A scoping review on electroencephalography for objective measures of tinnitus with potential for clinical application.

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
rTMS = repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation
DLPFC = dorsolateral prefrontal cortex
tDCS = transcranial Direct Current Stimulation
tRNS = transcranial Random Noise Stimulation
tACS = transcranial Alternating Current Stimulation
fMRI = functional magnetic resonance imaging

[1] Flinders University Australia, College of Education, Psychology and Social Work
[2] Flinders University Australia, College of Science and Engineering
[3] School of Biomedicine, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, 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 identify features from previous resting-state electroencephalography (EEG) research that have the potential to be objective measures of tinnitus presence, and symptom tracking.

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: 1) studies utilized resting-state EEG to assess tinnitus symptoms or compare tinnitus patients with controls, or 2) studies used resting state EEG to evaluate intervention treatments for tinnitus.

Results

We identified 129 studies, including 81 comparison studies and 48 intervention studies that used resting-state EEG. Spectral frequency were the most common results reported in studies that compared tinnitus to healthy controls, and in intervention studies. Connectivity and network analysis were the third most reported analysis type.

Conclusions

Electroencephalography (EEG) has potential to be utilised as an objective measure of tinnitus, independent of subject reports. While no single definitive EEG marker for tinnitus was identified, emerging evidence from comparison and intervention studies indicates a strong impact of 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 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 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). Chronic tinnitus 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 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 tinnitus, and no objective measure of tinnitus (R. Jackson et al., 2019). 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 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 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 measures neural signals by recording the electrical post-synaptic currents in the brain’s cortex through the potentials generated at external scalp sensors (A. F. Jackson & Bolger, 2014).

The search for objective measures of 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 tinnitus has been established. Jackson et al recommended that further research is necessary, potentially incorporating tools like fMRI or EEG, to complement self-report questionnaires in tinnitus assessment.

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 tinnitus (De Ridder & Vanneste, 2021; Elgoyhen et al., 2015; Fabrizio-Stover et al., 2024; 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 tinnitus, evaluate changes in tinnitus symptoms, 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 studies and treatment evaluations.
- Identify common features linked to tinnitus.
- 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.

2.2 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 EEG in the evaluation of tinnitus, tinnitus symptoms, and change after treatments. The date range for both search ranges was from 1 January 2001 to 18 October 2024.

2.3 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 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	Invasive recordings (i.e. electrocorticography or ECoG)

2.3 Study selection

The results of the search and screening for eligibility criteria are shown in Figure 1, resulting in 129 included studies from 879 references.



Figure 1. PRISMA Extraction diagram.

2.4 Data Extraction

We reviewed the 129 papers to capture the main EEG features of difference between groups, or changes in EEG after an intervention using Covidence (Goulas, 2022) templates. The focus for this review was on EEG measures of tinnitus that were resting EEG, that made their comparison between participants with tinnitus and healthy controls (between subject design) or before and after intervention (within subject design), or during periods of induced silence. 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.

3. Results

81 studies made group comparisons between people with tinnitus and healthy 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. 48 studies compared EEG before and after an intervention (Figure 2).



Figure 2. Histograms of studies using EEG to evaluate tinnitus. Several studies reported both band-power and connectivity results. Panel A shows studies by comparison type. Interventions may be compared before and after an intervention, or real compared to sham. Panel B breaks down the group comparisons by analysis type: tinnitus vs control or tinnitus vs tinnitus. Tinnitus vs. Tinnitus refers to the comparison of symptom characteristics or associated conditions like hearing loss. Panel C breaks down the intervention comparisons by intervention type. TMS (Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation) is pulsed or static magnetic stimulation.

The summarized EEG spectral band power analysis of tinnitus compared to controls and intervention studies are in Figure 3. Intervention studies are grouped by intervention in Table 2. Studies using EEG analysis comparing tinnitus to controls using connectivity and network measures are in Figure 4 and Table 3, and intervention studies are in Table 4. Studies comparing Machine Learning techniques or using multiple features for tinnitus classification are in Table 5. Information theory studies are in 3.6 and microstate studies are in Table 6.

3.1 Spectral Band Power Studies

The most common analysis evaluated differences in EEG spectral power between tinnitus and healthy controls, or before and after intervention, either in scalp signals (Klimesch, 2018), or in reconstructed source 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 (~30–100 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. Intervention studies reported temporary improvements in tinnitus and associated changes in spectral band-power. The data for Figure 4 is in Appendix 1.



Figure 3. The numbers indicate the count of studies reporting difference in spectral power by band and brain region in tinnitus vs. control group comparisons (Panel A), and intervention studies (Panel B). 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 statistically significant findings are counted in this figure. Most studies reported multiple regions and frequency power changes.

3.2 Spectral Band Power Intervention Studies

Comparisons between tinnitus vs. controls were the prevalent comparison in intervention studies. Electrical stimulation, acoustic stimulation and transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) or magnetic stimulation were the most common interventions, with neurofeedback studies becoming more popular in recent studies. Various types of interventions in 45 studies utilised pre and post resting EEG to evaluate neural changes following experimental interventions, or when tinnitus was temporarily silenced. Table 2 lists changes in spectral power following interventions.

