol 930. Methods in Molecular Biology. Humana Press; 2013:549-579. doi:10.1007/978-1-62703-059-5_23

26. McIntosh AR, Chau WK, Protzner AB. Spatiotemporal analysis of event-related fMRI data using partial least squares. *NeuroImage*. 2004;23(2):764-775. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2004.05.018

27. Zou H, Hastie T. Regularization and variable selection via the elastic net. *J R Stat Soc Ser B Stat Methodol*. 2005;67(2):301-320. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9868.2005.00503.x

28. Howes OD, Kapur S. The Dopamine Hypothesis of Schizophrenia: Version III--The Final Common Pathway. *Schizophr Bull*. 2009;35(3):549-562. doi:10.1093/schbul/sbp006

29. Burns J. The social brain hypothesis of schizophrenia. *World Psychiatry Off J World Psychiatr Assoc WPA*. 2006;5(2):77-81.

30. Hu W, MacDonald ML, Elswick DE, Sweet RA. The glutamate hypothesis of schizophrenia: evidence from human brain tissue studies. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*. 2015;1338:38-57. doi:10.1111/nyas.12547

31. Friston K, Brown HR, Siemerkus J, Stephan KE. The dysconnection hypothesis (2016). *Schizophr Res*. 2016;176(2-3):83-94. doi:10.1016/j.schres.2016.07.014

32. Mothi SS, Sudarshan M, Tandon N, et al. Machine learning improved classification of psychoses using clinical and biological stratification: Update from the bipolar-schizophrenia network for intermediate phenotypes (B-SNIP). *Schizophr Res*. 2019;214:60-69. doi:10.1016/j.schres.2018.04.037

33. Yang H, Liu J, Sui J, Pearlson G, Calhoun VD. A Hybrid Machine Learning Method for Fusing fMRI and Genetic Data: Combining both Improves Classification of Schizophrenia. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2010;4. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2010.00192

34. Poldrack RA, Huckins G, Varoquaux G. Establishment of Best Practices for Evidence for Prediction: A Review. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2020;77(5):534. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2019.3671

35. Schnack HG, Kahn RS. Detecting Neuroimaging Biomarkers for Psychiatric Disorders: Sample Size Matters. *Front Psychiatry*. 2016;7. doi:10.3389/fpsyt.2016.00050

36. Varoquaux G. Cross-validation failure: Small sample sizes lead to large error bars. *NeuroImage*. 2018;180:68-77. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2017.06.061

407 37. Burmeister M, McInnis MG, Zöllner S. Psychiatric genetics: progress amid controversy. *Nat Rev*
408 *Genet*. 2008;9(7):527-540. doi:10.1038/nrg2381

409 38. Hilker R, Helenius D, Fagerlund B, et al. Heritability of Schizophrenia and Schizophrenia Spectrum
410 Based on the Nationwide Danish Twin Register. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2018;83(6):492-498.
411 doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2017.08.017

412 39. Kessler RC, Birnbaum H, Demler O, et al. The prevalence and correlates of nonaffective psychosis in
413 the National Comorbidity Survey Replication (NCS-R). *Biol Psychiatry*. 2005;58(8):668-676.
414 doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2005.04.034

415 40. Moreno-Küstner B, Martín C, Pastor L. Prevalence of psychotic disorders and its association with
416 methodological issues. A systematic review and meta-analyses. *PLOS ONE*. 2018;13(4):e0195687.
417 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0195687

418 41. Saha S, Chant D, Welham J, McGrath J. A systematic review of the prevalence of schizophrenia. *PLoS*
419 *Med*. 2005;2(5):e141. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0020141

420 42. Simeone JC, Ward AJ, Rotella P, Collins J, Windisch R. An evaluation of variation in published
421 estimates of schizophrenia prevalence from 1990–2013: a systematic literature review. *BMC*
422 *Psychiatry*. 2015;15(1). doi:10.1186/s12888-015-0578-7

423 43. Avila M, Thaker G, Adami H. Genetic epidemiology and schizophrenia: a study of reproductive
424 fitness. *Schizophr Res*. 2001;47(2-3):233-241. doi:10.1016/S0920-9964(00)00062-1

425 44. Bassett AS, Bury A, Hodgkinson KA, Honer WG. Reproductive fitness in familial schizophrenia.
426 *Schizophr Res*. 1996;21(3):151-160. doi:10.1016/0920-9964(96)00018-7

427 45. Keller MC, Miller G. Resolving the paradox of common, harmful, heritable mental disorders: Which
428 evolutionary genetic models work best? *Behav Brain Sci*. 2006;29(4):385-404.
429 doi:10.1017/S0140525X06009095

430 46. MacCabe JH, Koupil I, Leon DA. Lifetime reproductive output over two generations in patients with
431 psychosis and their unaffected siblings: the Uppsala 1915–1929 Birth Cohort Multigenerational
432 Study. *Psychol Med*. 2009;39(10):1667. doi:10.1017/S0033291709005431

433 47. Liu C, Everall I, Pantelis C, Bousman C. Interrogating the Evolutionary Paradox of Schizophrenia: A
434 Novel Framework and Evidence Supporting Recent Negative Selection of Schizophrenia Risk Alleles.
435 *Front Genet*. 2019;10. doi:10.3389/fgene.2019.00389

436 48. da Cruz JR, Shaqiri A, Roinishvili M, et al. Neural Compensation Mechanisms of Siblings of
437 Schizophrenia Patients as Revealed by High-Density EEG. *Schizophr Bull*. 2020;46(4):1009-1018.
438 doi:10.1093/schbul/sbz133

439 49. Favrod O, Roinishvili M, da Cruz JR, et al. Electrophysiological correlates of visual backward masking
440 in patients with first episode psychosis. *Psychiatry Res Neuroimaging*. 2018;282:64-72.
441 doi:10.1016/j.pscychresns.2018.10.008

50. Garobbio SA, Roinishvili M, Favrod O, et al. *Electrophysiological Correlates of Visual Backward Masking in Patients with Bipolar Disorder*. Neuroscience; 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.12.090407