EEG functional connectivity as a prognostic biomarker of adaptive function in autistic people

Chirag Mehra[1], Petroula Laiou[2,3], Pilar Garcés[4], Joshua B Ewen[5,6], Eva Loth[1], Mark H Johnson[7], Luke Mason[1], Emily JH Jones[8,9], Tony Charman[10], Jan Buitelaar[11], Michael Absoud[12,13], Mark P Richardson[2], Declan Murphy[1], Jonathan O'Muircheartaigh[1,9,14]

1) Department of Forensic and Neurodevelopment Sciences, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK
2) Department of Basic and Clinical Neuroscience, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK
3) Department of Biostatistics & Health Informatics, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK
4) Roche Pharma Research and Early Development, Neuroscience and Rare Diseases, Roche Innovation Center Basel, F. Hoffmann–La Roche Ltd., Basel, Switzerland
5) Developmental & Behavioral Pediatrics, Ann & Robert H. Lurie Children's Hospital of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, USA
6) Department of Pediatrics at Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, Illinois, USA
7) Department of Psychology, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK
8) Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK
9) MRC Centre for Developmental Neurobiology, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK
10) Department of Psychology, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK
11) Department of Medical Neuroscience, Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behaviour, Radboud University Medical Centre, Nijmegen, Netherlands.
12) Department of Women and Children's Health, Faculty of Life Sciences and Medicine, School of Life Course Sciences, King's College London, London, UK
13) Children's Neurosciences, Evelina London Children's Hospital at Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust, UK
14) Department of Early Life Imaging, School of Biomedical Engineering and Imaging Sciences, King's College London, UK

Correspondence to: Chirag Mehra

Email: chirag.1.mehra@kcl.ac.uk

Running Title: Predicting adaptive function in autism

Keywords: autism, functional connectivity, adaptive function, prognostic biomarker, EEG

Abstract

Many autistic people have challenges with adaptive function, impacting education, employment and independent-living goals. Adaptive function outcomes of autistic people vary considerably, which makes planning for future independence or support needs challenging. Here, using a developmentally sensitive approach, we investigated if quantifying cortical functional connectivity – a neurobiological feature that differs in autism – could predict longitudinal changes in adaptive function in autistic people.

Using electroencephalography (EEG) in 150 autistic and 159 non-autistic participants (aged 6-31 years), we investigated if the extent of cortico-cortical functional connectivity (mean degree) and small-world network organisation (small-world index) could predict longitudinal changes in adaptive function over an interval of 19-months (SD = 3.5 months). We assessed predictive performance for both continuous and binary changes in adaptive function abilities. We explicitly studied age-effects, given differing neurodevelopmental trajectories in autistic compared to non-autistic people. We quantified the extent to which these functional connectivity metrics had properties desired in prognostic biomarkers: high reliability and convergence with underlying biology (polygenic variation).

Small-world index significantly predicted longitudinal changes in adaptive function in autistic people across the entire age-range. Predictive performance was best in 15-21-year-olds, where small-world index and mean degree explained 30% and 33% of additional variance in adaptive function outcomes, respectively. In this age-group, functional connectivity metrics outperformed measures of intelligence and autistic features in predictive ability. In categorising binary (increasing versus not-increasing) outcomes in autistic people, the model containing mean degree had an AUC of 0.80 [95% CI: 0.63-0.97] in 15-21-year-olds, while the model containing small-world index had an AUC of 0.76 [95% CI: 0.63- 0.89] across the 6-31-year age-range. Both metrics demonstrated high test-retest reliability and were significantly associated with polygenic variation in brain volume in autistic people.

We demonstrate the first evidence that EEG-derived functional connectivity metrics significantly predict adaptive function outcomes in autistic people and may be developed as prognostic biomarkers. Considering developmental stage may reconcile heterogeneous findings in previous autism connectivity literature.

Introduction

A minority of autistic adults work full-time (12-27%), are enrolled in or have completed postsecondary education (39%) or live independently (5-12%)[1–3]. Identifying approaches to support function in these domains is a research priority of autistic people[4,5]. The neurocognitive construct most strongly associated with these abilities in autistic people is adaptive function[1,3,6–8] (the application of one's abilities to navigate the everyday environment, including in a self-sufficient manner[9]). However, there is substantial variation in how adaptive function abilities of autistic people change over time[10–12]. This poses a challenge in helping autistic young-people and adults plan requirements for future support or independence in employment, education and independent living domains.

Current behavioural predictors of longitudinal improvements in adaptive function in autistic people include an absence of co-occurring intellectual disability[13,14]/higher intelligence[1], higher baseline adaptive function[1,14] and the presence of communicative speech before the age of five years[14]. However, most of the variance in adaptive function outcomes remains unexplained by these behavioural features[9,13,15–17]. Therefore, our group recently investigated if neurobiological metrics could predict adaptive function outcomes in autistic people[18,19]. We showed that both the speed of neural responses to faces[18] (the N170 event-related potential) and cortical structural differences[19] could predict outcomes. However, these metrics were either limited in the domains of adaptive function outcomes they could predict[18] or only explained a small proportion of additional variance (6% each) in adaptive function outcomes[18,19], limiting their practical utility as prognostic biomarkers.

Several studies have demonstrated that brain connectivity is different in autistic compared to non-autistic people[20–30]. Both the amount[20,31,32] and organisation[21,33–35] of functional connectivity in large-scale brain networks have been associated with the extent of autistic social-communication and behavioural traits. An important feature of large-scale brain-networks across species is their small-world organisation[36–40], which allows efficient segregation and integration of information processing, thereby facilitating both specialised and co-ordinated function within and across neural systems[36,41]. Small-world organisation has been found to differ between autistic and non-autistic people and is associated with autistic traits[33–35]. Therefore, such functional connectivity metrics from large-scale networks may show

promise as prognostic biomarkers for adaptive function outcomes in autistic people, as suggested by a previous small-sample functional MRI study[15].

However, the nature of functional connectivity differences between autistic and non-autistic people in previous studies has been heterogenous[22,25–29,42–48], limiting progress in biomarker discovery. Considering age-effects in autism research is especially important given that autism has been associated altered rates of white matter[21,22,49–51], brain volume[52] and behavioural[53] maturation. However, most prior studies have inadequately accounted for developmental stage or included only a narrow age-range of young adults (reviewed here[54]), possibly contributing to heterogenous findings.

Here, we investigated the performance of functional connectivity derived mean degree and small-world index as candidate prognostic biomarkers for adaptive function outcomes in autistic people. We explicitly studied age effects in a large dataset comprising participants aged 6-31 years. A candidate prognostic biomarker not only needs to be statistically associated with an outcome, but also be quantifiable in real-world settings, be highly reliable, and capture underlying biological processes[55–57]. Therefore, we measured neural activity using electroencephalography (EEG), a widely available and affordable tool in clinical settings[58]. Further, EEG-based functional connectivity reflects the mechanisms underlying neural interactions[59–64], and is robust against motion artefact[65,66]. Next, we quantified the reliability of mean degree and small-world index. Finally, as autism[67,68] and functional connectivity[69–71] are both highly heritable, we assessed convergence of functional connectivity metrics with biological processes by quantifying associations with polygenic variation.

Materials and methods

Participants

We included 150 autistic (27% female) and 159 non-autistic (33% female) participants, aged 6-31 years, from five study sites of the AIMS-2-TRIALS Longitudinal European Autism Project (LEAP)[72,73] in our analyses (Table 1a). Autism was diagnosed per the DSM-IV[74], DSM-5[75] or ICD-10[76] criteria. Included participants had at least one 20-second epoch of good quality eyes-closed resting-state EEG data and a good-quality T1 structural MRI image (for source reconstruction). Given that mental health and other developmental conditions commonly co-

occur with autism[77], we did not exclude participants with these conditions (Table 1a). We excluded participants with neurological conditions, gross structural brain lesions, diagnosed intellectual disability, a full-scale IQ less than 75 or significant systemic disease.

Age-groups

For the age-group analyses, participants were split into 3 age-groups (Table 1b): children (aged 6 – 14 years, n = 116), young-people (aged 15 – 21 years, n = 115), and adults (aged 22-31 years, n = 78). This split was chosen to allow for approximately an equal number of participants in each age-group and comparable age-group widths.

Table 1 - Demographics and clinical characteristics of participants. FSIQ = full-scale IQ. OCD = obsessive compulsive disorder. ADHD = attention deficit / hyperactivity disorder. GDD = global developmental delay. A = autistic, NA = non-autistic.

a) Demographics and clinical characteristics across all age-brackets			
	Autistic (n = 150)	**Non-autistic (n = 159)**	**Total (n = 309)**
Demographics			
Mean age (SD) – yrs	17.1 (5.8)	17.4 (5.9)	17.3 (5.8)
Age range – yrs	7.9 – 30.3	6.9 – 31.0	6.9 – 31.0
Female sex	41 (27%)	53 (33%)	94 (30%)
FSIQ			
Mean FSIQ (SD)	104.2 (14.8)	108.5(12.7)	106.4 (13.9)
FSIQ range	75 – 148	75 – 142	75 – 148
Mental health diagnoses			
Depression	11 / 135 (8%)	1/145 (1%)	12/280 (4%)
Anxiety	14 / 134 (10%)	2/146 (1%)	16/280 (6%)
OCD	6 / 134 (5%)	0/146 (0%)	6/280 (2%)
Developmental diagnoses			
ADHD	28 / 134 (21%)	5/146 (3%)	33/280 (12%)
Dyslexia / dyscalculia	5 / 56 (9%)	5/51 (10%)	10/107 (9%)
Dyspraxia	2 / 56 (4%)	1/51 (2%)	3/107 (3%)
GDD (previous)	6 / 55 (11%)	1/51 (2%)	7/106 (7%)

b) Demographic details within each age bracket						
	6 - 14 yrs		**15 - 21 yrs**		**22-31 yrs**	
	A n = 62	NA n = 54	A n = 52	NA n = 63	A n = 36	NA n = 42
Female Sex	32%	37%	25%	38%	22%	21%
Mean IQ	104	111	101	106	108	109

Co-occurring conditions

We ascertained diagnoses of co-occurring mental health, developmental, neurological and other conditions through use of both a parent- (for child participants) or self-reported (for adult participants) survey and a structured Family Medical History Interview[73].

