

1 **Classifying post-traumatic stress disorder using the magnetoencephalographic connectome**
2 **and machine learning**

3

4 **Running title:** MEG and machine learning for PTSD diagnoses

5

6 Jing Zhang^{1,2}, J. Don Richardson³ & Benjamin T. Dunkley^{1,2,4}

7

8 ¹ Department of Diagnostic Imaging, Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto ON, Canada

9 ² Neurosciences & Mental Health, SickKids Research Institute, Toronto ON, Canada

10 ³ St Josephs, London OSI, London ON, Canada

11 ⁴ Department of Medical Imaging, University of Toronto, Toronto ON, Canada

12

13 **Corresponding Author:**

14 Benjamin T. Dunkley

15 Office: 555 University Avenue, Toronto, M5G 1X8, Canada

16 Email: ben.dunkley@sickkids.ca

17 Office: (416)-813-7654 ext. 328817

18 Associate Scientist - Hospital for Sick Children

19 Assistant Professor - University of Toronto

20

21 **Acknowledgements**

22 Funded by Defence Research and Development Canada (DRDC), Canadian Institute for Military
23 and Veteran Health Research (CIMVHR), and Innovation for Defence Excellence and Security
24 (IDEaS) program.

25

26 **Keywords:**

27 PTSD, machine learning, classification, neuronal oscillations, functional connectivity, resting-
28 state, MEG

29

30 **Abstract**

31 Given the subjective nature of conventional diagnostic methods for post-traumatic stress disorder
32 (PTSD), an objectively measurable biomarker is highly desirable. Macroscopic neural circuits
33 measured using magnetoencephalography (MEG) has previously been shown to be indicative of
34 the PTSD phenotype and severity. In the present study, we employed a machine learning-based
35 classification framework using MEG neural synchrony to distinguish combat-related PTSD from
36 trauma-exposed controls. Support vector machine (SVM) was used as the core classification
37 algorithm. A recursive random forest feature selection step was directly incorporated in the
38 nested SVM cross validation process (CV-SVM-rRF-FS) for identifying the most important
39 features for PTSD classification. For the five frequency bands tested, the nested CV-SVM-rRF-
40 FS analysis selected the minimum numbers of edges per frequency that could serve as a PTSD
41 signature and be used as the basis for SVM modelling. Many of the selected edges have been
42 reported previously to be core in PTSD pathophysiology, with frequency-specific patterns also
43 observed. Furthermore, the independent partial least squares discriminant analysis suggested low
44 bias in the nested CV-SVM-rRF-FS process. The final SVM models built with selected features
45 showed excellent PTSD classification performance (area-under-curve value up to 0.9).
46 Testament to its robustness when distinguishing individuals from a heavily-traumatized control
47 group, these developments for a classification model for PTSD also provide a comprehensive
48 machine learning-based computational framework for classifying other mental health challenges
49 using MEG connectome profiles.

50

51 **Introduction**

52 Post-traumatic stress disorder is a chronic psychological injury that is typically brought
53 about by experiencing or witnessing a life-threatening event (American Psychiatric Association,
54 1980; Yehuda et al., 2011). The consequences to PTSD include prolonged suffering, distress,
55 impaired quality of life and increased mortality (Kapfhammer, 2014). The disorder is a major
56 neuropsychiatric disorder among military personnel, with up to 17% of Canadian Armed Forces
57 members developing PTSD within the first-year post-deployment (Richardson et al., 2010). The
58 current gold standard for PTSD diagnosis is based on Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of
59 Mental Disorders 5th edition (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). However, these protocols
60 rely heavily on the subjective report of the patients and, given the stigma of a diagnosis in some
61 groups, or difficulty articulating their symptoms, a clear diagnosis can be difficult. As such, an
62 objective diagnosis platform is highly desirable.

63 One critical step of developing such a framework for PTSD is understanding its
64 psychophysiological and molecular pathology. The underlying neurobiological pathogenesis is
65 increasingly understood within the context of dysfunctional brain circuits (Rauch, Shin & Phelps,
66 2006). A mechanism that mediates communication and information processing within and
67 between brain circuits is neural oscillations and synchrony (Fries, 2015).
68 Magnetoencephalography (MEG) can image these phenomena non-invasively, and has been used
69 as an effective research tool for exploring the neural activity associated with various
70 neurodegenerative and neuropsychological disorders, including depression, bipolar disorder,
71 mild traumatic brain injury (mTBI) and Alzheimer's disease (Stam 2010; Vakorin et al., 2016;
72 Alamian et al., 2017; Koelewijn et al., 2019) as well as PTSD-related functional circuitry
73 (Badura-Brack et al., 2018a, 2018b; Dunkley et al., 2014; Mišić et al., 2016). At the group level,
74 neural synchrony can stratify those with PTSD from a heavily-traumatised, but otherwise
75 matched, control group (Misic et al., 2016), with hippocampal synchrony directly related to
76 symptom severity across individuals (Dunkley et al., 2014). This suggests synchrony might be a
77 reliable signature for PTSD identification.

78 Rapid advancement in artificial intelligence and machine learning have shown promise in
79 brain imaging and computational neuroscience. Various Bayesian inference-based machine
80 learning algorithms have been developed and implemented for neuroimaging signal processing
81 and temporal brain activity prediction (Wu et al., 2016). In translational research and clinical

82 applications, these methods are being actively explored for pre-symptomatic diagnosis,
83 prognostic prediction, and medical intervention effectiveness prediction (Rizk-Jackson et al.,
84 2011). Neurodegenerative and neuropsychological disorders like Huntington's disease, mTBI
85 and bipolar disorder are among the examples with promising results (Rizk-Jackson et al., 2011;
86 Mitra et al., 2016; Librenza-Garcia et al., 2017).