Table 2. Intervention studies

Study Title	Demographics & Study Design	Intervention	Main Finding
Acoustic Stimulation			
(Leske et al., 2014)	Induced tinnitus. 3 (M), 9 (F), randomised 3 notch conditions & white noise sham.	Zwicker tone illusion	Zwicker tone illusion modulates auditory cortical **alpha-to-beta** band-power.
(Mohan, Bhamoo, et al., 2020).	17 (M), 30(F), control vs. tone conditions.	Zwicker tone illusion	Increased parahippocampus **theta** activity when experiencing the Zwicker tone illusion (temporary silence).
(King et al., 2021).	26 (M), 4 (F), repeated measures, single-blind crossover design, control vs. noise.	Residual inhibition	Increased whole head **alpha** and **gamma** spectral density during auditory residual inhibition.
(Schoisswohl Schecklmann, et al., 2021).	31 (M), 14 (F), 7 time point stimuli, no control condition.	Residual inhibition	Decreased **gamma** power and increased **alpha** power were associated with responders compared to non-responders.
(Kahlbrock & Weisz, 2008).	4 (M), 4 (F), Residual inhibition or Control sound.	Residual inhibition	Decreased power in temporal regions **delta** frequency power during residual inhibition.
(Kim et al., 2016).	18 (M), 14 (F), modified TRT, no control group.	Tinnitus retraining therapy	Loudness negatively correlated to auditory **delta** and **gamma**.
(Vanneste et al., 2013a).	17 (M), 9 (F), control vs. customised notch, or fill the gap.	Spectrally tailored music	Increase in anterior cingulate cortex **alpha**, and pregenual anterior cingulate cortex increases in **beta**. Related to loudness, annoyance and depressive symptoms.
(Feng et al., 2020).	44 with tinnitus assigned to Music + CBT or music conditions. Compared to CBT only prior data.	Music therapy	Music & CBT changes **alpha** and **theta** power at superior temporal gyrus, ventromedial prefrontal cortex, lateral prefrontal cortex and parahippocampus.
(Neff et al., 2019).	34 (M), 11 (F), active listening vs. resting, crossover design.	Active listening	No significant change in EEG band-power between the conditions at sensor and source levels.
(Cartocci et al., 2023).	12 Tinnitus (5 (M), 7 (F)), 7 Controls (3 (m), 4 (F). 7 quiet and 7 signal to noise conditions.	Continuous speech stimulus	Parietal **alpha** associated with listening effort and perception of tinnitus symptoms.
(Inguscio et al., 2024).	12 Tinnitus (5 (M), 7 (F)), and 7 healthy controls (3 (M), 4 (F)), cognitive ecological listening task under varying stress conditions and in silence.	Audio cognitive task	Frontal **beta** correlated with the anxiety trait in tinnitus.
(Wertz et al., 2024).	30 with tinnitus, 17 tinnitus and hyperacusis, 39 controls. Adaptive two-tone discrimination task 6 blocks of 20 trials.	Attentionally demanding auditory discrimination	Increased **gamma** power in temporoparietal regions was reversed during active discrimination of tinnitus frequencies Tinnitus with hyperacusis.
Electrical Stimulation			
(Mielczarek et al., 2016).	6 (M), 6 (F), 2 groups a unilateral group and bilateral tinnitus group. One session of 4 minutes of stimulation.	Bilateral and ipsilateral in ear non-invasive hydrotransmissive negative DC electrical stimulation	Increase in central temporal and frontal regions in **alpha** power was observed following stimulation, but not correlated to tinnitus improvements.
(Claes et al., 2014).	167 (M), 61 (F) with tinnitus retrospective analysis. 4 groups, single session tACS (40), 8 sessions tACS (11), single session tRNS (167), and 8 sessions tRNS (10).	Auditory cortex tACS and tRNS	**Alpha**-modulated tRNS reduced loudness and annoyance but not **alpha** modulated tACS.
(Raj-Koziak et al., 2024)	10 (M), 5 (F) with tinnitus, 10 (M), 4 (F) control group. 1 hour per day, tVNS paired with sound therapy over 12 weeks.	Transcutaneous vagus nerve stimulation.	No change in symptoms. **Theta** band power increase in tinnitus after stimulation.
(Hyvärinen et al., 2015).	7 tinnitus, 8 heathy controls. Real vs. sham	Transcutaneous vagus nerve stimulation	tVNS induced **beta** and **gamma** spectral density synchrony that correlated with THI scores.
(Vanneste & De Ridder, 2011).	9 (M) 3 (F), previous responders. Real vs. sham	Bifrontal tDCS	Bifrontal tDCS increased anterior cingulate cortex and