Behavioural measures

We measured adaptive function in autistic people (only) at timepoint 1 (T1) and timepoint 2 (T2) using the Vineland Adaptive Behaviour Scale, second edition[78], a structured interview. Interviewees rated the participant's adaptive functioning in the domains of communication, daily living and socialisation. Adaptive function across these domains was quantified by the adaptive behaviour composite (ABC) score, standardised for age (mean 100, SD 15). The mean time interval between T1 and T2 ABC measurements was 1 year 7 months (SD = 3.5 months, range 12-30 months), Supplementary Fig. S1a. We calculated longitudinal changes in adaptive function by subtracting T2 from T1 composite scores, as per previous work[18,19].

The age-standardised 'T-scores' of the Social Responsiveness Scale–Second Edition (SRS-2)[79] were used as trait measures of autistic behaviours. The SRS-2 T-score is highly reliable[79]. The child-version of the SRS-2 was completed by the participant's parent or carer while the adult-version was completed by the participant.

Intellectual ability was assessed using the Wechsler Abbreviated Scales of Intelligence – Second Edition (WASI-II)[80], or the shortened versions of the German, Dutch or Italian Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, third or fourth editions[81,82] or Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale third or fourth editions[83,84] (as the WASI-II is not translated into these languages). The shortened versions were used to minimise testing burden on participants. All used measures included two verbal subscales (Vocabulary, Similarities) and two non-verbal subscales (Block Design, Matrix Reasoning). These measures of full-scale IQ from the shortened scales are highly correlated (r = .93) with a full-scale IQ obtained by administering the complete test. Age-standardised estimates of intellectual functioning were derived from national population norms.

Electroencephalography methods

Four segments of 30 second, eyes-closed EEG recordings were captured using 10–20 layout caps, with 60–70 electrodes (site dependent). Short epochs were used to maximise comfort for

participants. We transformed EEG timeseries from sensor space to source space using individual-participant T1-weighted MRI images and a linearly constrained minimum variance beamformer[85], as per Garcés *et al.*[86]. Details of EEG data acquisition, artefact cleaning, source reconstruction and filtering are in the Supplementary Methods.

Cropping, down-sampling and filtering

We chose 20 second eyes-closed resting-state EEG epochs to produce functional connectivity adjacency matrices. This epoch length was chosen as a compromise between maximising the number of included participants and maximising network stability[87,88].

We downsampled the signals to 250Hz and performed data quality checks. We treated the whole 20-second epoch as a single window. Producing multiple windows has the advantage of better capturing moment-to-moment connectivity. However, longer window-length increases the association between the functional connectivity strength quantified empirically and the 'true' functional connectivity strength, as per simulations[88].

We filtered signals (see Supplementary Methods) between 6-9 Hz ('low-alpha') for the following reasons: first, small-world index based on 6-9 Hz EEG signals has been found to have the highest test-retest reliability among frequency bands between 0.5-45 Hz[89]. Second, functional connectivity differences between autistic and non-autistic people have been found in the theta and alpha frequency bands[22]. While the traditional limits of these bands are arbitrarily defined[59], statistical factor analyses of EEG spectra[90] revealed that the data-driven factor with the widest frequency band between 4-13 Hz is 6-9Hz. Finally, the 6-9Hz band may be sensitive to developmental changes in neurobiology: a metanalysis[91] of spectral power changes through development found that peak alpha frequency shifted from 5.4 Hz in toddlerhood to 9.9 Hz in late adolescence.

Functional connectivity network analyses

For each 20-second epoch, we calculated the weighted, undirected functional connectivity between brain-regions using the phase locking value (PLV)[92]. The PLV has the following advantages as an EEG functional connectivity method: it is largely independent of amplitude relationships between brain-regions; scalp EEG-derived PLV has been shown to have high test-retest reliability, concordance with its underlying structural connectivity and ability to predict

longitudinal changes in behaviour[93]. Importantly, the PLV is sensitive to age-related connectivity changes[93].

The PLV between the signals $x_i\,(t)$ and $x_j(t)$, $t\ =\ 1, \ldots., N$ where N is the number of points in an EEG epoch is defined as:

$$PLV_{ij} = \frac{1}{N}\left|\sum_{t=1}^{N} e^{i*\Delta\theta(t)}\right|, (1)$$

where $\Delta\theta(t)$ is the difference of the instantaneous phases $\theta_i\ (t), \theta_j(t)$of the signals $x_i(t), x_j(j)$. We used permutation testing to determine statistically significant edges (see Supplementary Methods).

We created weighted, undirected functional connectivity adjacency matrices with 68 nodes. Each node corresponded to a cortical region of the Desikan-Killiany atlas[94], while the weighted edges were the phase locking value between pairs of nodes. The network metrics of interest were the mean degree and the small-world index, calculated using the brain connectivity toolbox[95].

We used the mean degree to quantify the average number of connections per node in the functional network. The degree of each node was quantified and then averaged over 68 nodes to obtain the mean degree, D:

$$D\ = \frac{1}{N}\sum_i k_i, (2)$$

where k_i denotes the number of edges of node i and $i\ =\ 1, \ldots, N = 68$.

Then, we measured the small-world topology of each network using a modified (for weighted networks) Humphries and Gurney[96] definition of the weighted small-world index[97]. The weighted small-world index, σ, was calculated by dividing the normalised weighted clustering coefficient, C', by the normalised weighted pathlength, L' (see Supplementary Methods):

$$\sigma = \frac{C'}{L'}\ (3)$$

If a participant had more than one usable 20-second EEG epoch, an adjacency matrix, the mean degree and weighted small-world index was calculated for each epoch. Each participant had 1-4 usable epochs; the per-participant functional connectivity metrics (e.g. mean degree) used in analyses were calculated from the mean of 1-4 epochs. This is because the mean of multiple measures is more reliable than a single measure[98].

Test-retest reliability

We quantified the intrasession test-retest reliability between two epochs recorded between 1-3 minutes of each other. Intrasession test-retest reliability was used to reduce the confounding effects of circadian rhythm[99] and caffeine[100] on functional connectivity. Reliability was calculated for metrics derived from one 20-second epoch using interclass correlation coefficient (ICC (2,1)) and metrics derived from the mean of two 20-second epochs using ICC(2,k). ICC values were interpreted as per Ku and Li[101]: 0.9 -1.0 = excellent reliability, 0.75-0.9 = good, 0.5-0.75 = moderate and 0.0-0.5 = poor reliability.

Genetics

We calculated polygenic likelihood scores (PGS) using blood samples. Single-nucleotide polymorphism genotyping was undertaken by the "Centre National de Recherche en Génomique Humaine" (Paris, France), using the Infinium OmniExpress-24v1 BeadChip (>700 K markers) from Illumina. Using genome-wide association study summary statistics as a reference, PGS were produced for autism[102] and brain volume[103]. For brain volume PGS, a more positive value is associated with more alleles for large brain volume. PGS scores were adjusted for ancestry and the raw PGS for each participant for each trait was standardized (z-scored) using European non-autistic participants as a reference. PGS were available for 136 autistic people and 133 non-autistic people.

Statistical analysis: general linear models

We used general linear models to determine the presence of significant age x group interaction effects and adjust for the effect of nuisance covariates (e.g. site and sex). We retained interaction effects when $p < .05$ for the interaction term[104]. We used the False Discovery Rate to correct for multiple comparisons[105]; one comparison family was comprised of one hypothesis. All reported p values are two-tailed, $\alpha = .05$. We selected models by comparing the Akaike information criterion (AIC) and the adjusted R^2 between models with different nuisance co-variates. We adjusted models predicting changes in ABC scores in autistic participants for

participant age and age x T2 – T1 (time difference) interactions, as per Pretzsch *et al.*[19], as rate of behavioural change differs by developmental stage[53]. Effect sizes of independent variables in general linear models were measured using Type II Eta squared (η^2). $\eta^2 = 0.01$ indicates a small effect, $\eta^2 = 0.06$ indicates a medium effect, and $\eta^2 = 0.14$ indicates a large effect[106].

We standardised (z-scored to sample mean and standard deviation) values of mean degree and small-world index to allow comparisons between the coefficient estimates from different general linear models.

Model assumptions (e.g. normality of residuals and homoskedasticity) were tested using standard approaches. For the assumption of linearity, the Ramsey Regression Equation Specification Error Test[107] was used to assess whether the addition of non-linear combinations of the independent variables improved model fit. This was limited to altering the age variable to its quadratic form, only, for reasons of interpretability.

We evaluated the out-of-sample generalisability of the models predicting longitudinal changes in ABC score using the connectome-based predictive modelling protocol[108]. First, we plotted the predicted values from the model against the actual values from the data and fitted a regression line to assess bias. The gradient of this line was interpreted as follows: gradient ~ 1: predicted values closely match observed values, gradient < 1: model underestimates true values, gradient > 1: model overestimates true values. Then, we performed 5-fold cross-validation to assess model performance on 'unseen' participants. Finally, we tested the significance of the independent variables mean degree and small-world index – when adjusting for the presence of co-variates – using permutation testing, using the double residualisation permutation method[109] (robust in the presence of high nuisance co-variate:sample size ratio). We randomly assigned the ABC score changes to different participants and derived the correlation coefficient (r) for actual versus predicted values 10,000 times.

We explored the ability of general linear models to predict categorical changes in ABC score on a per-participant basis, using leave-one-out cross-validation. We used an ABC score change cutoff of 6 to define improving, worsening or static outcomes, based on evidence that longitudinal ABC score changes greater than 2.7-8[110,111] in autistic people without intellectual disability are minimal clinically-important differences. We assessed if predictive ability was better than chance by permuting the labels of actual category of change 1000 times. Then, to

illustrate predictive performance using the area under the receiver operated characteristic curve (AUC), sensitivity and specificity, we binarized outcomes to increased ($\geq$ 6) or not-increased (< 6) ABC scores. AUC was quantified using the R-package "Display and Analyze ROC Curves[112]," using bootstrapping to calculate 95% confidence intervals.

Results

There were no differences between the number of analysable EEG epochs per participant between autistic and non-autistic people (W = 11362, p = .66). Older participants had more usable epochs (r = .18, p = .002).