87 The objective here was to implement a machine learning classification modelling
88 workflow for delineating individuals with PTSD from trauma-exposed, matched control
89 participants using MEG-derived functional connectomes based on neural synchrony. We
90 developed a comprehensive machine learning pipeline based on support vector machine (SVM)
91 and random forest (RF) algorithms, leveraging their classification modelling and feature
92 selection capabilities, respectively. We recruited combat-related PTSD and trauma-exposed
93 control participants from the Canadian Armed Forces, data that has been published in previous
94 studies (Dunkley et al., 2014; Mišić et al., 2016). This design builds upon our established work
95 and also takes advantage of the similar contexts of traumatic exposure and chronic stress present
96 across participants from serving in a military context, as compared with those from a civilian
97 setting. The present study tests the capacity of machine learning in differentiating PTSD from
98 traumatic-exposure and more generally the potential of this method in distinguishing other
99 mental health challenges.

100

101 **Materials and methods**

102 Details on the patient group demographics, data acquisition, and imaging analysis can be
103 found in Dunkley et al., 2014. What follows below in a summary statement. Additional
104 information regarding data collection, processing and machine learning analysis can be found in
105 Supporting Information **S1**. Data acquisition from the 2014 study (Dunkley et al., 2014) was
106 performed with the written informed consent of each individual and under the approval of the
107 Research Ethics Board at the Hospital for Sick Children (SickKids)

108 *Participants*

109 23 Canadian Armed Forces soldiers diagnosed with PTSD (all male, mean age = 37.4,
110 SD = 6.8, age range 22-48) were recruited and had 5 minutes of eyes open MEG resting state

111 data recorded. Twenty-one trauma-exposed peers (all male, mean age = 33.05, SD = 5.26, age
112 range 18-45) who did not develop PTSD were recruited as a control group.

113 Inclusion criteria for the PTSD group were: a diagnosis of combat-related PTSD; PTSD
114 symptoms were present from 1-4 years prior to participation in the study; they were engaged in
115 regular mental health follow-up; they had moderate or greater severity on the PTSD check list
116 (PCL>50). All participants in the PTSD group were recruited from one of the Canadian Armed
117 Forces (CAF) Operational and Trauma Stress Support Centres (OTSSC), which are centres of
118 excellence for the diagnosis and treatment of trauma-related mental health injuries. Additional
119 inclusion criteria applied to both groups included: no history of a traumatic brain injury (TBI),
120 screened by a psychiatrist through a review of their electronic health record, telephone interview,
121 and administration of the Defence and Veteran's Brain Injury Centre (DVBIC) 3 item screening
122 tool; English-speaking and able to understand task instructions and give informed consent.
123 Exclusion criteria included ferrous metal inside the body that might be classified as MRI
124 contraindications or items that might interfere with MEG data acquisition; presence of implanted
125 medical devices; seizures or other neurological disorders, or active substance abuse; certain
126 ongoing medications (anticonvulsants, benzodiazepines, and/or GABA antagonists) known to
127 directly or significantly influence electroencephalographic (EEG) findings. As this was a
128 naturalistic sample, however, all PTSD patients were on evidenced-based psychotropic
129 medication(s), such as selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs), serotonin-norepinephrine
130 reuptake inhibitors (SNRIs) and Prazosin.

131

132 *Magnetoencephalography*


133 The details of MEG acquisition and analyses can be found in Dunkley et al., 2014;
134 briefly, we acquired 151 channel MEG on a CTF system at the Hospital for Sick Children. MEG
135 data were coregistered with an anatomical T1 MRI, and a beamformer was used to recover time
136 series from 90 regions of the Automated Anatomical Labelling atlas (AAL) (Tzourio-Mazoyer et
137 al., 2002). The weighted phase lag index (wPLI) was used to determine all pairwise
138 combinations of seed synchrony (Vinck et al., 2011), with wPLI varying between 0 and 1, and
139 used as the edge weight in the matrix. We tested canonical frequency ranges, included Theta (4-7
140 Hz), Alpha (8-14 Hz), Beta (15-30 Hz), Low Gamma (or L. Gamma, 30-80 Hz) and High

141 Gamma (or H. Gamma, 80-150 Hz). Evaluating multiple frequency ranges allowed us to test the
142 relative performance between the bands, predicting that those which showed the largest group
143 differences previously would provide the greatest accuracy in delineating individual cases here.

144

145 *Machine learning downstream data analysis*


146 A visual representation of the overall workflow for the downstream analysis can be
147 viewed in **Fig. 1**. The following core techniques are featured in the method: unsupervised
148 clustering analyses with hierarchical clustering and principal component analysis (PCA),
149 univariate statistical analysis, SVM-centric machine learning analysis, as well as partial least
150 squares discriminant analysis (PLS-DA). Independent from the upcoming machine learning
151 analysis, a univariate analysis step was used to examine the group differences and identify the
152 functional edges with statistically significant changes in connectivity. Data with only significant
153 edges then subject to a machine learning feature selection and modelling process to identify
154 edges essential for classification and subsequently to build a classification model (**Fig. 2**).
155 Similar strategy has been reported elsewhere (Busac et al., 2008). Generally, based on SVM
156 modelling and the previously described recursive RF feature selection (rRF-FS) process (Zhang
157 et al., 2016), a nested cross-validation (CV) framework was used for feature selection (CV-
158 SVM-rRF-FS). Subsequently, data with the selected edges were used for the final SVM
159 classification modelling step. Moreover, PLS-DA was conducted as an independent verification
160 algorithm for the machine learning feature selection and modelling analysis.



161

162 **Figure 1.** Flowchart for the overall process of machine learning MEG synchrony discovery
 163 framework.

164



165

166 **Figure 2.** Flowchart for the workflow of the SVM modelling analysis.

167

168 Unsupervised clustering analyses were used at various points of the downstream analysis.
169 Specifically, hierarchical clustering was used to explore the grouping pattern in synchrony
170 between the participant groups, as well as between the edges; PCA was used to confirm the
171 functional profile grouping for PTSD and control groups, as well as evaluate data complexity.

172 The entire downstream data analysis and visualization pipelines were carried out using
173 our custom developed R packages via UNIX Bash scripting. Detailed description of each step in
174 the workflow and software tools used can be found in Supporting Information **S1**.