	groups, single (participant) blinded.		parahippocampus **alpha** and decreased beta and **gamma** power in the right auditory region
(Souza et al., 2020).	10 (M), 2 (F), 20 minutes of anodal tDCS over the LTA and cathodal over the right DLPFC. 6 (M), 6 (F), 30s sham stimulation. Repeated stimulation for 5 days.	tDCS	Decreased **beta** and **theta** frequency band power with eyes opened and decreased **alpha** frequency power with eyes closed in the frontal, temporoparietal, and limbic regions after stimulation was associated with improved tinnitus annoyance and severity.
(Cho et al., 2023).	9 (M), 5 (F), 5 times per week for 4 weeks paired with notched sound therapy.	Transcutaneous Trigeminal Electrical Stimulation	Left hemisphere **alpha** power reduced after treatment. Not associated with changes in tinnitus symptoms.
Neurofeedback			
(Guillard et al., 2021).	19 (M), 9 (F), 10 sessions of neurofeedback.	Alpha band power neurofeedback.	Increase of **alpha** band-power. Improvements of the TFI score were correlated with **alpha** band power changes between timepoint one and timepoint two.
(Güntensperger et al., 2020).	38 (M), 10 (F) tinnitus participants, tomographic vs. non-tomographic neurofeedback, 15 weekly training sessions.	Alpha/delta band power ratio neurofeedback	After **alpha/delta** rato neurofeedback **alpha/delta** power increased between timepoint one and timepoint three.
(Güntensperger et al., 2019)	19 (M), 5 (F), 15 weekly neurofeedback training sessions.	Alpha/delta band power neurofeedback	Increased **alpha/delta** ratio after training. This increase was related to changes of tinnitus-related distress measures, due to increases in **alpha** frequency power.
(Hartmann et al., 2014).	7 (m), 1 (F), neurofeedback, 8 (M), 2 (F), rTMS group. Neurofeedback 10 sessions of auditory alpha neurofeedback, rTMS, or sham.	Alpha band power neurofeedback or rTMS	Neurofeedback decreased tinnitus symptoms and increases **alpha** power.
(Ma et al., 2022)	29 (M), 27 (F), 38 neurofeedback, 18 waitlist controls. 15 neurofeedback training sessions over 5 weeks.	Alpha band power neurofeedback	Increased occipital **alpha** band in the occipital lobe following alpha neurofeedback. Reduced tinnitus-related distress and sound perception in patients.
(Crocetti et al., 2011).	10 (M), 5 (F), 20 mins of neurofeedback training.	Alpha/delta band power neurofeedback	Increasing stability in **alpha/delta** ratio correlated to THI scores.
(Riha et al., 2021)	49 participants, analysis of previously collected data.15 weekly neurofeedback training sessions.	Alpha/delta band power neurofeedback	Throughout neurofeedback training **alpha** was enhanced and **delta** was stable.
(Jensen et al., 2023).	3 arm randomised controlled trial. Alpha/delta ratio (31), beta/theta ratio (28), non-neurofeedback intervention (35). 10 sessions over 4 weeks.	Alpha/delta band power ratio neurofeedback	**Alpha/delta** ratio neurofeedback was associated with Tinnitus improvements when compared to beta/theta ratio neurofeedback.
TMS or Magnetic Stimulation			
(Weisz et al., 2014).	10 (M), 20 (F) pseudorandomly assigned to rTMS individual peak alpha frequency adjusted frequency or sham group.	rTMS (left auditory)	anterior cingulate cortex **beta** power and posterior cingulate cortex **beta** connectivity was associated with behavioural changes.
(Schecklmann et al., 2015).	20 tinnitus participants, 20 matched controls. rTMS 200 pulses at 1Hz, sham and real stimulation	rTMS (left and right temporal and frontal)	Left temporal rTMS decreased frontal **theta** power and **delta**, increased **beta** power Right frontal rTMS decreased right temporal **beta** and **gamma** power.
(Weiler & Brill, 2005)	16 participants with tinnitus. Pulsed magnetic field 5 µTesia single session.	Pulsed magnetic field (on the back of the head)	increase of average total power in **delta**, **theta**, and **alpha** frequency bands in the frontal regions of the brain after magnetic-field therapy. Changes correlated with a reduction in symptoms.

(Kyong et al., 2024).	Tinnitus participants, 8, single site, 8, dual site stimulation, and 8 in a sham group.	rTMS (temporal and frontal)	Increased **alpha** power in the active stimulation groups after stimulation. Frontal changes were correlated to tinnitus symptom changes.
(Schoisswohl, Langguth, et al., 2021).	17 (M), 5 (F), 3 sessions 1, 10, 20 Hz at 200 pulses and 1 sham, over locations in random order over 2 days.	rTMS, (left and right temporo-parietal junction)	No associations between behavioural and EEG were found. Parietal-occipital **alpha** and frontal **gamma** increases observed in responders.
Psychological Intervention			
(Jedrzejczak WW et al., 2024).	Retrospective EEG recordings from 16 (M), 8 (F), tinnitus subjects tested prior to COVID-19, 17 (M), 9 (F) post COVID-19 (none reported to have had COVID-19)	COVID-19	Decreases in auditory **alpha** and **beta** power were observed compared to pre COVID, no association with tinnitus symptoms.
(Vanneste et al., 2016).	12 (M), 7 (F), tinnitus participants, 8 (M), 7 (F), no tinnitus and no hearing loss. Correlations to trail making test, Montreal cognitive assessment, mini mental state examination	Cognitive processing tasks	Loudness distress and duration correlated with cognitive processing tasks which were related to hippocampus, pregenual & subgenual anterior cingulate cortex and right insula **beta** activity.

The following studies found spectral band power differences following an intervention but that were not statistically associated with changes in tinnitus measures (Claes et al., 2014; De Ridder et al., 2013; Feng et al., 2020; Güntensperger et al., 2019; Hartmann et al., 2014; Kahlbrock & Weisz, 2008; Mielczarek et al., 2016; Riha et al., 2021; Schecklmann et al., 2015; Schoisswohl, Schecklmann, et al., 2021; Song, Punte, et al., 2013; Vanneste, Focquaert, et al., 2011; Vanneste & De Ridder, 2011, 2012b).

