Electroencephalographic features of chronic subjective tinnitus: A scoping review.

Lynton Graetz[1,2], Mitchell Goldsworthy[3,4] , Kenneth Pope[2], Sabrina Sghirripa[5], Tharin Sayed[1], Rebekah O'Loughlin[2], Giriraj Singh Shekhawat[1,6]

Key Terms and acronyms

EEG = electroencephalography
DLPFC = dorsolateral prefrontal cortex
fMRI = functional magnetic resonance imaging
TFI = Tinnitus Functional Index

[1] Flinders University Australia, College of Education, Psychology and Social Work
[2] Flinders University Australia, College of Science and Engineering
[3] Behaviour-Brain-Body Research Centre, Justice and Society, University of South Australia, SA, Australia
[4] Hopwood Centre for Neurobiology, Lifelong Health Theme, South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute (SAHMRI), Adelaide, SA, Australia
[5] University of Adelaide, Australian Institute of Machine Learning
[6] Tinnitus Research Initiative, Germany, Corresponding Author (giriraj.shekhawat@flinders.edu.au)

Abstract

Objective

The goal of this scoping review is to review the scope of features from previous resting-state electroencephalography (EEG) research that have the potential to be objective measures of chronic subjective tinnitus and presence.

Methods

Using keywords related to resting-state EEG and tinnitus we retrieved studies from Ovid, PubMed, and CINAHL. Studies were included if they met the following criteria: studies utilized resting-state EEG to assess chronic subjective tinnitus symptoms or compare those with tinnitus to control subjects.

Results

We identified and reviewed 81 comparison studies that used resting-state EEG. Spectral power source and electrode analysis were the most common results reported in studies that compared those with chronic subjective tinnitus to controls. Connectivity and network analysis were the third most reported analysis type.

Conclusions

Electroencephalography (EEG) has potential to be utilised as an objective measure of chronic subjective tinnitus, independent of subject reports. While no single definitive EEG marker for chronic subjective tinnitus was identified, emerging evidence from comparison studies indicates a strong impact of chronic subjective tinnitus on network measures and connectivity related features. We propose a pathway to establishing objective measures from EEG recordings. Combining spectral band power, network and connectivity as features and validating them with machine learning classification on large, diverse populations, is a proposed pathway to establish objective measures.

Significance

Idiopathic chronic subjective tinnitus affects up to a 20% of the population, particularly in the elderly, is associated with hearing loss, and lacks widely accepted treatments. Assessing tinnitus, and symptom changes are challenging due to the lack of objective measures of idiopathic chronic subjective tinnitus. This review focuses on the use of resting-state EEG research to identify candidates that may be developed for use in research and by clinicians.

1. Introduction

Tinnitus is a condition in which a phantom sound is heard with the absence of any external source (Baguley et al., 2013). Idiopathic chronic subjective tinnitus (defined as no identifiable cause, and persisting for longer than 3 months) can reduce quality of life (Langguth, 2011), and is highly prevalent, affecting up to 25% of the Australian population, with 7% of working Australians experiencing constant symptoms (Lewkowski et al., 2022), and 10% to 15% prevalence reported worldwide (Baguley et al., 2013). Some forms of tinnitus have an identifiable cause; however, most cases are idiopathic (of unknown cause) and subjective, heard only by the individual. The auditory system generates a phantom perception of sound and individuals report a wide variation of pitch, volume, and tone (Hazell & Jastreboff, 1990; Langguth et al., 2007). Often associated with hearing loss or sound exposure, models suggest chronic subjective tinnitus is a compensatory mechanism for nerve fibre damage and a result of deafferentation of auditory input (Paul et al., 2017).

There is currently no universally effective treatment to relieve the symptoms of idiopathic chronic subjective tinnitus, and no objective measure of chronic subjective tinnitus. Current methods of tinnitus assessment rely on self-report using questionnaires such as the Tinnitus Handicap Inventory (THI) (Newman et al., 1996) and the Tinnitus Functional Index (TFI) (Meikle et al., 2012), subjective audiological measures of pitch matching, loudness matching and minimal masking levels (Cima et al., 2019), and visual analogue scales of loudness and annoyance. These subjective measures are useful, but the development of cost-effective objective markers of chronic subjective tinnitus would aid in tracking changes in symptoms, identifying susceptibility, stratifying subtypes and personalised treatment for tinnitus (Husain & Khan, 2023), and assisting medico legal purposes (Fabrizio-Stover et al., 2024; R. Jackson et al., 2019).

Differences in neural activity among individuals with chronic subjective tinnitus can be objectively observed. Among measurement methods, resting-state electroencephalography (EEG) stands out for being non-invasive, relatively cost-effective, accessible, and requiring no participant input. EEG at the sensor level measures neural signals by recording the electrical post-synaptic currents in the brain's cortex through the potentials generated at external scalp sensors. Source level analysis (Grech et al., 2008) enables the estimation of deeper brain sources and subcortical structures from surface EEG recordings, offering valuable insights into the neural origins of tinnitus. This method has been widely adopted in tinnitus research to investigate activity in regions such as the auditory cortex and limbic system. However, source analysis remains a topic of debate due to challenges such as variability in methodological approaches and the inherent limitations of EEG in precisely localizing deep brain activity. These factors underscore the need for cautious interpretation.

The search for objective measures of chronic subjective tinnitus has led to diverse approaches. A recent systematic review on objective measures of tinnitus by Jackson et al. (2019) identified 21 articles assessing objective measures. The methods reviewed included measures derived from blood samples, radiological scans, balance assessments, and electrophysiological tests. Fifteen of the 21 studies employed EEG-based measures: five evaluated quantitative resting-state EEG metrics, while the remaining ten employed evoked or event-related EEG measures. The conclusions of this review echoed a previous scoping review on hearing aids (Jacquemin et al., 2021), indicating that no reliable or reproducible objective measure for chronic subjective tinnitus has been established (McCormack et al., 2016). Jackson et al (2019) recommended that further research is necessary, potentially incorporating tools like fMRI or EEG, to complement self-report questionnaires in tinnitus assessment Magnetoencephalography (MEG) is a similar method resulting in less noise compared to EEG. A recent review of tinnitus related MEG findings (Reisinger et al., 2023) found initial studies reported increased resting-state alpha and delta band power, suggesting hyperexcitability and reduced alpha variability, although these findings were tempered by inconsistent results in subsequent studies. Increased functional connectivity between auditory and non-auditory networks and in alpha and beta bands was also noted, suggesting auditory regions alone are not sufficient for understanding tinnitus (Reisinger et al., 2023).

Resting-state EEG has been extensively utilized in tinnitus research to evaluate the efficacy of various treatments, including acoustic, electrical, and magnetic stimulation, as well as psychological interventions and neurofeedback. It also aids in exploring neurophysiological differences in individuals with chronic subjective tinnitus (De Ridder & Vanneste, 2021; Elgoyhen et al., 2015; Fabrizio-Stover et al., 2024; Güntensperger et al., 2017; Husain & Khan, 2023; Lan et al., 2021; Lobarinas et al., 2008; Yasoda-Mohan & Vanneste, 2024). However, no recent reviews have summarised the findings from resting-state EEG measures in tinnitus research. This scoping review aims to examine the current literature to identify potential neural markers of chronic subjective tinnitus and chart a course toward clinically applicable objective measures.

Our review was structured according to the methodology of Arksey & O'Malley (2005). The objectives were to:

- Compile research on EEG markers from resting-state comparison.
- Identify resting-state EEG derived features observed in those with chronic subjective tinnitus compared to controls.
- Suggest future research directions to develop reliable clinical EEG tools for diagnosing, monitoring, and subtyping tinnitus.

2. Methods

2.1. Inclusion exclusion criteria

Using a systematic approach to addressing the question, without excluding studies based on quality (Mays et al., 2001; Munn et al., 2018), we followed a five stage framework. Stage 1: Identifying the research question; 2: Identifying relevant studies; 3: Study selection, 4: Charting the data, 5: Collating, summarizing and reporting the results (Arksey & O'Malley, 2005).

The PRISMA-ScR checklist was used to guide reporting (Page et al., 2020) and Covidence (Goulas, 2022) was used as a tool by the reviewers to maintain the workflow and extract data using standard forms. The inclusion and exclusion criteria are in Table 1. This review included all resting-state EEG-derived features, including frequency spectrum measures, functional and global connectivity measures, information theoretic measures and microstates, to comprehensively identify indicators of tinnitus and identify emerging themes.

2.2 Formulating the Research Question

The research question is: Can objective measures of tinnitus be identified using resting-state EEG features in individuals with tinnitus?

2.3 Identifying relevant studies

A research librarian assisted in the development of search strategies using relevant keywords and medical subject headings, focusing on EEG and tinnitus. Broad terms were used to capture as many studies as possible that used resting-state EEG in the evaluation of tinnitus, tinnitus symptoms, and change after treatments. No start date was set. The first study to fit the criteria was 2001 the end date of the search was 18 October 2024. For this scoping review, we selected PubMed, CINAHL, as primary databases for their extensive coverage of health-related literature, aligning with the review's focus on tinnitus and EEG. Embase was chosen to compliment these databases with a broader range of interdisciplinary research.

2.4 Search terms

The search contained the following search terms; *tinnitus.mp. [mp=title, abstract, full text, caption text] and tinnitus.m_titl. and eeg.mp. [mp=title, abstract, full text, caption text] or electroencephalography.mp. [mp=title, abstract, full text, caption text]* on Ovid. The search terms were replicated for searches in the PubMed *("tinnitus" AND ("eeg" OR "electroencepalography"))*. *TI tinnitus AND TI (eeg or electroencephalogram or electroencephalography),* CINAHL (Tinnitus AND (eeg or electroencephalography or electroencephalography)), and Embase. *(((tinnitus[MeSH Terms]) AND (tinnitus)) AND (electroencephalography[MeSH Terms])) AND (electroencephalography) databases.*

We built the search terms using variations of the theme and related review articles.

Table 1. Article eligibility criteria.

Inclusion	Exclusion
Subjective non-pulsatile tinnitus	Objective tinnitus (i.e. tinnitus with a known cause)
Chronic subjective tinnitus	Case studies
Resting-state EEG	Event-related potential (ERP) studies (i.e., not resting-state EEG)
Human studies	Non-human studies
Primary research studies	Reviews
Available online	Methods papers
Available in English	Magnetoencephalography (MEG)
	Invasive recordings (i.e. electrocorticography or ECoG)
	Intervention Studies

2.5 Study selection

The results of the search and screening for eligibility criteria are shown in Figure 1, resulting in 81 included studies from 879 references.



Figure 1. PRISMA Extraction diagram.

2.6 Data Extraction

We reviewed the 81 papers to capture the main EEG features of difference between groups using Covidence (Goulas, 2022) templates. The focus for this review was on EEG measures of chronic subjective tinnitus that were derived from resting-state EEG, and that made their comparison between participants with tinnitus and controls (between subject design). Some comparison studies were between related features or demographics such as EEG differences in gender, hyperacusis, hearing loss level, onset characteristics, sidedness, anxiety, distress and depression,

coping style, loudness, frequency of tinnitus, and the ability to turn tinnitus on and off. These studies are included in Appendix 1 for reference but were not included in the results, comparison tables or figures. Unless indicated otherwise tinnitus refers to chronic subjective tinnitus.