Cross-sectional group differences in functional connectivity

We quantified the extent of cortico-cortical functional connectivity per person using mean degree (MD). There was no significant main effect of diagnostic group on MD across the 6–31-year age-range (Supplementary Table S1). However, there were significant age-related findings: MD increased with age in both autistic and non-autistic people (Fig. 1a). There was a significant group x age interaction: age-associated increases in MD were slower in autistic than in non-autistic people (β = -0.03, SE = 0.017, p = .045, η^2 = 0.01), Fig. 1a. Given this interaction, compared to non-autistic people, MD was no different in autistic 6-14-year-olds (β = 0.11, SE = 0.18, p_{FDR} = .52), but significantly lower in autistic 15-21-year-olds (β = -0.58, SE = 0.18, p_{FDR} = .005) and 22-31-year-olds (β = -0.50, SE = 0.23, p_{FDR} = .044), Fig. 1c. In autistic people aged 6-31-years, the presence of more autistic features (SRS T-score) correlated with lower MD, even when adjusting for site effects (partial r = -.31, n = 118, p < .001), Fig. 1e.

There was no significant main effect of group on small-world index (SWI), across the 6-31-year age-range (Supplementary Table S2). However, there were significant age-related findings: SWI decreased with age in both autistic and non-autistic people (Fig. 1b). There was a significant group x age interaction: age-associated decreases in SWI were slower in autistic than in non-autistic people (β = 0.036, SE = 0.017, p = .039, η^2 = 0.01). We found no differences in SWI in autistic 6-14-year-olds (β = -0.12, SE = 0.18, p_{FDR} = .51, d = -0.12), 15-21-year-olds (β = 0.39, SE = 0.19, p_{FDR} = .13, d = 0.38) or 22-31-year-olds (β = 0.38, SE = 0.22, p_{FDR} = .14, d = 0.39) compared to non-autistic people (Fig. 1d). Within autistic people aged 6-31-years,

the presence of more autistic traits (SRS T-score) correlated with higher SWI, even when adjusting for site effects (partial $r = .30$, n = 118, $p < .001$), Fig. 1f.



Figure 1 – Cross-sectional relationships between functional connectivity metrics and autism diagnosis or autistic traits. In both autistic and non-autistic people, **a)** mean degree increased (β = .29, SE = .05, *p* <.001) and **b)** small-world index decreased (β = -.29, SE = .05, *p* <.001) with age from childhood to adulthood. **a-b)** There were significant group x age interactions in mean degree and small-world index: both changed more slowly from childhood to adulthood in autistic people (n = 309)**. c)** Mean degree was no different in autistic 6-14-year-olds (n = 116) but was lower in autistic 15-21-year-olds (n = 115) and 22-31-year-olds (n = 78), compared to non-autistic people. **d)** Small-world index did not differ by group in any age-group. In autistic people, **e)** lower mean degree and **f)** higher small-world index was associated with more autistic features (n = 118).

Functional connectivity predicts longitudinal changes in adaptive function

From the sample of 150 autistic people, we collected ABC score data at timepoint 1 (T1) from 122 people, at timepoint 2 (T2) from 90 people, and at both timepoints from 81 people, Table 2.

Table 2 – Vineland Adaptive Behaviour Composite (ABC) Scores by timepoint and age-bracket. T1 = timepoint 1

	6-14 years		15-21 years		22-31 years		6-31 years	
Mean ABC T1 (SD) Range	77.9 (9.9) 58 – 100	n=48	69.7 (9.1) 46 – 101	n=42	70.2 (20.6) 30 – 121	n=32	73.0 (13.8) 30-121	n=122
Mean ABC T2 (SD) Range	77.2 (10.4) 59 – 102	n=46	72.8 (12.8) 20 – 91	n=30	74.6 (12.6) 45 – 95	n=14	75.3 (11.6) 20-102	n=90
Mean ABC change (SD) Range	-1.6 (9.0) -23 - +26	n=40	1.5 (9.9) -37 - +15	n=28	7.5 (11.7) -12 - +30	n=13	0.95 (10.1) -37 - +30	n=81

Cross-sectional analyses between functional connectivity and adaptive function

First, we examined if MD and SWI were associated with T1 adaptive function abilities in autistic people. We found that lower MD and higher SWI were significantly associated with lower T1 adaptive function (n = 122; MD: $\beta = 2.79$, SE = 1.17, $p = .019$, $\eta^2 = 0.03$; SWI: $\beta = -2.85$, SE = 1.16, $p = .016$, $\eta^2 = 0.04$; Supplementary Tables S3-4), across the 6-31-year age-group.

Longitudinal analyses between functional connectivity and adaptive function

Next, we assessed the association between T1 functional connectivity metrics and longitudinal changes in adaptive function in autistic people. ABC score changes ranged from -37 to +30 (mean = +0.95, SD = 10.14), Supplementary Fig. S1b, Table 2. There were no differences in the variance of change in ABC scores between age-groups ($F_{2/78} = .61$, $p = .55$).

MD did not significantly predict longitudinal changes in ABC scores, when 6-31-year-old autistic people were analysed together (n = 81, $\beta = 1.89$, SE = 1.06, $p = .07$, $\eta^2 = 0.03$), Supplementary Table S5.

In 15-21-year-old autistic people, higher MD was associated with longitudinal improvements in ABC score, with a large effect size (n = 28, $\beta = 5.64$, SE = 1.44, $p_{FDR} = .003$, $p_{permute} = .017$,

$\eta^2 = 0.18$, Fig. 2a-b). Adding the variable MD to a general linear model predicting change in ABC score (already containing full-scale IQ, T1 ABC score, age and sex) increased the amount of variance explained in changes in ABC score by 33%, even while adjusting for the number of predictors in the model (model R^2_{adj} increased from $R^2_{adj} = .24$ to $R^2_{adj} = .57$).

MD did not significantly predict longitudinal changes in ABC score in 6-14-year-old (n = 40, $\beta = 1.21$, SE = 1.44, $p_{FDR} = .40$, $\eta^2 = 0.02$) and 22-31-year-old (n = 13, $\beta = 3.64$, SE = 2.05, $p_{FDR} = .17$, $\eta^2 = 0.06$) autistic people, Supplementary Tables S6-7.

a) Graph showing partial correlation



b) General linear model

N = 28 15-21-year-olds	Est. coeff.	Std. Error	t	*p*	η^2
Intercept	-172.10	127.20	-1.35	.193	
MD (standardised)	**5.64**	**1.44**	**3.92**	**.001**	**.18**
FSIQ	0.15	0.10	1.52	.145	.03
Current Vineland	-0.62	0.19	-3.30	.004	.13
Age	0.04	0.02	1.83	.084	.21
Age difference	0.40	0.21	1.96	.066	.11
Sex (male)	-4.89	3.22	-1.52	.147	.03
Site 2	5.47	3.03	1.81	.088	
Site 3	7.23	4.10	1.76	.095	.05
Age x age difference	0.00	0.00	-2.26	.037	.06
Vineland change ~ MD (standardised) + FSIQ + Current Vineland + Age + Age difference + Sex + Site + Age x Age difference. $R^2 = .71$, $R^2_{adj} = .57$, $F(9,18) = 4.95$, $p = .0019$					
Model statistics of a model where MD is omitted as a variable: $R^2 = .47$, $R^2_{adj} = .24$, $F(8,19) = 2.08$, $p = .091$. Change in R^2_{adj} on adding MD to the model = + .326.					

Figure 2 – Mean degree predicts longitudinal changes in adaptive function in autistic people aged 15-21-years. a-b) higher mean degree at timepoint 1 predicted longitudinal improvements in adaptive function. The values in the graph are residualised for the co-variates listed in **b).** η^2 for main effect of MD shows a large effect size. Adding the variable mean degree to the general linear model improved the amount of explained variance in changes in adaptive behaviour composite (ABC) scores by 33% (n = 28).

SWI significantly predicted longitudinal changes in ABC score when 6-31-year-old autistic people were analysed together. Lower SWI was associated with improvements in ABC score (n = 81, $\beta = -2.36$, SE = 1.02, $p = .023$, $p_{permute} = .024$, $\eta^2 = 0.04$), Fig. 3a-b. Adding the variable SWI to a model predicting changes in ABC score (already containing full-scale IQ, time 1 ABC score and age) increased the amount of variance explained in changes in ABC score by 4% when adjusting for the number of predictors in the model (model R^2_{adj} increased from $R^2_{adj} = 0.30$ to $R^2_{adj} = 0.34$).

Taking each age-group in turn, in 15-21-year-old autistic people, lower SWI was associated with longitudinal improvements in ABC score, with a large effect size (n = 28, $\beta = -5.60$, SE = 1.48, $p_{FDR} = .007$, $p_{permute} = .017$, $\eta^2 = 0.21$), Fig 3c-d. Adding the variable SWI to a model predicting changes in ABC score (already containing full-scale IQ, T1 ABC score, age and sex) increased the amount of variance explained in changes in ABC scores by 30%, even while adjusting for the number of predictors in the model (model R^2_{adj} increased from $R^2_{adj} = .23$ to $R^2_{adj} = .53$).

SWI did not significantly predict longitudinal changes in ABC score in 6-14-year-old (n = 40, $\beta = 0.12$, SE = 1.57, $p_{FDR} = .94$, $\eta^2 < 0.01$, Supplementary Table S8) or 22-31-year-old (n = 13, $\beta = -3.46$, SE = 1.77, $p_{FDR} = .22$, $\eta^2 = 0.06$, Supplementary Table S9) autistic people.

Scatterplots of actual versus predicted values of change in ABC score for each significant model are shown in Supplementary Figure S2.

We assessed the performance of the three models that significantly predicted longitudinal changes in adaptive function in autistic people on 'unseen' participants using 5-fold cross-validation (Table 3). The cross validation R^2s were between .335 and .459 (mean absolute error 6.5-6.9; Supplementary Table 10).