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 3. 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 2.

Table 3 <> denotes connectivity between: **General Terms:** TN tinnitus, HC healthy 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. HC (256)	**Source Localized** Lagged phase coherence Weighted adjacency matrices Maximum spanning tree Degree Betweenness 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)
		Eigenvector centrality Closeness centrality Common hubs	
(Mohan et al., 2016a)	TN (311) vs. HC (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. HC (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. HC (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. HC (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. HC (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. HC (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

Study	Sample size	Method/comparison	Findings (tinnitus vs. control)
			PCC <> LF RP <> RT, LF
(Lan et al., 2021)	Acute TN (< 1 month) (24) Chronic TN (> 6 months), (23) vs. HC (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.
(Cai, Li, et al., 2019)	TN (idiopathic sensorineural hearing loss), (25) vs. HC (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. HC (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
(Y.-H. Li et al., 2022)	TN (31) vs. HC (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. HC (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. HC (16)	Lagged phase and connectivity analysis.	TN + panic disorder ↓ alpha1 connectivity dACC <> insula, amygdala <> sgACC in.
(Mohaghegh ian et al., 2019)	TN (8) vs. HC (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. HC (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. HC (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. HC (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

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

3.4 Connectivity Intervention Studies

Table 4 groups studies that compared resting-state EEG-based connectivity measures before and after an intervention. Three studies used a control or sham condition.

Table 4. Connectivity studies with an intervention with main findings

Study Title	Demographics and Study Design	Intervention	Main Finding
Acoustic Stimulation			
(X. Zhang et al., 2021)	9 bilateral tinnitus participants, 6 sessions.	Acoustic stimulation	EEG networks weakened after long-term periodic acoustic stimulation and were associated with handicap inventory.
(Yi et al., 2023).	30 participants with tinnitus, 15m acoustic stimulation, 15 days.	Acoustic Stimulation	Acoustic stimulation induced differences in alpha/beta long-range frontal-parietal-occipital connections as well as changes in local frontal and parietaloccipital regions, with correlations to THI scores.
(Durai et al., 2021).	7 (M), 4 (F) with tinnitus, random allocation of masking type, crossover design 3 sessions each masking type.	Auditory masking	Using a spiking neural network (NeuCube) was able to predict sound therapy responders at 93% accuracy.
Electrical Stimulation			
(De Ridder & Vanneste, 2012).	260 (M), 415 (F), randomly assigned groups were 265 anode on DLPFC tDCS, 380 EEG localised tDCS, 65 waitlist controls.	Target localised Bifrontal tDCS	No advantage to gamma band functional connectivity driven tDCS compared to bifrontal tDCS.
(Vanneste, Focquaert, et al., 2011).	Study 1, 15 (M), 30 (F), single session tDCS. Study 2, 9 (M), 10 (F), random ordering of 1, 5 10, 20Hz and sham stimulation (200 pulses).	EEG evaluated Bifrontal tDCS.	Higher gamma band in the right primary and secondary auditory cortex and right parahippocampus for responders to tDCS. increased gamma band functional connectivity between the right dorsolateral prefrontal cortex and the right parahippocampus and subgenual anterior cingulate cortex.
(Smeele et al., 2023).	12 real, 11 sham. Double blind randomised placebo controlled parallel trial. Single 30 stimulation session.	High-Definition Infraslow Pink Noise Stimulation	Decreased beta1 activity in the inferior parietal lobule. Increased functional connectivity in beta1 between left and right parahippocampus.
(Song, Punte, et al., 2013).	9 tinnitus, EEG pre-op and post-op.	Cochlear implant	Increased activity right dorsolateral prefrontal cortex and decreased connectivity between orbitofrontal cortex, parahippocampus and AC, precuneus were related to tinnitus-related distress as compared with those with improvement.
Substance Intervention			
(Vanneste & De Ridder, 2012b).	5 (M), tinnitus participants, alcohol as needed to reduce tinnitus intensity by 30%, 5 (M) controls.	Alcohol	Alcohol intake decreased synchronized alpha in the orbitofrontal cortex, ventromedial frontal cortex, subcallosal anterior cingulate cortex, increased in the

				posterior cingulate cortex, and the retrosplenial area. Increased synchronized beta between the pregenual and dorsal anterior cingulate cortex and the left insula and decreased activity in the precuneus. Gamma decreased synchronized activity in the precuneus and the posterior cingulate cortex.

3.5 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 a direction of change, or if they compared multiple machine learning techniques as their focus are summarised in Table 5.

Table 5. Machine learning based studies classification methods and results.

Study	Number of Participants	Methodology	Features/Technique	Outcome
Spectral Frequency Power Based Studies				
(S.-J. Wang et al., 2017)	15 with tinnitus, 14 healthy 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 healthy 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 healthy controls.	Phase locking and inter-areal coupling	Alpha and gamma coupling (networks)	Discrimination accuracy: 83%
(Z. 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%
(C.-D. Wang et al., 2023)	187 tinnitus patients, and 80 healthy	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., 2021)	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 healthy 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 normal 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
Intervention Studies				
(Doborjeh et al., 2023)	8 participants, 4 responders, 4 non-responders	Convolutional neural networks with functional connectivity	Detecting responders vs. non-responders to sound therapy. In the frequency domain, FC3, P8, P4, T8, and CP5 were the main predictive electrodes. Increased functional connectivity between F1, Fz, F2, FC1, FCz, FC2, C1, Cz, and C2 electrodes after treatment in responders.	Accuracy up to 99%
(Awais et al., 2024)	103 participants treated with 5 different acoustic therapies, and a control group.	Graph Neural Network combined with Long Term Short Term Memory networks and principle components analysis.	Network analysis before and after sound therapies	Accuracy: 0.994

3.6 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 addition, they found that following the clinically-beneficial (binaural beat for a month) intervention there was reduced entropy in high alpha in the left frontal region. In another study using machine learning, delta, alpha1 and beta1 band sample entropy values were greater in tinnitus compared to healthy controls, in the parietal, central and left prefrontal regions (Jianbiao et al., 2023), Table 5.