3. Results

81 studies made group comparisons between people with tinnitus and controls using EEG feature analysis such as spectral band power at source and sensor level, sensor and source reconstructed functional connectivity, network analysis, microstates, and entropy (Figure 2).



Figure 2. A histogram of studies using EEG to evaluate tinnitus. Several studies reported both band-power and connectivity results.

The summarized EEG spectral band power analysis of tinnitus compared to controls. Studies using EEG analysis comparing tinnitus to controls using connectivity and network measures are in Figure 4 and Table 2. Studies comparing Machine Learning techniques or using multiple features for

tinnitus classification are in Table 3. Information theory studies are in 3.5 and microstate studies are in Table 4.

3.1 Spectral Band Power Studies

The most common analysis evaluated differences in EEG spectral power between tinnitus and controls, from scalp based electrodes, either at the cortical level (Klimesch, 2018), or in inferred subcortical sources reconstructed from the scalp electrode signals (Pascual-Marqui, 2002; Pascual-Marqui et al., 1994). The power spectra are commonly divided into bands named delta (~1–4 Hz), theta (~4–8 Hz), alpha (~8–13 Hz), beta (~13–30 Hz), and gamma (~30–45 Hz). Numerous studies further subdivide these bands (e.g. low and high alpha, beta or gamma). For this scoping review, we merged subdivisions into the canonical band names as listed above (Figure 3, Table 2 & Table 3). Despite differences in spatial accuracy, for the purposes of evaluating potential objective markers of tinnitus, this review combines frequency-based results using sensor locations and source reconstruction. The data for Figure 4 is in Appendix 2.



Figure 3. The numbers indicate the count of studies reporting difference in spectral power by band and brain region in tinnitus vs. control group. Only studies reporting differences associated with tinnitus improvements of at least 50% were included. All locations are estimated based on sensor location or source location as appropriate. Increases in band power are shown above the dotted line, and decreases in band power are below the dotted line. Only studies that reported statistically significant findings are counted in this figure (quality of the statistics was not evaluated). Most studies reported multiple regions and frequency power differences.

.

3.3 Connectivity Group Comparison Studies

Network connectivity features are network characteristics such as node strength, hubs, edge characteristics and information exchange, as well as a range of other related features (Chiarion et al., 2023).



Figure 4. Count of types of connectivity analysis, most papers used multiple approaches (Total = 20).

The results from studies comparing tinnitus to controls are in Table 2. Functional and global connectivity relates to analysis of parts of the brain that are functionally connected and is evaluated by measuring the similarity of activity in pairs of regions. Nine studies compared network and connectivity across a range of features of tinnitus (high and low distress, age of onset, hearing loss, laterality and tinnitus frequency) are reported in Appendix 1.

Table 2 <> denotes connectivity between: **General Terms:** TN tinnitus, C control, L left, R right, THI Tinnitus Handicap Inventory, **Auditory Pathways**: AC auditory cortex, IC inferior colliculus, STG superior temporal gyrus, TP temporal pole. **Frontal Areas**: FC frontal cortex, VLPFC, ventrolateral prefrontal cortex, FMC frontal medial cortex, dACC dorsal anterior cingulate cortex, pgACC pregenual anterior cortex, CCG central cingulate gyrus, M1 motor cortex, SMA supplementary motor area, IFG, inferior frontal gyrus. **Parietal and Sensory**: PFC parietal frontal cortex, SPG superior parietal gyrus, SOM somatosensory cortex, ITG inferior temporal gyrus, STG superior temporal gyrus, V1 primary visual cortex, V2 secondary visual cortex, IPS intraparietal sulcus. **Limbic System and Emotional Processing**: PCC posterior cingulate cortex, HIP hippocampus, NA nucleus accumbens, PHC parahippocampus. **Attention Networks**: DAN dorsal attention network, INS insula. **Brainstem and Cerebellum**: BS brain stem. **Side-Specific Designations**: LF Left frontal, RF Right frontal LT Left temporal, RT Right temporal, RP right parietal, LP left parietal.

Study	Sample size	Method/comparison	Findings (tinnitus vs. control)
(Mohan et al., 2016b)	TN (311) vs. C (256)	**Source Localized** Lagged phase coherence Weighted adjacency matrices Maximum spanning tree Degree Betweenness centrality Eigenvector centrality Closeness centrality	**Common connectivity hubs** Delta: L, SPG. R, S1 Theta: L, None. R, IPS Alpha1: L, V1, V2. R, V1, V2 Alpha 2: L, V1, V2. R, V1, V2 Beta3: L, None. R, dACC, SMA Gamma: Left, SMA, pre-SMA, PCC2, dACC. R, M1, SPS, SMA, pre-SMA, DLPFC, PCC1, PCC2, dACC

Study	Sample size	Method/comparison	Findings (tinnitus vs. control)
		Common hubs	
(Mohan et al., 2016a)	TN (311) vs. C (256)	**Source localised** Lagged phase coherence Small world network Clustering coefficient	**Small world network:** TN ↓ delta, alpha1, ↑ alpha2, beta1, gamma. **Node strength:** delta, alpha1 ↑; delta, alpha3, beta1 and gamma ↓ **Clustering coefficient:** HC, ↑ delta, alpha1, and in TN ↓ alpha2, gamma. **Local efficiency:** TN ↓ alpha2, beta1, gamma. HC ↑ in delta, alpha1. **Functional distance and path length**: TN ↑ alpha2, beta1 and gamma. HC, delta, theta, alpha1, beta2, and beta3. **Connectivity strength and node pairs:** TN network strength ↓ delta, theta alpha1 and alpha2. ↑ beta1, beta2, beta3 and gamma. **Nodal differences**: TN ↑ delta, theta, alpha2. HC ↑ beta1, beta2 and beta3. **Local efficiency**: TN ↑ beta1, beta2 beta3, gamma. HC ↓ in delta, theta, alpha1 and alpha 2. **Functional distance and path length:** TN ↑ delta, theta, alpha1 alpha2. HC↓ beta1 beta2, beta3, gamma.
(Xiong et al., 2023)	TN (57) vs. C (27)	**Source localised** Functional connectivity Lagged Coherence	TN ↑ beta3, R PHC <> L PCC (Moderate to severe TN) TN ↑ gamma, R AC <> R INS (Moderate to severe TN) TN ↑ gamma, R INS <> L PHC & R PCC (correlation to THI score)
(De Ridder et al., 2023)	TN (50) vs. C (50) vs. Pain (50)	**Source localised** Lagged phase coherence Granger causality Cross-frequency coupling Phase amplitude coupling	TN ↑ theta pgACC TN ↑ gamma AC <> L SMA & M1 TN ↑ theta L & R pgACC <> mPFC TN ↑ gamma L & R SMA <> M1 (compared to pain) TN ↑ theta L & R AC <> L & R PHC (compared to pain) TN theta PHC < AC (unidirectional in TN, bidirectional in pain) TN gamma PHC > SOM (bidirectional in pain, unidirectional TN)
(Vanneste et al., 2024)	TN on vs. TN off (9)	**Source localised** Lagged phase coherence Granger causality Cross frequency coupling	TN (on) ↓ theta pgACC <> AC TN (on) ↑ alpha dACC <> pgACC
(Mohan et al., 2017)	TN (311) vs. C (256)	**Virtual lesion comparisons** Random node attack Targeted attack (full network) Targeted attack (thresholded networks) Rich club node removal Feeder network node removal Local network node removal	TN ↓ path length TN ↓ global efficiency in low frequency bands TN ↑ short distance in high frequency bands TN ↓ path length, transitivity, global and local efficiency for delta, theta, alpha1, alpha2, beta1, beta2, beta3 and gamma after removal of nodes.
(Tsai et al., 2018)	TN (14) vs. C (14)	Dynamic causal modelling	TN ↑ right STG <> SPG ↑ cuneus/precuneus <> ↑ right cuneus/precuneus <> BS all frequency bands except the gamma band. ↑ connectivity, superior <> transverse STG ↑ R side connectivity ↑ R cuneus/precuneus compared to L ↑ parietal <> PFC <> NA isthmus of CCG, thalamus, and BS, associated with the perception, emotion, and attention of tinnitus. TN ↑ extrinsic connectivity to the visual and somatomotor systems
(Schlee et al., 2009)	TN (21) vs. C (20)	Global phase locking Alpha and gamma coupling	**Long range couplings**: ↓ in alpha ↑ alpha gamma coupling ↓ alpha connectivity LF <> ACC, RP, LT RF <> LT, LP, PCC, RP, RT ACC <> LT, RT, LF LT <> LF, RF, ACC, RT, RP LP <> RP, RF PCC <> RP, RF RP <> ACC, LT, LP, PCC, RT RT <> RP, LT, ACC, RF ↑ gamma LF <> RF, RP, PCC, LP RF <> LF, LT LT <> RF, ACC, RT ACC <> LT LP <> LF, RT PCC <> LF RP <> RT, LF