A plausible trivial explanation for different effect sizes in each age-group could be a difference in variance in SWI, MD or Vineland difference in each age-group. Levene's test showed that this was not the case for any variable (Vineland difference: $F_{2/78} = 0.61$, $p = .55$; SWI: $F_{2/147} = 2.86$, $p = .060$; MD: $F_{2/147} = .20$, $p = .82$). Additionally, we examined if the large effect size between functional connectivity and ABC score changes in 15-21-year-olds was specific to adaptive function change, or if it was also found in other brain-behaviour associations. We found that associations between SRS T-score and SWI or MD were stronger in 6-14-year-olds and 22-31-year-olds than in 15-21-year-olds (Supplementary Tables S11-16).

a) Relationship between small-world index and change in ABC scores in autistic 6-31-year-olds



b) General linear model predicting longitudinal change in adaptive function in autistic people using small-world index, in 6-31-year-olds

N = 81 6-31-year-olds	Est. coeff	Std. Error	t	*p*	η^2
Intercept	-3.71	19.14	-0.19	.847	
SWI (standardised)	**-2.36**	**1.02**	**-2.32**	**.023**	**.04**
FSIQ	0.07	0.06	1.17	.245	.01
Current Vineland	-0.47	0.10	-4.61	.000	.18
Age	3.56	1.22	2.92	.005	.01
Age difference	0.05	0.03	1.62	.110	.07
Site 2	1.34	2.33	0.58	.566	
Site 3	5.45	2.86	1.90	.061	.03
Age x age difference	-0.01	0.00	-2.77	.007	.06
SWI (standardised) + FSIQ + Current Vineland + Age + Age difference + Site + Age x Age difference. R^2 = .40, R^2_{adj} = .34, F(8,72) = 6.08, *p* < .001.					
Model statistics of a model where SWI is omitted as a variable: R^2 = .36, R^2_{adj} = .30, F(7,73) = 5.83, *p* < .001. Change in R^2_{adj} on adding SWI to model = + .04.					

c) Relationship between small-world index and change in ABC scores in autistic 15-21-year-olds



d) General linear model predicting longitudinal change in adaptive function in autistic people using small-world index, in 15-21-year-olds

N = 28 15-21-year-olds	Est. coeff	Std. Error	t	*p*	η^2
Intercept	-159.15	132.13	-1.21	.242	
SWI (standardised)	**-5.60**	**1.48**	**-3.78**	**.001**	**.21**
FSIQ	0.15	0.10	1.45	.164	.03
Current Vineland	-0.57	0.19	-2.96	.008	.13
Age	12.45	7.61	1.64	.117	.16
Age difference	0.36	0.21	1.69	.106	.09
Sex (male)	-5.81	3.47	-1.68	.109	.04
Age x age difference	-0.02	0.01	-1.94	.066	.05
Vineland change ~ SWI (standardised) + FSIQ + Current Vineland + Age + Age difference + Sex + Age x Age difference. R^2 = .65, R^2_{adj} = .53, F(7,20) = 5.30, *p* = .002.					
Model statistics of a model where SWI is omitted as a variable: R^2 = .40, R^2_{adj} = .23, F(6,21) = 2.32, *p* = .07. Change in R^2_{adj} on adding SWI to model = + .30.					

Figure 3 – Small-world index predicts longitudinal changes in adaptive function in autistic people. a-d) lower small-world index at timepoint 1 predicted longitudinal improvements in adaptive function, both when **a-b)** the whole age-range was looked at together, and when **c-d)** young people were analysed by themselves. However, the effect size of the predictive ability was larger in **d)** young people than in the **b)** whole age-range. The values in the graphs **a)** and **c)** are residualised for the co-variates listed in **b)** and **d)** respectively**.** Adding the variable small-world index to each of the general linear models improved the amount of explained variance in changes in adaptive behaviour composite (ABC) scores by **(b)** 4% in the whole age-range (n = 81) and **(d)** 30% in 15-21-year-olds (n = 28).

Clinical utility

To investigate the relative utility of MD and SWI as prognostic biomarkers of adaptive function outcomes, we compared their predictive performance to that of T1 autistic features (SRS T-score) and T1 full-scale IQ (FSIQ). For the models with a significant main effect of functional connectivity metric on adaptive function outcomes, we compared models that contained a functional connectivity variable (without SRS T-score or FSIQ) with models where the functional connectivity variable was *replaced* by SRS T-score or FSIQ. Models containing SRS or FSIQ instead of the functional connectivity variable led to decreased R^2_{adj}, with no main effect of SRS or FSIQ (Table 3). Then, we compared models that contained SRS or FSIQ *in addition* to the functional connectivity metric. Adding FSIQ increased the R^2_{adj} and decreased the AIC of the respective models (despite no main effect of FSIQ); thus, FSIQ was included in the models (e.g. Figure 1b). Adding SRS decreased the R^2_{adj} and increased the AIC of the models.

Table 3 – comparing the utility of functional connectivity and behavioural measures in predicting longitudinal changes in adaptive function. Initial models contain functional connectivity variables (small-world index or mean degree), and not the social-responsiveness scale (SRS) or full-scale IQ (FSIQ). When the functional connectivity variable is replaced with SRS or FSIQ in each model, the model R^2_{adj} decreases, and there is no significant main effect of replacement variable. T1 = timepoint 1, ABC = adaptive behaviour composite score, SWI = small-world index, MD = mean degree, SRS = social-responsiveness scale, FSIQ = full-scale IQ.

Initial models			**Replacement models, showing main effect of replacement variable**				
Dependent variable: Δ ABC score **Independent variables:**	**Age group**	**Original variable of interest**	**Replaced with**	**Est. coeff**	**Std. Error**	**Δ Adj. R^2**	***p***
SWI + T1 ABC + Age + Age difference + Sex + Age * Age difference	15-21	SWI	FSIQ	0.073	0.130	-.275	.579
SWI + T1 ABC + Age + Age difference + Sex + Age * Age difference	15-21	SWI	SRS	-0.019	0.206	-.296	.927
SWI + T1 ABC + Age + Age difference + Site + Age * Age difference	6-31	SWI	FSIQ	0.072	0.064	-.037	.261
SWI + T1 ABC + Age + Age difference + Site + Age * Age difference	6-31	SWI	SRS	-0.168	0.102	-.061	.105
MD + T1 ABC + Age + Age difference + Sex + Site + Age * Age difference	15-21	MD	FSIQ	0.099	0.130	-.296	.456
MD + T1 ABC + Age + Age difference + Sex + Site + Age * Age difference	15-21	MD	SRS	0.116	0.218	-.286	.603

Categorical prediction of adaptive function changes

As a proof of concept, we explored the ability of the three regression models to accurately predict ABC score changes categorically on a per-participant basis, using leave-one-out cross-validation. We used a minimal clinically-important difference of ABC score of 6[110,111] to define increased (≥ 6), decreased (≤ -6) and static (< |6|) Vineland outcomes. The accuracy of MD in 15-21-year-olds was 64.3% ($p_{permute}$ = .006), SWI in 15-21-year-olds was 57.1% ($p_{permute}$ = .039); SWI in 6-31-year-olds was 60.4% ($p_{permute}$ < .001), Table 4. All models categorised ABC score outcomes into three categories significantly better than chance. Then, we explored model performance in performing binary categorisation into increased (≥ 6) or not-increased (< 6) ABC score outcomes. For the model containing MD in 15-21-year-olds, AUC = 0.80 [95% CI: 0.63-0.97], sensitivity = 0.63, specificity = 0.85; for SWI in 15-21-year-olds, AUC = 0.66 [95% CI: 0.45-0.87]; sensitivity = 0.38; specificity = 0.75; for SWI in 6-31-year-olds, AUC = 0.76 [95% CI: 0.63- 0.89]; sensitivity = 0.43; specificity = 0.93.

Table 4 - Comparing actual versus predicted changes in ABC score, using leave-one-out cross-validation. Category thresholds are defined using a minimal-clinically important difference value of ≥ 6. All included models categorise ABC score outcome into three categories significantly better than chance, as per permutation analyses.

	Actual	**Predicted**		
		Decrease	Increase	No change
15-21 MD n = 28	Decrease	2	1	1
	Increase	0	5	3
	No Change	3	2	11
	Prediction accuracy = 64.3% ($p_{permute}$ = .006)			
15-21 SWI n = 28	Decrease	3	1	0
	Increase	0	3	5
	No Change	2	4	10
	Prediction accuracy = 57.1% ($p_{permute}$ = .039)			
6-31 SWI n = 81	Decrease	7	0	11
	Increase	1	9	11
	No Change	5	4	33
	Prediction accuracy = 60.4% ($p_{permute}$ = .000)			

Properties desired in candidate prognostic biomarkers: high reliability and convergence with underlying biology

MD and SWI had good test-retest reliability (n = 203), both when derived from one 20-second epoch and from the mean of 2 epochs. For MD, ICC (2,1) = .78 [95% CI: .72 - .82] and ICC

(2,k) = .88 [95% CI: .84 - .91]. For SWI, ICC (2,1) = .77 [95% CI: .71 - .82] and ICC (2,k) = .87 [95% CI: .83 - .90].

To assess for convergence with underlying biological processes, we investigated if MD and SWI were associated with polygenic variation. We found no significant associations between polygenic scores (PGS) for autism and MD or SWI (Supplementary Tables S17-18).

Given previous findings of differences in brain volume between autistic and non-autistic people[52] and an association between cortical volume and adaptive function outcomes[19], we next investigated associations between MD and SWI and PGS for brain volume. PGS for brain volume was significantly associated with variance in MD (n = 136, partial r^2 = .073, partial r = .27, p_{FDR} = .004) and SWI (n = 136, partial r^2 = .090, partial r = -.30, p_{FDR} = .002), even when adjusting for age and sex, Fig. 4. Notably, these gene-brain relationships were specific to autistic people; no association between PGS for brain volume and MD or SWI was found in the non-autistic group, despite similar variances in PGS and functional connectivity metrics between groups (Supplementary Table S19).

Given the association between PGS for brain volume and functional connectivity metrics, we confirmed that longitudinal changes in adaptive function were not trivially associated with head circumference (a proxy of brain volume[113]), Supplementary Tables S20–22.



Figure 4 – Relationship between polygenic score for brain volume and functional connectivity metrics. Partial correlations adjusting for age and sex found that polygenic scores for brain volume were significantly associated with variance in mean degree (partial r^2 = .073) and SWI (partial r^2 = .090), n = 136. A more positive polygenic score is associated with more alleles for large brain volume. These gene-brain relationships were only found in autistic people.

Discussion

By explicitly considering age-effects and using a large, multi-site dataset, this study is the first (to our knowledge) to demonstrate that EEG-derived functional connectivity metrics can predict longitudinal changes in adaptive function in autistic people. Both mean degree and small-world index predicted longitudinal changes in adaptive function, explaining 30-33% of the variance in outcomes in 15-21-year-old autistic people. Small-world index also significantly predicted adaptive function outcomes across autistic people aged 6-31 years. Both metrics showed convergence with polygenic scores for brain volume and high test-retest reliability. Therefore, EEG-derived mean degree and small world index may be developed as prognostic biomarkers for adaptive function in autistic people.