3.7 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 6 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 6. 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	(Cai, Chen, et al., 2019)
A, B, D A, D	Duration Correlated with visual analogue scale of loudness and annoyanceS	(Cao et al., 2020)
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	(Y. Wang et al., 2024)

4. Discussion

The scope of this review was to broadly assess features of resting EEG with potential as objective measures. Studies that compared EEG features in those with tinnitus to healthy controls, and pre-post intervention studies revealed a broad range of observations of changes in neural and brain dynamics. An objective measure of tinnitus presence, and symptom changes may emerge from a combination of statistical techniques robust to heterogeneous differences in those with tinnitus, a combination of spectral and network EEG features and machine learning classification techniques.

The literature on tinnitus explored through resting-state EEG, reveals a highly complex picture of neural activity. Comparative spectral band power analysis (Figure 3, panel A) reveals alterations across the anterior cingulate cortex, prefrontal cortex, auditory and limbic systems. These brain regions are involved in auditory processing, memory, emotion, and attention (Moring et al., 2022; Ueyama et al., 2013). In tinnitus, spectral band power in these regions show increases in spectral band power in the gamma frequency band a mix of increases and decreases in alpha and the other frequency bands (Figure 2). Secondary impacts from tinnitus on psychological and emotional responses as well as hearing loss, coping style, distress levels and frequency of the tinnitus sound can influence changes in spectral band power (Appendix 1). The variability in spectral power, the

influence of interventions across regions and frequencies, and the impact of associated secondary symptoms on spectral power indicates that tinnitus does not exist in isolation but is intertwined with broader neural dynamics (Husain & Khan, 2023).

The variation in analysis symptoms, hearing loss, and other related disorders create complexities in finding a matching control group. Intervention studies enable paired comparisons that reveal changes to cortical dynamics associated with symptom changes following an intervention. Interventions studies (Table 2) produced a range changes and modulations of spectral band power that differed depending on the type of interventions. Auditory (sound and listening) based interventions like the Zwicker tone illusion and music therapy produced changes in auditory alpha to beta power, and parahippocampal theta. The silence induced by residual inhibition increased alpha, as well as decreased gamma and delta, and whole-head spectral density increases were observed (King et al., 2021). Electrical stimulation studies were low-powered studies and although they induced changes in spectral power, many studies found the changes were not statistically associated with tinnitus symptom scores or improvements.

Neurofeedback is an attempt to use operant conditioning to obtain volitional control over features of brain activity (Niv, 2013). Interventions attempted to increase temporal alpha, and reduce delta frequency band or frontal alpha delta ratio (Dohrmann et al., 2007) are aimed at altering feedback loops resulting from decreased auditory input. Successful reductions in tinnitus related symptoms were correlated with increases in alpha spectral band power or stabilising the alpha delta ratio. The correlations of alpha delta ratio in neurofeedback (Crocetti et al., 2011; Güntensperger et al., 2019, 2020; Jensen et al., 2023) to tinnitus symptoms may be a promising objective measure of change. Ratios may act as a proxy for network changes; however, no tinnitus neurofeedback studies in this review used network effects as an outcome measure. Frequency band ratios, and comparisons to network effects in intervention and control comparisons studies are required to clarify the usefulness of ratios as an objective measure.

The majority of magnetic stimulation studies relied on repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation to induce neuroplasticity like changes (Pashut et al., 2011). The temporal and frontal regions were targeted and beta, delta, frontal theta and frontal or occipital and cingulate alpha power increases were associated with reduction in symptoms following magnetic stimulation. These results suggest magnetic stimulation may also influence connectivity in tinnitus. The strength of magnetic stimulation, particularly rTMS is that it can target specific regions. Larger studies with a focus on controlling for the heterogeneity of tinnitus (Genitsaridi et al., 2020), targeting tinnitus networks, and including network or connectivity analysis may help identify neural activity responses to tinnitus associated with tinnitus subtypes.

The interventions (Figure 3, panel B) that influenced both symptoms and spectral band power appear across the frequency spectrum with connectivity in the alpha and the gamma band across

regions associated with memory, attention and auditory networks, with beta (limbic and frontal regions), theta (anterior cingulate cortex and parahippocampus), and delta mentioned with parietal and frontal regions. Increases in connectivity across a range of measures, such as Granger causality, lagged phase coherence, as well as measures of path length, node strength and hubs demonstrated significant connectivity differences in tinnitus. Interventions that targeted or measured changes in tinnitus symptoms that were associated with network or connectivity measures found more correlations or statistical relationships to changes in tinnitus scores, particularly in auditory stimulation interventions. Network characteristics are often also influenced by other conditions or brain states for example, depression, age, hearing loss, level of distress, quality of life or cooping style. While no clear network profile emerges as an objective measure, machine learning classification tools that utilised connectivity measures performed well (Table 5). This indicates that the impact of tinnitus on connectivity measures are a more robust measure than only spectral frequency bands.