Study	Sample size	Method/comparison	Findings (tinnitus vs. control)
(Lan et al., 2021)	Acute TN (< 1 month) (24) Chronic TN (> 6 months), (23) vs. C (32)	Functional connectivity	TN ↑ functional (phase lagged) PHC <> PCC PHC <> precuneus in chronic but not in acute TN compared to HC or chronic TN.
(Zobay et al., 2015)	TN (28) vs. HC (19)	Functional connectivity (Partial directed coherence, imaginary coherence)	TN ↑ effective connectivity AC alpha and beta inflow to the AC from the global network.
(Li, et al., 2019)	TN (idiopathic sensorineural hearing loss), (25) vs. C (27)	Functional connectivity, linear lagged connectivity, lagged coherence.	TN ↓ FC in CCG <> R PFC ↓ gamma FC CCG <> FMC ↓ supramarginal gyrus <> AC ↓ DAN <> AC
(Vanneste, Focquaert, et al., 2011)	Unilateral left-side narrow band TN (18) vs. C (12)	Functional connectivity, multiple voxel-by-voxel t-statistics, with split half reliability analysis.	TN ↓ theta alpha2 gamma, ↑ theta, left PHC <> right PHC ↑ alpha2, L HIP <> L AC <> R AC <> R HIP TN ↑ gamma, L PHC area <> L & R AC
(Li et al., 2022)	TN (31) vs. C (34)	Functional global connectivity via amplitude envelope correlation	Global connectivity TN ↑ alpha L FP TN ↑ delta LF, L STG, LT, RF, RT, RP
(Vanneste & De Ridder, 2015)	Chronic TN (55) vs. C (55)	Seed based lagged phase synchronization	↑ lagged phase synchronization for alpha 1 PCC <> PHC ↑ beta3 R insula, PCC <> L & R PHC ↓ alpha1 L secondary AC <> L IFG frontal gyrus <> premotor cortex ↓ beta3 lagged phase synchronization between left AC <> dACC
(Pattyn et al., 2018)	TN (with panic disorder), (16) vs. TN (without panic disorder), (16) vs. C (16)	Lagged phase and connectivity analysis.	TN + panic disorder ↓ alpha1 connectivity dACC <> insula, amygdala <> sgACC in.
(Mohaghegh ian et al., 2019)	TN (8) vs. C (8)	Weighted Phase Lag Index Support vector machine learning classification Network analysis	TN ↑ delta, theta and beta1 connectivity HC ↑ average node strength in alpha2, beta2 and beta3
(Ahn et al., 2017)	TN (16) vs. C (16)	Granger causality Cross frequency coupling Phase amplitude coupling	HC ↑ phase amplitude coupling Frontocentral-phase/Central-amplitude coupling Central-phase/Frontocentral-amplitude coupling Granger causal connectivity was centred on the ACC and DLPFC in all frequency bands. TN ↑ connectivity delta, theta in frontal <> AC
(Vanneste et al., 2019)	TN (40) vs. C (20)	Lagged phase coherence Granger causality	TN ↑ phase coherence and the connectivity between the PHC <> AC in theta and alpha1. TN ↓ phase coherence pregenual anterior cingulate <> left HIP Loudness correlated with theta connectivity pgACC <> left PHC
(Mohan, Davidson, et al., 2020)	TN (311) vs. C (256)	Granger causality Network parameters Functional distance and characteristic path length Clustering coefficient/transitivity Inter/intramodular connectivity Intramodular connectivity Intermodular connectivity	Connectivity strength: TN ↓ alpha1, alpha2 Path length: TN ↑ in alpha1, alpha2 Transitivity: TN ↓ alpha1, alpha3 TN ↓ peripheral nodes, L lateralised connector nodes AC <> anterior TN, M1 <> ACC TN ↑ path length alpha 1 TN ↑ in path length from hubs to left STG <> left secondary AC <> right rostral ACC ↑ path length <> right PCC <> right rostral ACC all other hubs. ↑ alpha2 path length <> RT/RP <> IFG <> left subgenual ACC. Hubs in the tinnitus network; Alpha1 Left = ITG, STG, AC Right = PCC, sgACC, dACC Alpha2 Left = S1, SMA, Insula, ITG, STG, dACC, sgACC, HIP, AC Right = PreSMA, sgACC, TP, IFG, VLPFC Strength of connections ↑ Alpha1 Right ACC <> Right sgACC ↑ Alpha2 Right VLPFC <> Right IFG Left HIP <> Left sgACC Right IFG <> Right TP Right IFG <> Right VLPFC Left SOM <> Left STG Left SOM <> Left Insula Left HIP <> Right sgACC Left PHC <> Left sgACC

Study	Sample size	Method/comparison	Findings (tinnitus vs. control)
			Left SOM <> Left AC Left ACC <> Right VLPFC Left PHC <> Left HIP Left PHC <> left HIP Right ACC <> right TP

3.4 Feature-based machine learning

Studies that used either a combination of features for classification, or unique features not mentioned in the sections above, or did not identify the direction of difference, or if they compared multiple machine learning techniques as their focus are summarised in Table 3.

Table 3. Machine learning based studies classification methods and results.

Study	Number of Participants	Methodology	Features/Technique	Outcome
Spectral Frequency Power Based Studies				
(Wang et al., 2017)	15 with tinnitus, 14 controls.	Spectral power, support vector machine and multi-view fusion.	Multi-view-fusion feature classification, 6-view-fusion without Alpha 2 band.	Accuracy: 0.828, Precision: 0.811, Recall: 0.857, F1: 0.833
(Vanneste, Song, et al., 2018)	296 (M), 245 (F), 153 with tinnitus, 264 controls, 78 with pain, 31 with Parkinsons, 15 with major depression.	Current density of all frequency bands at regions of interest. Support vector machine learning classification.	Contributors to the model: Theta, beta, and gamma power at the dorsal anterior cingulate cortex, posterior cingulate cortex, auditory cortex, and the gamma-frequency band for the subgenual anterior cingulate cortex and parahippocampus.	Accuracy: 87.7%, TPR: 0.82, FPR: 0.08
(Mohsen et al., 2023)	20 (M), 9 (F), with tinnitus	Logistic regression supervised machine learning.	Source reconstructed frequency bands (Delta, Alpha), mean total of electrodes	Accuracy: 0.80, Sensitivity: 0.86, Specificity: 0.69
Connectivity Based Studies and Network Analysis				
(Schlee et al., 2009)	12 with tinnitus, 20 controls.	Phase locking and inter-areal coupling	Alpha and gamma coupling (networks)	Discrimination accuracy: 83%
(Li et al., 2022)	31 with tinnitus (20 (M)), 34 controls (13 (M))	Support vector machine, and multi-layer perceptron network.	Phase locking values, Pearson correlation coefficients	Accuracy: 99.4%
(Wang et al., 2023)	187 tinnitus patients, and 80 controls	Multi-Band EEG Contrastive Representational Learning, best compared to other models.	Alpha1, Beta1, Beta2, Beta3 in default mode network. High value electrodes are (Fp1 and Fz), parietal (Pz), central cranial (Cz), temporal (T5 and T3) and occipital region (O1) in each frequency.	Precision: 94.4, Recall: 95.0, F1: 94.7
Other Features				
(Allgaier et al., 2021a)	29 with tinnitus and 13 controls.	Neural Networks	1-second noise-reduced, down-sampled raw data epochs	Accuracy: 75.6%
(Emami & Bayrak, 2017)	6 with tinnitus and 6 controls	Comparing machine learning models in the time domain after noise reduction.	K Nearest Neighbour with K = 3 and distance metric: Euclidean, Distance weight: square inverse	Accuracy: 95.5%. Best epoch is 8 seconds, inverse weighting distance is the best distance function.

(Jianbiao et al., 2023)	10 with tinnitus and 10 controls	Support vector machine	Frequency band entropy values (increased values in tinnitus)	Accuracy: 91%
(Piarulli et al., 2023)	129 tinnitus patients and 142 controls	Support vector machine	Source reconstructed: absolute power spectral densities, relative power spectral density, complexity, inward flow, outward flow features.	Tinnitus accuracy: 94-97-%, Distress accuracy: 84-89%
(Ahmed et al., 2024)	51 deaf patients, 54 with tinnitus and 42 controls	Principle component analysis, feature reduction, evaluated with ensemble learning techniques; Random Forest, Extra Trees, Gradient Boosting, and CatBoost	Frequency band power data set. Extra Trees, and CatBoost performed best.	Precision and recall: ~89% and F1-score: 89.31

3.5 Information Theory Measures

Entropy can be a measure of how much information a dynamic system is carrying in its signals, and coding efficiency, particularly of sensory neurons. Sadeghijam et al, (2021) found increased entropy in a tinnitus subject group compared to controls across all regions of interest, particularly in the high alpha frequency band and beta in the right auditory, right frontal and central regions. In another study using machine learning, delta, alpha1 and beta1 band sample entropy values were greater in tinnitus compared to controls, in the parietal, central and left prefrontal regions (Jianbiao et al., 2023), Table 3.

3.6 Microstates

The brain is a dynamic system, and a microstates analysis attempts to capture the features of large scale network dynamics in the brain (Khanna et al., 2015). The studies in Table 4 indicate that there are differences in cortical activity states and state changes between tinnitus and controls. Microstates are difficult to assign directly to a functional component or network, so the conclusions beyond differences in neural dynamic states are limited.

Table 4. Microstate analysis of tinnitus. A is associated with the regions right-frontal left posterior, B is associated with left-frontal right posterior, C is associated with anterior-posterior, and D associated with fronto-central extreme. > denotes transition between states being significantly different.

Microstate Class	Associations to tinnitus	Study
A, D C D > B	Coverage, Lifespan Lifespan correlated to loudness p<0.016	(Cai et al., 2018)
A B A, B C > A C > B D > B D > C	Coverage, Lifespan, Amplitude, Frequency Frequency Frequency -ve correlation, Amplitude -ve correlation Tinnitus ISSHL vs. controls, Correlation between microstate and tinnitus symptoms Transition from D to C significantly different in tinnitus compared to controls	(Chen, et al., 2019)
A, B, D A, D	Duration Correlated with visual analogue scale of loudness and annoyanceS	(Cao et al., 2020)

Microstate Class	Associations to tinnitus	Study
B	Duration correlated with TFI score and intensity of tinnitus symptoms	(Zhu & Gong, 2023)
B, C A, B, C A, B B > D	Transition Coverage Occurrence All above were significantly different in open eyes transition to closed eyes in tinnitus compared to controls. Transition probability significantly different in tinnitus in open and closed eyes	(Wang et al., 2024)

4. Discussion

This review evaluates resting-state EEG features as potential objective measures of chronic subjective tinnitus. The findings highlight a complex interplay of neural dynamics, with differences in spectral band power, connectivity, and network characteristics across auditory and non-auditory brain regions in people with tinnitus compared to controls. These observations underscore the multidimensional nature of tinnitus and the challenges in identifying reliable objective measures. This section discusses key findings, the role of machine learning in advancing tinnitus research, and implications for future studies and clinical applications.

4.1 Neural Dynamics and EEG Features in Tinnitus

Resting-state EEG studies comparing individuals with tinnitus to controls reveal widespread differences in scalp electrode source derived neural activity, particularly in the anterior cingulate cortex, prefrontal cortex, auditory cortex, and limbic system—regions associated with auditory processing, attention, memory, and emotion (Moring et al., 2022; Ueyama et al., 2013). Spectral band power analyses (Figure 3) indicate consistent increases in auditory gamma band power, alongside variable differences in frontal alpha, beta, and delta bands across these regions (Figure 2). These findings align with recent MEG reviews reporting enhanced alpha and beta connectivity between frontal and auditory regions in those with tinnitus with and without hearing loss (Reisinger et al., 2023). The variability in spectral power differences is likely influenced by secondary factors such as hearing loss, psychological distress, coping styles, and tinnitus sound frequency (Appendix 1). These factors highlight that tinnitus is not an isolated phenomenon but is embedded within broader neural and psychological dynamics (Husain & Khan, 2023). Source-derived EEG measures further suggest involvement of deeper brain regions, including those linked to memory and emotion, indicating that hierarchical sensory integration networks may contribute to tinnitus perception (Sedley et al., 2016; Vanneste & De Ridder, 2012), however, source estimation of cortical structures is an approximation. These complex neural patterns pose challenges for identifying consistent objective measures but also point to potential therapeutic targets.4.2 Challenges in Standard Methodological Approaches

Standard EEG analysis methods, such as spectral band power and connectivity analyses, have been instrumental in identifying neural correlates of tinnitus. However, these approaches face limitations due to the heterogeneity of tinnitus populations and methodological variability across studies. For instance, differences in directing participants to attend to or ignore their tinnitus percept can affect EEG recordings, emphasizing the need for standardized protocols to ensure high-quality data (Adjamian et al., 2016). Additionally, the complexity of matching control groups—given variations in tinnitus symptoms, hearing loss, and comorbidities like depression or pain—complicates the identification of reliable biomarkers. These challenges highlight the limitations of traditional statistical methods, which often rely on predefined assumptions and may struggle to capture the multidimensional nature of tinnitus.