Conflicting findings from previous autism functional connectivity studies has limited the development of functional connectivity metrics as biomarkers. Our cross-sectional analyses highlight that functional connectivity differences between autistic and non-autistic people differ by developmental stage. Considering developmental stage in autism functional connectivity analyses may reconcile some of this heterogeneity, as has also been argued by Uddin *et al.*[54].

Clinical utility

Intelligence[13,14] and communicative speech before the age of 5 years[14] have been identified as predictors of longitudinal changes in adaptive function in autistic people. However, they leave most of the variance in adaptive function outcomes unexplained[1,15]. Here, in 15-21-year-old autistic people and 6-31-year-old autistic people (for SWI only), we found that EEG-derived MD and SWI were better predictors of changes in adaptive function than the extent of autistic features and/or full-scale IQ. In 15-21-year-olds, small-world index and mean degree explained 30% and 33% of additional variance in adaptive function outcomes, respectively. Thus, in this age-group, our metrics predicted greater variance in longitudinal changes in adaptive function than the N170[18] or cortical structure[19], which both explained 6% of additional variance. Our study expands on an important but small (n = 27) fMRI functional connectivity study in a homogenous sample of autistic males[15].

We also explored the ability of models containing MD and SWI to categorise adaptive function outcomes on a per-person basis, using evidence-based[110,111] cutoffs of minimal-clinically

important differences in ABC scores and leave-one-out cross-validation. Models containing MD and SWI categorised outcomes as increased, static and decreased ABC scores significantly better than chance, even when including participants across the 6-31-year age-range. Further, in binary categorisation into "increase" versus "no-increase" groups, the model containing MD in 15-21-year-old autistic people had an AUC of 0.80 and the model containing SWI in 6-31-year-old autistic people had an AUC of 0.76, suggesting promise as prognostic biomarkers[114].

Together, these findings suggest that EEG-derived mean degree and small-world index may be developed as prognostic biomarkers for both continuous and categorical changes in adaptive function outcomes, especially for autistic people aged 15-21-years. Possible applications include identifying groups of autistic people as being at risk of declining adaptive function during a key transitional period of development. This may enable targeted early interventions, such as those addressing adaptive function, employment and postsecondary-education skills in this age-group[115]. Another application includes stratifying autistic people for clinical trials in which the ABC score is an outcome measure. This could be performed by accounting for autistic people who are likely to spontaneously improve their adaptive function skills, thereby increasing the expected effect size of an intervention and reducing sample size requirements, as our group has previously demonstrated with simulated placebo-control trials[18].

Brain-behaviour associations in different age groups

We identified an age-bracket where EEG-derived functional connectivity is a particularly effective predictor of adaptive function outcomes. When analysing autistic people aged 6-31-years, adding SWI to the model only increased explained variance by 4%. However, when analysing autistic people aged 15-21-years, adding the variable MD or SWI to models increased the variance explained in adaptive function outcomes by 33% and 30%, respectively. The question is, *why*? We identify three possible, and related, explanations. First, within the 15-21-year-old group, encompassing late adolescence, precision in the development of functional connectivity could be particularly important for behavioural outcomes. Therefore, variation in functional connectivity between young people may have a large effect on outcomes. Consistently, cortical and subcortical functional connectivity organisation[116] – including that involved in social cognition[117–119] – is significantly disrupted and remodelled between the ages of 14-26 years[117,119]. In other age-groups, conservative maturation (where strong connections become stronger and weak connections become weaker) may be more pervasive[116,119]; therefore, variation across individuals may have a less profound impact.

Second, functional connectivity derived MD and SWI may be key drivers of adaptive function outcomes in late adolescence, whereas other features are more important at other ages. For example, in 22-31-year-old autistic people, we found that FSIQ predicted more variance in ABC score change than did MD or SWI (Supplementary Tables S6.13 and S6.15). Third, we found that the effect size of mean degree differences between autistic and non-autistic people was greatest in the 15-21-year age-group (Figure 1c). That connectivity is most different from non-autistic people in this age-group may also suggest that it is most relevant.

Additionally, we considered two explanations that might arise due to peculiarities of our dataset. It could be that brain-behaviour associations *in general* are strongest in the 15–21-year age-group. If this were the case, associations between MD and SWI and other behavioural features (e.g. SRS T-scores) would also be higher in this age-group than others. We found the opposite (Supplementary Table S16 - S21). Next, it could be that the variances in ABC score change, MD or SWI between age-groups were different, allowing associations to be found in some but not other groups. This was also found to not be the case.

Genetic associations with MD and SWI

Polygenic scores for brain volume[103] explained a high proportion of variance (in the context of polygenic scores[18,120]) in MD and SWI (7.3% and 9.0% respectively) in autistic people. Whole brain, white matter and cortical volume differences have been repeatedly found in autistic people[19,51,52]. Twin studies have shown that the heritability of the extent of large-scale functional connectivity is approximately 37%[121], while SWI has a heritability of approximately 50%[69,70]. Our findings suggest that the effects of genotype on MD and SWI could explained by polygenic variation in genes contributing to brain volume.

Interestingly, the associations between PGS for brain volume and MD / SWI were only found in autistic people. This may suggest that genetic influences on brain volume affect MD and SWI more strongly in the co-presence of genetic and environmental factors that autistic people (and not non-autistic people) are exposed to. It is plausible that genetic variants for brain volume and autistic features interact in complex ways.

Study strengths and limitations

Our study design had many strengths. Notably, we included autistic people at 5 study sites with co-occurring developmental and mental health conditions – reflecting autistic people in the

general population[77]. Thus, our findings may be applicable to a large group of autistic people. Second, we used the Vineland Adaptive Behaviour Scale[78,122] – shown to have high test-retest reliability[78], convergent validity and internal consistency[123] – to measure adaptive function. Third, EEG is a widely available and affordable measure of functional connectivity[58], further improving translation potential.

We showed the robustness of MD and SWI as prognostic biomarkers for adaptive function outcomes in several ways. MD showed sensitivity to diagnostic group: it was lower in autistic compared to non-autistic young people and adults. Within autistic people, MD and SWI varied with the extent of autistic features. Further, MD and SWI were associated with *current* adaptive function in the same direction as they were associated with longitudinal changes in adaptive function. The general linear models developed to predict longitudinal changes in adaptive function (containing MD and SWI as independent variables) explained a high proportion of variance in outcome even in 'unseen' autistic participants, as shown by 5-fold-cross-validation. Crucially, in the context of candidate prognostic biomarkers, MD and SWI showed high test-retest reliability and convergent validity with underlying biological processes (polygenic variation in brain volume-associated genes).

Our study has important limitations. Although our overall sample of participants was large, we had a relatively small sample size of autistic participants aged 15-21-years with longitudinal Vineland data (n = 28). Further, we discarded more epochs during quality assurance for children than for adults. Therefore, the values of SWI and MD may be less reliable in children compared to adults.

We used the Humphries[96] method of quantifying SWI, which is affected by network density / mean degree[40]. Networks with a higher mean degree had lower values of SWI (Supplementary Figure S6.3). Therefore, the two functional connectivity metrics used in this study are not independent. That said, this is true for most network metrics[124,125]. Previous research has addressed this issue by applying a threshold on network density[126] to keep it constant across participants. However, this has the effect of excluding weaker functional connections. We decided against this approach as weak functional connections play an important role in cognition[127,128].

Future work

Adaptive function skill is the amalgamation of many cognitive functions and their interactions with the environment. Future work could explore the cognitive abilities that mediate the effect of MD and SWI on longitudinal changes in adaptive function in autistic people. For example, recent findings from our group suggest that the organisation of EEG-derived large-scale functional connectivity networks is associated with complex facial emotion recognition in an age-sensitive manner[129]. Future work should also assess if EEG functional connectivity metrics predict adaptive function outcomes in an independent dataset, using a larger sample size of 15-21-year-old autistic people.

Conclusion

Our study is the first (to our knowledge) to demonstrate that EEG-derived functional connectivity can explain a significant proportion of the variance in longitudinal changes in adaptive function in autistic people. Therefore, EEG-derived mean degree and small-world index may be developed as prognostic biomarkers for adaptive function outcomes, especially for autistic people aged 15-21-years. This may help stratify groups of autistic people for clinical trials and identify groups at risk of declining adaptive function. Finally, our age-sensitive approach may reconcile the heterogenous findings in previous autism functional connectivity studies.

Data availability

The LEAP Study data is available here, subject to an approved data application:
https://redcap.pasteur.fr/surveys/?s=YRFF78PH89

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the AIMS-2-TRIALS LEAP-group for data collection and quality control procedures. We are grateful to Dr Piotr J. Franaszczuk for his expert advice on signal analysis and filtering.

Funding

This work was supported by EU-AIMS (European Autism Interventions), which received support from the Innovative Medicines Initiative Joint Undertaking under grant agreement no. 115300, the resources of which are composed of financial contributions from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (grant FP7/2007-2013), from the European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries and Associations companies' in-kind contributions, and from Autism Speaks. The results leading to this publication have also received funding from the Innovative Medicines Initiative 2 Joint Undertaking under grant agreement No 777394 for the project AIMS-2-TRIALS. This Joint Undertaking receives support from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme and EFPIA and AUTISM SPEAKS, Autistica, and SFARI. This study was also delivered through the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) Maudsley Biomedical Research Centre (BRC). None of the funders had a role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript, or in the decision to publish the results. Any views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of any of the funders, the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Competing interests

Joshua B Ewen previously consulted for Novartis. In the past 3 years, Jan K Buitelaar has been a consultant to / member of advisory board of / and/or speaker for Takeda, Medice, Angelini, Neuraxpharm and Bitsphi. He is not an employee of any of these companies, and not a stock shareholder of any of these companies. He has no other financial or material support, including expert testimony, patents, royalties. Pilar Garcés is employed by Roche Innovation Center, Basel, Switzerland. Tony Charman has received consultancy fees from F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd. and royalties from Sage Publishing and Guilford Press. No other author has competing interests to declare.

Supplementary material

Supplementary material is available online.