Machine learning classification tools evaluated a range of EEG features (Table 5) utilising a range of classification techniques such as support vector machines and neural networks to identify tinnitus from controls. A broad range of resting EEG features, network characteristics and connectivity metrics were tested with promising success, with some studies demonstrating differentiation from similar conditions such as pain and depression. Studies that included spectral band power as well as connectivity related measures performed well. However, 7 out of 12 machine learning studies had less than 35 participants. Machine learning interpretability and performance can be enhanced by larger more diverse datasets (Althnian et al., 2021).

Focussed machine learning assessment of measures that show differences between tinnitus and controls, such as connectivity measures, as well as lesser studied features like microstates, and entropy is a promising area of research. For translation to clinical use and tracking of symptoms, it is important that the techniques are interpretable and based on models of tinnitus. The ability to identify objective measures for classification purposes and predict intervention outcomes based on neural patterns is an important area of research. Machine learning classification algorithms offer a substantial opportunity in identifying objective measures.

The changes associated with tinnitus appear across the cortical surface of the brain, and source derived measures indicate deeper regions associated with memory, attention, and emotion in auditory and non-auditory regions (Vanneste & De Ridder, 2012a). Hierarchical networks of sensory integration are likely sources of differences between tinnitus and healthy controls (Sedley et al., 2016), and potential targets for future therapies and objective indicators of tinnitus. Recent studies using conjunction analysis have observed differences between pain and tinnitus networks based on the Bayesian Brain model (De Ridder et al., 2023). Assessing these models using

interpretable machine learning is one pathway to useful objective measures, tinnitus subtyping, and evaluating the neural changes following beneficial interventions.

4.4. Limitations

This scoping review focussed on resting-state EEG and comparisons between participants with tinnitus and controls and intervention studies. We did not assess in detail the quality of the studies included in this review. Differences between hearing status, gender, age, subtypes of tinnitus and various comorbidities were also not a focus of this review. We sought themes relating to changes in 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, and several intervention studies included changes between those who responded to treatment and excluded non-responders. 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 tinnitus (Fabrizio-Stover et al., 2024).

4.5. Future Directions

The complexity of identifying objective measures for 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). This approach could enhance understanding of the mechanisms of tinnitus translate to experimental data.

- **Study Design**: Prioritize well-powered studies with diverse participant pools, employing standardized methods to simplify comparison across studies.

- **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 changes in EEG features related to tinnitus symptoms such as loudness, annoyance, and distress (Allgaier et al., 2021; Emami & Bayrak, 2017; Mohagheghian et

al., 2019; Vanneste, Song, et al., 2018; S.-J. Wang et al., 2017). Ensuring access to 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.

5. Conclusion

In summary, this review highlights the impact of 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., 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. (2021). 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

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

Awais, M., Kassoul, K., Omri, A. E., Aboumarzouk, O. M., Abdulhadi, K., & Brahim Belhaouari, S. (2024). Graph-Based Electroencephalography Analysis in Tinnitus Therapy. *Biomedicines*, *12*(7). https://doi.org/10.3390/biomedicines12071404

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

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

Cartocci, G., Inguscio, B. M. S., Giliberto, G., Vozzi, A., Giorgi, A., Greco, A., Babiloni, F., & Attanasio, G. (2023). Listening Effort in Tinnitus: A Pilot Study Employing a Light EEG Headset and Skin Conductance Assessment during the Listening to a Continuous Speech

Stimulus under Different SNR Conditions. *Brain Sciences*, *13*(7). https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci13071084

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

Cho, Y. S., Park, S., Kim, G.-Y., Jo, M., Hong, S. H., & Moon, I. J. (2023). Effects of Transcutaneous Trigeminal Electrical Stimulation and Sound Therapy in Patients with Tinnitus. *Yonsei Medical Journal*, *64*(10), 618–624. https://doi.org/10.3349/ymj.2022.0611

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

Claes, L., Stamberger, H., Van de Heyning, P., De Ridder, D., & Vanneste, S. (2014). Auditory cortex tACS and tRNS for tinnitus: Single versus multiple sessions. *Neural Plasticity*, *2014*, 436713. https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/436713

Crocetti, A., Forti, S., & Del Bo, L. (2011). Neurofeedback for subjective tinnitus patients. *Auris, Nasus, Larynx*, *38*(6), 735–738. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anl.2011.02.003

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., Song, J.-J., & Vanneste, S. (2013). Frontal cortex TMS for tinnitus. *Brain Stimulation*, *6*(3), 355–362. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2012.07.002

De Ridder, D., & Vanneste, S. (2012). EEG Driven tDCS Versus Bifrontal tDCS for Tinnitus. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, *3*, 84. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2012.00084

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

Doborjeh, M., Liu, X., Doborjeh, Z., Shen, Y., Searchfield, G., Sanders, P., Wang, G. Y., Sumich, A., & Yan, W. Q. (2023). Prediction of Tinnitus Treatment Outcomes Based on EEG Sensors and TFI Score Using Deep Learning. *Sensors (Basel, Switzerland)*, *23*(2). https://doi.org/10.3390/s23020902