4.3 Advantages of Machine Learning Approaches

Machine learning classification techniques offer significant advantages over standard methodological approaches for identifying objective tinnitus measures. Unlike traditional methods, which often focus on isolated EEG features (e.g., spectral power in specific bands), machine learning can integrate multiple features—such as spectral band power, network connectivity, microstates, and entropy—into a single model (Figure 4). This multidimensional approach is better suited to capturing the complex, heterogeneous neural signatures of tinnitus. For example, machine learning studies utilizing support vector machines and neural networks have successfully differentiated tinnitus from healthy controls and related conditions like pain and depression, achieving promising classification accuracies (Table 3).

Machine learning approaches excel in handling large, diverse datasets and identifying patterns that may not be apparent through conventional analyses. By combining spectral and connectivity measures, machine learning models have demonstrated superior performance in distinguishing tinnitus-specific neural patterns (Althnian et al., 2021). Moreover, machine learning's ability to process high-dimensional data enables the exploration of understudied EEG features, such as microstates and entropy, which may reveal novel insights into tinnitus mechanisms. In contrast to standard methods, which often require manual feature selection and may miss subtle interactions, machine learning algorithms can automatically identify relevant features and their interactions, enhancing predictive power.

Another key advantage of machine learning is its potential for interpretability when paired with explainable AI techniques (Shabestari et al., 2025). Interpretable machine learning models, grounded in theoretical frameworks like the Bayesian Brain model (Hu et al., 2021), can elucidate how specific EEG features contribute to tinnitus classification or subtyping (De Ridder et al., 2023), and predict responses to interventions (Cardon et al., 2022), and progression (Hobeika et al., 2025). This interpretability is critical for clinical translation, enabling researchers to link machine learning findings to underlying tinnitus mechanisms and evaluate and predict the impact on neural

measures following interventions. However, challenges remain, as 7 of the 12 machine learning studies reviewed had small sample sizes (n < 35), limiting generalizability. Larger, more diverse datasets are needed to enhance model robustness and clinical applicability.

4.4 Future Directions and Clinical Implications

A number of tinnitus models have been proposed, (Biehl et al., 2019; Gerken, 1996; Noreña, 2011; Schlee et al., 2011; Sedley et al., 2016; Vanneste, Song, et al., 2018) and it is important to consider the predictions of these models in the context of differences in EEG; the factors that may impact differences, and the outcome measurement methods. The integration of machine learning with EEG-based tinnitus research holds substantial promise for identifying objective measures and advancing clinical applications (Allgaier et al., 2021b). Focused machine learning assessments of spectral power, connectivity measures, microstates, entropy and other non-oscillatory features (Kowalik & Elbert, 1994) could refine our understanding of tinnitus subtypes and neural mechanisms. Recent studies using conjunction analysis have distinguished tinnitus from pain networks based on Bayesian models, suggesting machine learning could further elucidate these differences (De Ridder et al., 2023). Developing interpretable machine learning models that align with neurobiological models of tinnitus is a critical next step for translating findings into clinical tools for diagnosis, subtyping, and monitoring treatment outcomes.

4.5. Limitations

This scoping review focussed on resting-state EEG and comparisons between participants with chronic subjective tinnitus and controls. However, there are limitations that bear consideration.

4.5.1 Quality of Studies

We did not assess in detail the methodological quality of the studies included in this review. A range of methodological differences can alter observed EEG activity (Adjamian et al., 2016). In addition to methodological differences, differences relevant to subtyping such as hearing status (Adjamian et al., 2012), gender, age, distress and depression (Riha et al., 2022) and various comorbidities were also not a focus of this review, but are important for subtype analysis. (Meyer et al., 2017) see (Appendix 1).

4.5.2 Feature Reporting

We sought broad changes in features such as spectral power and spectral density and did not differentiate source reconstructed and sensor-based locations as brain regions. Differences in spectral density may have been absolute or relative changes, corrected or uncorrected (for multiple comparisons) or classifier features.

4.5.3 Type of Studies

Studies that evaluated evoked response evidence were excluded. Neural event response studies are a large area of research, and a large and valuable area for consideration. Event related

potential studies may contain candidates for objective measures of chronic subjective tinnitus (Fabrizio-Stover et al., 2024). Intervention studies were not included due to the impact of the intervention on EEG characteristics, and the lack of relationship to tinnitus measures. This is a rich area of research for monitoring changes evoked by experimental interventions.

4.5.4 Exclusion of MEG and EcoG

The intention of focussing on EEG measures with potential direct translation to clinical use therefore excluding MEG and EcoG research, however a recent review (Reisinger et al., 2023) reached similar conclusions to this review in terms of future novel approaches (machine learning), and methodological standardisation (Adjamian et al., 2016).

4.6. Future Directions

The complexity of identifying objective measures for chronic subjective tinnitus, complicated by its impact on various neural networks, symptom heterogeneity, and individual variability, poses significant research challenges. To tackle these:

- **Model-Based Hypotheses**: Construct studies around hypotheses informed by theoretical models such as the Bayesian Brain model (De Ridder et al., 2023, 2024; De Ridder & Vanneste, 2021), central gain model (Auerbach et al., 2014; Hutchison et al., 2023; Noreña, 2011; Zeng, 2013), or global brain model (Hazell & Jastreboff, 1990; Schlee et al., 2011; Weisz, Dohrmann, et al., 2007). Refining these models has led to a level of convergence of ideas in sensory precision (Hullfish et al., 2019; Sedley et al., 2016), testing the predictions of these ideas with experimental EEG data is vital for progress in tinnitus research.

- **Study Design**: Prioritize well-powered studies with diverse participant pools, employing standardized methods to simplify comparison across studies (Adjamian et al., 2016). The inherent subjectivity of tinnitus may bias participants to be those who find it subjectively worse but may be objectively the same. Designs that include comparison of risk factors that increase severity with EEG features will potentially enable early intervention and severity tracking longitudinally (Hobeika et al., 2025).

- **Statistical Robustness**: Implement statistical methods like linear mixed effects models to manage variance and individual differences (Cederroth et al., 2019; Riha et al., 2020), to account for heterogeneity in tinnitus presentation.

- **Machine Learning**: Leverage the potential of machine learning, particularly with sophisticated algorithms like support vector machines and neural networks, to identify, classify, and track differences in EEG features related to chronic subjective tinnitus symptoms such as loudness, annoyance, and distress (Allgaier et al., 2021; Emami & Bayrak, 2017; Mohagheghian et al., 2019; Vanneste, Song, et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2017).

Utilising emerging explainable AI techniques that combine risk factors and machine learning classification techniques (Shabestari et al., 2025) can assist in the classification of subtypes, and pinpointing opportunities for effective clinical intervention.

- **Sharing Datasets**: Sharing high-quality, diverse datasets is crucial for further validation of these tools. If future research can release anonymised datasets in the open-source domain, machine learning specialists can explore various features and approaches.

- **Future Systematic Review Potential**: Heterogeneity in tinnitus research methods and subtypes remains a distinct issue restricting progress to useful clinical measures of tinnitus. Tinnitus EEG researchers would benefit from future systematic reviews that 1) Target evidence from tinnitus models 2) Delineate evidence for subtypes in EEG and 3) Based on models, evaluate EEG features to specific chronic subjective tinnitus measures.

5. Conclusion

In summary, this review highlights the impact of chronic subjective tinnitus on EEG metrics. Spectral band power, connectivity, and network characteristics emerged as key areas for assessing tinnitus symptoms, separating subtypes, monitoring symptom changes, and aiding in the development of targeted therapeutic strategies. Systematic testing based on theoretical models, using diverse datasets, robust statistical methods, and interpretable machine learning algorithms, is essential for identifying clinically-useful objective measures of tinnitus.

Bibliography

Adjamian, P., Schlee, W., Wallhäusser-Franke, E., Meyer, M., Diesch, E., & Neuroimaging Working Group of the COST TINNET Action. (2016). *On the Standardisation of M/EEG Procedures in Tinnitus Research*. TINNET. https://tinnet.tinnitusresearch.net/images/Standardisation_Report_V5.pdf

Adjamian, P., Sereda, M., Zobay, O., Hall, D. A., & Palmer, A. R. (2012). Neuromagnetic indicators of tinnitus and tinnitus masking in patients with and without hearing loss. *Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology : JARO*, *13*(5), 715–731. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10162-012-0340-5

Ahmed, M. A. O., Satar, Y. A., Darwish, E. M., & Zanaty, E. A. (2024). Synergistic integration of Multi-View Brain Networks and advanced machine learning techniques for auditory disorders diagnostics. *Brain Informatics*, *11*(1), 3. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40708-023-00214-7

Ahn, M.-H., Hong, S. K., & Min, B.-K. (2017). The absence of resting-state high-gamma cross-frequency coupling in patients with tinnitus. *Hearing Research*, *356*, 63–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2017.10.008

Allgaier, J., Neff, P., Schlee, W., Schoisswohl, S., & Pryss, R. (2021a). Deep Learning End-to-End Approach for the Prediction of Tinnitus based on EEG Data. *Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society. IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society. Annual International Conference*, *2021*, 816–819. https://doi.org/10.1109/EMBC46164.2021.9629964

Allgaier, J., Neff, P., Schlee, W., Schoisswohl, S., & Pryss, R. (2021b). *Deep Learning End-to-End Approach for the Prediction of Tinnitus based on EEG Data*. *2021-January*, 816–819. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1109/EMBC46164.2021.9629964

Althnian, A., AlSaeed, D., Al-Baity, H., Samha, A., Dris, A. B., Alzakari, N., Abou Elwafa, A., & Kurdi, H. (2021). Impact of Dataset Size on Classification Performance: An Empirical Evaluation in the Medical Domain. *Applied Sciences*, *11*(2), Article 2. https://doi.org/10.3390/app11020796

Arksey, H., & O'Malley, L. (2005). Scoping studies: Towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *8*(1), 19–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000119616

Ashton, H., Reid, K., Marsh, R., Johnson, I., Alter, K., & Griffiths, T. (2007). High frequency localised "hot spots" in temporal lobes of patients with intractable tinnitus: A quantitative electroencephalographic (QEEG) study. *Neurosci Lett*, *426*(1), 23–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2007.08.034

Auerbach, B. D., Rodrigues, P. V., & Salvi, R. J. (2014). Central Gain Control in Tinnitus and Hyperacusis. *Frontiers in Neurology*, *5*. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fneur.2014.00206

Baguley, D., McFerran, D., & Hall, D. (2013). Tinnitus. *The Lancet*, *382*(9904), 1600–1607. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)60142-7

Balkenhol, T., Wallhäusser-Franke, E., & Delb, W. (2013). Psychoacoustic tinnitus loudness and tinnitus-related distress show different associations with oscillatory brain activity. *PloS One*, *8*(1), e53180. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0053180

Biehl, R., Boecking, B., Brueggemann, P., Grosse, R., & Mazurek, B. (2019). Personality Traits, Perceived Stress, and Tinnitus-Related Distress in Patients With Chronic Tinnitus: Support for a Vulnerability-Stress Model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*, 3093. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.03093

Cai, Y., Chen, S., Chen, Y., Li, J., Wang, C.-D., Zhao, F., Dang, C.-P., Liang, J., He, N., Liang, M., & Zheng, Y. (2019). Altered Resting-State EEG Microstate in Idiopathic Sudden Sensorineural Hearing Loss Patients With Tinnitus. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, *13*, 443. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2019.00443

Cai, Y., Huang, D., Chen, Y., Yang, H., Wang, C.-D., Zhao, F., Liu, J., Sun, Y., Chen, G., Chen, X., Xiong, H., & Zheng, Y. (2018). Deviant Dynamics of Resting State Electroencephalogram Microstate in Patients With Subjective Tinnitus. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, *12*, 122. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2018.00122

Cai, Y., Li, J., Chen, Y., Chen, W., Dang, C., Zhao, F., Li, W., Chen, G., Chen, S., Liang, M., & Zheng, Y. (2019). Inhibition of Brain Area and Functional Connectivity in Idiopathic Sudden

Sensorineural Hearing Loss With Tinnitus, Based on Resting-State EEG. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, *13*, 851. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2019.00851

Cao, W., Wang, F., Zhang, C., Lei, G., Jiang, Q., Shen, W., & Yang, S. (2020). Microstate in resting state: An EEG indicator of tinnitus? *Acta Oto-Laryngologica*, *140*(7), 564–569. https://doi.org/10.1080/00016489.2020.1743878

Cardon, E., Jacquemin, L., Schecklmann, M., Langguth, B., Mertens, G., Vanderveken, O. M., Lammers, M., Van de Heyning, P., Van Rompaey, V., & Gilles, A. (2022). Random Forest Classification to Predict Response to High-Definition Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation for Tinnitus Relief: A Preliminary Feasibility Study. *Ear & Hearing*, *43*(6), 1816–1823.