175

176 **Results**

177 *Univariate analysis*

178 A summary of the univariate analysis can be viewed in **Table 1**. The complete univariate
179 analysis along with clustering analysis results are included in Supporting Information **S1** and
180 **Table S1**. Hierarchical clustering was conducted on the data with only the significant edges to
181 assess the clustering pattern upon univariate analysis feature reduction (**Figs 3A, 3B and S3**). In
182 general, reduced data showed improved group clustering results for the five frequency bands.
183 However, we also observed varying results corresponding to specific frequency bands.
184 Regarding the Alpha band (**Fig. 3A**), the clustering result grouped seven participants from the
185 control group into a major cluster, with the second major cluster containing the rest. Within the
186 second major cluster, most PTSD participants were grouped together. For H. Gamma band, with
187 an improved grouping pattern (**Fig. 3B**), the control group exhibited a higher-level of variance
188 than the PTSD group, where six control participants were included in the PTSD cluster.
189 Moreover, the reduced profile in the Theta band managed to mostly separate the PTSD
190 participants from control (**Fig. S3A**). As seen in **Fig. S3B**, the Beta band also showed
191 substantially improved PTSD and control group clustering with the reduced data where only two
192 PTSD participants were placed in the control group. For L. Gamma band (**Fig. S3C**), although
193 two clusters were identified mostly according to the participant groups, the first major cluster
194 only included five control participants, with the rest clustered with the PTSD group to form the
195 second major cluster.

196


197 *Support vector machine analysis*

198 Using feature-reduced data with only the significant edges identified in the univariate
199 analysis, nested CV-SVM-rRF-FS and classification modelling was carried out. SVM models
200 were trained with the randomly partitioned training set and based on the results from the nested
201 CV featuring rRF-FS. The final SVM models were evaluated by CV step during the modelling
202 process before assessed by the external test set (from the initial random data partitioning step).
203 ROC-AUC analysis with the external test set and permutation test with randomized sample label
204 for training set were used (**Figs. 3C, 3D, S4, S5**). The permutation test suggested that the
205 prediction accuracy of the original model was higher than all the permutation models, leading to
206 a permutation p value at 0.01 across the five frequency bands tested (**Fig. S5**). A summary of the
207 rRF-FS results can be viewed in **Table 1**; and the full list of nested CV-SVM-rRF-FS selected
208 edges can be viewed in **Table 2**. A complete description for SVM modelling results can be found
209 in Supporting Information S1 and **Table S2**.

210 Here we use Alpha and H. Gamma as examples to exhibit the FS and SVM modelling
211 results. For Alpha, the rRF-FS step nested CV process identified 14 edges as the most relevant
212 features for PTSD-control stratification, including edges between the right superior parietal lobe
213 and supramarginal gyrus, left middle temporal gyrus and middle temporal pole, as well as left
214 precentral gyrus and inferior frontal gyrus pars triangularis. The final Alpha band SVM model
215 was then trained with 31 support vectors with an internal CV accuracy of 0.94. Upon evaluating
216 with external testing data, the AUC value for the Alpha band was 0.9 (**Fig. 3C**). For H. Gamma,
217 19 edges were selected by the rRF-FS step as the most important features, including edges
218 involving the left amygdala, left hippocampus and thalamus. The nested CV also led to a nested
219 CV accuracy of 0.78 ± 0.06 . For the final model, 36 support vectors were used, leading to an
220 internal CV accuracy at 0.94. The AUC value was determined at 0.9 for H. Gamma band (**Fig.**
221 **3D**).

222

223



224

225 **Figure 3.** Heatmaps for hierarchical clustering analysis results using only the significant edges
226 as well as ROC-AUC results for the Alpha and H. Gamma bands. For heatmaps, dendrograms
227 show the clusters for participants (columns) and the edges (rows), and z score was plotted. For
228 ROC, AUC values are shown on the plot. (A) Alpha band heatmap, (B) H. Gamma band
229 heatmap, (C) Alpha band ROC, and (D) H. Gamma band ROC.


230

231

232 *Principal component analysis*

233 Serving as an unsupervised clustering and data complexity assessment tool, PCA was
234 conducted at various points of the downstream data analysis for the five frequency bands tested.
235 The results can be viewed in **Figs. 4** and **S6**. For all five frequency bands, when using all edges,
236 PCA failed to separate the PTSD group from the control participants, whereas the feature-
237 reduced datasets showed substantially improved group clustering. Due to the reduced data
238 dimensionality for the feature-reduced data sets, the data complexity also decreased
239 considerably, which is demonstrated by the increase of the percentage variance explained by the
240 first two PCs in the PCA results.

241




242

243 **Figure 4.** Score plots and biplots (i.e. score plot and loading plot) showing PCA result. For
244 biplot, the loading plots exhibit the contribution of the edges to clustering pattern. Left column:
245 Score plots for PCA results from all the edges; middle column: biplots for PCA results from
246 feature-reduced data with only the significant edges; right column: biplots for PCA results from
247 data with nested CV-SVM-rRF-FS selected edges. (A) Alpha band and (B) H. Gamma band.

248

249 *Partial least squares discriminant analysis*

250 PLS-DA results can be viewed in Supporting Information **S1**, **S2**, as well as **Figs. 5**, **S7**,
 251 **S8**.



252
 253 **Figure 5.** Score plots and VIP plots showing PLS-DA results. Left column: PLS-DA score plots
 254 showing the supervised clustering pattern on both components upon PLS-DA modelling using the
 255 nested CV-SVM-rRF-FS selected edges; right column: PLS-DA VIP scores for both model
 256 components for all the nested CV-SVM-rRF-FS selected edges, with the horizontal dashed line
 257 indicating the importance threshold (0.8), and the codes on the x-axis representing the edges. (A)
 258 Alpha band and (B) H. Gamma band.