Dohrmann, K., Weisz, N., Schlee, W., Hartmann, T., & Elbert, T. (2007). Neurofeedback for treating tinnitus. *Progress in Brain Research*, *166*, 473–485. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0079-6123(07)66046-4

Durai, M., Sanders, P., Doborjeh, Z., Doborjeh, M., Wendt, A., Kasabov, N., & Searchfield, G. D. (2021). Prediction of tinnitus masking benefit within a case series using a spiking neural network model. *Progress in Brain Research*, *260*, 129–165. https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.pbr.2020.08.003

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

Feng, T., Wang, M., Xiong, H., Zheng, Y., & Yang, H. (2020). Efficacy of an Integrative Treatment for Tinnitus Combining Music and Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy-Assessed With Behavioral and EEG Data. *Frontiers in Integrative Neuroscience*, *14*, 12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnint.2020.00012

Genitsaridi, E., Hoare, D. J., Kypraios, T., & Hall, D. A. (2020). A Review and a Framework of Variables for Defining and Characterizing Tinnitus Subphenotypes. *Brain Sciences*, *10*(12), Article 12. https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci10120938

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

Guillard, R., Fraysse, M.-J., Simeon, R., Cervoni, T., Schmutz, J., Piedfort, B., Ferat, V., Congedo, M., & Londero, A. (2021). A portable neurofeedback device for treating chronic subjective tinnitus: Feasibility and results of a pilot study. *Progress in Brain Research*, *260*, 167–185. https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.pbr.2020.08.001

Güntensperger, D., Kleinjung, T., Neff, P., Thüring, C., & Meyer, M. (2020). Combining neurofeedback with source estimation: Evaluation of an sLORETA neurofeedback protocol for chronic tinnitus treatment. *Restorative Neurology and Neuroscience*, *38*(4), 283–299. https://doi.org/10.3233/RNN-200992

Güntensperger, D., Thüring, C., Kleinjung, T., Neff, P., & Meyer, M. (2019). Investigating the Efficacy of an Individualized Alpha/Delta Neurofeedback Protocol in the Treatment of Chronic Tinnitus. *Neural Plasticity*, *2019*, e3540898. https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/3540898

Hartmann, T., Lorenz, I., Müller, N., Langguth, B., & Weisz, N. (2014). The effects of neurofeedback on oscillatory processes related to tinnitus. *Brain Topography*, *27*(1), 149–157. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10548-013-0295-9

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

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

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

Hyvärinen, P., Yrttiaho, S., Lehtimäki, J., Ilmoniemi, R. J., Mäkitie, A., Ylikoski, J., Mäkelä, J. P., & Aarnisalo, A. A. (2015). Transcutaneous vagus nerve stimulation modulates tinnitus-related beta- and gamma-band activity. *Ear and Hearing*, *36*(3), e76-85. https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0000000000000123

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).

Inguscio, B. M. S., Rossi, D., Giliberto, G., Vozzi, A., Borghini, G., Babiloni, F., Greco, A., Attanasio, G., & Cartocci, G. (2024). Bridging the Gap between Psychophysiological and Audiological Factors in the Assessment of Tinnitus: An EEG Investigation in the Beta Band. *Brain Sciences*, *14*(6), Article 6. https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci14060570

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

Jedrzejczak WW, Gos E, Ganc M, Raj-Koziak D, Skarzynski PH, & Skarzynski H. (2024). Effect of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Resting-State Brain Activity in Individuals with Tinnitus. *Brain Sci*, *14*(2). https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci14020174

Jensen, M., Alanis, J. C. G., Hüttenrauch, E., Winther-Jensen, M., Chavanon, M.-L., Andersson, G., & Weise, C. (2023). Does it matter what is trained? A randomized controlled trial evaluating the specificity of alpha/delta ratio neurofeedback in reducing tinnitus symptoms. *Brain Communications*, *5*(4), fcad185. https://doi.org/10.1093/braincomms/fcad185

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

Kahlbrock, N., & Weisz, N. (2008). Transient reduction of tinnitus intensity is marked by concomitant reductions of delta band power. *BMC Biology*, *6*, 4. https://doi.org/10.1186/1741-7007-6-4

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

Kyong, J.-S., Noh, T.-S., Kyun Park, M., Oh, S.-H., Lee, J. H., & Suh, M.-W. (2024). Modulated Alpha Power as a Predictor of Tinnitus Alleviation. *The Journal of International Advanced Otology*, *20*(5), 397–404. https://doi.org/10.5152/iao.2024.231051

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

Leske, S., Tse, A., Oosterhof, N. N., Hartmann, T., Müller, N., Keil, J., & Weisz, N. (2014). The strength of alpha and beta oscillations parametrically scale with the strength of an illusory auditory percept. *NeuroImage*, *88*, 69–78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.11.014

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.

Ma, X., Wang, F., Zhang, C., Shen, W., & Yang, S. (2022). Self-Directed Neurofeedback Treatment for Subjective Tinnitus Patients Evaluated by Multimodal Functional Imaging. *Neural Plasticity*, *2022*, 5114721. https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/5114721

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.