Chiarion, G., Sparacino, L., Antonacci, Y., Faes, L., & Mesin, L. (2023). Connectivity Analysis in EEG Data: A Tutorial Review of the State of the Art and Emerging Trends. *Bioengineering*, *10*(3), Article 3. https://doi.org/10.3390/bioengineering10030372

Cima, R. F. F., Mazurek, B., Haider, H., Kikidis, D., Lapira, A., Noreña, A., & Hoare, D. J. (2019). A multidisciplinary European guideline for tinnitus: Diagnostics, assessment, and treatment. *HNO*, *67*(1), 10–42. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00106-019-0633-7

De Ridder, D., Friston, K., Sedley, W., & Vanneste, S. (2023). A parahippocampal-sensory Bayesian vicious circle generates pain or tinnitus: A source-localized EEG study. *Brain Communications*, *5*(3), fcad132. https://doi.org/10.1093/braincomms/fcad132

De Ridder, D., & Vanneste, S. (2021). The Bayesian brain in imbalance: Medial, lateral and descending pathways in tinnitus and pain: A perspective. *Progress in Brain Research*, *262*, 309–334. https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.pbr.2020.07.012

De Ridder, D., Vanneste, S., Sedley, W., & Friston, K. (2024). The Bayesian Brain and Tinnitus. In W. Schlee, B. Langguth, D. De Ridder, S. Vanneste, T. Kleinjung, & A. R. Møller (Eds.), *Textbook of Tinnitus* (pp. 189–203). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-35647-6_17

Demopoulos, C., Duong, X., Hinkley, L. B., Ranasinghe, K. G., Mizuiri, D., Garrett, C., Honma, S., Henderson-Sabes, J., Findlay, A., Racine-Belkoura, C., Cheung, S. W., & Nagarajan, S. S. (2020). Global resting-state functional connectivity of neural oscillations in tinnitus with and

without hearing loss. *Human Brain Mapping*, *41*(10), 2846–2861. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.24981

Eggermont, J. J., & Tass, P. A. (2015). Maladaptive neural synchrony in tinnitus: Origin and restoration. *Frontiers in Neurology*, *6*, 29. https://doi.org/10.3389/fneur.2015.00029

Elgoyhen, A. B., Langguth, B., De Ridder, D., & Vanneste, S. (2015). Tinnitus: Perspectives from human neuroimaging. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *16*(10), 632–642. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn4003

Emami, Y., & Bayrak, C. (2017). *EEG Analysis Of Evoked Potentials Of The Brain To Develop A Mathematical Model For Classifying Tinnitus Datasets*. Ieee.

Fabrizio-Stover, E., Oliver, D. L., & Burghard, A. L. (2024). Tinnitus Mechanisms and the Need for an Objective Electrophysiological Tinnitus Test. A Review. *Hearing Research*, 109046. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2024.109046

Gerken, G. M. (1996). Central tinnitus and lateral inhibition: An auditory brainstem model. *Hearing Research*, *97*(1–2), 75–83.

Goulas, G. (2022, June 28). *Covidence systematic review software*. https://support.covidence.org/help/how-can-i-cite-covidence

Grech, R., Cassar, T., Muscat, J., Camilleri, K. P., Fabri, S. G., Zervakis, M., Xanthopoulos, P., Sakkalis, V., & Vanrumste, B. (2008). Review on solving the inverse problem in EEG source analysis. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, *5*(1), 25. https://doi.org/10.1186/1743-0003-5-25

Güntensperger, D., Thüring, C., Meyer, M., Neff, P., & Kleinjung, T. (2017). Neurofeedback for Tinnitus Treatment—Review and Current Concepts. *Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience*, *9*, 386. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnagi.2017.00386

Hazell, J. W., & Jastreboff, P. J. (1990). Tinnitus. I: Auditory mechanisms: A model for tinnitus and hearing impairment. *The Journal of Otolaryngology*, *19*(1), 1–5.

Hébert, S., Fullum, S., & Carrier, J. (2011). Polysomnographic and quantitative electroencephalographic correlates of subjective sleep complaints in chronic tinnitus. *Journal of Sleep Research*, *20*(1 Pt 1), 38–44. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2869.2010.00860.x

Hobeika, L., Fillingim, M., Tanguay-Sabourin, C., Roy, M., Londero, A., Samson, S., & Vachon-Presseau, E. (2025). Tinnitus risk factors and its evolution over time. *Nature Communications*, *16*(1), 4244. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-025-59445-3

Houdayer, E., Teggi, R., Velikova, S., Gonzalez-Rosa, J. J., Bussi, M., Comi, G., & Leocani, L. (2015). Involvement of cortico-subcortical circuits in normoacousic chronic tinnitus: A source localization EEG study. *Clinical Neurophysiology : Official Journal of the International Federation of Clinical Neurophysiology*, *126*(12), 2356–2365. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2015.01.027

Hu, S., Hall, D. A., Zubler, F., Sznitman, R., Anschuetz, L., Caversaccio, M., & Wimmer, W. (2021). Bayesian brain in tinnitus: Computational modeling of three perceptual phenomena using a modified Hierarchical Gaussian Filter. *Hearing Research*, *410*, 108338. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2021.108338

Hullfish, J. a, Sedley, W. b, & Vanneste, S. a. (2019). Prediction and perception: Insights for (and from) tinnitus. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *102*, 1–12.

Husain, F. T., & Khan, R. A. (2023). Review and Perspective on Brain Bases of Tinnitus. *Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology*, *24*(6), 549–562. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10162-023-00914-1

Hutchison, P., Maeda, H., Formby, C., Small, B., Eddins, D., & Eddins, A. (2023). Acoustic deprivation modulates central gain in human auditory brainstem and cortex. *Hear. Res.*, *428*, 108683. Journals@Ovid Full Text. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2022.108683

Hyvarinen, P., Yrttiaho, S., Lehtimaki, J., Ilmoniemi, R. J., Makitie, A., Ylikoski, J., Makela, J. P., & Aarnisalo, A. A. (2015). Transcutaneous Vagus Nerve Stimulation Modulates Tinnitus-Related Beta- and Gamma-Band Activity. *Ear & Hearing*, *36*(3).

Jackson, A. F., & Bolger, D. J. (2014). The neurophysiological bases of EEG and EEG measurement: A review for the rest of us. *Psychophysiology*, *51*(11), 1061–1071. https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.12283

Jackson, R., Vijendren, A., & Phillips, J. (2019). Objective Measures of Tinnitus: A Systematic Review. *Otology & Neurotology*, *40*(2), 154. https://doi.org/10.1097/MAO.0000000000002116

Jacquemin, L., Gilles, A., & Shekhawat, G. S. (2021). Hearing more to hear less: A scoping review of hearing aids for tinnitus relief. *International Journal of Audiology*, *0*(0), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1080/14992027.2021.2007423

Jianbiao, M., Xinzui, W., Zhaobo, L., Juan, L., Zhongwei, Z., & Hui, F. (2023). EEG signal classification of tinnitus based on SVM and sample entropy. *Computer Methods in Biomechanics and Biomedical Engineering*, *26*(5), 580–594. https://doi.org/10.1080/10255842.2022.2075698

Khanna, A., Pascual-Leone, A., Michel, C. M., & Farzan, F. (2015). Microstates in resting-state EEG: Current status and future directions. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *49*, 105–113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2014.12.010

Kim, S. H., Jang, J. H., Lee, S.-Y., Han, J. J., Koo, J.-W., Vanneste, S., De Ridder, D., & Song, J.-J. (2016). Neural substrates predicting short-term improvement of tinnitus loudness and distress after modified tinnitus retraining therapy. *Scientific Reports*, *6*, 29140. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep29140

King, R. O. C., Singh Shekhawat, G., King, C., Chan, E., Kobayashi, K., & Searchfield, G. D. (2021). The Effect of Auditory Residual Inhibition on Tinnitus and the Electroencephalogram. *Ear and Hearing*, *42*(1), 130–141. https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0000000000000907

Klimesch, W. (2018). The frequency architecture of brain and brain body oscillations: An analysis. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, *48*(7), 2431–2453. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejn.14192

Kowalik, Z. J., & Elbert, T. (1994). Changes of chaoticness in spontaneous EEG/MEG. *Integrative Physiological and Behavioral Science : The Official Journal of the Pavlovian Society*, *29*(3), 270–282. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02691331

Lan, L., Li, J., Chen, Y., Chen, W., Li, W., Zhao, F., Chen, G., Liu, J., Chen, Y., Li, Y., Wang, C.-D., Zheng, Y., & Cai, Y. (2021). Alterations of brain activity and functional connectivity in transition from acute to chronic tinnitus. *Human Brain Mapping*, *42*(2), 485–494. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.25238

Langguth, B. (2011). A review of tinnitus symptoms beyond “ringing in the ears”: A call to action. *Current Medical Research and Opinion*, *27*(8), 1635–1643. https://doi.org/10.1185/03007995.2011.595781

Langguth, B., Goodey, R., Azevedo, A., Bjorne, A., Cacace, A., Crocetti, A., Del Bo, L., De Ridder, D., Diges, I., Elbert, T., Flor, H., Herraiz, C., Ganz Sanchez, T., Eichhammer, P., Figueiredo, R., Hajak, G., Kleinjung, T., Landgrebe, M., Londero, A., … Vergara, R. (2007). Consensus for tinnitus patient assessment and treatment outcome measurement: Tinnitus Research Initiative meeting, Regensburg, July 2006. In B. Langguth, G. Hajak, T. Kleinjung, A. Cacace, & A. R. Møller (Eds.), *Progress in Brain Research* (Vol. 166, pp. 525–536). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0079-6123(07)66050-6

Lewkowski, K., Heyworth, J., Ytterstad, E., Williams, W., Goulios, H., & Fritschi, L. (2022). The prevalence of tinnitus in the Australian working population. *Medical Journal of Australia*, *216*(4), 189–193. https://doi.org/10.5694/mja2.51354

Li, Y.-H., Chi, T.-S., Shiao, A.-S., Li, L. P.-H., & Hsieh, J.-C. (2022). Pros and cons in tinnitus brain: Enhancement of global connectivity for alpha and delta waves. *Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology & Biological Psychiatry*, *115*, 110497. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pnpbp.2021.110497

Li, Z., Wang, X., Shen, W., Yang, S., Zhao, D. Y., Hu, J., Wang, D., Liu, J., Xin, H., Zhang, Y., Li, P., Zhang, B., Cai, H., Liang, Y., & Li, X. (2022). Objective Recognition of Tinnitus Location Using Electroencephalography Connectivity Features. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2021.784721

Lobarinas, E., Sun, W., Stolzberg, D., Lu, J. M. S., & Salvi, R. (2008). Human Brain Imaging of Tinnitus and Animal Models. *Seminars in Hearing Tinnitus: Part II*, *29*(4), 333–349.