259
 260 **Discussion**

261 Due to the subjective nature of PTSD diagnostics, the overlap of PTSD symptoms with
 262 other disorders (concussion, for example; Garber, Rusu & Zamorski, 2014), and the high
 263 comorbidity of other diseased states, including anxiety and depression (Vun et al., 2018), an
 264 objectively measurable signature for diagnosing PTSD is desirable. Such a platform may work in
 265 concert with the conventional interview and questionnaire-based PTSD diagnostic methods for

266 increased accuracy and facilitating individualized medicine. Given the complexity and dynamic
267 repertoire of neural activity, additional qualifications for an optimal fingerprint include being
268 non-invasive, neurobiologically-informed, as well as high-throughput – this can be achieved by
269 leveraging functional neuroimaging in combination with machine learning and artificial
270 intelligence-inspired approaches.

271 We considered macroscopic neural circuits based on MEG synchrony as one fingerprint
272 source. Indeed, MEG has been used to understand human neurophysiology, including a wide
273 range of neurodegenerative and neuropsychological disorders, such as mTBI, Alzheimer’s
274 disease, depression and bipolar disorder (Vakorin et al., 2016; Alamian et al., 2017; Koelewijn et
275 al., 2019). Neural oscillations recovered using MEG are known to be dysfunctional in PTSD and
276 correlate with primary symptoms and secondary complaints in the disorder (Kolassa et al., 2007;
277 Dunkley et al., 2014; Mišić et al., 2016; Badura-Brack et al., 2018a, 2018b). Building on this, we
278 developed a comprehensive machine learning-based pipeline for downstream mining and
279 modelling of MEG data. We applied our pipeline to a dataset with over 4000 unique edges,
280 across a number of neurophysiological frequency ranges that are used for multiplexed
281 communication in the brain. It is also worth noting that the current study featured a traumatized
282 control group that had experienced similar combat-related stress as the PTSD cohort, which
283 speaks to the robustness of our machine learning classification framework.

284 First, unsupervised hierarchical clustering analysis conducted on all the edges showed
285 that the complete functional profiles failed to exhibit any grouping patterns across any of the
286 frequency bands. Moreover, the PCA results on the full dataset with all edges were found to be
287 in complete agreement with the hierarchical clustering analysis, where the score plot exhibited
288 substantial level of overlap among participants from the two groups. These results are at least
289 consistent with the similar life experience the participants with PTSD and control participants
290 had in their military training, deployment and experience of chronic stress and acute trauma
291 during frontline deployment - it is not surprising that the groups possess similar superficial
292 functional profiles in neural activity indexed by synchrony.

293 Severing as an initial feature reduction method, the univariate analysis substantially
294 reduced the data features for all the frequency bands, with an average number of remaining
295 features at 40 ± 15 (mean \pm SD), a hundred-fold reduction from the original 4005 edges. The

296 number of significant edges fluctuated according to frequency band, showing frequency-specific
297 patterns. For example, L. Gamma band exhibited the least amount of significant edges,
298 suggesting that the PTSD functional profiles might contain more individual variance across the
299 two participant groups. H. Gamma included the largest number of significant edges, consistent
300 with our previous findings where substantial group difference in neural synchrony was identified
301 for the H. Gamma rhythm (Dunkley et al., 2014; Mišić et al., 2016).

302 Using the feature-reduced data, the hierarchical clustering and PCA results showed
303 drastically improved group clustering patterns. Specifically, hierarchical clustering exhibited
304 almost complete clustering for the two groups in Theta, Beta and L. Gamma. Even though the
305 Alpha and H. Gamma bands failed to exhibit similar results, the clustering analysis still saw a
306 clear trend of grouping the participants by diagnostic label. Despite the similarity of the complete
307 functional profiles when comparing the two groups, our parametric univariate analysis workflow
308 was able to capture the subtle differences between the two groups. Furthermore, the PCA results
309 suggested that, with the feature-reduced dataset, the two groups could be mostly separated on the
310 first PC. Naturally, the data complexity was also greatly reduced for the data with smaller
311 dimensionality. Consistent with the hierarchical clustering results, PCA also exhibited
312 frequency-specific patterns. Moreover, PCA showed the groups were separated on PC1, which
313 explained the most percentage data variance (around 20%), suggesting the patient/control
314 grouping was the most crucial variable differentiating the data.

315 The SVM machine learning modelling process was conducted for all five frequency
316 bands using the univariate feature-reduced data. Our 10-fold nested CV-SVM-rRF-FS process
317 produced a consensus edge list. This step further reduced the number of edges by more than 50%
318 across all five frequency bands (**Table 1**). Despite the substantial reduction in data
319 dimensionality, clustering performance stayed mostly unchanged from the univariate feature-
320 reduced data, as seen in the PCA results. This indicates that the current machine learning feature
321 selection strategy was capable of effectively reducing the dimensionality of the data while
322 preserving the information necessary to separate PTSD participants from the control group.
323 Moreover, the PLS-DA VIP (variable importance in projection) evaluation independently
324 confirmed the importance of the selected features. These suggests that our feature selection
325 process was subject to minimal bias.

326 Frequency-specific patterns were observed for the feature selection results. First, the
327 quantity of the selected edges followed a similar trend as the univariate analysis results, where
328 Beta and H. Gamma exhibited the most selected features, whereas the Theta and L. Gamma
329 bands showed the least. Moreover, based on the corresponding univariate analysis results, we
330 evaluated the directionality distribution for the CV-SVM-rRF-FS selected edges. For example,
331 Theta showed decreased synchrony for 10 out of 11 total selected edges when comparing the
332 PTSD group with controls. Interestingly, a previous study of ours revealed an increase in
333 synchrony in PTSD when compared to controls under the same frequency band, but in a task-
334 dependent manner, during a cognitive flexibility protocol (Dunkley et al., 2015). This suggests
335 the repertoire of neurophysiological activity in PTSD in this particular frequency channel is
336 highly dynamic and flexibly modulated by task. Whilst not examined here, it also suggests using
337 task-induced changes in neural synchrony might be ripe for use as features in machine learning
338 classification for mental illness, as this highly dynamic neural activity is essentially untapped in
339 resting state paradigms. In any case, the initial univariate analysis here revealed an equal number
340 of edges with significant increases and decreases in synchrony, whereas, in addition to
341 drastically reducing the number of edges, CV-SVM-rRF-FS selected more edges with decreased
342 connectivity. These confirmed that while the univariate feature reduction identified the edges
343 with statistical significance at the group level, machine learning was able to further select those
344 features that were most important for individual classification – the increase/decrease ratio
345 compared between the two approaches might not always and necessarily be consistent. Machine
346 learning approaches are ideally suited to recover this granularity. Additionally, the L. Gamma
347 results were mostly consistent with previously reported overall decreases in a range of metrics in
348 the gamma frequency band observed from EEG, such as frontal nodal connection strength and
349 communication efficiency (Lee et al., 2014).