References

1. Farley MA, McMahon WM, Fombonne E, et al. Twenty-year outcome for individuals with autism and average or near-average cognitive abilities. *Autism Research*. 2009;2(2):109-118. doi:10.1002/AUR.69
2. Farley M, Cottle KJ, Bilder D, Viskochil J, Coon H, McMahon W. Mid-life social outcomes for a population-based sample of adults with ASD. *Autism Res*. 2018;11(1):142-152. doi:10.1002/AUR.1897
3. Forbes G, Kent R, Charman T, Baird G, Pickles A, Simonoff E. How do autistic people fare in adult life and can we predict it from childhood? *Autism Research*. 2023;16(2):458-473. doi:10.1002/AUR.2868;PAGE:STRING:ARTICLE/CHAPTER
4. Roche L, Adams D, Clark M. Research priorities of the autism community: A systematic review of key stakeholder perspectives. *https://doi.org/101177/1362361320967790*. 2020;25(2):336-348. doi:10.1177/1362361320967790
5. Pellicano E, Dinsmore A, Charman T. What should autism research focus upon? Community views and priorities from the United Kingdom. *Autism*. 2014;18(7):756-770. doi:10.1177/1362361314529627/ASSET/IMAGES/LARGE/10.1177_1362361314529627-FIG2.JPEG
6. de Bildt A, Sytema S, Kraijer D, Sparrow S, Minderaa R. Adaptive functioning and behaviour problems in relation to level of education in children and adolescents with intellectual disability. *J Intellect Disabil Res*. 2005;49(Pt 9):672-681. doi:10.1111/J.1365-2788.2005.00711.X
7. Howlin P, Alcock J, Burkin C. An 8 year follow-up of a specialist supported employment service for high-ability adults with autism or Asperger syndrome. *http://dx.doi.org/101177/1362361305057871*. 2005;9(5):533-549. doi:10.1177/1362361305057871
8. Magiati I, Tay XW, Howlin P. Cognitive, language, social and behavioural outcomes in adults with autism spectrum disorders: a systematic review of longitudinal follow-up studies in adulthood. *Clin Psychol Rev*. 2014;34(1):78-86. doi:10.1016/J.CPR.2013.11.002
9. Liss M, Harel B, Fein D, et al. Predictors and Correlates of Adaptive Functioning in Children with Developmental Disorders. *J Autism Dev Disord*. 2001;31(2):219-230. doi:10.1023/A:1010707417274/METRICS
10. Baird G, Charman T, Pickles A, et al. Regression, developmental trajectory and associated problems in disorders in the autism spectrum: the SNAP study. *J Autism Dev Disord*. 2008;38(10):1827-1836. doi:10.1007/S10803-008-0571-9
11. Seltzer MM, Shattuck P, Abbeduto L, Greenberg JS. Trajectory of development in adolescents and adults with autism. *Ment Retard Dev Disabil Res Rev*. 2004;10(4):234-247. doi:10.1002/MRDD.20038
12. Szatmari P, Georgiades S, Duku E, et al. Developmental trajectories of symptom severity and adaptive functioning in an inception cohort of preschool children with autism spectrum disorder. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2015;72(3):276-283. doi:10.1001/JAMAPSYCHIATRY.2014.2463
13. McGovern CW, Sigman M. Continuity and change from early childhood to adolescence in autism. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*. 2005;46(4):401-408. doi:10.1111/J.1469-7610.2004.00361.X
14. Billstedt E, Carina Gillberg I, Gillberg C. Autism in adults: symptom patterns and early childhood predictors. Use of the DISCO in a community sample followed from

childhood. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*. 2007;48(11):1102-1110. doi:10.1111/J.1469-7610.2007.01774.X

15. Plitta M, Barnes KA, Wallace GL, Kenworthy L, Martin A. Resting-state functional connectivity predicts longitudinal change in autistic traits and adaptive functioning in autism. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2015;112(48):E6699-E6706. doi:10.1073/PNAS.1510098112/ASSET/DD00959F-B1DB-4FD5-8E76-F562207A69C9/ASSETS/GRAPHIC/PNAS.1510098112FIG02.JPEG
16. Tillmann J, San José Cáceres A, Chatham CH, et al. Investigating the factors underlying adaptive functioning in autism in the EU-AIMS Longitudinal European Autism Project. *Autism Res*. 2019;12(4):645-657. doi:10.1002/AUR.2081
17. Kanne SM, Gerber AJ, Quirmbach LM, Sparrow SS, Cicchetti D V., Saulnier CA. The role of adaptive behavior in autism spectrum disorders: Implications for functional outcome. *J Autism Dev Disord*. 2011;41(8):1007-1018. doi:10.1007/s10803-010-1126-4
18. Mason L, Moessnang C, Chatham C, et al. Stratifying the autistic phenotype using electrophysiological indices of social perception. *Sci Transl Med*. 2022;14(658). doi:10.1126/SCITRANSLMED.ABF8987/SUPPL_FILE/SCITRANSLMED.ABF8987_SM.PDF
19. Pretzsch CM, Schäfer T, Lombardo M V., et al. Neurobiological Correlates of Change in Adaptive Behavior in Autism. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2022;179(5):336-349. doi:10.1176/APPI.AJP.21070711/ASSET/IMAGES/LARGE/APPI.AJP.21070711F3.JPEG
20. Holiga Š, Hipp JF, Chatham CH, et al. Patients with autism spectrum disorders display reproducible functional connectivity alterations. *Sci Transl Med*. 2019;11(481). doi:10.1126/SCITRANSLMED.AAT9223
21. Watanabe T, Rees G. Age-associated changes in rich-club organisation in autistic and neurotypical human brains. *Scientific Reports 2015 5:1*. 2015;5(1):1-13. doi:10.1038/srep16152
22. O'Reilly C, Lewis JD, Elsabbagh M. Is functional brain connectivity atypical in autism? A systematic review of EEG and MEG studies. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(5). doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0175870
23. Horwitz B, Rumsey JM, Grady CL, Rapoport SI. The Cerebral Metabolic Landscape in Autism: Intercorrelations of Regional Glucose Utilization. *Arch Neurol*. 1988;45(7):749-755. doi:10.1001/ARCHNEUR.1988.00520310055018
24. Lukmanji S, Manji SA, Kadhim S, et al. The co-occurrence of epilepsy and autism: A systematic review. *Epilepsy and Behavior*. 2019;98:238-248. doi:10.1016/j.yebeh.2019.07.037
25. Murias M, Webb SJ, Greenson J, Dawson G. Resting State Cortical Connectivity Reflected in EEG Coherence in Individuals With Autism. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2007;62(3):270-273. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2006.11.012
26. Courchesne E, Campbell K, Solso S. Brain growth across the life span in autism: Age-specific changes in anatomical pathology. *Brain Res*. 2011;1380:138-145. doi:10.1016/j.brainres.2010.09.101
27. Barttfeld P, Wicker B, Cukier S, Navarta S, Lew S, Sigman M. A big-world network in ASD: Dynamical connectivity analysis reflects a deficit in long-range connections and an excess of short-range connections. *Neuropsychologia*. 2011;49(2):254-263. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2010.11.024
28. Nomi JS, Uddin LQ. Developmental changes in large-scale network connectivity in autism. *Neuroimage Clin*. 2015;7:732-741. doi:10.1016/j.nicl.2015.02.024

29. Courchesne E, Pierce K. Why the frontal cortex in autism might be talking only to itself: local over-connectivity but long-distance disconnection. *Curr Opin Neurobiol*. 2005;15(2):225-230. doi:10.1016/J.CONB.2005.03.001
30. Mehra C, Absoud M. Commentary on… the overlapping and distinct resting functional connectivity between autism spectrum disorder and attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*. 2019;214(6):345-346. doi:10.1192/BJP.2019.77
31. Oldehinkel M, Mennes M, Marquand A, et al. Altered Connectivity Between Cerebellum, Visual, and Sensory-Motor Networks in Autism Spectrum Disorder: Results from the EU-AIMS Longitudinal European Autism Project. *Biol Psychiatry Cogn Neurosci Neuroimaging*. 2019;4(3):260-270. doi:10.1016/J.BPSC.2018.11.010
32. Ilioska I, Oldehinkel M, Llera A, et al. Connectome-wide Mega-analysis Reveals Robust Patterns of Atypical Functional Connectivity in Autism. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2023;94(1):29-39. doi:10.1016/J.BIOPSYCH.2022.12.018
33. Soma D, Hirosawa T, Hasegawa C, et al. Atypical Resting State Functional Neural Network in Children With Autism Spectrum Disorder: Graph Theory Approach. *Front Psychiatry*. 2021;12:790234. doi:10.3389/FPSYT.2021.790234/BIBTEX
34. Zhang J, Zhang Z, Sun H, et al. Personalized functional network mapping for autism spectrum disorder and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Translational Psychiatry 2024 14:1*. 2024;14(1):1-11. doi:10.1038/s41398-024-02797-z
35. Barttfeld P, Amoruso L, Ais J, et al. Organization of brain networks governed by long-range connections index autistic traits in the general population. *J Neurodev Disord*. 2013;5(1):1-9. doi:10.1186/1866-1955-5-16/FIGURES/3
36. Bassett DS, Bullmore ET. Small-World Brain Networks Revisited. *Neuroscientist*. 2017;23(5):499-516. doi:10.1177/1073858416667720
37. JG W, E S, JN T, S B. The structure of the nervous system of the nematode Caenorhabditis elegans. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*. 1986;314(1165):1-340. doi:10.1098/RSTB.1986.0056
38. Zhang Y, Zhang Y, Cai P, Luo H, Fang F. The causal role of α-oscillations in feature binding. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2019;116(34):17023-17028. doi:10.1073/PNAS.1904160116/-/DCSUPPLEMENTAL
39. Wang XJ, Kennedy H. Brain structure and dynamics across scales: in search of rules. *Curr Opin Neurobiol*. 2016;37:92-98. doi:10.1016/J.CONB.2015.12.010
40. Muldoon SF, Bridgeford EW, Bassett DS. Small-World Propensity and Weighted Brain Networks. *Scientific Reports 2016 6:1*. 2016;6(1):1-13. doi:10.1038/srep22057
41. Medaglia JD, Lynall ME, Bassett DS. Cognitive network neuroscience. *J Cogn Neurosci*. 2015;27(8):1471-1491. doi:10.1162/JOCN_A_00810
42. Just MA, Keller TA, Malave VL, Kana RK, Varma S. Autism as a neural systems disorder: A theory of frontal-posterior underconnectivity. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. 2012;36(4):1292-1313. doi:10.1016/J.NEUBIOREV.2012.02.007
43. Han YMY, Chan AS, Sze SL, et al. Altered immune function associated with disordered neural connectivity and executive dysfunctions: A neurophysiological study on children with autism spectrum disorders. *Res Autism Spectr Disord*. 2013;7(6):662-674. doi:10.1016/J.RASD.2013.02.011
44. Chan AS, Han YMY, Sze SL, et al. Disordered connectivity associated with memory deficits in children with autism spectrum disorders. *Res Autism Spectr Disord*. 2011;5(1):237-245. doi:10.1016/J.RASD.2010.04.005
45. Orekhova E V., Elsabbagh M, Jones EJ, et al. EEG hyper-connectivity in high-risk infants is associated with later autism. *J Neurodev Disord*. 2014;6(1):1-11. doi:10.1186/1866-1955-6-40/FIGURES/4