Matsuoka, M., Mitsukura, Y., & Kanzaki, S. (2017). Influence on Electroencephalogram at the Prefrontal Cortex Due to Tinnitus and Sounds. In *2017 Ieee International Symposium on Signal Processing and Information Technology (isspit)* (pp. 343–347). Ieee.

Mays, N., Roberts, E., & Popay, J. (2001). Synthesising research evidence. In *Studying the Organisation and Delivery of Health Services*. Routledge.

McCormack, A., Edmondson-Jones, M., Somerset, S., & Hall, D. (2016). A systematic review of the reporting of tinnitus prevalence and severity. *Hearing Research*, *337*, 70–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2016.05.009

Meikle, M. B., Henry, J. A., Griest, S. E., Stewart, B. J., Abrams, H. B., McArdle, R., Myers, P. J., Newman, C. W., Sandridge, S., Turk, D. C., Folmer, R. L., Frederick, E. J., House, J. W., Jacobson, G. P., Kinney, S. E., Martin, W. H., Nagler, S. M., Reich, G. E., Searchfield, G., … Vernon, J. A. (2012). The Tinnitus Functional Index: Development of a New Clinical Measure for Chronic, Intrusive Tinnitus. *Ear and Hearing*, *33*(2), 153. https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0b013e31822f67c0

Meyer, M., Luethi, M. S., Neff, P., Langer, N., & Büchi, S. (2014). Disentangling tinnitus distress and tinnitus presence by means of EEG power analysis. *Neural Plasticity*, *2014*, 468546. https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/468546

Meyer, M., Neff, P., Grest, A., Hemsley, C., Weidt, S., & Kleinjung, T. (2017). EEG oscillatory power dissociates between distress- and depression-related psychopathology in subjective tinnitus. *Brain Res*, *1663*, 194–204. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2017.03.007

Milner, R., Lewandowska, M., Ganc, M., Nikadon, J., Niedziałek, I., Jędrzejczak, W. W., & Skarżyński, H. (2020). Electrophysiological correlates of focused attention on low- and high-distressed tinnitus. *PloS One*, *15*(8), e0236521. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0236521

Moazami-Goudarzi, M., Michels, L., Weisz, N., & Jeanmonod, D. (2010). Temporo-insular enhancement of EEG low and high frequencies in patients with chronic tinnitus. QEEG study of chronic tinnitus patients. *BMC Neuroscience*, *11*, 40. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2202-11-40

Mohagheghian, F., Makkiabadi, B., Jalilvand, H., Khajehpoor, H., Samadzadehaghdam, N., Eqlimi, E., & Deevband, M. R. (2019). Computer-Aided Tinnitus Detection based on Brain Network Analysis of EEG Functional Connectivity. *Journal of Biomedical Physics & Engineering*, *9*(6), 687–698. https://doi.org/10.31661/jbpe.v0i0.937

Mohan, A., Bhamoo, N., Riquelme, J. S., Long, S., Norena, A., & Vanneste, S. (2020). Investigating functional changes in the brain to intermittently induced auditory illusions and

its relevance to chronic tinnitus. *Human Brain Mapping*, *41*(7), 1819–1832. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.24914

Mohan, A., Davidson, C., De Ridder, D., & Vanneste, S. (2020). Effective connectivity analysis of inter- and intramodular hubs in phantom sound perception—Identifying the core distress network. *Brain Imaging and Behavior*, *14*(1), 289–307. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11682-018-9989-7

Mohan, A., De Ridder, D., Idiculla, R., DSouza, C., & Vanneste, S. (2018). Distress-dependent temporal variability of regions encoding domain-specific and domain-general behavioral manifestations of phantom percepts. *The European Journal of Neuroscience*, *48*(2), 1743–1764. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejn.13988

Mohan, A., De Ridder, D., & Vanneste, S. (2016a). Emerging hubs in phantom perception connectomics. *NeuroImage. Clinical*, *11*, 181–194. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2016.01.022

Mohan, A., De Ridder, D., & Vanneste, S. (2016b). Graph theoretical analysis of brain connectivity in phantom sound perception. *Scientific Reports*, *6*, 19683. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep19683

Mohan, A., De Ridder, D., & Vanneste, S. (2017). Robustness and dynamicity of functional networks in phantom sound. *NeuroImage*, *146*, 171–187. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.04.033

Mohsen, S., a, b, Sadeghijam, M., Talebian, S., & Pourbakht, A. (2023). *Use of Some Relevant Parameters for Primary Prediction of Brain Activity in Idiopathic Tinnitus Based on a Machine Learning Application. 28*(6), 446–457. Journals@Ovid Full Text. https://doi.org/10.1159/000530811

Mohsen, S., Mahmoudian, S., Talebian, S., & Pourbakht, A. (2019). Multisite transcranial Random Noise Stimulation (tRNS) modulates the distress network activity and oscillatory powers in subjects with chronic tinnitus. *Journal of Clinical Neuroscience : Official Journal of the Neurosurgical Society of Australasia*, *67*, 178–184. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jocn.2019.06.033

Moring, J. C., Husain, F. T., Gray, J., Franklin, C., Peterson, A. L., Resick, P. A., Garrett, A., Esquivel, C., & Fox, P. T. (2022). Invariant structural and functional brain regions associated with tinnitus: A meta-analysis. *PLOS ONE*, *17*(10), e0276140. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0276140

Munn, Z., Peters, M. D. J., Stern, C., Tufanaru, C., McArthur, A., & Aromataris, E. (2018). Systematic review or scoping review? Guidance for authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping review approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, *18*(1), 143. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-018-0611-x

Neff, P., Hemsley, C., Kraxner, F., Weidt, S., Kleinjung, T., & Meyer, M. (2019). Active listening to tinnitus and its relation to resting state EEG activity. *Neuroscience Letters*, *694*, 176–183. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2018.11.008

Newman, C. W., Jacobson, G. P., & Spitzer, J. B. (1996). Development of the Tinnitus Handicap Inventory. *Archives of Otolaryngology–Head & Neck Surgery*, *122*(2), 143–148. https://doi.org/10.1001/archotol.1996.01890140029007

Noreña, A. J. (2011). An integrative model of tinnitus based on a central gain controlling neural sensitivity. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, *35*(5), 1089–1109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2010.11.003

Ortmann, M., Müller, N., Schlee, W., & Weisz, N. (2011). Rapid increases of gamma power in the auditory cortex following noise trauma in humans. *The European Journal of Neuroscience*, *33*(3), 568–575. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-9568.2010.07542.x

Page, M. J., McKenzie, J., Bossuyt, P., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T., Mulrow, C., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J., Akl, E., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M., Li, T., Loder, E., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., … Moher, D. (2020). *The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews*. MetaArXiv. https://doi.org/10.31222/osf.io/v7gm2

Pascual-Marqui, R. D. (2002). Standardized low-resolution brain electromagnetic tomography (sLORETA): Technical details. *Methods and Findings in Experimental and Clinical Pharmacology*, *24*(SUPPL. D), 5–12. Scopus.

Pascual-Marqui, R. D., Michel, C. M., & Lehmann, D. (1994). Low resolution electromagnetic tomography: A new method for localizing electrical activity in the brain. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, *18*(1), 49–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-8760(84)90014-X

Pattyn, T., Vanneste, S., De Ridder, D., Van Rompaey, V., Veltman, D. J., Van de Heyning, P., Sabbe, B., & Van Den Eede, F. (2018). Differential electrophysiological correlates of panic disorder in non-pulsatile tinnitus. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, *109*, 57–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores.2018.03.168

Paul, B. T., Bruce, I. C., & Roberts, L. E. (2017). Evidence that hidden hearing loss underlies amplitude modulation encoding deficits in individuals with and without tinnitus. *Hearing Research*, *344*, 170–182. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2016.11.010

Pawlak-Osińska, K., Kaźmierczak, W., Kaźmierczak, H., Wierzchowska, M., & Matuszewska, I. (2013). Cortical activity in tinnitus patients and its modification by phonostimulation. *Clinics (Sao Paulo, Brazil)*, *68*(4), 511–515. https://doi.org/10.6061/clinics/2013(04)12

Piarulli, A., Vanneste, S., Nemirovsky, I. E., Kandeepan, S., Maudoux, A., Gemignani, A., De Ridder, D., & Soddu, A. (2023). Tinnitus and distress: An electroencephalography classification study. *Brain Communications*, *5*(1), fcad018. https://doi.org/10.1093/braincomms/fcad018

Pierzycki, R. H., McNamara, A. J., Hoare, D. J., & Hall, D. A. (2016). Whole scalp resting state EEG of oscillatory brain activity shows no parametric relationship with psychoacoustic and psychosocial assessment of tinnitus: A repeated measures study. *Hearing Research*, *331*, 101–108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2015.11.003

Reisinger, L., Demarchi, G., & Weisz, N. (2023). Eavesdropping on Tinnitus Using MEG: Lessons Learned and Future Perspectives. *Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10162-023-00916-z

Riha, C., Güntensperger, D., Kleinjung, T., & Meyer, M. (2020). Accounting for Heterogeneity: Mixed-Effects Models in Resting-State EEG Data in a Sample of Tinnitus Sufferers. *Brain Topography*, *33*(4), 413–424. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10548-020-00772-7

Riha, C., Güntensperger, D., Kleinjung, T., & Meyer, M. (2022). Recovering Hidden Responder Groups in Individuals Receiving Neurofeedback for Tinnitus. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, *16*, 867704. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2022.867704

Sadeghijam, M., Talebian, S., Mohsen, S., Akbari, M., & Pourbakht, A. (2021). Shannon entropy measures for EEG signals in tinnitus. *Neuroscience Letters*, *762*, 136153. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2021.136153

Schlee, W., Hartmann, T., Langguth, B., & Weisz, N. (2009). Abnormal resting-state cortical coupling in chronic tinnitus. *BMC Neuroscience*, *10*, 11. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2202-10-11