350 The completely data-driven nested CV-SVM-rRF-FS process was able to extract
351 information that is in line with our knowledge of the neurobiology of PTSD. For example, Theta
352 activity involving the right middle frontal gyrus were among the selected edges with decreased
353 synchrony, including those synchronising with the left insula and right postcentral gyrus. For
354 Alpha, edges involving the right superior parietal lobe and right supramarginal gyrus, left middle
355 temporal gyrus and left middle temporal pole, as well as left precentral gyrus and left inferior
356 frontal gyrus pars triangularis were among the top features differentiating PTSD and controls –

357 other studies have previously reported dysfunction involving the superior parietal lobe, middle
358 temporal gyrus, and left precentral gyrus (Sartory et al., 2013). Additionally, decreased
359 synchrony between the amygdala and fusiform was found to be important for PTSD
360 classification, in line with work from Stevens and colleagues where the weakened coupling
361 between the amygdala and the prefrontal regions was also observed in PTSD conditions (Stevens
362 et al., 2013). L. Gamma synchrony between the left hippocampus and right middle temporal pole
363 also proved to be an important feature, consistent with our previous findings where MEG hyper-
364 synchrony was observed at the group-level for PTSD (Dunkley et al., 2014). Additionally,
365 decreased synchrony between the thalamus and lingual gyrus across multiple frequencies might
366 be related to previously reported findings reporting structural changes in these regions in PTSD
367 (Tan et al., 2013). Taken together, PTSD status was identified using our MEG-derived
368 synchrony and our nested CV-SVM-rRF-FS workflow, highlighting its potential as an
369 application in this disorder and other neuropsychiatric disease, as well as a tool for hypothesis-
370 generation and mechanistic exploration in MEG studies more generally.

371 Ultimately, a final SVM classification model was built using the CV-SVM-rRF-FS
372 selected data. For the five frequency bands tested, the resulted final SVM models were
373 significant in classifying individuals with PTSD against the trauma-exposed controls according
374 to the permutation tests using the training set. Using the independent test data set, the
375 classification performance showed AUC values over 0.8 for all five frequency bands, suggesting
376 excellent classification accuracy. Notably, Alpha and H. Gamma bands exhibited AUC value of
377 0.9. Such results were consistent with the previous studies where the Alpha and gamma activity
378 were associated with PTSD in EEG (Clancy et al., 2017; Moon et al., 2018). Additionally, the
379 classification capacity of the selected edges was independently tested using PLS-DA modelling.
380 The results suggested that the high classification capability of the selected edges shown with the
381 SVM modelling also manifest by the PLS-DA modelling, thus considered universal regardless of
382 the classification method.

383 Notwithstanding the limitation of a small sample size in the context of machine learning-
384 based data mining, the present study demonstrated the utility of a comprehensive machine
385 learning pipeline for PTSD classification based off MEG-derived signatures. In summary, the
386 univariate analysis successfully reduced the data size and considerably improved group
387 clustering capacity. The subsequent nested CV-SVM-rRF-FS analysis selected the minimal

388 number of biologically-relevant features that could serve as potential PTSD signatures and be
389 used as the basis for SVM modelling. All final SVM models were significant in classification
390 and exhibited high prediction accuracy, seen by the permutation test and ROC-AUC analysis
391 results, respectively. Furthermore, PLS-DA VIP analysis suggested low method-derived bias for
392 the nested CV-SVM-rRF-FS results. Taken together, the current study not only developed a
393 potential neural circuit marker and an associated classification model for PTSD – it should be
394 remembered this was tested against control participants who themselves were heavily
395 traumatised, some with sub-threshold PTSD symptoms - but also described a machine learning-
396 based computational framework for MEG neural circuit fingerprint discovery and development
397 that could potentially be rolled out to myriad other neuropsychiatric disease.

398

399 **Disclosures**

400 The authors declare no conflict of interest for this work.

401

402 **Acknowledgement**

403 The authors would like to thanks Margot Taylor, Elizabeth Pang, Rakesh Jetly, Pang Shek, Paul
404 Sedge, Marc Lalancette and Amanda Robertson.