46. Coben R, Clarke AR, Hudspeth W, Barry RJ. EEG power and coherence in autistic spectrum disorder. *Clinical Neurophysiology*. 2008;119(5):1002-1009. doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2008.01.013
47. Duffy FH, Als H. A stable pattern of EEG spectral coherence distinguishes children with autism from neuro-typical controls - a large case control study. *BMC Med*. 2012;10. doi:10.1186/1741-7015-10-64
48. Vasa RA, Mostofsky SH, Ewen JB. The Disrupted Connectivity Hypothesis of Autism Spectrum Disorders: Time for the Next Phase in Research. *Biol Psychiatry Cogn Neurosci Neuroimaging*. 2016;1(3):245-252. doi:10.1016/j.bpsc.2016.02.003
49. Andrews DS, Lee JK, Harvey DJ, et al. A Longitudinal Study of White Matter Development in Relation to Changes in Autism Severity Across Early Childhood. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2021;89(5):424-432. doi:10.1016/J.BIOPSYCH.2020.10.013
50. Wolff JJ, Gu H, Gerig G, et al. Differences in white matter fiber tract development present from 6 to 24 months in infants with autism. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2012;169(6):589-600. doi:10.1176/APPI.AJP.2011.11091447
51. Hazlett HC, Poe MD, Gerig G, et al. Early Brain Overgrowth in Autism Associated with an Increase in Cortical Surface Area Before Age 2. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2011;68(5):467. doi:10.1001/ARCHGENPSYCHIATRY.2011.39
52. Courchesne E, Karns CM, Davis HR, et al. Unusual brain growth patterns in early life in patients with autistic disorder: an MRI study. *Neurology*. 2001;57(2):245-254. doi:10.1212/WNL.57.2.245
53. Jones W, Klin A. Attention to eyes is present but in decline in 2–6-month-old infants later diagnosed with autism. *Nature 2013 504:7480*. 2013;504(7480):427-431. doi:10.1038/nature12715
54. Uddin LQ, Supekar K, Menon V. Reconceptualizing functional brain connectivity in autism from a developmental perspective. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2013;7(JUL):458. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2013.00458
55. Ewen J, Babiloni C, Collins G, et al. *The GREENBEAN Checklist for Reporting Studies Evaluating the Effectiveness of EEG-Based Biomarkers*.; 2024.
56. FDA-NIH Biomarker Working Group. *BEST (Biomarkers, EndpointS, and Other Tools) Resource*. Food and Drug Administration (US); 2016. Accessed July 26, 2024. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK326791/
57. Davis KD, Aghaeepour N, Ahn AH, et al. Discovery and validation of biomarkers to aid the development of safe and effective pain therapeutics: challenges and opportunities. *Nature Reviews Neurology 2020 16:7*. 2020;16(7):381-400. doi:10.1038/s41582-020-0362-2
58. Mclane HC, Berkowitz AL, Patenaude BN, et al. Availability, accessibility, and affordability of neurodiagnostic tests in 37 countries. *Neurology*. 2015;85(18):1614. doi:10.1212/WNL.0000000000002090
59. Lopes da Silva F. EEG and MEG: relevance to neuroscience. *Neuron*. 2013;80(5):1112-1128. doi:10.1016/J.NEURON.2013.10.017
60. Singer W. Neuronal Synchrony: A Versatile Code for the Definition of Relations? *Neuron*. 1999;24(1):49-65. doi:10.1016/S0896-6273(00)80821-1
61. Buzsáki G. *Rhythms of the Brain*. Oxford Academic; 2006. Accessed August 6, 2022. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=ldz58irprjYC&oi=fnd&pg=PA4&ots=Q3Xd56bNDP&sig=95tLOMYuIOWVdNlEQCVN5Y24sBw
62. Varela F, Lachaux JP, Rodriguez E, Martinerie J. The brainweb: phase synchronization and large-scale integration. *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2001;2(4):229-239. doi:10.1038/35067550

63. Rodriguez E, George N, Lachaux JP, Martinerie J, Renault B, Varela FJ. Perception's shadow: long-distance synchronization of human brain activity. *Nature 1999 397:6718*. 1999;397(6718):430-433. doi:10.1038/17120
64. Bressler SL, Coppola R, Nakamura R. Episodic multiregional cortical coherence at multiple frequencies during visual task performance. *Nature 1993 366:6451*. 1993;366(6451):153-156. doi:10.1038/366153a0
65. Steyrl D, Krausz G, Koschutnig K, et al. Removal of movement-induced EEG artifacts: current state of the art and guidelines. *J Neural Eng*. 2022;19(1):011004. doi:10.1088/1741-2552/AC542C
66. Deen B, Pelphrey K. Perspective: Brain scans need a rethink. *Nature 2012 491:7422*. 2012;491(7422):S20-S20. doi:10.1038/491s20a
67. Tick B, Bolton P, Happé F, Rutter M, Rijsdijk F. Heritability of autism spectrum disorders: a meta-analysis of twin studies. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 2016;57(5):585-595. doi:10.1111/JCPP.12499
68. Genovese A, Butler MG. The Autism Spectrum: Behavioral, Psychiatric and Genetic Associations. *Genes (Basel)*. 2023;14(3). doi:10.3390/GENES14030677
69. Smit DJA, Stam CJ, Posthuma D, Boomsma DI, De Geus EJC. Heritability of "small-world" networks in the brain: A graph theoretical analysis of resting-state EEG functional connectivity. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2008;29(12):1368. doi:10.1002/HBM.20468
70. Sinclair B, Hansell NK, Blokland GAM, et al. Heritability of the Network Architecture of Intrinsic Brain Functional Connectivity. *Neuroimage*. 2015;121:243. doi:10.1016/J.NEUROIMAGE.2015.07.048
71. Reineberg AE, Hatoum AS, Hewitt JK, Banich MT, Friedman NP. Genetic and Environmental Influence on the Human Functional Connectome. *Cereb Cortex*. 2020;30(4):2099-2113. doi:10.1093/CERCOR/BHZ225
72. Charman T, Loth E, Tillmann J, et al. The EU-AIMS Longitudinal European Autism Project (LEAP): Clinical characterisation. *Mol Autism*. 2017;8(1):1-21. doi:10.1186/S13229-017-0145-9/TABLES/8
73. Loth E, Charman T, Mason L, et al. The EU-AIMS Longitudinal European Autism Project (LEAP): design and methodologies to identify and validate stratification biomarkers for autism spectrum disorders. *Mol Autism*. 2017;8(1). doi:10.1186/S13229-017-0146-8
74. American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. 4th ed. American Psychiatric Publishing, Inc; 1994.
75. American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. Published online May 22, 2013. doi:10.1176/APPI.BOOKS.9780890425596
76. Organisation WH. The ICD-10 Classification of mental and behavioural disorders: diagnostic criteria for research. *WHO*. Published online 1993.
77. Lai MC, Kassee C, Besney R, et al. Prevalence of co-occurring mental health diagnoses in the autism population: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2019;6(10):819-829. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(19)30289-5
78. Sparrow SS, Balla DA, Cicchetti DV. *Vineland II: Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales*. American Guidance Service Publishing; 2005.
79. Bruni TP. Test Review: Social Responsiveness Scale–Second Edition (SRS-2). *http://dx.doi.org/101177/0734282913517525*. 2014;32(4):365-369. doi:10.1177/0734282913517525

80. Wechsler D. Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence--Second Edition. APA PsycTests. 2011. Accessed July 31, 2024. https://psycnet.apa.org/doiLanding?doi=10.1037%2Ft15171-000
81. The Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children—Fourth Edition. Accessed July 30, 2024. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2010-04803-007
82. Woolger C. Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Third Edition (wisc-iii). *Understanding Psychological Assessment*. Published online 2001:219-233. doi:10.1007/978-1-4615-1185-4_11
83. Ryan JJ, Lopez SJ. Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-III. *Understanding Psychological Assessment*. Published online 2001:19-42. doi:10.1007/978-1-4615-1185-4_2
84. Wechsler D. Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Fourth Edition. Published online 2008. doi:10.1037/T15169-000
85. Anzolin A, Presti P, Van De Steen F, Astolfi L, Haufe S, Marinazzo D. Quantifying the Effect of Demixing Approaches on Directed Connectivity Estimated Between Reconstructed EEG Sources. *Brain Topogr*. 2019;32(4):655-674. doi:10.1007/S10548-019-00705-Z
86. Garcés P, Baumeister S, Mason L, et al. Resting state EEG power spectrum and functional connectivity in autism: a cross-sectional analysis. *Molecular Autism 2022 13:1*. 2022;13(1):1-16. doi:10.1186/S13229-022-00500-X
87. Fraschini M, Demuru M, Crobe A, Marrosu F, Stam CJ, Hillebrand A. The effect of epoch length on estimated EEG functional connectivity and brain network organisation. *J Neural Eng*. 2016;13(3). doi:10.1088/1741-2560/13/3/036015
88. Pullon RM, Yan L, Sleigh JW, Warnaby CE. Granger Causality of the Electroencephalogram Reveals Abrupt Global Loss of Cortical Information Flow during Propofol-induced Loss of Responsiveness. *Anesthesiology*. 2020;133(4):774. doi:10.1097/ALN.0000000000003398
89. van der Velde B, Haartsen R, Kemner C. Test-retest reliability of EEG network characteristics in infants. *Brain Behav*. 2019;9(5). doi:10.1002/BRB3.1269
90. Niedermeyer Ernst, Schomer DL., Lopes da Silva FH. Niedermeyer's electroencephalography : basic principles, clinical applications, and related fields. Published online 2011:1275. Accessed July 30, 2024. https://www.wolterskluwer.com/en/solutions/ovid/niedermeyers-electroencephalography-basic-principles-clinical-applications-and-related-fields-8611
91. Freschl J, Azizi L Al, Balboa L, Kaldy Z, Blaser E. The development of peak alpha frequency from infancy to adolescence and its role in visual temporal processing: A meta-analysis. *Dev Cogn Neurosci*. 2022;57:101146. doi:10.1016/J.DCN.2022.101146
92. Lachaux JP, Rodriguez E, Martinerie J, Varela FJ. Measuring phase synchrony in brain signals. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 1999;8(4):194. doi:10.1002/(sici)1097-0193(1999)8:4<194::aid-hbm4>3.0.co;2-c
93. Mehra C, Beyh A, Laiou P, et al. Zero-phase-delay connectivity increases the reliability, concordance with structure, and prognostic ability of functional connectivity metrics. *bioRxiv*. Published online January 4, 2025:2025.01.04.631256. doi:10.1101/2025.01.04.631256
94. Desikan RS, Ségonne F, Fischl B, et al. An automated labeling system for subdividing the human cerebral cortex on MRI scans into gyral based regions of interest. *Neuroimage*. 2006;31(3):968-980. doi:10.1016/J.NEUROIMAGE.2006.01.021
95. Rubinov M, Kötter R, Hagmann P, Sporns O. Brain connectivity toolbox: a collection of complex network measurements and brain connectivity datasets. *Neuroimage*. 2009;47:S169. doi:10.1016/S1053-8119(09)71822-1