Schlee, W., Lorenz, I., Hartmann, T., Müller, N., Schulz, H., & Weisz, N. (2011). A Global Brain Model of Tinnitus. In A. R. Møller, B. Langguth, D. De Ridder, & T. Kleinjung (Eds.), *Textbook of Tinnitus* (pp. 161–169). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-60761-145-5_20

Schlee, W., Schecklmann, M., Lehner, A., Kreuzer, P. M., Vielsmeier, V., Poeppl, T. B., & Langguth, B. (2014). Reduced variability of auditory alpha activity in chronic tinnitus. *Neural Plasticity*, *2014*, 436146. https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/436146

Schoisswohl, S., Schecklmann, M., Langguth, B., Schlee, W., & Neff, P. (2021). Neurophysiological correlates of residual inhibition in tinnitus: Hints for trait-like EEG power spectra. *Clinical Neurophysiology : Official Journal of the International Federation of Clinical Neurophysiology*, *132*(7), 1694–1707. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2021.03.038

Sedley, W., Friston, K. J., Gander, P. E., Kumar, S., & Griffiths, T. D. (2016). An Integrative Tinnitus Model Based on Sensory Precision. *Trends in Neurosciences*, *39*(12), 799–812. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tins.2016.10.004

Shabestari, P. S., Schoisswohl, S., Wellauer, Z., Naas, A., Kleinjung, T., Schecklmann, M., Langguth, B., & Neff, P. (2025). Prediction of acoustic tinnitus suppression using resting-state EEG via explainable AI approach. *Scientific Reports*, *15*(1), 10968. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-95351-w

Shulman, A., Avitable, M. J., & Goldstein, B. (2006). Quantitative electroencephalography power analysis in subjective idiopathic tinnitus patients: A clinical paradigm shift in the

understanding of tinnitus, an electrophysiological correlate. *The International Tinnitus Journal*, *12*(2), 121–131.

Shulman, A., & Goldstein, B. (2002). Quantitative electroencephalography: Preliminary report—Tinnitus. *The International Tinnitus Journal*, *8*(2), 77–86.

Song, J.-J., De Ridder, D., Schlee, W., Van de Heyning, P., & Vanneste, S. (2013). “Distressed aging”: The differences in brain activity between early- and late-onset tinnitus. *Neurobiology of Aging*, *34*(7), 1853–1863. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2013.01.014

Song, J.-J., Vanneste, S., Schlee, W., Van de Heyning, P., & De Ridder, D. (2015). Onset-related differences in neural substrates of tinnitus-related distress: The anterior cingulate cortex in late-onset tinnitus, and the frontal cortex in early-onset tinnitus. *Brain Structure & Function*, *220*(1), 571–584. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00429-013-0648-x

Souza, D. da S., Almeida, A. A., Andrade, S. M. D. S., Machado, D. G. da S., Leitão, M., Sanchez, T. G., & Rosa, M. R. D. da. (2020). Transcranial direct current stimulation improves tinnitus perception and modulates cortical electrical activity in patients with tinnitus: A randomized clinical trial. *Neurophysiologie Clinique = Clinical Neurophysiology*, *50*(4), 289–300. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neucli.2020.07.002

Tsai, M.-C., Cai, Y.-X., Wang, C.-D., Zheng, Y.-Q., Ou, J.-L., & Chen, Y.-H. (2018). Tinnitus Abnormal Brain Region Detection Based on Dynamic Causal Modeling and Exponential Ranking. *BioMed Research International*, *2018*, 8656975. https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/8656975

Ueyama, T., Donishi, T., Ukai, S., Ikeda, Y., Hotomi, M., Yamanaka, N., Shinosaki, K., Terada, M., & Kaneoke, Y. (2013). Brain regions responsible for tinnitus distress and loudness: A resting-state FMRI study. *PloS One*, *8*(6), e67778. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0067778

Vanneste, S., Alsalman, O., & De Ridder, D. (2018). COMT and the neurogenetic architecture of hearing loss induced tinnitus. *Hearing Research*, *365*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2018.05.020

Vanneste, S., Alsalman, O., & De Ridder, D. (2019). Top-down and Bottom-up Regulated Auditory Phantom Perception. *The Journal of Neuroscience : The Official Journal of the Society for Neuroscience*, *39*(2), 364–378. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0966-18.2018

Vanneste, S., Byczynski, G., Verplancke, T., Ost, J., Song, J.-J., & De Ridder, D. (2024). Switching tinnitus on or off: An initial investigation into the role of the pregenual and rostral to dorsal anterior cingulate cortices. *NeuroImage*, *297*, 120713. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2024.120713

Vanneste, S., & De Ridder, D. (2012). The auditory and non-auditory brain areas involved in tinnitus. An emergent property of multiple parallel overlapping subnetworks. *Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience*, *6*, 31. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnsys.2012.00031

Vanneste, S., & De Ridder, D. (2015). Stress-Related Functional Connectivity Changes Between Auditory Cortex and Cingulate in Tinnitus. *Brain Connect*, *5*(6), 371–383. https://doi.org/10.1089/brain.2014.0255

Vanneste, S., & De Ridder, D. (2016). Deafferentation-based pathophysiological differences in phantom sound: Tinnitus with and without hearing loss. *NeuroImage*, *129*, 80–94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.12.002

Vanneste, S., Faber, M., Langguth, B., & De Ridder, D. (2016). The neural correlates of cognitive dysfunction in phantom sounds. *Brain Research*, *1642*, 170–179. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2016.03.016

Vanneste, S., Focquaert, F., Van de Heyning, P., & De Ridder, D. (2011). Different resting state brain activity and functional connectivity in patients who respond and not respond to bifrontal tDCS for tinnitus suppression. *Experimental Brain Research*, *210*(2), 217–227. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-011-2617-z

Vanneste, S., Heyning, P. V. de, & Ridder, D. D. (2011). Contralateral parahippocampal gamma-band activity determines noise-like tinnitus laterality: A region of interest analysis. *Neuroscience*, *199*, 481–490. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2011.07.067

Vanneste, S., Joos, K., Langguth, B., To, W. T., & De Ridder, D. (2014). Neuronal correlates of maladaptive coping: An EEG-study in tinnitus patients. *PloS One*, *9*(2), e88253. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0088253

Vanneste, S., Mohan, A., De Ridder, D., & To, W. T. (2021). The BDNF Val(66)Met polymorphism regulates vulnerability to chronic stress and phantom perception. *Progress in Brain Research*, *260*, 301–326. https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.pbr.2020.08.005

Vanneste, S., Plazier, M., van der Loo, E., Van de Heyning, P., & De Ridder, D. (2010). The differences in brain activity between narrow band noise and pure tone tinnitus. *PloS One*, *5*(10), e13618. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0013618

Vanneste, S., Plazier, M., van der Loo, E., Van de Heyning, P., & De Ridder, D. (2011). The difference between uni- and bilateral auditory phantom percept. *Clinical Neurophysiology : Official Journal of the International Federation of Clinical Neurophysiology*, *122*(3), 578–587. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2010.07.022

Vanneste, S., Song, J.-J., & De Ridder, D. (2018). Thalamocortical dysrhythmia detected by machine learning. *Nature Communications*, *9*(1), 1103. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-02820-0

Vanneste, S., Van De Heyning, P., & De Ridder, D. (2015). Tinnitus: A large VBM-EEG correlational study. *PloS One*, *10*(3), e0115122. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0115122

Vanneste, S., van Dongen, M., De Vree, B., Hiseni, S., van der Velden, E., Strydis, C., Joos, K., Norena, A., Serdijn, W., & De Ridder, D. (2013). Does enriched acoustic environment in humans abolish chronic tinnitus clinically and electrophysiologically? A double blind placebo controlled study. *Hearing Research*, 141–148.

Velikova, S., Teggi, R., Gonzalez-Rosa, J., Comi, G., Bussi, M., & Leocani, L. (2011). Tinnitus in normoaccusic subjects is related to abnormal resting activity in cortical auditory brain networks: EEG evidence e/s LORETA. *J. Neurol.*, *258*, 179–180.

Wang, C.-D., Zhu, X.-R., Zhou, X., Li, J., Lan, L., Huang, D., Zheng, Y., & Cai, Y. (2023). Cross-subject Tinnitus Diagnosis based on Multi-band EEG Contrastive Representation Learning. *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, 1–12. IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics. https://doi.org/10.1109/JBHI.2023.3264521

Wang, S.-J., Cai, Y.-X., Sun, Z.-R., Wang, C.-D., & Zheng, Y.-Q. (2017). Tinnitus EEG Classification Based on Multi-frequency Bands. *Neural Information Processing (Iconip 2017), Pt Iv*, *10637*, 788–797.

Wang, Y., Zeng, P., Gu, Z., Liu, H., Han, S., Liu, X., Huang, X., Shao, L., & Tao, Y. (2024). Objective Neurophysiological Indices for the Assessment of Chronic Tinnitus Based on EEG Microstate Parameters. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering : A Publication of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society*, *32*, 983–993. https://doi.org/10.1109/TNSRE.2024.3367982

Weiler, E. W. J., & Brill, K. (2004). Quantitative electroencephalography patterns in patients suffering from tinnitus. *The International Tinnitus Journal*, *10*(2), 127–131.

Weiler, E. W. J., & Brill, K. (2005). Pulsed magnetic-field therapy: A new concept to treat tinnitus? *The International Tinnitus Journal*, *11*(1), 58–62.

Weisz, N., Dohrmann, K., & Elbert, T. (2007). The relevance of spontaneous activity for the coding of the tinnitus sensation. *Progress in Brain Research*, *166*, 61–70. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0079-6123(07)66006-3

Weisz, N., Müller, S., Schlee, W., Dohrmann, K., Hartmann, T., & Elbert, T. (2007). The neural code of auditory phantom perception. *The Journal of Neuroscience : The Official Journal of the Society for Neuroscience*, *27*(6), 1479–1484. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3711-06.2007

Xiong, B., Liu, Z., Li, J., Huang, X., Yang, J., Xu, W., Chen, Y.-C., Cai, Y., & Zheng, Y. (2023). Abnormal Functional Connectivity Within Default Mode Network and Salience Network Related to Tinnitus Severity. *Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology : JARO*, *24*(4), 453–462. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10162-023-00905-2

Yasoda-Mohan, A., & Vanneste, S. (2024). The Electrophysiological Explorations in Tinnitus Over the Decades Using EEG and MEG. In W. Schlee, B. Langguth, D. De Ridder, S. Vanneste, T. Kleinjung, & A. R. Møller (Eds.), *Textbook of Tinnitus* (pp. 175–186). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-35647-6_16

Zeng, F.-G. (2013). An active loudness model suggesting tinnitus as increased central noise and hyperacusis as increased nonlinear gain. *Hearing Research*, *295*, 172–179. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2012.05.009

Zhang, J., Zhang, Z., Huang, S., Zhou, H., Feng, Y., Shi, H., Wang, D., Nan, W., Wang, H., & Yin, S. (2020). Differences in Clinical Characteristics and Brain Activity between Patients with Low- and High-Frequency Tinnitus. *Neural Plasticity*, *2020*, 5285362. https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/5285362

Zhu, M., & Gong, Q. (2023). EEG spectral and microstate analysis originating residual inhibition of tinnitus induced by tailor-made notched music training. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, *17*, 1254423. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2023.1254423

Zobay, O., Palmer, A. R., Hall, D. A., Sereda, M., & Adjamian, P. (2015). Source space estimation of oscillatory power and brain connectivity in tinnitus. *PloS One*, *10*(3), e0120123. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0120123

APPENDIX

Appendix 1: Connectivity differences when comparing between various tinnitus groups or with controls.