405

406 **References**

- 407 Alamian, G., Hincapié, A. S., Combrisson, E., Thiery, T., Martel, V., Althukov, D. & Jerbi, K.
408 (2017). Alterations of intrinsic brain connectivity patterns in depression and bipolar
409 disorders: a critical assessment of magnetoencephalography-based evidence. *Front*
410 *Psychiatry*, 8, 41. doi: 10.3389/fpsy.2017.00041.
- 411 American Psychiatric Association. (1980). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders*
412 3rd edn.
- 413 American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders*
414 4th edn.
- 415 Badura-Brack, A., McDermott, T. J., Becker, K. M., Ryan, T. J., Khanna, M. M., Pine, D. S.,
416 Bar-Haim, Y., Heinrichs-Graham, E. & Wilson, T. W. (2018a). Attention training
417 modulates resting-state neurophysiological abnormalities in posttraumatic stress disorder.
418 *Psychiatry Res Neuroimaging*, 271, 135 – 141. doi: 10.1016/j.psy.2017.11.008.
- 419 Badura-Brack, A., McDermott, T. J., Heinrichs-Graham, E., Ryan, T. J., Khanna, M. M., Pine,
420 D. S., Bar-Haim, Y. & Wilson, T. W. (2018b). Veterans with PTSD demonstrate amygdala
421 hyperactivity while viewing threatening faces: A MEG study. *Biol Psychol*, 132, 228 – 232.
422 doi: 10.1016/j.biopsycho.2018.01.005.
- 423 Bursac Z1, Gauss CH, Williams DK, Hosmer DW. (2008). Purposeful selection of variables in
424 logistic regression. *Source Code Biol Med*. 3,17. doi: 10.1186/1751-0473-3-17.
- 425 Clancy K1, Ding M2, Bernat E3, Schmidt NB1, Li W1. (2017). Restless 'rest': intrinsic sensory
426 hyperactivity and disinhibition in post-traumatic stress disorder. *Brain*.140(7), 2041 - 2050.
427 doi: 10.1093/brain/awx116.
- 428 Dunkley, B. T., Doesburg, S. M., Sedge, P. A., Grodecki, R. J., Shek, P. N., Pang, E. W. &
429 Taylor, M. J. (2014). Resting-state hippocampal connectivity correlates with symptom
430 severity in post-traumatic stress disorder. *Neuroimage Clin*, 5, 377 – 384. doi:
431 10.1016/j.nicl.2014.07.017.
- 432 Dunkley, B. T., Sedge, P. A., Doesburg, S. M., Grodecki, R. J., Jetly, R., Shek, P. N., Taylor, M.
433 J., Pang, E. W (2015) Theta, mental flexibility, and post-traumatic stress disorder:
434 connecting in the parietal cortex. *PLoS One*, 10(4), e0123541. doi:
435 10.1371/journal.pone.0123541.
- 436 Fries, P. (2015). Rhythms for Cognition: Communication through Coherence. *Neuron*, 88, 220 –
437 235. doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2015.09.034.
- 438 Garber, B. G., Zamorski, M. A. & Jetly, R. (2012). Mental health of Canadian Forces members
439 while on deployment to Afghanistan. *Can J Psychiatry*, 57(12), 736 – 744.

- 440 Garber, B. G., Rusu, C., & Zamorski, M. A. (2014). Deployment-related mild traumatic brain
441 injury, mental health problems, and post-concussive symptoms in Canadian armed forces
442 personnel. *BMC Psychiatry*. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-014-0325-5>
- 443 Kapfhammer, H. P. (2014). Patient-reported outcomes in post-traumatic stress disorder. Part II:
444 focus on pharmacological treatment. *Dialogues Clin Neurosci*, 16, 227 – 237.
- 445 Koelewijn, L., Lancaster, T. M., Linden, D., Dima, D. C., Routley, B. C., Magazzini, L., Barawi,
446 K., Brindley, L., Adams, R., Tansey, K. E., Bompas, A., Tales, A., Bayer, A. & Singh K.
447 (2019). Oscillatory hyperactivity and hyperconnectivity in young APOE-ε4 carriers and
448 hypoconnectivity in Alzheimer's disease. *Elife*, pii, e36011. doi: 10.7554/eLife.36011.
- 449 Kolassa, I.T., Wienbruch, C., Neuner, F., Schauer, M., Ruf, M., Odenwald, M. & Elbert, T.
450 (2007). Altered oscillatory brain dynamics after repeated traumatic stress. *BMC Psychiatry*,
451 7, 56.
- 452 Lee, S. H., Yoon, S., Kim, J. I., Jin, S. H., Chung, C. K. (2014) Functional connectivity of resting
453 state EEG and symptom severity in patients with post-traumatic stress disorder. *Prog*
454 *Neuropsychopharmacol Biol Psychiatry*, 51, 51-7.
- 455 Librenza-Garcia, D., Kotzian, B. J., Yang, J., Mwangi, B., Cao, B., Pereira Lima, L. N.,
456 Bermudez, M.B., Boeira, M. V., Kapczinski, F. & Passos, I. C. (2017). The impact of
457 machine learning techniques in the study of bipolar disorder: A systematic review. *Neurosci*
458 *Biobehav Rev*, 80, 538 – 554. doi: 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2017.07.004.
- 459 Mišić, B., Dunkley, B. T., Sedge, P. A., Da Costa, L., Fatima, Z., Berman, M. G., Mišić, B.,
460 Dunkley, B. T., Sedge, P. A., Da Costa, L., Fatima, Z., Berman, M. G., Doesburg, S. M.,
461 McIntosh, A. R., Grodecki, R., Jetly, R., Pang, E. W. & Taylor, M. J. (2016). Post-traumatic
462 stress constrains the dynamic repertoire of neural activity. *J Neurosci*, 36, 419 – 431. doi:
463 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1506-15.2016.
- 464 Mitra, J., Shen, K. K., Ghose, S., Bourgeat, P., Fripp, J., Salvado, O., Pannek, K., Taylor, D. J.,
465 Mathias, J. L. & Rose, S. (2016). Statistical machine learning to identify traumatic brain
466 injury (TBI) from structural disconnections of white matter networks. *Neuroimage*, 129,
467 247 – 259. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.01.056.
- 468 Moon, S. Y., Choi, Y. B., Jung, H. K., Lee, Y. I.1, Choi, S. H. (2018) Increased frontal gamma
469 and posterior delta powers as potential neurophysiological correlates differentiating
470 posttraumatic stress disorder from anxiety disorders. *Psychiatry Investig*. 15(11), 1087 -
471 1093. doi: 10.30773/pi.2018.09.30.
- 472 Rauch, S. L., Shin, L. M., & Phelps, E. A. (2006). Neurocircuitry Models of Posttraumatic Stress
473 Disorder and Extinction: Human Neuroimaging Research-Past, Present, and Future.
474 *Biological Psychiatry*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2006.06.004>