96. Humphries MD, Gurney K. Network 'Small-World-Ness': A Quantitative Method for Determining Canonical Network Equivalence. *PLoS One*. 2008;3(4):e0002051. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0002051
97. Bolaños M, Bernat EM, He B, Aviyente S. A weighted small world network measure for assessing functional connectivity. *J Neurosci Methods*. 2013;212(1):133-142. doi:10.1016/J.JNEUMETH.2012.10.004
98. Noble S, Scheinost D, Constable RT. A decade of test-retest reliability of functional connectivity: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Neuroimage*. 2019;203:116157. doi:10.1016/J.NEUROIMAGE.2019.116157
99. Fafrowicz M, Bohaterewicz B, Ceglarek A, et al. Beyond the Low Frequency Fluctuations: Morning and Evening Differences in Human Brain. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2019;13:477076. doi:10.3389/FNHUM.2019.00288/BIBTEX
100. Haller S, Rodriguez C, Moser D, et al. Acute caffeine administration impact on working memory-related brain activation and functional connectivity in the elderly: a BOLD and perfusion MRI study. *Neuroscience*. 2013;250:364-371. doi:10.1016/J.NEUROSCIENCE.2013.07.021
101. Koo TK, Li MY. A Guideline of Selecting and Reporting Intraclass Correlation Coefficients for Reliability Research. *J Chiropr Med*. 2016;15(2):155-163. doi:10.1016/J.JCM.2016.02.012
102. Grove J, Ripke S, Als TD, et al. Identification of common genetic risk variants for autism spectrum disorder. *Nat Genet*. 2019;51(3). doi:10.1038/s41588-019-0344-8
103. Biton A, Traut N, Poline JB, et al. Polygenic Architecture of Human Neuroanatomical Diversity. *Cerebral Cortex*. 2020;30(4):2307-2320. doi:10.1093/CERCOR/BHZ241
104. Beck CW, Bliwise NG. Interactions are critical. *CBE Life Sci Educ*. 2014;13(3):371-372. doi:10.1187/CBE.14-05-0086/ASSET/IMAGES/LARGE/371FIG1.JPEG
105. Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*. 1995;57(1):289-300. doi:10.1111/J.2517-6161.1995.TB02031.X
106. anova - How to interpret and report eta squared / partial eta squared in statistically significant and non-significant analyses? - Cross Validated. Accessed July 30, 2024. https://stats.stackexchange.com/questions/15958/how-to-interpret-and-report-eta-squared-partial-eta-squared-in-statistically
107. Tests for Specification Errors in Classical Linear Least-Squares Regression Analysis on JSTOR. Accessed July 30, 2024. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2984219
108. Shen X, Finn ES, Scheinost D, et al. Using connectome-based predictive modeling to predict individual behavior from brain connectivity. *Nature Protocols 2017 12:3*. 2017;12(3):506-518. doi:10.1038/nprot.2016.178
109. Hemerik J, Thoresen M, Finos L. Permutation testing in high-dimensional linear models: an empirical investigation. *J Stat Comput Simul*. 2021;91(5):897-914. doi:10.1080/00949655.2020.1836183
110. Chatham CH, Taylor KI, Charman T, et al. Adaptive Behavior in Autism: Minimal Clinically-Important Differences on the Vineland-II. *Autism Res*. 2018;11(2):270. doi:10.1002/AUR.1874
111. Clinch S, Hudgens S, Gibbons E, et al. Quantitative and Qualitative Exploration of Meaningful Change on the Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales (Vineland™-II) in Children and Adolescents with Autism Without Intellectual Disability Following Participation in a Clinical Trial. *Patient Relat Outcome Meas*. 2023;14:337-354. doi:10.2147/PROM.S385542

112. Robin X, Turck N, Hainard A, et al. pROC: An open-source package for R and S+ to analyze and compare ROC curves. *BMC Bioinformatics*. 2011;12(1):1-8. doi:10.1186/1471-2105-12-77/TABLES/3
113. Courchesne E, Carper R, Akshoomoff N. Evidence of Brain Overgrowth in the First Year of Life in Autism. *JAMA*. 2003;290(3):337-344. doi:10.1001/JAMA.290.3.337
114. Mandrekar JN. Receiver Operating Characteristic Curve in Diagnostic Test Assessment. *Journal of Thoracic Oncology*. 2010;5(9):1315-1316. doi:10.1097/JTO.0B013E3181EC173D
115. T-STEP - TEACCH School Transition to Employment and Postsecondary Education | TEACCH® Autism Program. Accessed May 15, 2025. https://teacch.com/adult_services/tstep/
116. Gracia-Tabuenca Z, Moreno MB, Barrios FA, Alcauter S. Development of the brain functional connectome follows puberty-dependent nonlinear trajectories. *Neuroimage*. 2021;229:117769. doi:10.1016/J.NEUROIMAGE.2021.117769
117. Klapwijk ET, Goddings AL, Burnett Heyes S, Bird G, Viner RM, Blakemore SJ. Increased functional connectivity with puberty in the mentalising network involved in social emotion processing. *Horm Behav*. 2013;64(2):314. doi:10.1016/J.YHBEH.2013.03.012
118. Kelly AMC, Di Martino A, Uddin LQ, et al. Development of Anterior Cingulate Functional Connectivity from Late Childhood to Early Adulthood. *Cerebral Cortex*. 2009;19(3):640-657. doi:10.1093/CERCOR/BHN117
119. Váša F, Romero-Garcia R, Kitzbichler MG, et al. Conservative and disruptive modes of adolescent change in human brain functional connectivity. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2020;117(6):3248-3253. doi:10.1073/PNAS.1906144117/SUPPL_FILE/PNAS.1906144117.SAPP.PDF
120. Lewis CM, Vassos E. Polygenic risk scores: From research tools to clinical instruments. *Genome Med*. 2020;12(1):1-11. doi:10.1186/S13073-020-00742-5/TABLES/2
121. Barber AD, Hegarty CE, Lindquist M, Karlsgodt KH. Heritability of Functional Connectivity in Resting State: Assessment of the Dynamic Mean, Dynamic Variance, and Static Connectivity across Networks. *Cereb Cortex*. 2021;31(6):2834-2844. doi:10.1093/CERCOR/BHAA391
122. Sparrow S, Balla D, Cicchetti D. *Vineland Adpative Behavior Scales: Interview Edition Survey Form Manual.*; 1984. Accessed July 30, 2024. https://www.google.com/search?q=Sparrow%2C+S.+S.%2C+Balla%2C+D.%2C+%26+Cicchetti%2C+D.+V.+(1984).+Vineland+Adpative+Behavior+Scales%3A+Interview+edition+survey+form+manual.+Circle+Press%2C+MN%3A+American+Guidance+Service.&rlz=1C1UEAD_enUS1053US1053&oq=Sparrow%2C+S.+S.%2C+Balla%2C+D.%2C+%26+Cicchetti%2C+D.+V.+(1984).+Vineland+Adpative+Behavior+Scales%3A+Interview+edition+survey+form+manual.+Circle+Press%2C+MN%3A+American+Guidance+Service.&gs_lcrp=EgZjaHJvbWUyBggAEEUYOdIBBzY3M2owajeoAgCwAgA&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8
123. Perry A, Flanagan HE, Dunn Geier J, Freeman NL. Brief report: the Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales in young children with autism spectrum disorders at different cognitive levels. *J Autism Dev Disord*. 2009;39(7):1066-1078. doi:10.1007/S10803-009-0704-9
124. Bañuelos C, Verstynen T. How structural brain network topologies associate with cognitive abilities in a value-based decision-making task. *bioRxiv*. Published online August 22, 2019:743245. doi:10.1101/743245

125. Richardson MP. Large scale brain models of epilepsy: Dynamics meets connectomics. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2012;83(12):1238-1248. doi:10.1136/jnnp-2011-301944
126. Bassett DS, Nelson BG, Mueller BA, Camchong J, Lim KO. Altered resting state complexity in schizophrenia. *Neuroimage*. 2012;59(3):2196-2207. doi:10.1016/J.NEUROIMAGE.2011.10.002
127. Schneidman E, Berry MJ, Segev R, Bialek W. Weak pairwise correlations imply strongly correlated network states in a neural population. *Nature 2006 440:7087*. 2006;440(7087):1007-1012. doi:10.1038/nature04701
128. Santarnecchi E, Galli G, Polizzotto NR, Rossi A, Rossi S. Efficiency of weak brain connections support general cognitive functioning. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2014;35(9):4566-4582. doi:10.1002/HBM.22495
129. de Jonge E, Garcés P, de Bildt A, et al. Atypical Resting-State EEG Graph Metrics of Network Efficiency Across Development in Autism and Their Association with Social Cognition: Results from the LEAP Study. *J Autism Dev Disord*. 2025;9:1-17. doi:10.1007/S10803-025-06731-0/FIGURES/3