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

Mielczarek, M., Michalska, J., Polatyńska, K., & Olszewski, J. (2016). An Increase in Alpha Band Frequency in Resting State EEG after Electrical Stimulation of the Ear in Tinnitus Patients-A Pilot Study. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, *10*, 453. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2016.00453

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

Niv, S. (2013). Clinical efficacy and potential mechanisms of neurofeedback. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *54*(6), 676–686. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.11.037

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

Pashut, T., Wolfus, S., Friedman, A., Lavidor, M., Bar-Gad, I., Yeshurun, Y., & Korngreen, A. (2011). Mechanisms of Magnetic Stimulation of Central Nervous System Neurons. *PLOS Computational Biology*, *7*(3), e1002022. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002022

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

Raj-Koziak, D., Gos, E., Kutyba, J., Ganc, M., Jedrzejczak, W. W., Skarzynski, P. H., & Skarzynski, H. (2024). Effectiveness of transcutaneous vagus nerve stimulation for the treatment of tinnitus: An interventional prospective controlled study. *International Journal of Audiology*, *63*(4), 250–259. CINAHL. https://doi.org/10.1080/14992027.2023.2177894

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., Oschwald, J., Kleinjung, T., & Meyer, M. (2021). Application of Latent Growth Curve modeling to predict individual trajectories during neurofeedback treatment for tinnitus. *Progress in Brain Research*, *263*, 109–136. https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.pbr.2021.04.013

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

Schecklmann, M., Lehner, A., Gollmitzer, J., Schmidt, E., Schlee, W., & Langguth, B. (2015). Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation induces oscillatory power changes in chronic tinnitus. *Frontiers in Cellular Neuroscience*, *9*, 421. https://doi.org/10.3389/fncel.2015.00421

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., Langguth, B., Hebel, T., Abdelnaim, M. A., Volberg, G., & Schecklmann, M. (2021). Heading for Personalized rTMS in Tinnitus: Reliability of Individualized Stimulation Protocols in Behavioral and Electrophysiological Responses. *Journal of Personalized Medicine*, *11*(6). https://doi.org/10.3390/jpm11060536

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

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.

Smeele, S. J., Adhia, D. B., & De Ridder, D. (2023). Feasibility and Safety of High-Definition Infraslow Pink Noise Stimulation for Treating Chronic Tinnitus-A Randomized Placebo-

Controlled Trial. *Neuromodulation : Journal of the International Neuromodulation Society*, *26*(4), 801–816. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurom.2022.10.049

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., Punte, A. K., De Ridder, D., Vanneste, S., & Van de Heyning, P. (2013). Neural substrates predicting improvement of tinnitus after cochlear implantation in patients with single-sided deafness. *Hearing Research*, *299*, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2013.02.001

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. (2011). Bifrontal transcranial direct current stimulation modulates tinnitus intensity and tinnitus-distress-related brain activity. *The European Journal of Neuroscience*, *34*(4), 605–614. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-9568.2011.07778.x

Vanneste, S., & De Ridder, D. (2012a). 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. (2012b). The use of alcohol as a moderator for tinnitus-related distress. *Brain Topography*, *25*(1), 97–105. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10548-011-0191-0

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. (2013a). Does enriched acoustic environment in humans abolish chronic tinnitus clinically and electrophysiologically? A double blind placebo controlled study. *Hearing Research*, *296*, 141–148. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2012.10.003

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. (2013b). 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., Lüchinger, C., Thut, G., & Müller, N. (2014). Effects of individual alpha rTMS applied to the auditory cortex and its implications for the treatment of chronic tinnitus. *Human Brain Mapping*, *35*(1), 14–29. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.22152

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

Wertz, J., Rüttiger, L., Bender, B., Klose, U., Stark, R. S., Dapper, K., Saemisch, J., Braun, C., Singer, W., Dalhoff, E., Bader, K., Wolpert, S. M., Knipper, M., & Munk, M. H. J. (2024). Differential cortical activation patterns: Pioneering sub-classification of tinnitus with and without hyperacusis by combining audiometry, gamma oscillations, and hemodynamics. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, *17*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2023.1232446

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

Yi, C., Liu, C., Zhang, J., Zhang, X., Jiang, L., Si, Y., He, G., Ao, M., Zhao, Y., Yao, D., Li, F., Ma, X., Xu, P., & He, B. (2023). The long-term effect of modulated acoustic stimulation on alteration in EEG brain network of chronic tinnitus patients: An exploratory study. *Brain Research Bulletin*, *205*, 110812. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainresbull.2023.110812

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

Zhang, X., Jiang, Y., Zhang, S., Li, F., Pei, C., He, G., Ao, M., Yao, D., Zhao, Y., & Xu, P. (2021). Correlation Analysis of EEG Brain Network With Modulated Acoustic Stimulation for Chronic Tinnitus Patients. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation*

Engineering : A Publication of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society, *29*, 156–162. https://doi.org/10.1109/TNSRE.2020.3039555

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, De Ridder, 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

Paper	Comparison	Summary of network differences
		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.
(J. 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.
(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 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)	↓ (Lan et al., 2021),	H (Mohan et al., 2016a)

			H (Mohan, Bhamoo, et al., 2020)	H (Mohan et al., 2016a), r	
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-Osińska et al., 2013) u	↑ (Matsuoka et al., 2017)	
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, Schecklmann, 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., 2013b)* ↓ (Kim et al., 2016)*,l	↑ (Vanneste et al., 2010, 2016) ↑ (Vanneste et al., 2013b)*	↑ (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)				