- 475 Richardson, L. K., Frueh, B. C. & Acierno, R. (2010). Prevalence estimates of combat-related
476 post-traumatic stress disorder: critical review. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry*, 44(1), 4 – 19. doi:
477 10.3109/00048670903393597.
- 478 Rizk-Jackson, A., Stoffers, D., Sheldon, S., Kuperman, J., Dale, A., Goldstein, J., Corey-Bloom,
479 J., Poldrack, R. A. & Aron, A. R. (2011). Evaluating imaging biomarkers for
480 neurodegeneration in pre-symptomatic Huntington's disease using machine learning
481 techniques. *Neuroimage*, 56, 788 – 796. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.04.273.
- 482 Sartory, G., Cwik, J., Knuppertz, H., Schürholt, B., Lebens, M., Seitz, R.J. & Schulze, R. (2013).
483 In search of the trauma memory: a meta-analysis of functional neuroimaging studies of
484 symptom provocation in posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD). *PLoS One*, 8, e58150. doi:
485 10.1371/journal.pone.0058150.
- 486 Stam, C. J. (2010). Use of magnetoencephalography (MEG) to study functional brain networks
487 in neurodegenerative disorders. *J Neurol Sci*, 289, 128 – 134. doi:
488 10.1016/j.jns.2009.08.028.
- 489 Stevens, J. S., Jovanovic, T., Fani, N., Ely, T. D., Glover, E. M., Bradley, B. & Ressler, K. J.
490 (2013). Disrupted amygdala-prefrontal functional connectivity in civilian women with
491 posttraumatic stress disorder. *J Psychiatr Res*, 47, 1469 – 1478. doi:
492 10.1016/j.jpsychires.2013.05.031.
- 493 Tan, L., Zhang, L., Qi R., Lu, G., Li, L., Liu, J. & Li, W. (2013). Brain structure in post-
494 traumatic stress disorder: A voxel-based morphometry analysis. *Neural Regen Res*, 8(26),
495 2405 – 2414. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1673-5374.2013.26.001.
- 496 Tzourio-Mazoyer, N., Landeau, B., Papathanassiou, D., Crivello, F., Etard, O., Delcroix, N.,
497 Mazoyer, B. & Joliot, M. (2002). Automated anatomical labeling of activations in SPM
498 using a macroscopic anatomical parcellation of the MNI MRI single-subject brain.
499 *Neuroimage*, 15, 273 – 289.
- 500 Vakorin, V. A., Doesburg, S. M., da Costa, L., Jetly, R., Pang, E. W. & Taylor, M. J. (2016).
501 Detecting mild traumatic brain injury using resting state magnetoencephalographic
502 connectivity. *PLoS Comput Biol*, 12, e1004914. doi: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1004914.
- 503 Vinck, M., Oostenveld, R., van Wingerden, M., Battaglia, F. & Pennartz, C.M. (2011). An
504 improved index of phase-synchronization for electrophysiological data in the presence of
505 volume-conduction, noise and sample-size bias. *Neuroimage*, 55, 1548 – 1565. doi:
506 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.01.055.
- 507 Vun, E., Turner, S., Sareen, J., Mota, N., Afifi, T. O., & El-Gabalawy, R. (2018). Prevalence of
508 comorbid chronic pain and mental health conditions in Canadian Armed Forces active
509 personnel: analysis of a cross-sectional survey. *CMAJ Open*.
510 <https://doi.org/10.9778/cmajo.20180093>

- 511 Wu, W., Nagarajan, S. & Chen, Z. (2016). Bayesian machine learning: EEG/MEG signal
512 processing measurements. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 33, 14 – 36. doi:
513 10.1109/MSP.2015.2481559.
- 514 Yehuda, R., Koenen, K. C., Galea, S. & Flory, J. D. (2011). The role of genes in defining a
515 molecular biology of PTSD. *Dis Markers*, 30, 67 – 76. doi: 10.3233/DMA-2011-0794.
- 516 Zhang, J., Hadj-Moussa, H. & Storey, K. B. (2016). Current progress of high-throughput
517 microRNA differential expression analysis and random forest gene selection for model and
518 non-model systems: an R implementation. *J Integr Bioinform*, 13, 306. doi: 10.2390/biecoll-
519 jib-2016-306.
- 520

521 **Tables**

522 **Table 1.** Feature reduction results summary.

Frequency band	Significant edges	Increase	Decrease	rRF-FS selected edges	Increase	Decrease
Theta	30	15	15	11	1	10
Alpha	40	22	18	14	9	5
Beta	49	30	19	20	10	10
L.Gamma	22	7	15	12	4	8
H.Gamma	59	26	33	19	9	10

523

524

525 **Table 2.** Edges selected by the SVM/rRF-FS process. Abbreviations: inf, inferior; sup, superior;
 526 mid, middle; orb, orbital; tri, pars triangularis; oper, operculum; ant, anterior.

Frequency band	Region 1	Region 2
Theta	Lingual.L	Temporal.Sup.R
	Frontal.Mid.R	Insula.L
	Frontal.Mid.R	Postcentral.R
	Supp.Motor.Area.L	Occipital.Mid.L
	Frontal.Inf.Tri.R	Temporal.Mid.R
	Fusiform.L	SupraMarginal.R
	Frontal.Inf.Oper.R	Thalamus.L
	Frontal.Inf.Oper.R	Lingual.L
	Frontal.Inf.Tri.R	Rectus.R
	ParaHippocampal.R	Parietal.Inf.L
	Frontal.Mid.L	Temporal.Inf.R
Alpha	Parietal.Sup.R	SupraMarginal.R
	Temporal.Mid.L	Temporal.Pole.Mid.L
	Precentral.L	Frontal.Inf.Tri.L
	Frontal.Sup.Medial.R	Temporal.Pole.Mid.R
	Lingual.R	Caudate.L
	Temporal.Pole.Sup.L	Temporal.Mid.L
	Frontal.Inf.Oper.L	Olfactory.R
	Angular.R	Caudate.L
	Frontal.Inf.Oper.L	Thalamus.R
	Olfactory.R	Calcarine.L
	Frontal.Sup.Medial.L	Cuneus.L
	SupraMarginal.R	Heschl.R
	Temporal.Pole.Mid.R	Putamen.R
	Beta	Precentral.L
Frontal.Inf.Orb.L		Temporal.Inf.L
Rectus.L		Temporal.Inf.L
Amygdala.L		Fusiform.L
Lingual.R		Thalamus.R