Paper	Comparison	Summary of network differences
(Mohsen et al., 2019)	Chronic Tinnitus split into low vs. high (>56 tinnitus handicap index score)	Elevated functional coherence connectivity in the high tinnitus handicap index group between the secondary auditory cortex and the frontal areas, and the parahippocampus and centrofrontal regions.
(Song et al., 2013)	Early onset vs. late onset tinnitus and control groups	Increased localized activity in distress networks and default mode networks, and intrinsic alertness networks. Differences had similar features to pathologies to pain and depression.
(Demopoulos et al., 2020)	Tinnitus with and without hearing loss and control groups	Global functional connectivity changes associated with tinnitus. Beta connectivity may be associated with non-auditory symptoms and different between those with and without hearing loss.
(Song et al., 2015)	Onset age. Early onset, compared to late onset. High distress compared to low distress.	Increased functional connectivity for the late onset, primarily in the anterior cingulate cortex and parahippocampus. Early-onset tinnitus with high distress was associated with the orbitofrontal cortex and dorsolateral prefrontal cortex connectivity. similarities of the anterior cingulate cortex networks to depression networks.
(Vanneste, Plazier, et al., 2011)	Left sided vs right sided tinnitus compared to controls	No differences in auditory cortex connectivity.
(Vanneste et al., 2014)	Coping style comparison, adaptive vs maladaptive coping styles.	Increased activity in resting-state connectivity in the default resting-state networks in those with a maladaptive coping style. Alpha band hyperconnectivity in the default network in those with maladaptive coping style.
(Vanneste & De Ridder, 2015)	Loudness, grades of tinnitus related distress.	Loudness, distress and increase in grade of tinnitus related distress result in the activation of different network connections at different frequency bands.
(Vanneste & De Ridder, 2016)	Tinnitus with and without hearing loss	Two different tinnitus generating network mechanisms depending on the amount of hearing loss, with tinnitus being associated with parrahippocampal involvement and the auditory cortex implicated in tinnitus with no hearing loss. Increased functional and effective connectivity between the auditory cortex and the parahippocampus.
(Zhang et al., 2020)	Low and high frequency tinnitus	Higher gamma linear connectivity between the right primary and secondary auditory cortex and the right angular gyrus in the high frequency group.

Paper	Comparison	Summary of network differences
(Vanneste et al., 2024)	Tinnitus on vs. tinnitus off	Increased theta-gamma coupling between the pregenual anterior cingulate cortex and the auditory cortex. Alpha effective connectivity increased from the dorsal anterior cingulate cortex in tinnitus on.

Appendix 2: Details of the spectral power in tinnitus compared to controls by region and connectivity hubs.

Note reported electrodes were allocated to the nearest region. Both source analysis, and electrode locations are included. ↑=higher power in tinnitus, ↓=lower power in tinnitus, r=right side, l=left side, u=uncorrected. * = Intervention associated with tinnitus change (note only studies that reported more than 50% improvement in tinnitus are included), higher power or lower power are in comparison with after treatment. **=Intervention led to increased alpha + gamma in responders (↓=lower power in tinnitus compared to non-responders). Red and blue are resting-state EEG frequency studies, black are intervention studies. H = connectivity hubs. Green = hubs, red and blue = frequency studies, **black** = intervention studies.

Name of the region	Delta	Theta	Alpha	Beta	Gamma
Frontal Lobe	↑(Weiler & Brill, 2005)*, (Eggermont & Tass, 2015)*	↑(Weiler & Brill, 2005)* ↑(Souza et al., 2020)*	↑(Souza et al., 2020)*, ↓ (Eggermont & Tass, 2015)*	↑ (Meyer et al., 2014), (Riha et al., 2020)r,	↑(Hyvarinen et al., 2015)*, (Riha et al., 2020) (De Ridder et al., 2023)
Supplementary motor area			↓ (Cai, Chen, et al., 2019) H (Mohan, Bhamoo, et al., 2020)	↓ (Lan et al., 2021), H (Mohan et al., 2016a), r	H (Mohan et al., 2016a)
Dorsolateral prefrontal cortex		↓ (Kim et al., 2016)*,r	↑ [45], l ↓ (Kim et al., 2016)*,r		↑ (Eggermont & Tass, 2015)*, H (Mohan et al., 2016a), r
Fronto-parietal cortex	↑ (Velikova et al., 2011)				
Orbital frontal cortex	↑ (Velikova et al., 2011)		↑ (Matsuoka et al., 2017; Milner et al., 2020; Pawlak-	↑ (Matsuoka et al., 2017)	

			Osińska et al., 2013) u		
Inferior frontal gyrus			↓ (Kim et al., 2016)*,l H (Mohan, Bhamoo, et al., 2020), r	↑ (Shulman & Goldstein, 2002)	
Medial prefrontal cortex		↓ (Kim et al., 2016)*,l	↑ (Pawlak-Osińska et al., 2013)u,	↑ (Pawlak-Osińska et al., 2013), u, (Shulman & Goldstein, 2002)	
Ventro-lateral prefrontal cortex	↑ (Velikova et al., 2011), ↓ (Lan et al., 2021)		↑ (Vanneste et al., 2021), ↓ (Lan et al., 2021) H (Mohan, Bhamoo, et al., 2020), r	↓ (Lan et al., 2021)	↓ (Lan et al., 2021)
Name of the region	**Delta**	**Theta**	**Alpha**	**Beta**	**Gamma**
Parietal Lobe	↑ (S.-J. Wang et al., 2017),		↓ (Houdayer et al., 2015),r ↑ (S.-J. Wang et al., 2017)	↓ (Houdayer et al., 2015) ↑ (S.-J. Wang et al., 2017)	↑ (S.-J. Wang et al., 2017)
Primary, secondary & tertiary somatosensory cortex	H (Mohan et al., 2016a). l		H (Mohan, Bhamoo, et al., 2020), l		↑ (Velikova et al., 2011), H (Mohan et al., 2016a)
Superior parietal gyrus	H (Mohan et al., 2016a), r		↑ (Pawlak-Osińska et al., 2013), u,		

Intra-parietal sulcus		H (Mohan et al., 2016a), r			↑ (Velikova et al., 2011)
Occipital Lobe			↑ (S.-J. Wang et al., 2017), H (Mohan et al., 2016a)		↑ (S.-J. Wang et al., 2017)
Name of the region	**Delta**	**Theta**	**Alpha**	**Beta**	**Gamma**
Temporal Lobe	↑ (Eggermont & Tass, 2015)*****, (Riha et al., 2020)		↓ (Houdayer et al., 2015; Schlee et al., 2014), (Eggermont & Tass, 2015)*	↓ (Houdayer et al., 2015)	↓ (Schoisswohl et al., 2021)**,l
Medial or inferior temporal gyrus			H (Mohan, Bhamoo, et al., 2020), l		↑ (Vanneste, Plazier, et al., 2011)
Superior temporal gyrus			H (Mohan, Bhamoo, et al., 2020), l	↑ (Eggermont & Tass, 2015)*	↑ (Vanneste, Plazier, et al., 2011), (Eggermont & Tass, 2015)***, l**
Occipital-temporal cortex	↑ (Lan et al., 2021)		↑ (Lan et al., 2021)		
Primary auditory cortex	↑ (Adjamian et al., 2012), (Pawlak-Osińska et al., 2013) ↓ (Kim et al., 2016)*,r	↑ (Vanneste & De Ridder, 2016)	↓ (Vanneste et al., 2016) H (Mohan, Bhamoo, et al., 2020), l		↑ (Ashton et al., 2007; Ortmann et al., 2011; Vanneste, Alsalman, et al., 2018; Vanneste et al., 2016; Vanneste, Heyning, et al., 2011; Vanneste, Plazier, et al.,

					2011; Vanneste & De Ridder, 2016) ↑ (Kim et al., 2016)*,r
Secondary auditory cortex	↑ (Kim et al., 2016)*,r		H (Mohan, Bhamoo, et al., 2020), l		↑ (Vanneste, Heyning, et al., 2011),r ↑ (Kim et al., 2016)*,r
Name of the region	**Delta**	**Theta**	**Alpha**	**Beta**	**Gamma**
Limbic System		↑(Souza et al., 2020)*	↑(Souza et al., 2020)*		
Insula			H (Mohan, Bhamoo, et al., 2020), l		
Dorsal anterior cingulate cortex				H (Mohan et al., 2016a), r	H (Mohan et al., 2016a)
Subgenual anterior cingulate cortex			↓ (Vanneste & De Ridder, 2015) ↑ (Vanneste et al., 2021) H (Mohan, Bhamoo, et al., 2020)	↓ (Vanneste et al., 2016; Vanneste & De Ridder, 2015) **l, r**	
Parahippocampal gyrus	↑ (Kim et al., 2016)*,	↑ (Vanneste & De Ridder, 2016)			↑ (Vanneste, Heyning, et al., 2011) ↑ (Kim et al., 2016)*,

Posterior cingulate cortex2			H (Mohan, Bhamoo, et al., 2020), r	↑ (Vanneste et al., 2016)	H (Mohan et al., 2016a)
Pregenual anterior or dorsal cingulate cortex	↑ (Eggermont & Tass, 2015)*	↑ (Vanneste, Alsalman, et al., 2018) ↓ (Kim et al., 2016)*,l	↑ (Vanneste et al., 2013)* ↓ (Kim et al., 2016)*,l	↑ (Vanneste et al., 2010, 2016) ↑ (Vanneste et al., 2013)*	↑ (Vanneste et al., 2010) H (Mohan et al., 2016a)
Hippocampal area			↑ (Vanneste et al., 2021) H (Mohan, Bhamoo, et al., 2020), l		↑ (Vanneste, Alsalman, et al., 2018; Vanneste et al., 2015; Vanneste, Heyning, et al., 2011)
Average Power					
Scalp Average	**Delta**	**Theta**	**Alpha**	**Beta**	**Gamma**
↑(Shulman et al., 2006; Weiler & Brill, 2004)	↑ (Adjamian et al., 2012; Balkenhol et al., 2013) ↓ (Hébert et al., 2011; Moazami-Goudarzi et al., 2010; Weisz, Müller, et al., 2007)	↑ (Moazami-Goudarzi et al., 2010)	↑ (Mohan et al., 2018) ↓(King et al., 2021)**	↑ (Pawlak-Osińska et al., 2013) (Hyvarinen et al., 2015)*	↑ (Balkenhol et al., 2013) ↓(King et al., 2021)** ↓(Mohan, Bhamoo, et al., 2020)**
No Difference	(Neff et al., 2019; Pierzycki et al., 2016)				

1