	Parietal.Sup.L	Precuneus.R
	Rolandic.Oper.L	Temporal.Pole.Sup.L
	Rolandic.Oper.L	Putamen.L
	Rolandic.Oper.R	Occipital.Sup.R
	Cingulum.Ant.R	Pallidum.R
	Rolandic.Oper.L	Insula.L
	Cingulum.Mid.R	SupraMarginal.L
	Frontal.Sup.R	Frontal.Sup.Orb.R
	Frontal.Inf.Tri.R	Temporal.Mid.R
	Frontal.Sup.Medial.L	Postcentral.R
	Frontal.Sup.R	Paracentral.Lobule.L
	Frontal.Mid.L	Fusiform.R
	Hippocampus.R	Temporal.Pole.Mid.L
	Fusiform.L	Putamen.R
L.Gamma	Cingulum.Mid.L	Caudate.R
	Hippocampus.L	Temporal.Pole.Mid.R
	Frontal.Mid.Orb.R	SupraMarginal.L
	ParaHippocampal.R	Angular.L
	Occipital.Inf.R	Angular.L
	Frontal.Inf.Tri.L	Heschl.R
	Rectus.R	Occipital.Inf.L
	Frontal.Mid.Orb.L	ParaHippocampal.L
	Frontal.Mid.Orb.L	Paracentral.Lobule.L
	Lingual.L	Temporal.Inf.R
	Olfactory.L	SupraMarginal.L
	Calcarine.L	Parietal.Inf.R
H.Gamma	Insula.R	Parietal.Inf.R
	Parietal.Inf.L	Pallidum.R
	Cingulum.Post.R	Hippocampus.L
	Parietal.Inf.L	Temporal.Inf.L
	Cingulum.Mid.L	Parietal.Inf.R
	Cingulum.Post.R	ParaHippocampal.L

ParaHippocampal.R	Temporal.Pole.Sup.R
Temporal.Mid.R	Temporal.Pole.Mid.R
Occipital.Mid.R	Temporal.Pole.Mid.L
Frontal.Mid.Orb.L	Parietal.Sup.L
Rolandic.Oper.R	Parietal.Inf.R
Frontal.Inf.Orb.L	Amygdala.L
Supp.Motor.Area.R	Temporal.Mid.R
SupraMarginal.L	Thalamus.R
Frontal.Inf.Oper.L	Cuneus.L
Frontal.Inf.Oper.R	Paracentral.Lobule.R
Frontal.Sup.R	ParaHippocampal.R
Precuneus.R	Heschl.L

527

528

529 **Supporting Information**

530 **S1.** Supplementary methods and results

531 **S2.** PLS-DA results summary

532 **Table S1.** Complete results for univariate analysis

533 **Table S2.** CV-SMV-rRF-FS results with univariate analysis stats.

534 **Fig. S1.** Heatmaps for hierarchical clustering analysis results using all edges for the five
535 frequency bands. Dendrograms show the clusters for participants (columns) and the edges
536 (rows). (A) Theta band, (B) Alpha band, (C) Beta band, (D) L. Gamma band, and (E) H. Gamma
537 band.

538 **Fig. S2.** The volcano plots show the edges with significant changes in synchrony (red dots).
539 Horizontal dashed line indicates the p value threshold (0.01) while the vertical line divides
540 directionality (i.e. increases or decreases). (A) Theta band, (B) Alpha band, (C) Beta band, (D) L.
541 Gamma band, and (E) H. Gamma band.

542 **Fig. S3.** Heatmaps for hierarchical clustering analysis results using only the significant edges for
543 the Theta (A), Beta (B) and L. Gamma (C) bands. Z score is plotted for the heatmaps.
544 dendrograms show the clusters for participants (columns) and the edges (rows).

545 **Fig. S4.** ROC-AUC results for the Theta (A), Beta (B) and (C) L. Gamma bands. AUC values
546 are shown in the ROC plots.

547 **Fig. S5.** SVM model evaluation using permutation test. Permutation results showing the
548 percentage accuracy of both the final SVM model and the permutation models, with dashed line
549 indicating the final model accuracy level. Numbers on the x-axis are the models, with 0
550 representing the final SVM model. (A) Theta band, (B) Alpha band, (C) Beta band, (D) L.
551 Gamma band, and (E) H. Gamma band.

552 **Fig. S6.** Score plots and biplots (i.e. score plot and loading plot) showing PCA result. For biplot,
553 the loading plots exhibit the contribution of the edges to clustering pattern. Left column: Score
554 plots for PCA results from all the edges; middle column: biplots for PCA results from feature-
555 reduced data with only the significant edges; right column: biplots for PCA results from data
556 with nested CV-SVM-rRF-FS selected edges. (A) Theta band, (B) Beta band and (C) L. Gamma
557 band.

558 **Fig. S7.** Score plots and VIP plots showing PLS-DA results. Left column: PLS-DA score plots
559 showing the supervised clustering pattern on both components upon PLS-DA modelling using
560 the nested CV-SVM-rRF-FS selected edges; right column: PLS-DA VIP scores for both model
561 components for all the nested CV-SVM-rRF-FS selected edges, with the horizontal dashed line
562 indicating the importance threshold (0.8), and the codes on the x-axis representing the edges. (A)
563 Theta band, (B) Beta band and (C) L. Gamma band.

564 **Fig. S8.** ROC-AUC and permutation for the PLS-DA models. Left column: ROC curve with
565 AUC values for both components. Right column: Permutation test results showing RMSEP (root
566 mean squared error of prediction) values for both final and permutation PLS-DA models for both
567 participant groups; numbers on the x-axis are the models, with 0 representing the final SVM
568 model. (A) Theta band, (B) Alpha band, (C) Beta band, (D) L. Gamma band, and (E) H. Gamma
569 band.